

DRAFT MEETING MINUTES
MARICOPA ASSOCIATION OF GOVERNMENTS
TRANSIT COMMITTEE

Tuesday May 17, 2016
Maricopa Association of Governments; Saguaro Room;
302 N. 1st Avenue, Suite 200
Phoenix, Arizona

MEMBERS ATTENDING

ADOT: Jaclyn Birley for Mike Normand
Avondale: Kristen Taylor, Vice Chair
#Buckeye: Andrea Marquez
Chandler: Jason Crampton for RJ Zeder
#El Mirage: Jose Macias
*Gila River Indian Community, Vacant
#Gilbert: Kristin Myers
Glendale: Kevin Link for Debbie Albert
#Goodyear: Christine McMurdy
#Maricopa: David Maestas
Maricopa County DOT: Reed Kempton
#Mesa: Jodi Sorrell

*Paradise Valley: Jeremy Knapp
Peoria: Stuart Kent
Phoenix: Ken Kessler for Maria Hyatt, Chair
Queen Creek: Mohamed Youssef
Scottsdale: Gregory P. Davies for
Madeline Clemann
Surprise: Martín Lucero
Tempe: Robert Yabes
*Tolleson: Vacant
Valley Metro: Wulf Grote
#Youngtown: Grant Anderson

* Members neither present nor represented
by proxy.

Participated (or attended) by teleconference
+ Participated (or attended) by videoconference

OTHERS PRESENT

Audra Koester Thomas, MAG
Marc Pearsall, MAG
Alice Chen, MAG
Margaret Boone, MAG
DeDe Gaisthea, MAG
Teri Kennedy, MAG
Amy St. Peter, MAG

Jean Moriki, Disability Rights Advocate
Donna Powers, Independent Living Specialist
Amina Donna Kruck, Ability 360
Jeff Martin, Chandler-Mesa
Joe Bowar, Phoenix
Stephanie Child, Phoenix
David Kohlbeck, Surprise
Abhishek Dayal, Valley Metro
Jorge Luna, Valley Metro
Steven Wilcox, AECOM
Cathy Brady, Auditor General/SEC

1. Call to Order

The meeting was called to order at 2:01 p.m. by Vice Chair Kristen Taylor. She welcomed everyone in attendance and announced that a quorum was present. She noted that several members were joining the meeting by teleconference: Andrea Marquez of Buckeye, Jose Macias of El Mirage, Kristin Myers of Gilbert, Christine McMurdy of Goodyear, David Maestas of Maricopa, Jodi Sorrell of Mesa, and Grant Anderson of Youngtown. She asked if there were any public comment cards, and there being none, proceeded to the next item on the agenda.

2. Approval of Draft April 19, 2016 Meeting Minutes

Vice Chair Taylor inquired if there were any comments or corrections to the Draft April 19, 2016 Minutes. Hearing no comments, she called for a motion to approve the Draft April 19, 2016 Minutes. Martin Lucero of Surprise moved to approve the motion, Robert Yabes of Tempe seconded, and the motion passed unanimously. Vice Chair Taylor then proceeded to the next item on the agenda.

3. Call to the Audience

Vice Chair Taylor stated that she had not received any request to speak cards from the audience and moved onto the next item on the agenda. She advised that there were attendees who will be speaking on Agenda Item #8 later on in the meeting.

4. Transit Planning Report

Vice Chair Taylor introduced the MAG Transit Planning Project Manager, Audra Koester Thomas. Ms. Koester Thomas then proceeded to brief the Committee with the Transit Planning Report.

Ms. Koester Thomas welcomed back, via teleconference, returning member Ms. Christine McMurdy of Goodyear. She then noted under calendar items, a 'save the date' for the Arizona Liveable Cities Summit on Tuesday June 14 at the Phoenix Desert Botanical Gardens, which would feature a 7:30am-12:30pm session and a 5:30pm evening session / reception. She also mentioned that Valley Metro would be hosting the 2016 APTA Rail Conference, scheduled for June 19-22, 2016 at the Sheraton Grand Phoenix Hotel in downtown Phoenix, AZ.

