

June 5, 2012

TO: Members of the MAG Bicycle and Pedestrian Committee

FROM: Reed Kempton, Scottsdale, Chair of the MAG Bicycle and Pedestrian Committee

SUBJECT: MEETING NOTIFICATION AND TRANSMITTAL OF TENTATIVE AGENDA

Tuesday, June 19, 2012 at 1:30 p.m.
MAG Offices, Ironwood Room, Second Floor
302 North First Avenue, Phoenix

A meeting of the MAG Bicycle and Pedestrian Committee will be held at the time and place noted above. Committee members may attend the meeting either in **person, by video conference or by telephone conference call**. Those attending by videoconference must notify the MAG site five days before the meeting. Those attending by telephone conference call are requested to call (602) 744-5840 and the meeting I.D. is 2453.

If you are attending in person, please park in the garage under the building. Bring your ticket to the meeting and parking will be validated. For those using transit, the Regional Public Transportation Authority will provide transit tickets for your trip. For those using bicycles, please lock your bicycle in the bike rack in the parking garage.

Pursuant to Title II of the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA), MAG does not discriminate on the basis of disability in admissions to or participation in its public meetings. Persons with a disability may request a reasonable accommodation, such as a sign language interpreter, by contacting Maureen DeCindis at the MAG office. Requests should be made as early as possible to allow time to arrange the accommodation.

Please be advised that under procedures adopted by the MAG Regional Council on June 26, 1996, all MAG committees need to have a quorum to conduct business. A quorum is a simple majority of the membership. If you are unable to attend the meeting, please make arrangements for a proxy from your jurisdiction to represent you. If you have any questions, please contact Maureen DeCindis at (602) 452-5073, or send email to mdecindis@azmag.gov.

TENTATIVE AGENDA

1. Call to Order

2. Approval of the May 15, 2012 Meeting Minutes of the Bicycle and Pedestrian Committee.

3. Call to the Audience

An opportunity will be provided to members of the public to address the committee on items not scheduled on the agenda that fall under the jurisdiction of MAG, or on items on the agenda for discussion but not for action. Members of the public will be requested not to exceed a three minute time period for their comments. A total of 15 minutes will be provided for the Call to the Audience agenda item, unless the Committee requests an exception to this limit. Please note that those wishing to comment on action agenda items will be given an opportunity at the time the item is heard. Please fill out blue cards for Call to the Audience and yellow cards for Action Items.

4. Staff and Member Agency Reports

Staff and committee members are invited to provide an update of pedestrian and bicycle-related activity in their agencies.

5. MAG Bicycles Count Project

MAG staff will give an update status on the contract for the consultant for the MAG Bicycles Count project.

2. For information, discussion and action to approve the meeting minutes of the May 15, 2012 Bicycle and Pedestrian Committee meeting.

3. For information.

4. For information and discussion.

5. For information and discussion.

6. Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) 2015, 2016, 2017 Applications

MAG staff will distribute the revised TIP application which incorporated the Congestion Mitigation (CMP) questions. Discussion will address the new electronic process, new criteria, and the new scoring system. See Attachment #1.

7. MAG Bike Map

MAG staff will give a status update on the printing of the 2012 MAG Regional Bikeways Map. Committee members will be asked to approve the final draft front and back of the bike map.

8. FTA Discretionary Grant Process

For the past four years, the Federal Transit Administration (FTA) has made available discretionary transit grants to MAG member agencies. While MAG has coordinated the efforts with City of Phoenix and RPTA, the process has evolved and has not been formalized. In advance of future grant opportunities, MAG staff is proposing transit committee members formally recommend a process for applying for FTA discretionary grants. The process will include coordination with the MAG Bicycle and Pedestrian Committee in recommending for approval to regional council a policy framework, application process, and evaluation criteria. MAG staff is requesting a meeting of the Transit Operators Working Group including a representative from the Bicycle and Pedestrian Committee, to help draft the evaluation criteria. Please see Attachment #2 for additional information.

9. Request for Future Agenda Items

Members will have the opportunity to suggest future agenda topics.

