

MEETING MINUTES  
MARICOPA ASSOCIATION OF GOVERNMENTS  
TRANSIT COMMITTEE

January 12, 2012  
Maricopa Association of Governments; Ironwood Room;  
302 N. 1<sup>st</sup> Avenue, Suite 200  
Phoenix, Arizona

MEMBERS ATTENDING

*ADOT: Mike Normand	#Peoria: Maher Hazine
Avondale: Kristen Sexton for Rogene Hill	Phoenix: Neal Young
#Buckeye: Andrea Marquez	*Queen Creek: Tom Condit
Chandler: Ann Marie Riley for RJ Zeder	Scottsdale: Madeline Clemann
#El Mirage: Lance Calvert	Surprise: David Kohlbeck
Gilbert: Ken Maruyama	#Tempe: Robert Yabes for Jyme Sue McLaren
Glendale: Cathy Colbath, Chair	Tolleson: Chris Hagen
Goodyear: Cato Esquivel	Valley Metro Rail: Ben Limmer for Wulf Grote
Maricopa County: Mitch Wagner	*Youngtown: Grant Anderson
Mesa: Mike James, Vice Chair	Regional Public Transportation Authority: Carol Ketcherside
*Paradise Valley: William Mead	

\*Members neither present nor represented by proxy. + - Attended by Videoconference  
# - Attended by Audioconference

OTHERS PRESENT

Eileen Yazzie, MAG  
Alice Chen, MAG  
Teri Kennedy, MAG

Jenna Goad, Glendale  
Christine McMurdy, Goodyear  
Jeff Martin, Mesa  
Ken Kessler, Phoenix  
Kini Knudson, Phoenix  
Eve Ng, Scottsdale  
John Lopez, Tolleson  
Bob Reiss, Gannett Fleming

1. Call to Order

The meeting was called to order at 1:02 p.m. by Chair Cathy Colbath. Chair Colbath welcomed everyone in attendance and announced that a quorum was present. She noted that the following members were joining the meeting by teleconference, Ms. Andrea Marquez of Buckeye, Mr. Lance Calvert of El Mirage, Mr. Maher Hazine of Peoria and Mr. Robert Yabes of Tempe. Chair Colbath asked if there were any public comment cards, and there being none, proceeded to the next item on the agenda.

2. Approval of Draft December 8, 2011 Minutes

Chair Colbath asked if there were any comments or corrections to the Draft December 8, 2011 meeting minutes. Hearing no comments or corrections to the meeting minutes, Chair Colbath called for a motion to approve the draft meeting minutes. Mr. Mike James of Mesa moved to approve the motion. Ms. Madeline Clemann of Scottsdale seconded, and the motion passed unanimously.

3. Call to the Audience

Chair Colbath stated that she had not received any request to speak cards from the audience and moved onto the next item on the agenda.

4. Transit Program Manager's Report

Chair Colbath introduced Ms. Eileen Yazzie who presented her Transit Program Manager's Report.

Ms. Yazzie began her report by noting that she had two introductions. She welcomed Mr. Neal Young, the new City of Phoenix Public Transit Director. She also introduced Ms. Teri Kennedy, the new MAG Transportation Improvement Program Manager. She noted that Ms. Kennedy came to MAG from ADOT and would be handling the TIP and programming responsibilities.

Ms. Yazzie updated the Committee on a previously posed question from December by Mr. Maher Hazine. Mr. Hazine's question was if the Preventive Maintenance (PM) cost was a reimbursable item if it was associated with taxi-cab companies that were contracted for ADA service or Dial A Ride service. She noted that she and MAG Planner Marc Pearsall inquired with the Federal Transit Administration on the issue, and that the FTA had responded with an answer to the eligibility inquiry. The FTA clarified that 5307 funds were not reimbursable if the services were used to maintain privately owned-for profit vehicles. The ownership and maintenance of the privately owned vehicle is assumed to be included in the contracting cost of doing business between a private contractor and a public agency. However, if it were a vehicle purchased under 5310, 5316 or 5317 in which the public agency owns the vehicle, then preventive maintenance could be utilized. Additional discussion pertaining to East Valley Dial A Ride followed.

Chair Colbath thanked Ms. Yazzie for her report and asked if there were any questions or comments. Hearing no further comments or questions, Chair Colbath proceeded to the next item on the agenda.

## 5. Federal Transit Discretionary Grants

Chair Colbath introduced Ms. Alice Chen of MAG to brief the committee on an update regarding Federal Transit Discretionary Grants.

Ms. Chen noted that the item was on the agenda for information and discussion. She noted that in recent years, the federal government has switched from the previous earmark allocation to a new discretionary competitive grant process. She proceeded to give an overview of the process that MAG has followed over the past two years, as well as some insight into 2012 and actions that the region may want to take in the future.