She continued by advising of a few of webinar and training opportunities. The FTA would be hosting a Public Transportation Safety Standards and Protocols meeting. It would occur on Tuesday, May 17. The National Transit Institute (NTI) and Rutgers would also be hosting an all-day webinar on public involvement techniques and process at Valley Metro, Suite 1300, Room 13A on June 1, 2, and 3, 2016 from 8:00am - 4:00pm. She also reminded that there was still a TSI's Transit Safety/Safety Management Systems meeting would take place in Phoenix, AZ on June 22-24, 2016. She concluded here report.

Vice Chair Taylor thanked Ms. Koester Thomas and asked if there were further questions or comments regarding the agenda item. Hearing no further comments, she proceeded to the next item on the agenda.

5. Draft MAG Title VI and Environmental Justice Program

Vice Chair Taylor invited Amy St. Peter of MAG to present on the item. Ms. St. Peter explained that she was pleased to present the draft MAG Title VI and Environmental Justice Program and that it was on the agenda for information, discussion and recommended approval.

She began by noting that the new and revised Title VI and Environmental Justice plan was available for review and that the previous version had been approved in December 2014. She added that the MAG Region had one more year to prepare for the new update, but ADOT had recently undergone an audit and subsequently requested some changes to the plans from the COGs and MPOs throughout the State of Arizona. She stated that MAG was complying with their request in that the new plan addresses ADOT's concerns by adding a few more protected classes along with compliance with directives from the Governor's Office regarding domestic violence; as well as responsibilities that fulfill requirements by the Federal Transit Administration, the Federal Highway Administration, and the U.S. Department of Justice. Detailed maps for communities of concern of populations, demographics, capital regions and bus services were also created by MAG staff to accompany the plan, in addition to other minor, administrative revisions.

She explained that the draft program was being offered to the following MAG committees in May: Transit Committee, Human Services Technical Committee, Transportation Review Committee, and the Human Services Community Initiatives Committee. The program would then be offered to the MAG Management Committee in June 2016 with final approval requested from the Regional Council on June 22, 2016. She then completed her presentation.

Vice Chair Taylor inquired if there were any questions or comments on the item. Hearing no comments, she called for a motion. Stuart Kent of Peoria moved to approve the motion, Robert Yabes of Tempe seconded, and the motion passed unanimously. Vice Chair Taylor thanked Ms. St. Peter and then proceeded to the next item on the agenda.

6. FTA Transit-Oriented Development Planning Pilot Program Grant Submission

Vice Chair Taylor invited Audra Koester Thomas of MAG to present on the item on behalf of Albert Santana. Ms. Koester Thomas explained a brief background regarding the FTA Transit-Oriented Development Planning Pilot Program Grant Submission and invited Valley Metro or Phoenix staff to add to the report.

She stated that on Thursday, April 14, 2016 a Notice of Funding Opportunity (NOFO) was released announcing the availability of \$20.49 million. The purpose was to fund local communities to integrate land use and transportation planning with a transit capital investment that was seeking or

had recently received funding through the Capital Investment Grants (CIG) Program. The South Central Corridor light rail project was candidate project that City of Phoenix and Valley Metro were considering in association with the submittal. She noted that the applicants could seek awards between \$250,000 and \$2 million with a minimum twenty percent local match.

Mr. Santana of the City of Phoenix then continued with additional information from his presentation. He stated that Phoenix believed that the pending TOD grant was a great opportunity to assist in the success of the future South Central Corridor light rail project in connecting downtown and Baseline Road via South Central Avenue. He re-emphasized the importance of proactive engagement with the hundreds of small business community along the corridor and noted that the \$2 million grant, with a twenty percent match (\$400,000) from the T2050 funds, would help ensure success for the project. He mentioned that he had recently had a positive meeting with LISC on partnering with the City if the grant comes to fruition, by way of a \$50,000 grant from the organization.

The grant application, due June 13, 2016, would be used for a comprehensive needs assessment for all of the existing businesses within the corridor prior to construction, which would commence in three years. Another goal of the grant would be to look at future opportunity sites that would help create a more inviting and revitalized environment for business growth. He added that Valley Metro and the city's other agencies have been working in close coordination on this effort. Mr. Grote noted that this was the second year that this grant program had been available and was only available for major capital corridor projects currently in the FTA pipeline. He advised that last year Valley Metro had been successful in acquiring grant funding for a TOD related to the Tempe Streetcar project.

Vice Chair Taylor again thanked Ms. Koester Thomas, Mr. Santana and Mr. Grote and asked if there were further questions or comments regarding the agenda item. Hearing none, she proceeded to the next item on the agenda.