6. For information and discussion.

7. For information and discussion.

8. For information and discussion.

10. For information and discussion.

10. Next Meetings

All meetings will be on the third Tuesday of the month in the Ironwood Room at 1:30 p.m., except where otherwise noted.

July 17, 2012

August 21, 2012

September 18, 2012

October 16, 2012

November 20, 2012

December 18, 2012 (noon)

MINUTES OF THE
MARICOPA ASSOCIATION OF GOVERNMENTS
BICYCLE AND PEDESTRIAN COMMITTEE

Tuesday, May 15, 2012 at 1:30 p.m.
MAG Office Building, Ironwood Room
302 North First Avenue, Phoenix

MEMBERS ATTENDING

Reed Kempton, Scottsdale, Chair of Bicycle and Pedestrian Committee	Ken Maruyama, Gilbert
Margaret Boone, Avondale, Vice-Chair of Bicycle and Pedestrian Committee	^ Steve Hancock, Glendale
Michael Sanders, ADOT	^ Joe Schmitz, Goodyear
* Tiffany Halperin, ASLA, Arizona Chapter	Julius Diogenes for M.Cartsonis, Litchfield Pk
* Robert Wisener, Buckeye	Denise Lacey, Maricopa County
* D.J. Stapley, Carefree	Jim Hash, Mesa
Chris Mosely for Bob Beane, Coalition of Arizona Bicyclists	Brandon Forrey, Peoria
^ Ann Marie Riley for Jason Crampton, Chandler	Katherine Coles, Phoenix
* Mark Smith, El Mirage	Dawn Coomer, RPTA
	Karen Savage, Surprise
	Eric Iwersen, Tempe
	* Mark Hannah, Youngtown

*Members neither present nor represented by proxy.

^Attended via audio-conference

OTHERS PRESENT

Peter Schelstraete, Tempe Transp. Commission	Anissa Jonovich, RPTA
Vince Lopez, Maricopa County Public Health	Lee Jimenez, MCDOT
Jothan Samuelson, MAG	Steve Tate

1. Call to Order

Reed Kempton called the meeting to order at 1:30 p.m.

2. Approval of the April 17, 2012 Meeting Minutes of the Bicycle and Pedestrian Committee

Denise Lacey moved to approve the meeting minutes of the Bicycle and Pedestrian Committee for April 17, 2012. Dawn Coomer seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

3. Call to the Audience

An opportunity was provided to members of the public to address the MAG Bicycle and Pedestrian Committee on items not scheduled on the agenda that fall under the jurisdiction of MAG, or on items on the agenda for discussion but not for action. Members of the public were requested not to exceed a three minute time period for their comments. A total of 15 minutes was provided for the Call to the Audience agenda item, unless the Bicycle and the Pedestrian Committee requests an exception to this limit. Please note that those wishing to comment on action agenda items were given an opportunity at the time the item was heard.

4. Staff and Member Agency Reports

Ken Maruyama said that the town of Gilbert celebrated with bike events for Valley Bike Month. Ann Marie Riley reported that the city of Chandler had 400 people participate in three Valley Bike Month rides. In Tempe, Eric Iwersen announced the mayor's ride and other events attracted 500 riders with six businesses offering free breakfast. Jim Hash said that Mesa hosted their event in conjunction with the El Tour de Mesa attracting 4,500 people. There was a Cyclovia and Bike Swap Meet as well. The Mesa Bike to Work drew 97 employees. Jim Hash reminded committee members that on Wednesday May 16th there will be a Ride of Silence from Mountain View Park (on the northeast corner of Lindsay and Adobe) in Mesa to Gilbert. Reed Kempton reported that the Scottsdale Cycle to the Arts was successful as well as the Bike to Work day event.

5. MAG Bicycles Count Project: Bicycles Count Station Selection Process and Preliminary Results

The consultant has performed a preliminary selection of bicycle count stations for the MAG Bicycles Count project. Sherry Ryan explained the methodology, described the selection process and presented the preliminary results. If you look at the map that was distributed as a handout, there are 200 locations based on the siting criteria. There were three main criteria: demographics (population, employment density and income) for the MAG region. Sherry Ryan also explained that she took into account the locations submitted by local jurisdictions and then tried to locate the count station sites on existing bicycle facilities. In the table, the sites are listed in alphabetical order by jurisdiction name. Two hundred is good number to achieve comprehensive coverage. Even though, we can't use all of these at this time due to funding restrictions, but this will act as a goal.

