

DRAFT MINUTES OF THE
MARICOPA ASSOCIATION OF GOVERNMENTS
TRANSPORTATION REVIEW COMMITTEE

March 25, 2004

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

MEMBERS ATTENDING

Scottsdale: Jan Dolan, Chairperson	Litchfield Park: Mike Cartsonis
ADOT: Dan Lance	Maricopa County: Mike Ellegood
Avondale: Dave Fitzhugh	Mesa: Jim Huling for Jeff Martin
Buckeye: Joe Blanton	*Paradise Valley: Robert M. Cicarelli
Chandler: Dan Cook for Patrice Kraus	Peoria: Burton Charron for David Moody
*El Mirage: Ramon Leon	Phoenix: Tom Callow for Phoenix
*Fountain Hills: Randy Harrel	RPTA: Bryan Jungwirth
*Gilbert: Tami Ryall	Surprise: Randy Overmyer
Glendale: Terry Johnson for Jim Book	Tempe: Robert Yabes for Tempe
Goodyear: Grant Anderson	*Wickenburg: Shane Dille
*Guadalupe, Antonio Figueroa - Iturralda	

EX-OFFICIO MEMBERS ATTENDING

*Regional Bicycle Task Force: Randi Alcott, RPTA	*Pedestrian Working Group: Eric Iwersen, City of Tempe
*Street Committee: Don Herp, Phoenix	*Telecommunications Advisory Group:
*ITS Committee: Jim Book	
*Members neither present nor represented by proxy.	

OTHERS PRESENT

Eric Anderson, MAG	Mary O' Connor, City of Scottsdale
Ken Hall, MAG	Ali Makarachi, City of Phoenix
Paul Ward, MAG	Tom Remes, MAG
Steve Tate, MAG	David Meinhardt, City of Scottsdale
Lynn Timmons, City of Phoenix	Jonathan Lindsey, Fennemore Craig/BNSF
Peggy Carpenter, City of Scottsdale	Jim Creedon, Landry, Creedon and Associates
Bob Antila, RPTA	Jim Dickey, RPTA
Chris Voigt, MAG	Stuart Boggs, RPTA
Roger Herzog, MAG	Chuck Eaton, DMJM & Harris
Clem Ligocki, MCDOT	Chris Plumb, MCDOT
Dawn Coomer, MAG	

1. Call to Order

Chairperson Jan Dolan called the meeting to order at 10:12 a.m.

2. Approval of February 26, 2004 Minutes

Addressing the first order of business, Chairperson Dolan asked if there were any changes or amendments to the meeting minutes. Mr. Bryan Jungwirth moved to approve the minutes as presented. Mr. Tom Callow seconded, and the minutes were subsequently approved by unanimous voice vote of the Committee.

3. Call to the Audience

Chairperson Dolan stated that she had not received any request to speak cards from the audience, and moved to the next item on the Agenda.

4. Transportation Director's Report

Chairperson Dolan introduced Mr. Eric Anderson, MAG Transportation Director, to provide the Transportation Director's report. Mr. Anderson informed those in attendance that the federal reauthorization legislation drafted by the House Transportation and Infrastructure Committee has recently been approved by Congress. Mr. Anderson stated that the bill was approved for a total of \$275 Billion, and that it was still uncertain as to how much funding the region would receive as part of the new legislation.

Mr. Anderson then informed the Committee that there would be a plan amendment in April for the 20-mile segment of the regional Light Rail system, otherwise known as the Minimum Operating System (MOS). Mr. Anderson informed the Committee that light rail was part of the 2006 air quality conformity network, and that the plan amendment and Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) Amendment would be going before the MAG Transportation Policy Committee for approval in April, and on to the MAG Regional Council in June of 2004. Mr. Anderson then addressed activities associated with Life Cycle Program Management, and informed the Committee that MAG was working very closely with ADOT, RPTA and Valley Metro Rail on a variety of planning and programming items associated with the proposed life cycle program. Mr. Anderson then addressed a question from Mr. Mike Cartsonis regarding the Regional Arterial Program. There were no additional questions, and this concluded Mr. Anderson's report.

5. Approval of Consent Agenda

Addressing the next order of business, Chairperson Dolan addressed Agenda item #5 (Request to Amend the FY 2004-2007 MAG Transportation Improvement Program to Add a City of Phoenix Bridge Project to FY 2004), Agenda item #6 (Request to Amend the FY 2004-2007 MAG Transportation Improvement Program to Make Changes to Three Quiet Pavement Projects), Agenda item #7 (ADOT TIP Amendment), and Agenda item #8 (Project and Consultant Approvals for the MAG Pedestrian Design Assistance Program), and asked members in attendance if they would like to entertain a motion to approve these items as presented, or to remove any of the items for discussion.

