

MEETING MINUTES
MARICOPA ASSOCIATION OF GOVERNMENTS
TRANSIT COMMITTEE

November 8, 2012
Maricopa Association of Governments; Ironwood Room;
302 N. 1st Avenue, Suite 200
Phoenix, Arizona

MEMBERS ATTENDING

*ADOT: Nicole Patrick	Paradise Valley: Jeremy Knapp
Avondale: Kristen Sexton for Rogene Hill	Peoria: Maher Hazine
*Buckeye: Andrea Marquez	Phoenix: Kini Knudson for Neal Young
Chandler: Dan Cook for RJ Zeder	*Queen Creek: Kevin Johnson
El Mirage: Sue McDermott	*Scottsdale: Madeline Clemann, Vice Chair
Gilbert: Mike Gillespie for Nicole Dailey	Surprise: Karen Savage for David Kohlbeck
Glendale: Cathy Colbath, Chair	Tempe: Robert Yabes for Greg Jordan
*Goodyear: Cato Esquivel	*Tolleson: Chris Hagen
*Maricopa County DOT: Mitch Wagner	Valley Metro: John Farry for 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

Marc Pearsall, MAG	Bob Antila, Valley Metro/RPTA
Alice Chen, MAG	Jason Crampton, Chandler
Teri Kennedy, MAG	Christine McMurdy, Goodyear
Jorge Luna, MAG	Ken Kessler, Phoenix
De De Gaisthea, MAG	Bill Cowdrey, HDR
Nathan Pryor, MAG	

1. Call to Order

The meeting was called to order at 10:06 a.m. by Chair Cathy Colbath. She welcomed everyone in attendance and announced that a quorum was present. She noted that no members were joining the meeting by teleconference. 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 October 11, 2012 Minutes

Chair Colbath asked if there were any comments or corrections to the Draft October 11, 2012 meeting minutes. Hearing none, she called for a motion to approve the draft meeting minutes. Maher Hazine moved to approve the motion and Jeff Martin 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 invited Marc Pearsall to brief the Committee on behalf of Transit Program Manager Eileen Yazzie. Mr. Pearsall noted that Ms. Yazzie would be returning to MAG part-time in mid-December and then full time in January. He also noted that the Sustainable Transportation and Land Use Integration Study Tool that Mr. Jorge Luna had been working on for the past year was now available for review by MAG member agencies on the BQAZ website. He also added that Regional Council recently approved the Major Amendment to allow the allocation of flexing STP funds to be used for the Gilbert Road light rail extension, and were currently soliciting public comments in the November time-frame and referred further questions to Valley Metro staff. Mr. Pearsall also noted that at a future Transit Committee meeting, both Mr. Luna and he would be presenting updates to their respective Southwest and Northwest Transit Studies. Chair Colbath thanked Mr. Pearsall and moved onto the next item on the agenda.

5. Federal Transit Funds Programming Update

Chair Colbath then requested that Alice Chen of MAG present Federal Transit Funds Programming Update.

Ms. Chen began her presentation by referring to two handouts associated with Agenda 5 , the Federal Funds Programming Metrics Working Group v2 handout and the Transit Close Out handout. She stated that at the October 2012 Transit Committee Meeting, MAG staff proposed scenarios for setting baseline preventative maintenance (PM) funding. MAG member agencies suggested that PM funding should be programmed at or above the current TIP levels for the future beyond 2015. She also noted that it was suggested that a minimum level of PM of 22% to 25% of the 5307 apportionment was proposed therefore the balance of available federal funds would be programmed for projects through a regional evaluation process. The transit operators working group met on Thursday November 6, 2012 to discuss the evaluation criteria and process.

She elaborated in her presentation that the funding in question was not for park-and-rides, transit centers, or projects that would be addressed directly in RTP (or "Prop 500"), nor was it for congestion management (CMAQ dedicated funding). She added that there was a focus on small projects (following objectives of the RTP), but always inherently competing with PM. She also explained qualifying criteria, eligible projects, evaluation criteria/metrics, and the close-out scenarios.