The table reflects how the sites are situated across the region and are compared to the percent of the population. Sherry Ryan said that she needs input on refining count station locations from committee members:

- which locations should be eliminated
- which sites need to be added
- which are the priority locations in your city
- list any future sites where bike facility projects are planned to be built

MAG staff will send out the map and the table electronically with a due date when this information is due.

Maureen DeCindis explained that there some jurisdictions that were not counted. It was agreed that MAG staff would contact them and request their participation. Sherry Ryan explained that many of the sites were selected based on the bike facilities network. Eric Iwersen asked how they would do counts on grade separated intersections. Sherry Ryan said it would similar to two segment counts. Brandon Forrey asked about locations with future facilities which will give before and after counts. If each jurisdiction could add those “future” sites, that would be helpful. Margaret Boone said that she has a new site that she would like to submit. Sherry Ryan responded that members should add as many sites as they would like to see in the basic report. Denise Lacey asked about the area north of the 101 and in the Buckeye area as these are in the Maricopa County unincorporated area. Sherry Ryan responded that Denise Lacey should put together a list of station count sites in these unincorporated areas. Reed Kempton said that the map needs more street names.

6. Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) 2015, 2016, 2017 Applications

MAG staff distributed the revised TIP application which incorporated the Congestion Mitigation (CMP) questions. There are two applications: one for facility projects and one for education projects. Reed Kempton explained that the discussion will address:

- the issue of whether there should be a set-aside of funding for regional or sub-regional education projects and should way-finding projects be part of the education fund
- the new questions in the updated TIP application for facility and education projects
- the Bicycle Level of Service formula and consider whether to incorporate that formula into the TIP application questions
- the cost estimate form - should this ADOT enhancement form be used in the TIP application or should it be modified?

Maureen DeCindis explained that the evaluation criteria will be discussed at the June meeting

A member asked if the question in the TIP application in Part B “*Is this a one time opportunity?*” necessary? Is this a valid question? Eric Iwersen said he always marked yes as each project is urgent. Reed Kempton suggested that this question is appropriate if a city would be able to save money if this project is tied into another project or can be partly funded with a private development project. Katherine Coles suggested that members add that information in the response to question number 14. Reed Kempton said to change water fountains to drinking fountains. Katherine Coles asked the committee if they wanted to identify a separate pot of funding for education projects. In some years if an amount allocated, there might not be enough projects to use the funding. Brandon Forrey said that the money would just be folded into the money for the facilities projects. Reed Kempton suggested ranking education projects first and then rank the facilities projects. Maureen DeCindis asked if way-finding projects should be considered under the education application. Dawn Coomer noted that way-finding projects would probably need to move dirt and therefore would need to use the facility application.

Eric Iwersen asked if there would be separate criteria for education projects. Maureen DeCindis responded that there would be separate criteria for each application. Eric Iwersen said that because there is limited funds for facilities, he hesitated to share the funding with education unless it is a very good

educational project. Dawn Coomer noted that funding in the past has come from MAG Planning funds and STP funds for education projects. Steve Tate commented that the MAG Safety Committee has used HSIP money for bike safety education

Reed Kempton suggested putting aside \$200,000 - \$300,000 for bike education projects. If the projects are not worthy, the projects would not get funded. The committee would only fund projects that were justified. Dawn Coomer noted that the last question in the education application asks for measures of success of a project. It may not measure congestion mitigation per se but there are other evaluative criteria. Denise Lacey said that she recalled a discussion that up to 20% of all funding should go for educational projects. Brandon Forrey acknowledged that he could not remember that discussion.

Denise Lacey made a motion for two separate funds, one for facilities and one for education. Jim Hash seconded the motion. Reed Kempton asked for discussion and asked if the committee wanted to identify the exact amount of funding, leave it flexible or determine a percentage? Brandon Forrey said that he did not want to see an artificial project for a fixed dollar. Maybe the committee should rank education projects first and not be concerned with an allocated special amount. Let's rank good projects with good value and then move on to ranking the facility projects. There was no action taken on this motion.