7. SRTP Expansion Fleet Need Influencers

Vice Chair Taylor invited Mr. Jorge Luna of Valley Metro to present on the SRTP Expansion Fleet Need Influencers.

Mr. Luna noted that this presentation stems from a previous discussion on the Transit Standards and Performance Measures (TSPM) regarding fleet expansion requests over the next few years. He referred to his presentation and explained that the Short Range Transit Program (SRTP) included a number of expansion vehicles in the development years of the program. The needs identified in the SRTP was an estimated gross number and actual need could change based on different parameters. He also gave a brief description of such parameters, which may change as the program moves from year to year, to help committee members better understand future fleet needs.

He briefly explained the SRTP expansion fleet prioritization and noted that he had previously presented the estimated fleet needs. The fiscal year 2019-2021 estimated fleet need was five buses for 2019, 28 for 2020 and 63 for 2021. He also noted that the fleet need influencers included: the number of vehicles will vary depending on: committed funding (e.g. member agency), running vehicle for additional years, more mid-life maintenance, service efficiencies (e.g. interlining), route

level adjustment (e.g. layover), and vehicle sharing and route swapping (such as Route 83 and Grand Avenue Limited as examples). He then concluded his presentation.

Vice Chair Taylor again thanked Mr. Luna and asked if there were any questions or comments regarding the agenda item. Mr. Link asked if those fleet projects that Mr. Luna referred to were limited to only those in the TLCP. Mr. Luna responded that the projects included those beyond the TLCP and were regionwide, which was why Valley Metro created a new list that reflected fleet regionwide irregardless of funding source, but still recommended that members go through the MAG SRTP process in order to implement those fleet needs and services.

Hearing no further questions or comments, Vice Chair Taylor proceeded to the next item on the agenda.

8. Draft FY 2017-2021 Transportation Improvement Program Listings and FY 2016 POP

Vice Chair Taylor returned to the agenda sequence and invited Ms. Chen to present on the Draft FY 2017-2021 Transportation Improvement Program Listings and FY 2016 POP, which was on the agenda for information, discussion and recommended approval. She also advised that there were attendees who would be speaking on the item during the public comment phase.

Ms. Chen began her presentation by explaining that MAG was currently developing a schedule for the Fiscal Year 2016 Annual Transit Program of Projects (POP) and the Fiscal Year 2017-2021 Transportation Improvement Program (TIP). At the March 15, 2016 Transit Committee meeting, member agencies provided input regarding the programming of federal funds with the funding projections available at the time. At the April 17, 2016 meeting, updated financial information from the Transit Life Cycle Program and Federal funds projections was provided. For the May 17, 2016 meeting, the Committee requested that MAG staff prepare additional funding scenarios for discussion, including funding provisions for bus expansion, information and technology upgrades, and infrastructure that improve accessibility to transit. She noted that those three programming scenarios would be presented for discussion and advised the members to refer to their attachment.

She summarized Scenario 1 as created during the March Transit Committee. The primary components were: Reduce JARC sub-allocation to \$750,000; move funds previously allocated to JARC (approximately \$1,000,000) to ADA accessibility improvements to bus stops; and fund approximately 40-45 expansion vehicles over 6 years. Within Scenario 2 from the April Transit Committee, the primary components were: Reduce JARC sub-allocation to \$750,000; un-fund all provisions for ADA accessibility improvements to bus stops; and program the funds previously allocated to ADA improvements to bus stops to expansion buses, thereby increasing the net expansion vehicle to approximately 65-70 vehicles over 6 years. The final Scenario 3, featured blended primary components that included: Eliminate the JARC sub-allocation; fund \$2.5 million for ADA accessibility improvements to bus stops in Fiscal years 2016-2017; fund approximately 55-60 expansion vehicles over 6 years; and leave \$6.0 million un-programmed from FY 2018-2021 to be discussed (JARC, ADA, expansion vehicles, ITS) in the next TIP development cycle. She then provided a financial summary total for FY2016-2021 as well as a JARC scenarios table.