Ms. Chen further elaborated on qualifying criteria: 1. demonstrated requirements of the program; 2. Local Match as demonstrated by either the: CIP budget or letter of commitment project scope; 3. NEPA started (non-CE projects) or demonstration of CE; 4. close-out, design, bid/award/complete; 5. environmental (Including Design 1 year); 6. initiation review/documentation; 7. complete/FTA approved, right-of-way (1 year); 8. site selection/acquisition completion; 9. construction (1 year), and bid/award/completed. She also noted that any deferments must go through the committee process and demonstrate extraordinary circumstances. There would be a maximum deferment of 1 year, and a 2nd call for projects at year three, with new project follow same time line (3 years to complete), with all unused funds at end of year six allocated to PM.

Ms. Chen's presentation also explored the elements of the project selection, where variables like eligible projects/evaluation criteria/metrics, goals/projects/metrics and the preservation of system, state of good repair, accessibility / livability, safety; performance based system, and equity as per Title VI and special needs transit users. She further explained the components of livability/transit accessibility and a performance based system at a factor of (40%), with criteria guidelines based upon: 1. improved access to the riders, 2. improved system connectivity and system, 3. relation to land use, and 4. cost of the project in relation to the number of people served.

She also summarized some other important elements of the programming guidelines. She said that the equitable / Title VI /special needs (30%) and stated that it would improve accessibility and transport services for economically disadvantaged populations, non-drivers, senior citizens, and persons with disabilities. She added that the safety factors (20%), was integral in that it asked: does the project improve the safety of transit users or providers; 2. does it directly address transit crime concerns including bicyclists and pedestrians; 3. does it directly address the pedestrian and bicyclists traffic safety concerns; and 4. does it improve security of the transit location. Ms. Chen concluded with a summary of the other criteria specifically the age relative to its useful life and if the project was critical to the type of service it provides, and whether it is bus replacement, midlife rebuilt, parts replacement or facility maintenance issue.

Chair Colbath asked if there was any discussion on this agenda item. Ms. Sexton inquired as to whether the Avondale UZA would be using the same or different guidelines as the MAG Phoenix UZA. Ms. Chen recalled that a previous committee discussion, noted the need to apply consistent regional guidelines for project evaluation to both UZA's in the region however she noted that if there were components within these guidelines that gave concern, then they may be able to be adjusted, especially since operations falls outside of PM.

Mr. Jeff Martin noted that in the agenda the suggested minimum level for PM was 22-25%, but inquired what the original recommended level. Ms. Chen replied that the original recommendation was 20%, which translated into approximately 11 million annually for the region. She noted that the previous discussions acknowledged that the amount would be slightly lower than what was programmed in the TIP. She said that the 11 million estimated for 2013/14 did not include additional CMAQ funds in the calculation, so at least 9 million would be available each year in CMAQ funds from 2015-18, but the overall apportionments would be significantly lower than the original projected 11 million. Mr. Martin commented that while the 20% level was discussed previously, there was not consent on that percentage by the committee as a whole and that there should be consensus at TC, in lieu of what the operators group decided upon.

Discussion followed with comments by Kini Knudson, Dan Cook, Grant Anderson, and Robert Yabes. Chair Colbath asked Ms. Chen to provide a timeline of when these processes need to be formalized, and Ms. Chen summarized that in order to make the February deadline for the TIP process, the Transit Committee would have to begin working on the TIP in December or January. Mr. Martin asked if it was possible to provide a summary spreadsheet on the savings associated with how the agencies were spending PM funds for the region. Ms. Chen had requested this information from the member agencies so that she may compile the information for the next meeting.

Chair Colbath asked if there was any additional discussion on this agenda item. Hearing none, she thanked Ms. Chen and moved onto the next agenda item.

6. Designing Transit Accessible Communities Update

Chair Colbath then requested that Alice Chen of MAG continue with a presentation on Designing Transit Accessible Communities.