Dawn Coomer made a motion that she likes the set aside concept and made a motion that up to 2% of the total amount for each year should be allocated towards education projects. Maureen DeCindis asked for a specific amount. Dawn Coomer responded with an amount of \$200,000. Brandon Forrey seconded the motion. Ken Maruyama asked if other jurisdictions beside Valley Metro could submit education projects. Reed Kempton reaffirmed that the education project category is open to all jurisdictions. Dawn Coomer noted that jurisdictions could work together and with the Coalition of Arizona Bicyclists to put together a joint project. Brandon Forrey noted that the current motion has a cap. Reed Kempton said that the other 98% of the funding would not have any restrictions and could fund more education projects. Katherine Coles suggested using the word "approximately" in the motion. Dawn Coomer amended her motion to read that "Approximately 2% of CMAQ funding would be allocated to education projects". Reed Kempton called for the vote. All voted for the motion except for Eric Iwersen who opposed the motion.

Maureen DeCindis explained that if the committee wanted to consider Bicycle Level of Service score, this would entail collecting the width of the lanes because the ADT (average daily traffic) count, the posted is already collected in the application. Reed Kempton suggested that the percentage of truck traffic can be estimated as well as the quality of pavement. If the pavement is twenty years old and has ruts it can be deemed low quality. Scottsdale did Bicycle Level of Service (BLOS) for its streets. Steve Tate suggested collecting a BLOS for the current level of service and for the future level of service. Reed Kempton said that it is only applicable for on-street projects because it does not work for shared use projects. Brandon Forrey asked if it would be applicable if one calculated the nearest for BLOS for an adjacent street. Brandon Forrey made a motion to incorporate BLOS and "before bicycle counts" on bike projects in the application. Dawn seconded the motion. How does BLOS affect the pedestrian only project? Reed Kempton asked for the vote. No one voted for the motion. No one voted against the motion. Brandon Forrey pulled the motion.

Maureen DeCindis asked whether the application should require “before” bike counts on each project. Reed Kempton suggested using a latent demand number from the pedestrian plan which may be a more important number for shared-use facilities.

Eric Iwerson noted that BLOS is very different from the road level of service. Some streets are level F for cars but community members really like the interaction in a dynamic area such as downtown. Steve Tate said the BLOS measures quality of the biking experience. Reed Kempton explained that using the BLOS is more of a comparison for ranking quality of the bike projects. It is a way of prioritizing projects.

Reed Kempton suggested that doing “before” bike counts should not be considered in this round of TIP applications but rather after the consultant in the Bicycles Count project develops a standard methodology for counting bikes in the region. The committee agreed.

Maureen DeCindis asked if the ADOT Enhancement Cost Estimate Sheet should be included in the TIP application as is or should it be modified? Members said that they will take the Cost Estimate Sheet back to their respective jurisdictions for input and this should be considered at the June meeting.

7. MAG Bike Map

MAG staff will give a status update on the printing of the 2012 MAG Regional Bikeways Map. Maureen DeCindis asked how many more cities have last minute bike projects that need to be listed on the map. She will send out a final notice via email to members.

8. Request for Future Agenda Items

Members had the opportunity to suggest future agenda items.

- Criteria for TIP applications
- ADOT Enhancement Cost Estimate Sheet
- MAG Bike Map

9. Next Meetings

All meetings will be on the third Tuesday of the month in the Ironwood Room at 1:30 p.m., except where otherwise noted.

June 19, 2012
July 17, 2012
August 21, 2012
September 18, 2012
October 16, 2012
November 20, 2012
December 18, 2012 (noon)

PART B-PEDESTRIAN, BICYCLE & SHARED-USE PROJECT DESCRIPTION AND PROPOSED IMPROVEMENTS

This part of the form identifies the current characteristics and proposed improvements for each project.

The purpose of Part B is to provide sufficient information to evaluate the cost estimate for the project and to provide assurance that the project will be capable of meeting the ADOT administered federal design review and clearance process. This process requires environmental, ROW and utilities clearances and a bid ready design prior to FHWA approval to encumber federal funding for construction.

