

DRAFT MEETING MINUTES
MARICOPA ASSOCIATION OF GOVERNMENTS
TRANSIT COMMITTEE

October 11, 2012
Maricopa Association of Governments; Ironwood Room;
302 N. 1st Avenue, Suite 200
Phoenix, Arizona

MEMBERS ATTENDING

| | |
|---|---|
| *ADOT: Nicole Patrick | Paradise Valley: Jeremy Knapp for Jim Shano |
| *Avondale: Rogene Hill | Peoria: Maher Hazine |
| *Buckeye: Andrea Marquez | Phoenix: Ken Kessler for Neal Young |
| Chandler: Dan Cook for RJ Zeder | *Queen Creek: Kevin Johnson |
| El Mirage: Sue McDermott | Scottsdale: Madeline Clemann, Vice Chair |
| Gilbert: Nicole Dailey | *Surprise: David Kohlbeck |
| Glendale: Matthew Dudley for Cathy Colbath, Chair | Tempe: Greg Jordan |
| *Goodyear: Cato Esquivel | *Tolleson: Chris Hagen |
| *Maricopa County DOT: Mitch Wagner | Valley Metro Rail/Metro: Wulf Grote |
| Mesa: Jeff Martin for Jodi Sorrell | Youngtown: Grant Anderson for Jim Fox |

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

OTHERS PRESENT

| | |
|--------------------|-----------------------|
| Alice Chen, MAG | Kini Knudson, Phoenix |
| Teri Kennedy, MAG | Robert Yabes, Tempe |
| Jorge Luna, MAG | Bill Cowdrey, HDR |
| Alex Oreschak, MAG | |

1. Call to Order

The meeting was called to order at 10:05 a.m. by Vice Chair Madeline Clemann. She welcomed everyone in attendance and announced that a quorum was present. She noted that no members were joining the meeting by teleconference. Vice Chair Clemann asked if there were any public comment cards, and there being none, proceeded to the next item on the agenda.

2. Approval of Draft July 12, 2012 Minutes

Vice Chair Clemann asked if there were any comments or corrections to the Draft July 12, 2012 meeting minutes. Hearing none, she called for a motion to approve the draft meeting minutes. Ken Kessler moved to approve the motion and Jeff Martin seconded, and the motion passed unanimously.

3. Call to the Audience

Vice Chair Clemann 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

Jorge Luna reported for Eileen Yazzie, and added that Mrs. Yazzie gave birth to a baby girl named Joyce on September 24th. Mr. Luna welcomed the newly appointed Vice Chair Madeline Clemann. Mr. Luna also welcomed the new representative from El Mirage, Sue McDermont. Mr. Luna stated that RPTA and Metro Light Rail will now be represented by one person, Wulf Grote, under the Valley Metro name. Mr. Luna stated that full updates on the Southwest Local Transit Study, the Designing Transit Accessible Communities Study, and the Northwest Local Study will be made at the November Transit Committee Meeting. Mr. Luna invited members of the committee to the Sustainable Transit and Land Use Integration Study, meeting #5 on October 24th, 9-10:30 in the Ironwood room at MAG. Vice Chair Clemann thanked Mr. Luna and moved onto the next item on the agenda.

5. Transit Programming Guidelines - Preventive Maintenance

Ms. Chen presented on the transit programming guidelines for preventative maintenance. At the conclusion of the presentation, Vice Chair Clemann thanked Ms. Chen, and opened the floor for questions. Mr Cook asked about bicycle accessibility and ADA accommodation. He asked if there was a desire for acceptable use of money for ADA or non-ADA dial-a-ride. Ms. Chen said it was eligible, under 5307, up to 10%, but the region had decided not to use it for that purpose since different agencies have different definitions of dial-a-ride. Ms. Chen said for any project type we're considering, we make ADA one project consideration.