Ms. Chen noted that there were other considerations for the scenario(s) selected by the committee members: Assume average of \$25k per ADA improvement; implement a “Use it or lose it” rule for ADA funding; the mix of vehicles will impact number of available expansion buses; conversely future implementation, interline opportunities, service changes, scheduling updates will impact need for expansion buses; FY2018 (Year 5 of the TIP) does not need to be fully programmed; and development of the FY 2018-2022 TIP and FY 2017 Program of Projects will begin Summer 2016. She concluded by noting that the item was for information, discussion and recommended approval of the Draft FY2016 Program of Projects, and amendments and administrative modifications to the FY 2014-2018 MAG Transportation Improvement Program, and as appropriate to the 2035 Regional Transportation Plan, and as appropriate, for inclusion in the Draft FY 2017-2021 Transportation Improvement Program.

Vice Chair Taylor thanked Ms. Chen and asked if there were any questions or comments regarding the agenda item. She advised that there were three individuals presented who wished to speak and address the committee and invited them to the lectern. (Their comments were both verbal and written and were included in their entirety in the meeting minutes for the record:)

Courtesy of Ms. Jean Moriki, Disability Rights Advocate

Ms. Moriki introduced herself and stated that she was pleased to be able to address the Committee. She noted that she had reviewed the agenda from the April and May Transit Committee meetings, specifically the scenarios that were presented for the Draft TIP and POP. She said that she was fully in support of Scenario 1, as it permitted \$11.5 million to be allocated to ADA improvements over a five-year period. As a frequent public transit user, she noted that Scenarios 2 and 3 simply did not provide enough funding for the needed transit improvements to inaccessible bus stops. She thanked the Chair and completed her comments.

Courtesy of Ms. Donna Powers, Independent Living Specialist

Ms. Powers introduced herself and stated that she was a frequent transit user of both light rail and bus services in the Valley. She said that she understands the operational issues facing Valley Metro when it comes to bus replacements, and that buses break down, specifically with older vehicles. However, she explained that while a brand new bus could be put into service, the bus would not be a useful vehicle if some of its bus stops were inaccessible to passengers. Ms. Powers supported Scenario 1 because it allocated more funding to improving bus stops and permitted bringing bus stops up to ADA standards. She noted that while some bus stops were considered fully ADA compliant, some of them such as the 44th Street/Washington LRT Station bus stop featured impediments to mobility devices such as steeper inclines, gravel on driveways and utility poles on the sidewalk. She asked that the agencies take this observation under consideration in order to repair bus stops that are considered ADA compliant, but not necessarily user friendly, especially on days when passenger’s personal physical abilities vary. She thanked the Chair and completed her comments.

Courtesy of Ms. Amina Donna Kruck, VP Advocacy – Ability 360

Prepared statement, Prioritization of ADA Improvements

Dear Committee Members: I want to address the decision you will be making today to recommend a Transit Plan scenario to the full MAG membership. In particular, I want to address the need for

prioritizing ADA Improvements in your final proposed scenario because these kinds of improvements allow Maricopa residents with disabilities and their families to use our transit system. I represent Ability360, a program that offers advocacy and programs by and for individuals with disabilities. We also have a state of the art Ability Center where eleven other disability related organizations are located and a fully accessible sports and fitness center. We have offices in Glendale, Phoenix, and Mesa. I invite you to come see our Center, if you haven't already, which is a model of accessibility and where we will soon enjoy a new light rail stop near 50th and Washington Street.

I want to remind you that ADA improvements are action items to 1) help our cities comply with the Americans with Disabilities Act civil rights law; and even more important 2) make improvements that facilitate our transit system to be accessible and workable for our Maricopa County residents that have disabilities that likely represent %15 to 20% of our residents. These residents are of all ages, all kinds of physical, behavioral and sensory functional loss. Today they may be or tomorrow they could be your parent, your child, your sibling or co-worker. They use wheelchairs, have hearing and vision loss. Many either are unable to drive or can't afford the luxury of a \$30,000 accessible vehicle for transportation and the automobile insurance that goes with it.

Residents with disabilities use public transit to go to work, to volunteer in their community, to shop, to visit with family, to recreate and to get to medical appointments. It is much cheaper for the county for them to use the bus and light rail than to rely on para transit. We invite Valley Metro to our main location at 50th Street and Washington every month to orient residents how to use the transit system and offer them free bus and light rail rides. The essential nature of an accessible transit system to our disability community members is the reason why we have been such strong advocates for every transit election that has taken place over the last 20 years.