Ms. Chen then referred the members to her presentation, where she reviewed the 2010 Results. She noted that the date of the first discretionary Notice of Funding Availability (NOFA) was Dec 2009, and that the time between the NOFA and submittal deadline was 6 weeks. She added that the total number of grants submitted by region was eleven, with a total requested funding value of \$109.8 Million. The total award to the region was \$9.0 Million, a percentage of 8.2%. She then referred to the 2011 Results, and that the date of the first discretionary NOFA was June 2011. The time duration between the NOFA and submittal deadline was 4-8 weeks. The number of grants submitted by the MAG region was five, with a total requested funding value of \$135.4 Million. The award for the region was \$10.4 Million, and percentage of 7.7%.

Ms. Chen then recapped the 2010 time-line of events. She explained that the “not applicable” were placeholders for what the region did differently in 2011. She also noted that the red blocks indicated federal events and the purple were regional events. She then described that bus livability was first, with an 8 week deadline; followed by Clean fuels at 8 weeks; SGR at 6 weeks; and TIGGER grants at 4 months. She stated that within the 2011 time-line of events, there was a Technical Working Group meeting that included transit operators. She noted however that local lead time was probably not sufficient, although it was the best given the short deadline. She noted that all were working concurrently was moving the projects through the MAG committee process.

She then explained some 2012 assumptions. NOFAs with same criteria / funding requirement will be made available in 2012. The time-line between the released date and submittal date will be 4–8 weeks. She said that one observation was that fewer applications and greater regional collaboration from a single region has lead to greater success in peer regions. Additionally, repeat requests for funding can be successful. For example, she noted that METRO’s solar panel project and COP’s refurbishment projects were repeat requests in 2010 and 2011, although METRO did modify the application to include private entity partnership.

Ms. Chen then summarized the proposed 2012 preliminary time-line. There was a January Transit Committee meeting with a review of 2011; followed by a Transit Operators Working Group Meeting during the week of January 23<sup>rd</sup>. By the end of February, projects will be verified for eligibility and City Council Approval, which may take 4 weeks. By February 24, the Local Application will be completed (4 weeks) and by March 23 the Regional Application completed(4 weeks). She noted that in the March/April time-frame, both SGR/Livability Federal Submittal and Clean Fuels will be readied for federal submittal; however, both submittals were dependent on continuing resolutions and NOFA release dates.

Chair Colbath thanked Ms. Chen and asked if there were any questions or comments. Ms. Madeline Clemann stated that she had two questions. She added that Ms. Chen's presentation had a lot of valuable information and requested that the powerpoint be emailed to the committee members. Ms. Chen replied that it was currently on the website and could also be emailed on request. Ms. Clemann also asked about Phoenix' diesel hybrid vehicles submittal and if it reflected an award directly to Phoenix, instead of the region. Ms. Chen deferred the question to Mr. Ken Kessler of Phoenix for clarification. Mr. Kessler replied that the chart was incorrect and that it should be corrected. Ms. Chen noted that the information would be revised and redistributed to the members.

Discussion regarding TIGGER allocations and distributions member agencies as well as agency collaborations followed. Questions about the Transit Operators Working group meeting also followed. Mr. Ben Limmer added some commentary on the pending NOFA schedule and its due dates from the FTA. He noted that he would be happy to provide the calendar list to those members who request it. Vice Chair James of Mesa also requested that MAG staff inquire and research what the national trends have been for funding bus, bus facilities and regional transit projects, as it appeared that collaboration was key to obtaining federal funding.

Chair Colbath thanked Ms. Chen and asked if there were any further questions or comments. Hearing no further comments or questions, Chair Colbath proceeded to the next item on the agenda.

#### 6. Sustainable Transportation Land Use Integration Study Update

Chair Colbath introduced Ms. Eileen Yazzie of MAG to present an update on the Sustainable Transportation Land Use Integration Study.

Ms. Yazzie noted that the item was on the agenda for information and discussion. She explained that the Sustainable Transportation Land Use Integration Study was launched in 2010 and referred to her presentation where she introducing the project, its study progress and milestones, completed work to date, as well as next up/key components and lastly, next steps. She briefed the members on key Study Components, research & analysis, potential mobility guidelines, scenario modeling & policy development, and strategies (recommended policies, programs, investments, and pathways).

Ms. Yazzie then delved into the aspects of Research & Analysis. She noted that completed so far, was best practices research. Additionally, there had been Stakeholder Group meetings and an ULI Public Panel #1. Regional market analysis, as well as High Capacity Transit (HCT) Corridor Analysis and Transit Corridor Evaluation Report were submitted to Stakeholders. She added that there were market research findings: showing growing demand, coupled with uneven feasibility. Highlights were: Changing demographics increase demand for TOD: 19% of total households fall into categories with greater demand for access to HCT; 310,000 households in 2010; with 485,000 households in 2040.