Mr. Kessler asked if 5307 eligibility was for dial-a-ride only, so not available for non-ADA. Ms. Chen commented on percentages, and noted that PM and good repair is already a priority. Discussion requested a higher level (perhaps 25%) as a baseline rather than requiring a competitive process for any additional funds. Mr. Anderson echoed Mr. Kessler's comments, saying that the average being used for PM/good repair should be the baseline percentage used by MAG. Mr. Grote wanted to add caution saying part of state of good repair is keeping decently aged buses, maintaining facilities in good condition, etc. He added that before the region starts increasing PM amounts, maybe the region should look more closely at upcoming capital needs. He added that no one wants to get to the point where we're driving 22 year old

buses and stated that there needs to be balance between PM and Capital expenditure and to spend time understanding PM needs vs growth needs before committing to a higher level.

Vice Chair Clemann asked to what extent capital was considered in the process. Ms. Chen stated that MAG looked at projected capital figures from RPTA and TLCP funds, and took the difference. Vice Chair Clemann asked Ms. Chen to elaborate on the overall effect of what's left if the percentage is increased, and what the region can and can't do with that money. Ms. Chen responded with the different remaining competitive money. Mr. Cook recalled that PM money that was allocated hadn't gotten used because there was more allocated than needed. He requested analysis on whether additional allocation percentage was even needed.

Mr. Martin commented that he liked what was proposed so far, but agreed on a need for added analysis. Because PM was eligible under competitive process, everyone could submit their ideas and the committee may decide what should be allocated to PM that way. Vice Chair Clemann suggested that one option is that agencies could choose to not participate in the grant process, and if they made that decision, they could receive more PM funds. Ms. Chen said we needed to be careful not to allow jurisdictions to choose one over another, since they are regional funds, there needs to be a regional process. Mr. Cook asked if regional transit routes in TLCP qualified. Ms. Chen said that we must look at routes that have greater demand/need.

Mr. Hazine commented that there are already calculations in place to determine life cycles and needs. PM side has changed with new dial-a-rides, taxi services, etc. A good portion of the available money is not being used in PM or bus replacement now. Funding first to keep buses in good working order, then using the surplus as needed. He added that overall the need still exists. Ms. Chen responded that this wouldn't impact vehicle replacements.

Mr. Jordan reiterated that vehicle replacements was already covered, so we don't need to worry about that. He wanted to examine mid-life rehab as an option for these funds. He said that the region never hit capacity limit with our operators, so credits were being sent back to jurisdictions to accommodate what projects are needed. A new emphasis on PM was a bridge to a better economy down the road and the need for stable/predictable funding going forward, rather than a competitive process, was key to all projections to be as accurate as possible. Mr. Kessler echoed Mr. Jordan's thoughts and recognized there will be more facility needs at some point, but probably not in the next five years covered in the TIP.

He added it was important to have a predictable PM fund. Going to 25% would actually not be a significant increase. If the money was there, why not dedicate it to PM when we already have bus replacement covered and extra money for facility needs. Mr. Cook replied that this is an arbitrary number without backing behind it. He added that it didn't matter what the percentage was, but that we should just do what's needed and make it based on something.

Mr. Luna said jurisdictions got feedback from transit operators, and that people who changed their formulas are the ones who left money on the table. Vice Chair Clemann said "you can't look at TLCP to meet everyone's needs" since we took money out in order to balance it. Let's make a list of needs, and if the need is there, let's move the percentage up a little bit. Ms. Chen replied that operators did express needs while the analysis was being conducted. One of the concerns was that we didn't know 100% what the needs are. If we put everything in PM every

year, there's no basis for discussion of other needs within the agencies since we're flexible on the numbers and there's no right way to calculate. She said that MAG went with what we thought was consistent with history. But she added that there was concern with too high a number in regards to what happens when we no longer have extra TLCP funds. She concluded that the number's not perfect, but it's a minimal guarantee through the current cycle.