I have reviewed scenarios 1 through 3 which you will be discussing next and I want to address the proposals for ADA Improvements specifically. I will start with the bad news. I am extremely troubled that scenario 2 is even being proposed since it deletes all proposed funding towards ADA Improvements. This is falsely optimistic and totally unacceptable. Scenario 2 is unrealistic. Although it starts with funding in 2016, the funding is woefully inadequate to meet the needs and only proposes funding for ADA improvements for two years out of five.

Now for the good news: Scenario 1 is the best option for ADA Improvements because there is funding in each year 2017 through 2021, totally \$11M. Even so, it has no funding for 2016 and it is listed within Priority 9, which I argue should be moved up to Priority 3 at minimum. ADA Improvements will be needed each of the next five years. Allow me to give you some examples of improvements that are needed so that our residents and out of town visitors with disabilities can use our transit system safely and effectively to access our community. These access issues are abundant throughout the county.

- Some Bus Stops need to have a wide enough sidewalk so that wheelchair users can off board without landing in gravel or tipping off the side of the sidewalk. Some bus stops like at the N.E. corner of Priest and Washington have to accommodate more than one bus at a time. In these cases, the sidewalk needs to be wide enough so that riders using mobility devices like scooters or power wheelchairs from both buses can load and unload safely without the danger of tipping over because the sidewalk drops to gravel below.

- Sidewalks leading up to bus and light rail stops need to be wide enough to access the bus stop without worry of tipping off the edge or into tree planter areas or gravel drop offs, and to be able to go safely around graded driveways and barriers like garbage cans and light poles.
- Some sidewalks are just simply too narrow for a big power, chair even without obstructions. An example is the narrow sidewalk on the north side of Washington between 40th and 44th street.
- We need to explore how we can prevent power chair users from getting their wheels stuck between the sidewalk and the light rail care as they enter or exit. This happens now. Imagine how frightening that would be!

I appreciate the opportunity to speak to the scenarios you are considering today. As you prepare to make your important project and funding recommendations that will direct the next 5 years of County transit improvements, please keep in mind the essential nature of accessibility improvements for residents with disabilities who rely on transit as their main or only form of transportation. She thanked the Chair and completed her comments.

Vice Chair Taylor thanked Ms. Chen and the members of the public for their comments and asked if there were any further questions or comments from the Transit Committee members regarding the agenda item.

Mr. Grote commented on the three scenarios listed within the presentation and noted that each scenario had varying ranges for funding for rail. Ms. Chen noted that there were newer funding ranges within the revised packet and that the amended version was now being used. He continued by stating that he was appreciated of the public comments today by the members of the community regarding the importance of accessibility and ADA. He added that doling out funding for small projects that it was difficult to manage, but by having a larger regional contract for implementation and the funding could go further in an expedited fashion. Mr. Kessler added that federal funding may not be the most efficient way to deliver these projects, and emphasized the benefit of using local funds as they are less expensive compared to the federal guidelines. Mr. Lucero commented that he agreed with Phoenix on the restrictions of federal ADA requirements may add cost and schedule whereas more cost efficiencies that may occur with use of local funds. He also concurred with the benefits of a regional implementation plan for multiple ADA improvements and accommodations.

Mr. Crampton added that local funds were more appropriate for these ADA and accessibility issues and that the federal funds may be better used for fleet expansion. Mr. Kempton inquired if there was a comprehensive non-accessible bus stops regional inventory available for review. Vice Chair Taylor replied that one was not available, but one was in the works for the future. Mr. Grote replied that within the Valley Metro work program, there was a regionwide study planned for 2017. Mr. Youssef stated that Scenario #3 would be the best option for the Committee to consider. Mr. Lucero agreed and noted that the blended, flexible scenario would be meet the demands and wishes of the committee over the past three months of discussion. Mr. Yabes of Tempe added that each community currently knows what its needs are for accessibility to make stops more used friendly and Mr. Crampton noted that a single regional contract to manage the bus stop improvements would greatly assist all the member agencies and asked if MAG would oversee that contract.