Section 1 - Project Description

1. What is the type of bicycle project? (Check all that apply)

- Bicycle lane (4' min. w/o curb/gutter)
- Bicycle lane (5' min. with curb/gutter)
- Shared-use path (10' min.)
- Bridge (overpass)
- Tunnel (underpass)
- Paved shoulders (5' min.)
- Signalized crossing
- Signalized midblock crossing/HAWK
- Mid-block crossing w/ pedestrian refuge
- Other

1a. What is the type of pedestrian project? (Check all that apply)

- Sidewalk (5' min.)
- Wide sidewalk (8' min.)
- Detached sidewalk (4' min. buffer)
- Bridge (overpass)
- Tunnel (underpass)
- Signalized crossing
- Signalized midblock crossing/HAWK
- Mid-block crossing w/ pedestrian refuge
- Other

2. Please describe the facility on which the improvement will be located.

For a linear feature please enter the Facility Name, Starting Limit and Ending Limit. For a point feature (e.g. an intersection or crossing) please enter a Facility Name and a Crossing Feature.

Type of Facility

Arterial Road
Collector Road
Residential Road
Unpaved Road/Path

Length (in Miles)

Posted Speed Limit (MPH)

Through Lanes

3. Please provide a map, aerial map, graphics and photos that clearly show the segment alignment and features that connect to other bicycle facilities and that cross into or about the alignment such as: washes, canals, railroad crossings, and other crossing features that may affect the project.

4. Please provide a simple diagram of the current typical cross section, including widths, of the segment that shows the right of way limits, sidewalks and shoulders (if any), and the lanes of travel.

PART B-PEDESTRIAN, BICYCLE & SHARED-USE PROJECT DESCRIPTION AND PROPOSED IMPROVEMENTS

5. Please provide an estimated traffic volume (ADT) below.

ADT Estimate	Name of road the traffic count was taken from	Date Counted
<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>

Description of Methodology used for the ADT Estimate

6. Federal law requires that all federally funded projects comply with a federal environmental clearance. For projects that have a minimum ground disturbance, environmental surveys are required and an environmental document will need to be prepared, which typically requires 12 months to complete. Describe any known cultural, historical and biological resources, hazardous materials or other environmental issues that could affect work on the segment.

Describe any known cultural, historical and biological resources, hazardous materials or other environmental issues that could affect work on the segment.

7. Current ROW: (Check all that apply)

- Agency owns all ROW Needed
- Agency owns easement
- ROW to be acquired
- Agency has right-of-use (i.e. canal)
- Owners will donate ROW
- Condemnation may be required

8. Please describe any right of way issues associated with the project.

PART B-PEDESTRIAN, BICYCLE & SHARED-USE PROJECT DESCRIPTION AND PROPOSED IMPROVEMENTS

9. Current Utilities in or abutting the alignment: (Check all that apply)

- No Utility in or abutting the alignment
- Pipelines, Sewer and Water
- Canals & Drainage
- Private Structures
- Power Lines & Cables
- Other

10. Please describe any utility conflicts that will need to be addressed.

Section 2 - Proposed Improvements

11. Please describe the work to be performed on the project:

12. Guidelines used to develop project: (Check all that apply)

- MAG Pedestrian Policies and Design Guidelines
- MAG Complete Streets Guide
- AASHTO Guide for Bicycle Facilities
- Other

13. Why is this project an enhancement to the local and/or regional transportation system? Is this a one-time opportunity?

PART B-PEDESTRIAN, BICYCLE & SHARED-USE PROJECT DESCRIPTION AND PROPOSED IMPROVEMENTS

14. Please describe the current surface condition of the proposed project

15a. Safety improvements to be included for bike facilities: (Check all that apply)

<input type="checkbox"/> Wide bike lanes (6'-7')	<input type="checkbox"/> Signalized crossing
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade-separated crossing (overpass or underpass)	<input type="checkbox"/> Path lighting
Buffer Zone, Width <input type="text"/>	Other <input type="text"/>

15b. Safety improvements to be included for pedestrian facilities: (Check all that apply)