Mr. Dudley noted that when everyone's looking at Glendale P&R, it hasn't been deleted, it's been deferred. What's been programmed in the region is being counted on by the operators, With anything under 20% as a nonstarter. Mr. Jordan echoed that original numbers were greater than 20% and the jurisdictions have been counting on the higher numbers. He added that we must do a better job letting local agencies see what the savings are, so they can take action on them. Ms. Chen responded that it would help for operators to give MAG more information on how the PM is being utilized, so that all agencies could see what's going on. Vice Chair Clemann asked when we'll be able to take action on it? Ms. Kennedy replied by December 1st. Ms. Chen suggested a formal working group to work more closely with the numbers. There was general agreement for nothing lower than what's currently programmed. 25% is a better base.

Mr. Martin agreed that there's a need for transparency on how the funding is distributed. He said that it currently goes into the RPTA black box and you can't figure out what exactly you're getting. He stated that one might not be told because it results in jurisdictional equity issues. Mr. Jordan would suggest RPTA to reconstruct their rates and cost-of-service requests as each rate has its own line item so you know exactly where the savings are and suggested putting that in all the IGAs. He also suggested all operators put the information together so the whole committee knows what it is. Mr. Kessler says Phoenix doesn't put it in the IGA, but they do delineate the funding in terms of credit per mile. Vice Chair Clemann suggested you can show the increase and decrease, and how that can affect jurisdictions and service. Phoenix did analysis for Glendale, and equated for about \$0.05 per million miles for PM credit.

Mr. Grote asked if 25% still gets the region the base needs for other state-of-good repair items? Ms. Chen responded that everything shown is after everything else in the TLCP is already funded. The money shown is only what's left over. Mr. Grote said that projects at risk would be those for potential growth. Ms. Chen said that MAG could include that in the evaluation, but we should focus on other preventative maintenance and other maintenance (long term capital needs, for example). She added that she doesn't think the region is ready for growth, so that shouldn't be a criteria. TLCP side is for growth, however this side is for looking at what we've got and how to maintain that. Mr. Cook said that table handed out had facilities in it, but in TLCP discussions, most cities got rid of facilities. He noted that when it came down to "cut service or cut facilities", most jurisdictions cut facilities. However, facilities matter to get people to want to ride so we should get back to a minimal level of facilities, and the grant process allows for that. Ms. Chen responded that is the TLCP role. Mr. Cook said there's no question that we need to maintain our fleet.

Vice Chair Clemann asked that as far as operators coming together to create a matrix, how should we proceed. Ms. Chen said she'll send request out to operators, and will contact members to schedule around the holidays. Vice Chair Clemann asked if there was any

additional discussion on this agenda item. Hearing none, Vice Chair Clemann thanked Ms. Chen and moved onto the next agenda item.

6. Quarterly Status Report on Federal Grant Activity

Vice Chair Clemann introduced Mr. Ken Kessler of the City of Phoenix Transit Department and noted that he was present to answer committee questions for the Quarterly Status Report on Federal Grant Activity for June 2012. Mr. Kessler commented that there's a large number of open/active grants, and everyone needs to work to finish projects in a timely manner. He added that the number of open grants had doubled, so it was a bigger challenge to manage all of them. He emphasize moving forward on projects and drawing funds down in a timely manner.

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

7. Request for Future Agenda Items

Vice Chair Clemann asked the members of the Committee if there were any issues that they would like added as future agenda items. Mr. Jordan requested an overview on MAP-21. Ms. Chen said that MAG did not have final regulations or final information, but would report as soon as MAG acquired it. Mr. Kessler said FTA just put out interim guidance and said it did not have much detail, but does explain eligibility and what has changed. He added that there was no change for 5307 program, and a little change in bus and bus facilities for 5309. Mr. Kessler would return in November with an update.

Vice Chair Clemann asked the members of the Committee if there were any other issues that they would like added as future agenda items. Hearing no further comments, she proceeded to the next item on the agenda.

8. Next Meeting Date

Vice Chair Clemann thanked those present and she announced that the next meeting of the MAG Transit Committee would be held on Thursday, November 8, 2012, at 10:00 a.m. in the MAG Office, Ironwood Room. There being no further business, she adjourned the meeting at 10:56 a.m.