Mr. Callow addressed the Committee, and requested that Agenda item #8 be removed from the Consent Agenda. Chairperson Dolan then asked for a motion, and Mr. Mike Ellegood

moved to recommend approval of consent agenda items #5, #6 and #7. Mr. Bryan Jungwirth seconded, and the motion was unanimously approved by subsequent voice vote of the Committee.

Mr. Callow called the Committee's attention to the Staff Report which was prepared for item #8 in the TRC Agenda packet. He stated that the Staff Report referenced the fact that the MAG Pedestrian Working Group approved two projects for funding, and questioned what had happened to a third project that was approved by the MAG Pedestrian Working Group at their last meeting, which was held on March 9, 2004.

Mr. Eric Anderson then called on Ms. Dawn Coomer, MAG Multi-Modal Planning Manager, who addressed the Committee. Ms. Coomer stated that at the March 2004 MAG Pedestrian Working Group Meeting, a third project was approved by the committee as a separate motion. Ms. Coomer stated that the project called for multi-use pathways along the Rio Salado Parkway in the City of Tempe for \$80,000. Ms. Coomer informed the Committee that under guidelines for eligibility, the project was not eligible for funding primarily due to the fact that the nature of the project was not pedestrian-oriented. She also said that the project was four miles long and to be eligible, it would have to be less than a half mile long. Discussion followed, and there were several questions concerning the origin and validity of the guidelines which were utilized by the MAG Pedestrian Working Group. Ms. Coomer informed the Committee that the guidelines were established by the Working Group in 1996, and had been adhered to since the group's inception.

Mr. Eric Anderson stated that the Rio Salado Multi-Use Pathway project was included in the draft MAG FY 2005 Unified Planning Work Program for \$50,000. Discussion then followed pertaining to the guidelines utilized for project selection. Several Committee members stated that in the future, the MAG TRC needed to have a better understanding of policies that were initiated at the subcommittee level. Ms. Coomer stated that the projects reviewed by the MAG Pedestrian Work Group were for the Pedestrian Design Assistance Program, which creates designs for pedestrian projects and implements the MAG *Pedestrian Area Policies and Design Guidelines*. Ms. Coomer stated that the \$80,000 in funding that was left over would be addressed at the upcoming April meeting of the MAG Pedestrian Work Group. There were no further questions from the Committee, and Mr. Grant Anderson moved to approve the Project and Consultant Approvals for the MAG Pedestrian Design Assistance Program. Mr. David Fitzhugh seconded, and the motion was unanimously approved by subsequent voice vote of the Committee.

9. Federal Fiscal Year (FFY) 2004 Interim Close Out of the MAG Federally Funded Program

Addressing the next order of business, Chairperson Dolan introduced Paul Ward, MAG Transportation Programming Manager, to provide an overview of the FFY 2004 Interim Close Out of the MAG Federally Funded Program. Mr. Ward stated that there were three phases of the Close Out Process. The first phase compares the funds available to the projects programmed and the difference is how many uncommitted funds are available. He reported that, due to the problems with the reauthorization bill, he was uncertain as to how much funding would be allocated to the MAG Region on October 1, 2004. However, ADOT staff

had provided a “best guess” estimate, based on the FY 2004 Transportation Appropriations Bill and assuming a further extension of TEA-21.

Mr. Ward reported that the Interim Phase of the close out process is when MAG staff totals up the requests by member agencies to defer projects and adds that amount to the uncommitted funds available. He called the Committee’s attention to the Attachment #5 of the Agenda packet, and informed the Committee that the projects to date which have requested a deferral total just under \$18.0 Million. Mr. Ward informed the Committee that two projects have been eliminated from the Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) and would not be constructed with federal funds, which were from the cities of Goodyear and Tempe. Mr. Ward said that after considering assignments and the reallocation of certain project funding, it was anticipated that there would be a total of approximately \$22.0 to \$23.0 million available for the Close Out process.