She then explained additional research & analysis. The feasibility analysis revealed varying TOD market strength by location, with strong and wide ranging product types feasible. The research showed Downtown Tempe, Downtown Scottsdale, and parts of Downtown Phoenix

as most viable. In the moderate category, only 2-3 story apartments were feasible in areas such as Mid-Town Phoenix, the Camelback Corridor, and Chandler. She also explained the limited category, which indexed limited current feasibility.

She then described the findings from the study: a sustainable transportation scan, featuring eight factors for Sustainable Transportation Performance, a neighborhood street network, housing and employment density, mixed-use neighborhoods, regional accessibility (job centrality and concentration), frequent and convenient transit service, and demand management / incentives for Transit Oriented Development (TOD - including mixed income housing). She

also mentioned that demographics played a key role. Additional findings from the ULI Focus Group included infill obstacles such as: land assemblage, parking, higher-risk than fringe development and over-zoning in Phoenix.

Ms. Yazzie further explained that there was genuine interest in bus options: branding, productive routes, frequent and reliable service. Key lessons have included some industry truths as experienced by peer regions; namely: “We can plan all we want. However, the market will dictate where development goes.”; “The region needs to take a hard look at rubber tire transit options.”; and “Four and five story infill development will work along bus rapid transit corridors just as well as it will work along light rail corridors.” Other observations have been based on the project progress and stakeholder input. Mobility solutions are needed throughout the region, but limited parts of the region can support TOD and HCT in the near term.

She mentioned that sustainability depends on productive investments; and that there needed to be responsiveness to the needs of people and businesses. There must also be enthusiasm for transit orientation and investment in the region, as a one size fits all philosophy wont solve challenges, especially since future federal funding levels remain uncertain.

Ms. Yazzie summarized key study components as well as recapping research and analysis for the study. She also highlighted potential mobility guidelines, scenario modeling and policy development, as well as strategy (i.e. recommended policies, programs, investments, and pathways). She stated that a potential mobility guideline should establish a frequent transit network, that in turn provided walk access to transit for a certain percentage of region’s population. It should also expand scheduled transit service to cover a certain percentage of the region’s area, thus achieve transit productivity. By also provide HCT access to a certain percentage of region’s job and career center, transit’s appeal would be increased, thus improving services for the transit dependent. She noted that scenario modeling would provide walk access to HCT for a certain percentage of region’s population. The recommendation would focus on achieving transit productivity as measured by cost per seat mile and farebox recovery.

She explained that one of the main goals of the study was to highlight pathways. Those tools would enable local selection of objectives and strategies, and to coordinate progression of investments and services. She said that the pathways addressed three aspects of land use and transportation integration. For cities: zoning regulations, pedestrian and bicycle improvements, station area design. For the region: transit investments and services, multi-modal connectivity. And for private sector response: development and revitalization consistent with

transit-supportive standards. The pathways would effectively define a process for evolution of transit investments and services based upon. Some of those include; Community conditions such as land use, connectivity, and demographics near stops and stations and in wider community as well as corridor transit performance and service characteristics.

Ms. Yazzie concluded with an overview of the next steps for the study. They included: mobility guidelines; scenario modeling and reporting; the upcoming ULI Panel Meeting #2 on February 23, 2012 and the Stakeholders Meeting #5 scheduled at a day to be determined in February or March 2012. She also mentioned to the members that the following study documents were available for review on the website: ULI Panel #1 Summary; HCT Readiness Analysis; Market Reports; and Working Paper #1. She referred the members to [www.bqaz.org](http://www.bqaz.org) for more information on Sustainable Transportation Land Use Integration Study. Ms. Carol Ketcherside and Eileen Yazzie briefly discussed population density and vehicle capacity. Mr. Cato Esquivel of Goodyear inquired as to if there were any additional high capacity corridors that extended into the west valley and if they were included in the study review. Ms. Yazzie clarified that only the 44 high capacity corridors that were identified in the 2010 Regional Transit Framework Study by the MAG Regional Council are being evaluated in the current Sustainable Transportation Land Use Study. She noted that only high capacity transit corridors are being reviewed, and that new lines are not included in the study. Discussion followed.

Chair Colbath again thanked Ms. Yazzie for her presentation. Hearing no further comments or questions, Chair Colbath proceeded to the next item on the agenda.

7. Request for Future Agenda Items

Chair Colbath asked the members of the Committee if there were any issues that they would like added as future agenda items.

Chair Colbath inquired as to the possibility at a future meeting, of obtaining a comprehensive listing of all of the current and planned, local and regional transit studies in the MAG Region. MAG staff acknowledged that a list would be forthcoming at a future meeting.

Chair Colbath thanked the Committee and asked if there were any further questions or comments. Hearing no further comments, she proceeded to the next item on the agenda.

8. Next Meeting Date

Chair Colbath thanked those present for attending the MAG Transit Committee meeting and she announced that the next meeting of the MAG Transit Committee would be held on Thursday, February 9, 2012 at 10:00 a.m. in the MAG Ironwood Room. There being no further business, Chair Colbath adjourned the meeting at 1:57 p.m.