Ms. Chen began by explaining the Designing Transit Accessible communities Study focused on addressing the greatest needs and mitigating the primary concerns of the bicyclist and pedestrian accessing transit. She noted that the study began in December 2011 and during the course of the study, MAG staff and the consultant team had held stakeholder workshops, on-sight interviews, and technical working groups in communities throughout the MAG Region to identify areas of focus and need for improvement. The study's objective was to provide low cost or cost neutral planning and design recommendations along with implementation strategies for planners, engineers, and policy makers. She also referred to a quote from the American Public Transit Association that said 'Transit Accessibility is... the segment of an individual trip that occurs between an origin or destination point and the transit system.'

She then proceeded with giving a brief project overview of the goals & objectives of the study. She referred to her presentation that identified the challenges faced by users getting to transit, and that the study's conclusions insofar were recommending improvements, polices and guidelines to enhance transit accessibility, as well as providing measures and strategies for local governments to create transit accessible and livable neighborhoods, in addition to identifying options and provide a regional framework for applying for federal grants.

Ms. Chen then showcased some case study methods that had been reviewed over the past year. She stated that stakeholder input, review of demographics and Built Environment Data in GIS review had been integral in the study process. She also said that invaluable data had been culled by the consultants using Intercept Surveying of bus riders, as well as in-person field reviews had also been of great benefit. The Technical Working Group established within the perimeters of the study had also focused on key areas such as transit, bike/ped, street, land use, safety, and rail interface. She also added that they were key examples of common recurring themes within the study duration. Specifically, what would make a person walk/ride transit more often; what were some near misses for transit service accessibility; and how does the transit rider feel about their bus stop. The study also broke down accessible market types; specifically Suburban Residential; Suburban Retail; Urban Residential; Urban Retail; and Metropolitan Core.

Ms. Chen summarized that there were overall rankings that had emerged from the study in terms of bus stop facilities demand from the transit users. They were in descending order: 1. Shade Trees (58%); 2. Bus Schedule Information (55%); 3. Streetlights (46%); 4. Bicycle Lanes (42%); 5. Bicycle Parking (38%); 6. Landscaping (38%); 7. Curb Extensions (35%); 8. Decorative Pavement (30%); 9. Art (27%); and 10. Medians (26%). She also noted the next steps in the study process were to develop the accessible transit tool box, followed by a tabulation of new bus stops, then infill development, street improvements and new communities.

Chair Colbath asked if there was any discussion on this agenda item. Mr. Cook inquired as to the ability of bicycle integration into the study efforts, specifically on the option of riding bicycles on sidewalks. Ms. Chen replied that riding bicycles on sidewalks as opposed to in the general traffic lanes were statutes left up to each individual municipality. Mr. Cook replied that it would be a good idea to get the cycling community to weigh-in on their views of sidewalk riding, as it seems that in some communities there are environs that encourage riding on the sidewalks rather than in traffic lanes that do not feature bicycle lanes. Discussion followed as to whether there could be regional bike lane standards developed and adopted in the future under the Complete Streets program. Additional discussion followed.

Chair Colbath asked if there was any additional discussion on this agenda item. Hearing none, she thanked Ms. Chen and moved onto the next agenda item.

7. MAP-21 Information and Interim Guidance

Chair Colbath then requested that Ken Kessler of City of Phoenix present an update on MAP-21 Information and Interim Guidance.

Mr. Kessler began by explaining that in the October 16, 2012, the Federal Register of the Federal Transit Administration (FTA) issued important information and interim guidance about new FTA programs and changes to existing programs authorized regarding the Moving Ahead for Progress in the 21st Century Act (MAP-21). He added that the City of Phoenix, as the designated recipient for federal transit funds for the Phoenix-Mesa Urbanized Area, would provide an overview of the information and highlights of the impacts to the region. He added that it was being provided to allow sufficient time to prepare for action steps that may be required of agencies and jurisdictions in the region as a result the implementation of MAP-21 in 2013.