Mr. Ward stated that although funding was not certain until the completion of the federal authorization and sub-allocation process, he believed that the majority of funding would come from the Congestion Mitigation and Air Quality Program (CMAQ), and anticipated that less than 10 percent of all funding, if any, would come from Surface Transportation Program (STP) funding. Mr. Ward stated that the \$22.0 to \$23.0 Million would have to be utilized this Federal Fiscal Year, and that MAG Agencies are encouraged to submit requests in order to utilize the available funds. Mr. Ward informed the Committee that if member agencies can find ways of utilizing these funds, and if the region receives reauthorization later in the year, that there may be a substantial amount more than the \$22.0 or \$23.0 that he estimates is currently available. Mr. Ward informed members that he would send members more complete figures within the next week.

Mr. Ward then addressed several questions from the Committee. When asked what the difference between the “just under” \$18 million and the \$22 to \$23 million amount was, Mr. Ward explained that the difference, of approximately \$5.0 million, was the difference between what was originally programmed for the year and the amount of projects programmed, known as “uncommitted funds.” Terry Johnson then addressed the Committee, and informed Mr. Ward that the City of Glendale is officially requesting to defer their project for the installation of a computerized signal system in the amount of \$665,000, from Bell Road, 51st Avenue to 83rd Avenue, due to timing difficulties that the city has encountered during the environmental review process. Further discussion followed, and Mr. Ward answered several more questions from the Committee.

Mr. Johnson then moved to recommend approval of the Federal Fiscal Year (FFY) 2004 Interim Close Out of the MAG Federally Funded Program, to include the deferment of the City of Glendale project in the amount of \$665,000. Mr. Tom Callow seconded, and the motion was unanimously approved by subsequent voice vote of the Committee. There were no further questions, and this concluded Mr. Ward’s presentation.

10. Regional Arterial Program

Addressing the next order of business, Chairperson Dolan introduced Mr. Eric Anderson, MAG Transportation Director, who provided an overview of the Regional Arterial Program.

Mr. Anderson informed the Committee that the Regional Arterial Program included a total of 62 street projects to be phased over the duration of the Regional Transportation Plan's (RTP) 20-year planning horizon, which totaled an amount of approximately \$1.3 Billion. Mr. Anderson stated that the Regional Arterial Program also included \$113.0 Million in funding for 34 intersection projects, and \$50.0 Million in funding for arterial Intelligent Transportation System (ITS) projects. To implement the program over a 20-year period, Mr. Anderson stated that \$863 Million would come from the half-cent sales tax extension; \$497 Million would come from federal Surface Transportation Program (STP) funds; and that the remaining \$105 Million would come from federal Congestion Mitigation and Air Quality Program (CMAQ) funds.

Mr. Anderson addressed the Regional Arterial Program in relationship to the Life Cycle Budget of the future half-cent sales tax. He stated that House Bill (HB) 2456 requires MAG to adopt a budget process that ensures that the estimated cost of the arterial street mode does not exceed the total amount of revenue estimated to be available for the construction of projects. When assessing the objectives and factors of the Regional Arterial Program, Mr. Anderson stated that the sponsoring jurisdiction is the appropriate entity to manage future projects from scoping, to design, and on through to the completion of construction. Mr. Anderson stated that for projects which cross multiple jurisdictions, a lead jurisdiction needed to be identified. If in fact a lead jurisdiction could not be identified, Mr. Anderson informed the Committee that it may be necessary to break the project up individually by municipality. Discussion followed, and Mr. Anderson addressed several questions pertaining to responsible parties, applicant and certification issues, and the process of following federal procedures. Mr. Anderson stated that it was not the intent of MAG to act within a strict regulatory capacity throughout the implementation of the Regional Arterial Program.

Mr. Anderson stated that the jurisdiction should be able to change projects following a formal process, and informed those in attendance that HB 2456 specifically defines the requirements for major amendments. He also informed the Committee that jurisdictions should be able to "advance construct" projects, and would be able to request reimbursement in accordance with the adopted schedule. Mr. Anderson addressed the concept of firewall protections which assure the protection of funding, and stated that if a jurisdiction wanted to advance construct, there should be a process in place by the Committee to accommodate such a request. Mr. Anderson then addressed the life cycle program, and stated that it must include all of the arterial projects as identified within the MAG RTP. Discussion followed and Mr. Anderson addressed questions pertaining to street projects that may vary between communities, and standards that may vary by project and by jurisdiction. Mr. Anderson emphasized the importance of continuity of arterial street configuration between jurisdictions, and stated that one of the primary reasons for the survey included within Attachment Number Six of the Agenda packet was to obtain better project definitions. Mr. Anderson stated that many of the projects within the RTP have not been fully scoped at this time, and said that in the future, arterial projects will need to be scoped. Discussion followed concerning the need to encourage funding from third parties; the need to ensure adequate sales tax funds; funding availability in future years of the program; and making sure that a jurisdiction has adequate funding available prior to construction.