<input type="checkbox"/> Wide sidewalk (8' min.)	<input type="checkbox"/> Signalized crossing
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade-separated crossing (overpass or underpass)	<input type="checkbox"/> Path lighting
Buffer Zone, Width <input type="text"/>	<input type="checkbox"/> Shade
	Other <input type="text"/>

16a. Number of convenience improvements to be included for bike facilities:

<input type="text" value="0"/> Number of Drinking Fountains	<input type="text" value="0"/> Number of Seating/Rest(s)
<input type="text" value="0"/> Number of Way-finding Signs	<input type="text" value="0"/> Number of Trees/shade structures
<input type="text" value="0"/> Number of Bike racks/lockers	Other <input type="text"/>
<input type="text" value="0"/> Number of Trash receptacles	

16b. Number of convenience improvements to be included for pedestrian facilities:

<input type="text" value="0"/> Number of Drinking Fountains	<input type="text" value="0"/> Number of Seating/Rest(s)
<input type="text" value="0"/> Number of Way-finding Signs	<input type="text" value="0"/> Number of Trees/shade structures
<input type="text" value="0"/> Number of Trash receptacles	Other <input type="text"/>

17. How does this project improve upon an existing safety issue?

18. How does the project improve ADA facilities for persons with disabilities?

PART B-PEDESTRIAN, BICYCLE & SHARED-USE PROJECT DESCRIPTION AND PROPOSED IMPROVEMENTS

19. Connectivity: (Check all that apply)

Project fills a gap in the system

Project is on a regional facility

Regional Facility Name

Multi Jurisdiccional Project

List of Participating Jurisdictions

Project connects to other local facilities

Number of transit routes and Park & rides served.

List: route number(s)/park & ride(s) served.

20. Total length of facility connected by this project (in miles)

21. Number of activity centers (parks, libraries, senior centers, recreational centers, etc.) this project will benefit:

Within 1/4 mile List:

1/4 mile to 1/2 mile List:

1/2 mile to 1 mile List:

21. Number of commercial destinations (malls, retail centers, business parks, etc.) and transit services (bus/rail routes, stops, and stations) this project will benefit:

Within 1/4 mile List:

1/4 mile to 1/2 mile List:

1/2 mile to 1 mile List:

22. Number of schools (public elementary, middle, and high schools, colleges, and universities) this project will benefit:

Within 1/4 mile List:

1/4 mile to 1/2 mile List:

1/2 mile to 1 mile List:

23. What are the demographics of the area served:

+15 Units 15 - 5 Units < 5 Units Housing Density (Number of dwelling units per acre) within 1/2 mile

The project is in a block group where the average household income is less than \$26,000/year (Use blockgroup data from the Census 2010)

The project is in an area that serves adults over the age of 60 years (Use blockgroup data from the Census 2010)

24. Jurisdiction has the following policies for improved bicycle/shared use facilities:

With new development and capital improvement projects, bike lanes on arterial streets are: Required Recommended Not Addressed

With new development and capital improvement projects, bike lanes on collector streets are: Required Recommended Not Addressed

PART B-PEDESTRIAN, BICYCLE & SHARED-USE PROJECT DESCRIPTION AND PROPOSED IMPROVEMENTS

With pavement restoration or regular pavement maintenance on arterial streets, bike lanes are:

Required Recommended Not Addressed

With new development or during development retrofits, shared-use paths are:

Required Recommended Not Addressed

Bicycle program implemented, including bike education, safety events, and bike maps

Required Recommended Not Addressed

Complete Streets Policy

Required Recommended Not Addressed

35. The project is: (Check one)

Identified in General Plan, council adopted policy, or Capital Improvements Program

List:

Consistent with general policy/practices, but not formally identified

Explain:

Not addressed by jurisdiction's plans, policies, or practices

34. Describe how this project will be publicized to the general public.

35. How will you determine customer satisfaction/evaluation?

June xx, 2012

To: Members of the MAG Transit Committee
From: Alice Chen
Subject: Federal Discretionary Grants Process

Background

For the past four years, the Federal Transit Administration (FTA) has made available discretionary transit grants to MAG member agencies. While MAG has coordinated the efforts with City of Phoenix and RPTA, the process has evolved and has not been formalized. In advance of future grant opportunities, MAG staff is proposing transit committee members formally recommend a process for applying for FTA discretionary grants. The process will include coordination with the MAG Bicycle and Pedestrian Committee in recommending for approval to regional council a policy framework, application process, and evaluation criteria. MAG staff is requesting a meeting of the Transit Operators Working Group including a representative from the Bicycle and Pedestrian Committee, to help draft the evaluation criteria. The proposed process is outlined in five (5) parts below.