Mr. Kessler proceeded with his presentation and provided a general overview of the MAP-21 program, featuring sections on the areas such as repealed programs, consolidated & modified programs, new programs, cross-cutting programmatic requirements and changes. He further explained that within the issuance of MAP-21 in the October 16, 2012 Federal Register FTA Notice, there was an overall decrease in discretionary programs, but an increase in formula programs and that 2010 Census data would be used for funding formulas beginning with 2013 apportionments, as well as the Section 5307 Phoenix-Mesa UZA 2013 partial apportionments.

Mr. Kessler then explained that the list of repealed programs, which included Section 5308 Clean Fuels, Section 5309 Fixed Guideway Modernization, Section 5309 Bus and Bus Facilities, Section

5316 Job Access and Reverse Commute, Section 5317 New Freedom, and Section 5339 Alternatives Analysis.

Mr. Kessler also briefed the committee on the consolidated & modified programs, which included: Section 5307 Urbanized Area Formula Grants, Section 5309 Fixed Guideway Capital Investment, Section 5310 Enhanced Mobility of Seniors and Individuals with Disabilities. He noted that Section 5307 Urbanized Area Formula Grants and JARC projects would be eligible under 5307. He said that JARC projects would be for maintenance or development, but that there was no floor or ceiling on the amount of funds that can be spent on JARC activities. The funding formula included a low-income factor, with certain vanpool expenditures that may count as part of local match for a capital project. He summarized by stating that the operating assistance provision for operators was in large UZA's operating less than 100 vehicles.

He then proceeded with the Section 5309 Fixed Guideway Capital Investment overview. He added that it provided funding for projects that will expand the core capacity of an existing fixed guideway corridor and that core capacity improvement projects must increase the capacity of the existing fixed guideway system in the corridor by at least 10%. He said that there was a streamlined process with reduced steps. He noted as well that Section 5310 Enhanced Mobility of Seniors and Individuals with Disabilities would now include the former New Freedom program (5317), which as folded into this program.

Mr. Kessler also added that for funds apportioned to large urbanized areas, the projects must be included in a locally developed, coordinated public transit-human services transportation plan. Therein, the competitive selection process was now optional, with 10% of apportionment that may be used for grant administration expenses. He also noted that not less than 55 percent of program funds must be spent on prior 5310 program activities, with the remaining 45 percent that may be used for prior 5317 program activities. The designated recipient may be the State, but the current 5310 designated recipient (ADOT) remains in effect until changed by Governor.

He also briefed the committee members on the five new programs featured within MAP-21. Section 5326 Transit Asset Management¹, Section 5329 Transit Safety and Oversight¹, Section 5337 State of Good Repair, Section 5339 Bus and Bus Facilities, Transit-Oriented Development Planning Pilot. Section 5326 Transit Asset Management. He explained that MAP-21 required FTA to define the term "state of good repair" and create objective standards, and based on that definition, the FTA must establish a national transit asset management system. Additionally, the FTA must develop performance measures under which all FTA grantees will be required to set targets. He stated a crucial element in that all FTA grantees and their sub-recipients were required to develop transit asset management plans, and that each designated recipient of FTA formula funding will be required to report TAP measures and targets must be incorporated into metropolitan and statewide transportation plans and transportation improvement programs (TIPs). He added that FTA staff would support this effort through technical assistance, but said that the requirement for the Transit Asset Management plan was not in effect until FTA issued its final rulemaking, which were in the NTD Reporting Manual and would be published in a future Federal Register notice.

On another explanation from the PowerPoint, Mr. Kessler said that within Section 5329 Transit Safety, FTA must develop safety performance criteria for all modes of public transportation (rail, bus, etc.), and that FTA must develop minimum safety performance standards for vehicles not

regulated by other Federal agencies. Further, the FTA must develop a public transportation safety certification training program for individuals involved in transit safety, and all recipients of FTA funding required to develop agency safety plans. The safety measures and targets must be incorporated into metropolitan and statewide transportation plans and transportation improvement programs (TIPs), and the safety plan must include an adequately trained safety officer who reports directly to the recipient's chief executive.