Mr. Anderson then addressed the need for the Committee to agree upon a structure option for the Regional Arterial Program, and presented two options to those in attendance. Mr. Anderson addressed Option Number One, and stated that the option called for a cost reimbursement program that strives to achieve 70 percent regional funding for each project. He addressed cost increases affiliated with the program; the need to ensure consistency; the process of determining eligible project components; and also addressed several challenges that were inherent within the actual life cycle program itself, which related to project costs and funding availability. Under Option One, Mr. Anderson stated that if a member agency had a project in the RTP, whether allowing for funding in two years, or ten years from now, the regional responsibility is still 70 percent. He said that this presents a problem, because when jurisdictions begin to scope projects, many of the projects will cost much more to construct than originally intended. Discussion followed, and several members of the Committee expressed concerns that scoping cost increases in the early part of the program could compromise the fiscal integrity of the program overtime.

Mr. Anderson then addressed Option Number Two, which proposes a grant-type program that reimburses jurisdictions based on RTP budgets, plus adjustments for inflation. Mr. Anderson informed the Committee that this option would require less oversight by MAG Staff, allow more flexibility for jurisdictions, and stated that the jurisdictions would be responsible to pay for cost increases in the projects. As an example, Mr. Anderson stated that if a community had a \$5.0 Million project, and after scoping it was determined that the total project cost had increased, the community would pay for anything over the initial \$5.0 Million in project allocation with local funds. Discussion followed, and members in attendance favored the second option as presented by Mr. Anderson for Regional Arterial Program funding, because it was fair and simple to understand.

Mr. Anderson then answered a number of questions from the Committee. He stated that Option Two brought certainty to the program, and that he wasn't sure whether Option One could realistically be implemented over time. After continued discussion, Chairperson Dolan summarized the Committee's preferences by stating that the overall consensus of the Committee was to chose Option Two, but that further detail needed to be gathered and presented by MAG Staff. Mr. Anderson addressed the Committee, and asked those in attendance to let him know of their concerns after they have had a chance to further review the information. Mr. Anderson informed the Committee that this particular item would once again be on the Agenda for the upcoming TRC Meeting on April 29, 2004.

Chairperson Dolan inquired about the possibility of having MAG Staff schedule an additional meeting with transportation personnel from member agencies in an effort to further address the Regional Arterial Program, and the two options that were presented at today's meeting. Mr. Anderson agreed, and informed Chairperson Dolan and those in attendance that he would follow up with this request. Further detailed discussion followed pertaining to funding flexibility; the need to develop a true "regional" system; implementing a series of project "checks and balances" for municipal applicants; the integrity behind the process of defining the original project costs; and clarification on local match requirements.

Mr. Paul Ward then called the Committee's attention to the Data Entry Forms in Attachment Number Six, and reminded the Committee that MAG Staff was attempting to receive all

information by April 30, 2004. When questioned about the deadline, Mr. Ward stated that MAG was attempting to have the appropriate information on all projects that were identified within the First Phase (2006 to 2010) in order to formally conduct an Air Quality Conformity Assessment on them. Mr. Ward informed the Committee that in accordance with the forms, he would need a map of the project; a detailed description of the project; information on ITS and relevant Multi-modal issues; cost estimates; a schedule for project development; detailed zoning and planning maps pertaining to the project, along with information on developer involvement; a TIP Data Sheet, which is information needed by MAG Staff in order to place the projects into the MAG TIP; and detailed CMS and CMAQ Data. Mr. Ward stated that the major Staff priorities at this time centered upon receiving enough guidance to detail specific project information for the first two phases, and receiving Data Sheets in order to identify the projects that communities were going to “advance construct” over the next five years.

Discussion followed, and Mr. Jim Huling questioned whether an April 30th deadline allowed the City of Mesa and other communities with enough time. Mr. Anderson informed the Committee that realistically speaking, the official deadline for the project submittals was in January of 2005. However, Mr. Anderson stated that this was essentially an “early warning” in order to ensure that all projects are received by the Fall. He said that if any member agencies needed more time, and could not meet the April 30, 2004, deadline, to please give MAG Staff a call. There were no further questions from the Committee, and this concluded Mr. Anderson’s presentation.

11. Next Meeting Date

Chairperson Dolan informed members in attendance that the next meeting of the Committee would be held on April 29, 2004. There being no further business, Chairperson Dolan adjourned the meeting at 11:10 a.m.