Ms. Kennedy of MAG replied that this issue had been discussed by staff for some time and noted that the individual ADA upgrades for compliance on a one by one basis is not cost-effective using federal dollars. She said that sub-regional contracts and phasing were more efficient with a single

contract manager. She suggested that the region include and implement a one-time deferral option for non-rail elements within our policies and procedures, which would provide agencies with a little elbow room, but would no longer permit deferring projects year after year. That worked on the highway side so it may work well for the transit side, but would require starting back at the beginning of the process should an agency wish to defer for another subsequent year. In regards to the inventory, the Call for Projects that Ms. Chen had performed previously and the individual cities had done self-evaluation inventories that would enable MAG to prepare a comprehensive draft list of the regional projects in order to start the conversation. Mr. Grote noted that Valley Metro had the capital capabilities to implement the program and work with City of Phoenix to roll out the projects, once the priorities were established by MAG. Mr. Kessler concurred with Phoenix' ability to assist Valley Metro to get the sub-regional contract work done when called upon. He added that he preferred Scenario #3 as it left the region with the most flexibility to use funds where they were needed the most. Brief discussion followed.

Vice Chair Taylor inquired if there were any further questions or comments on the item. Hearing no comments, Martin Lucero of Surprise moved to approve the motion to accept Scenario #3 with an amendment of the one-year deferral option for non-rail projects, and permitting JARC to return in the later years (2018); Mohamed Youssef of Queen Creek seconded, and the motion passed unanimously. Vice Chair Taylor thanked the members and then proceeded to the next item on the agenda.

9. Updates to Regional Programming Guidelines for Federal Transit Formula Funds

Vice Chair Taylor invited Ms. Chen of MAG to continue and present on the item. Ms. Chen explained that she was presenting the updates to Regional Programming Guidelines for Federal Transit Formula Funds and that it was on the agenda for information, discussion and recommended approval.

She noted that the MAG Regional Programming Guidelines for Federal Transit Formula Funds was approved on March 27, 2013 and that it had been modified twice with the latest version approved on May 27, 2015. The guidelines were developed under MAP-21 and as the region was recovering from an economic recession, with updated federal legislation and shifting transit needs under the current economic conditions have created the need to update the guidelines to better utilize federal funds for the MAG region. She further explained that the updates reflected the current funding environment and transit element of the Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) and the Program of Projects (POP) development process. On April 19, 2016, a draft revision of the guidelines was presented to the Transit Committee and that a few revisions had been made reflecting comments by member agencies. She then gave an in-depth breakdown of the additions, subtractions and changes to the specific items within the TIP and referred members to their packets and her presentation.

Within 202 Transit Life Cycle Program, the additional line was 'Buses funded under the Transit Life Cycle Program include any buses currently in the system as of January 1, 2016.' and the subtracted line was 'There are no expansion unprogrammed buses in the Life Cycle bus capital program.' Under 500. Transportation Programming Priorities Update; Section 1. Provide services and improvements as required by law - the subtracted line was 'Under MAP-21 it is required that 1% of 5307 funds are used for transit security or be able to certify that it is not necessary to do so.' Under Section 2, 'Provide funding for support services for grant management to the designated recipient, the City of

Phoenix.’ removed line ‘Currently, FY2012, this is \$40,000.’ and added line ‘The funding amount will remain \$40,000 until further guidance is provided.’ Section 3. Fund Preventive Maintenance/Operations/Complementary ADA Service. - Preventive maintenance funding for the Phoenix-Mesa-Glendale UZA would be distributed based on approved methodology outlined in Section 400. The baseline funding would be 25% of 5307 funds. - Avondale/Goodyear UZA would receive operations funding in line with 2012 for the FY TIP years, removed line ‘2014-2018’ and replaced it with ‘2016-2021.’

Continuing with 500, Ms. Chen noted the following for Section 4. Fund the Job Access Reverse Commute program using the process outlined in Section 703 Job Access Reverse Commute (JARC).; Section 5. Support the Transit Life Cycle Program (TLCP) capital bus program; Section 6. Support the TLCP capital facility program; Section 7. Remove line ‘Support the TLCP regional transit supergrid service’; Section 8. Support the other TLCP projects as the program is updated; and Section 9. Fund additional projects; additional line ‘through a collaborative process by assessing regional transit needs, implementing elements of adopted regional efforts, and meeting regional performance based criteria. For additional information see section 802, with the removal of line ‘based on a regional competitive evaluation process that is outlined in the Section 700 Regional Competitive Evaluation Process or by conducting a Regional Transit Survey and through a collaborative discussion at the Transit Committee, per the Committee’s discretion.’