Mr. Kessler then proceeded with a background on the Section 5337 State of Good Repair, which replaced the Section 5309 fixed guideway modernization program. He said that it was limited to fixed guideway systems and high intensity bus, and that projects were limited to replacement, rehabilitation, or to maintain public transportation systems in a state of good repair. He also said that the projects must be included in a transit asset management plan to receive funding, and that the new formula comprised of the following: (1) the former fixed guideway modernization formula; (2) a new service-based formula; and (3) a new formula for buses on HOV lanes. He concluded with a rundown of Section 5339 Bus and Bus Facilities, which replaced the previous Section 5309 discretionary Bus and Bus Facilities program, and provided funding to replace, rehabilitate, and purchase buses and related equipment, and to construct bus-related facilities.

Mr. Kessler then explained the elements regarding the Transit-Oriented Development Planning Pilot, which was a new discretionary pilot program for TOD planning grants. They included funding eligible activities that featured comprehensive planning in corridors with new rail, BRT, or core capacity projects. He said that the plans should seek to: enhance economic development, ridership, and other goals, facilitate multi modal connectivity and accessibility, increase access to transit hubs for pedestrian and bicycle traffic, enable mixed-use development, identify infrastructure needs associated with the project, and include private sector participation. He noted that funds were not available under the current Continuing Resolution.

He also briefed the members on the Cross-cutting Programmatic Requirements and Changes, Veteran Hiring preference required for FTA funded capital projects. He said that neither required a preference to any veteran over equally qualified applicant who was a member of any racial or ethnic minority, female, an individual with a disability, or a former employee. He noted that the federal procurement clauses would be updated, and that the FTA may bar an entity from receiving funding for non-compliance with FTA's drug and alcohol regulations. He concluded with explain that the FTA share now required that 85% for acquisition of vehicles to comply or maintain compliance with the ADA or the Clean Air Act, whereas the previous requirement was 83%.

He completed his presentation by adding that there was an expanded period of availability for Section 5307 Urbanized Area Formula Grants, which was 6 years. For Section 5309 Fixed Guideway Capital Investment, the period was 5 years, Section 5310 Enhanced Mobility of Seniors and Individuals with Disabilities was 3 years, Section 5337 State of Good Repair was 4 years, and lastly Section 5339 Bus and Bus Facilities was 4 years. For MPO/Statewide Planning, MAP-21 established a performance-based planning process to target USDOT-issued national goals, such as safety, infrastructure condition, congestion reduction, system reliability, economic vitality, environmental sustainability, reduced project delivery delays, transit safety, and transit asset management. Mr. Kessler noted that the legislation also requires transit representation on MPO Boards.

Chair Colbath asked if there was any discussion on this agenda item. Mr. Farry commented that in the long run, it would be good for the region to work together to have a coordinated response to FTA regarding their requirements on rule-making. Brief discussion followed.

Chair Colbath asked if there was any additional discussion on this agenda item. Hearing none, she thanked Mr. Kessler and moved onto the next agenda item.

8. Sustainable Transportation and Land Use Integration (STLUIS) Study Update

Chair Colbath noted that due to the constraints of time, the Sustainable Transportation and Land Use Integration (STLUIS) Study Update would not be heard and would be postponed until a future meeting.

9. Quarterly Status Report on Federal Grant Activity

Chair Colbath noted that Mr. Ken Kessler of the City of Phoenix Transit Department was available to answer committee questions for the Quarterly Status Report on Federal Grant Activity for September 2012. She asked if there were any questions or comments on the agenda item. Hearing no further comments or questions, Chair Colbath thanked Mr. Kessler and proceeded to the next item on the agenda.

10. 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. Hearing no comments, she proceeded to the next item on the agenda.

11. Next Meeting Date

Chair Colbath thanked those present and she announced that the next meeting of the MAG Transit Committee would be held on Thursday, December 13, 2012 at 10:00 a.m. in the MAG Office, Ironwood Room. However, it was noted by members present that there may be a potential conflict with the Transportation Review Committee meeting scheduled for the same time. Mr. Pearsall advised that he would schedule an alternative time/date in order to avoid a conflict and send that information to the Committee. There being no further business, Chair Colbath adjourned the meeting at 11:50 a.m.

Adjourn.