Part 1: Proposed Grant Development Process

This part discusses the proposed *Grant Development* process. It provides a timeline for the next few months as the process is being developed and recommended to Regional Council for approval. When completed, it is expected that MAG Regional Council will have approved a process and evaluation criteria for future grant applications.

June 2012 (Current)

- Transit and Bicycle and Pedestrian Committee - Present Proposed Grant Process
- Set up Transit Operators Working Group (TOWG), including a representative from Bicycle and Pedestrian Committee
- Use the 2011 Evaluation Criteria as a starting point (**Attachment XX**)

July 2012

- Transit Committee- Present draft Evaluation Criteria from Transit Operators Working Group
- TOWG Meet again if necessary

August 2012

- TOWG Meet again if necessary

September 2012

- Transit Committee to finalize process and evaluation criteria
- Finalize approval from MAG Regional Council

Part 2: Proposed Project Selection Process

This part discusses the proposed *Project Selection* process. When completed and approved by Regional Council, it is the process by which MAG member agencies will follow for future Transit Discretionary Grants.

Month #1 –November (Tentative):

- Introduce process to Transit and Bike/Pedestrian committees
- Set up Operators Working Group Meeting (TOWG)
- TOWG to compile list of “qualifying” regional projects (see note box)

Month #2 – January (Tentative):

- Transit Committee categorize projects into grant programs and approve final list of projects to move forward with ranking process
- Transit Operators Working Group rank projects utilizing feedback and project criteria check list

Month #3 – February (Tentative):

- Transit Committee review ranked list of projects and recommends projects for submittal or
- List of recommended projects to be approved by MAG Regional Council

Month #4 or Month of NOFA Release:

- Project applications recommended for approval due to MAG

Month of NOFA Release:

- MAG/RPTA/COP Staff collaborate to compile final draft for submission

Part 3: Proposed Qualifying Criteria for All Projects

As part of the process, it is proposed that all projects are first subject to a set of *Qualifying Criteria*. If projects do not demonstrate all parts of the *Qualifying Criteria*, it is to be ineligible to move forward in the *Project Selection* Process.

- Demonstrates requirements of the program
- Local Match as demonstrated by either the:
 - CIP Budget or
 - Letter of Commitment
- Project Scope
- NEPA Started (non-CE projects) or Demonstration of CE

Part 4: Evaluation Criteria

This part discusses the criteria by which to evaluate projects that have deemed as eligible given the *Qualifying Criteria* stated in Part 3. As stated in the most current as well as all prior years, each grant program has a differing set of evaluation criteria stated in the Notices of Funding Availability. The *Evaluation Criteria's* rating system will be based on the committee's final recommendation in *Evaluation*

Framework in Part 5. The prior years' evaluation criteria are attached. Currently, there are three grant programs to be evaluated as part of this process.

State of Good Repair

Section I: Demonstration of Need

Section II: Planning and Local & Regional Prioritization/Project Readiness

Bus Livability

Section I: Linkage to Livability Principles

Section II: Planning and Local & Regional Prioritization/Project Readiness

Section III: Leveraging of Public and Private Investments

Clean Fuels

Section I: Demonstration of Need/Technological Advancement

Section II: Planning and Local & Regional Prioritization/Project Readiness

Part 5: Evaluation Framework

This part discusses the need for an *Evaluation Framework*. Upon approval, the region would utilize the *Evaluation Framework* by which the *Evaluation Criteria* as discussed in Part 4 will be established. In Fiscal Year 2012, the Transit Operators Working Group utilized the following framework:

- Achieve maximum funding for the region
- Provide funding for projects that have the most benefit to the most number of people – either directly or indirectly

Please be prepared provide feedback and comments on the concepts stated above. If you have any questions, please contact Alice Chen at the MAG office at 602-254-6300 or achen@azmag.gov.