Ms. Chen further noted that in 700. Job Access Reverse Commute (JARC), under SAFETEA-LU, the MAG region was allocated \$1.8 million in FY 2012 specifically for JARC eligible projects. With the passage of MAP-21, JARC dedicated funding was repealed. However, JARC projects are eligible under 5307 formula funds. In that section, there would be the addition of ‘Under the FAST Act, requirements and eligibility for JARC remain unchanged.’ JARC eligibility includes private and public agencies, operations and capital projects under (replace MAP-21 with FAST Act) do not have to be derived from the Human Service Coordination Plan. FTA encourages MPO’s and recipients to continue the coordinated planning process in identifying and developing projects for funding.

She added that the plan was updated annually and may be found on the MAG website. This would feature the removal of ‘For Fiscal Year 2013, the amount will be held constant to FY 2012 level. For TIP programming Years 2014 - 2018, the amount will be adjusted in accordance with 5307 apportionment increases or decreases’ and the addition of ‘The MAG Region will, through the Transportation Programming Guidebook, determine a sub-allocation toward JARC eligible activities in the MAG Planning region. Funding will emphasis non-profit organizations and other activities that fulfill the “spirit” of the program. Funding amounts and the future of the program will be reviewed annually/biannually or during TIP development cycles.’

Ms. Chen then stated that there would be a revised 800, with the “Priority 8” Projects (for the Phoenix-Mesa UZA). It noted that any project request that is not part of Priorities 1 - 7 are addressed through Priority 8, and it also included as part of Priority 8 are: 1a) any bus expansion vehicle, 2b) advancement of replacement vehicles, and/or c) change in vehicle types for replacement vehicles (i.e. 40’ standard to 60’), d) cost increases of replacement vehicles due to special requests related to specs and/or technology that is not part of the standard fleet.

She then explained 802. Regional Transit Survey and noted that in lieu of a competitive process, the Transit Committee may elect to request that MAG conduct a Regional Survey to access the needs of the region and fund projects under Priority 9 and through a collaborative discussion at the Transit

Committee. The process will be initiated every two year, consistent with the Regional Transportation Improvement Programming (TIP) cycle or as necessary, per the recommendation of the Transit Committee. Features included - The process will focus funding the implementation of on-going and existing regional planning efforts at Valley Metro and MAG., including but not limited to: Transit Standards and Performance Measures; Short Range Transit Plan; Regional Transit Framework Study and Subregional Studies (i.e. Southwest Valley, Northwest Valley, Southeast Valley Local System Studies). Within 803. NON-TLCP BUS CAPITAL, bus expansion purchased will be programmed for replacement so long as the route remains in service. Any discontinuation or significant change in service will require the agency work through the TSPM/SRTP and competitive process. These buses remain outside the Transit Life Cycle Program.

She then gave a brief update on the 2015 FAST Act and its history and details, then advised that the full redlined guidebook may be found under resources on the Transit Committee web-page at <http://azmag.gov/Committees/Committee.asp?CMSID=1162>. She noted that the item was for information, discussion and recommended approval of the updates to the MAG Regional Programming Guidelines for Federal Transit Formula Funds and concluded her presentation.

Vice Chair Taylor inquired if there were any questions or comments on the item. Hearing no comments, she called for a motion. Wulf Grote of Valley Metro moved to approve the motion, Stuart Kent of Peoria seconded, and the motion passed unanimously. Vice Chair Taylor thanked Ms. Chen and then proceeded to the next item on the agenda.

10 . Request for Future Agenda Items

Vice Chair Taylor asked the members of the Committee if there were any issues or topics that they would like added as future agenda items. Mr. Reed Kempton inquired if the Committee members could revisit the 2:00 p.m. start-time as it was affecting his ability to attend both the Bike Committee and Transit Committee in sequence. Ms. Koester Thomas noted that she much thought and planning had occurred in trying to make the current schedule work and that she would be talking with the Bike/Ped Committee to see if the timing and flow could be better adjusted to suit both Committees needs without making any further major changes to the schedule. Mr. Kempton concurred. Hearing no further comments, Vice Chair Taylor proceeded to the next item on the agenda.

11. Next Meeting Date

Vice Chair Taylor thanked those present and announced that the next meeting of the MAG Transit Committee would be held on Tuesday, June 21, 2016, at the new time of 2:00 p.m. in the MAG Office, Saguaro Room. There being no further business, she adjourned the meeting at 3:20 p.m.