

MINUTES OF THE
MARICOPA ASSOCIATION OF GOVERNMENTS
TRANSPORTATION POLICY COMMITTEE MEETING

July 18, 2012
MAG Office, Saguaro Room
Phoenix, Arizona

MEMBERS ATTENDING

- Mayor W. J. "Jim" Lane, Scottsdale, Chair
- * Mayor Jackie Meck, Buckeye, Vice Chair
- F. Rockne Arnett, Citizens Transportation Oversight Committee
- Ron Barnes, Total Transit
- # Mayor Bob Barrett, Peoria
- Dave Berry, Swift Transportation
- Jed Billings, FNF Construction
- Councilmember Ben Cooper, Gilbert
- * Councilmember Shana Ellis, Tempe
- Councilmember Dick Esser, Cave Creek
- Joseph La Rue, State Transportation Board
- * Mark Killian, The Killian Company/Sunny Mesa, Inc.
- * Lt. Governor Stephen Roe Lewis, Gila River Indian Community
- * Garrett Newland, Macerich
- # Mayor Marie Lopez Rogers, Avondale
- Mayor Georgia Lord, Goodyear
- Mayor Elaine Scruggs, Glendale
- Councilmember Jack Sellers, Chandler
- * Mayor Scott Smith, Mesa
- Mayor Greg Stanton, Phoenix
- * Karrin Kunasek Taylor, DMB Properties
- * Supervisor Max W. Wilson, Maricopa County
- Mayor Sharon Wolcott, Surprise

* Not present

Participated by telephone conference call

+ Participated by videoconference call

1. Call to Order

The meeting of the Transportation Policy Committee (TPC) was called to order by Chair W. J. "Jim" Lane at 12:07 p.m.

2. Pledge of Allegiance

The Pledge of Allegiance was recited.

Mayor Bob Barrett participated in the meeting by telephone.

Chair Lane announced that the revised material for agenda item #4B that was previously emailed was at each place.

Chair Lane requested that members of the public fill out blue cards for Call to the Audience and yellow cards for consent or action items on the agenda, and then turn in the cards to staff, who will bring them to him. He stated that parking garage validation and transit tickets for those who used transit to attend the meeting were available from staff.

3. Call to the Audience

Chair Lane stated that an opportunity is provided to the public to address the Transportation Policy Committee on items that are not on the agenda that are within the jurisdiction of MAG, or non action agenda items that are on the agenda for discussion or information only. Citizens 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 Transportation Policy Committee requests an exception to this limit. Those wishing to comment on agenda items posted for action will be provided the opportunity at the time the item is heard.

No requests for public comment were received.

4. Approval of Consent Agenda

Chair Lane stated that agenda items #4A and #4B were on the consent agenda. He stated that public comment is provided for consent items, and noted that no public comment cards had been received. Chair Lane asked members if they would like to remove any of the consent agenda items or have a presentation. No requests were noted.

Mr. Arnett moved to recommend approval of agenda items #4A and #4B on the consent agenda. Mr. Barnes seconded, and the motion carried unanimously.

4A. Approval of the May 16, 2012, Meeting Minutes

The Transportation Policy Committee, by consent, approved the May 16, 2012, meeting minutes.

4B. Project Changes – Amendment and Administrative Modification to the FY 2011-2015 MAG Transportation Improvement Program and to the Regional Transportation Plan 2010 Update

The Transportation Policy Committee, by consent, recommended approval of amendments and administrative modifications to the FY 2011-2015 MAG Transportation Improvement Program, and as appropriate, to the Regional Transportation Plan 2010 Update; and necessary project funding modifications related to approved federal fiscal year 2012 Closeout projects, based on the forthcoming final apportionment tables from Federal Highway Administration and Federal Transit Administration. The Fiscal Year (FY) 2011-2015 MAG Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) and Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) 2010 Update were approved by the MAG Regional Council on July 28, 2010, and have been modified sixteen times with the last modification approved on June 27, 2012. Since then, there is a need to modify projects in the programs. The amendment requires a new conformity determination on the FY2011-2015 TIP and Regional

Transportation Plan 2010 Update. In addition, the administrative modification includes minor project revisions that do not require a conformity determination. The new Finding of Conformity and conformity consultation on these projects will be included in the MAG Committee process as separate agenda items beginning with the July 11, 2012, MAG Management Committee meeting. Table A includes all Highway and Transit Program project requests for changes and modifications to the FY 2011-15 TIP and 2010 Regional Transportation Plan. Table B includes all Highway and Transit Program project requests for changes and modifications that are outside of the TIP window. The project modifications related to the rebalancing of the Freeway Life Cycle Program, approved by the MAG Regional Council on May 23, 2012, are also included in Table A and Table B. In 2008, the light rail Northwest Phase 1 Extension Project, originally planned for 2012, was put on hold until 2023 due to economy driven reductions in Transit 2000 tax revenues. METRO proposed accelerating this extension project to be completed in 2016, consistent with the sequence of project implementation in the original RTP. The majority of the design was completed in fall 2009. The City of Phoenix has completed most of the land acquisition. The project line items for the Northwest Phase 1 Extension are included in Table A. METRO requested line item changes to the Central Mesa light rail extension to reflect budget changes that meet the updated schedules and the grant agreement. Items are included in Table A. The projects listed in Table C are requested modifications to Arterial Life Cycle Program (ALCP) projects in the FY 2011 - 2015 TIP. The City of Mesa and the Town of Gilbert are requesting to change the lead agency responsibilities on the Power Road: Santan Freeway to Pecos Road project from the Town of Gilbert to the City of Mesa. The projects listed in Table D are ALCP projects outside the current TIP window. The changes in Table C will be incorporated into the TIP pending approval, but will not be included in the approved ALCP until the program is rebalanced. At that time, the schedule changes in Tables C and D will be incorporated into the ALCP.

5. Phoenix West Extension Locally Preferred Alternative Report Recommendations

Eileen Yazzie, MAG staff, provided a report on the Phoenix West Extension Locally Preferred Alternative Report recommendations. She stated that METRO, in partnership with the City of Phoenix and the Federal Transit Administration (FTA), initiated a study in May 2007 to analyze potential high-capacity transit (HCT) improvements in the west Phoenix area. As part of the process to request funding from the FTA, the project underwent an alternatives analysis (AA) where several modes and alignments were evaluated to address the project's purpose and need and to define the Locally Preferred Alternative (LPA).

Ms. Yazzie noted that the requested motion was a three part process. She said that the Tempe LPA for the modern streetcar was a five-part process and the Mesa Light Rail extension was a three-part process. She explained that this is the final step in the approval process for the Phoenix West extension. Ms. Yazzie displayed a map of the study area and noted that it was broken down into two different areas: mainline and downtown.

Ms. Yazzie stated that the Alternatives Analysis process for the Phoenix West extension started five years ago. Ms. Yazzie stated that the study documents are available on the MAG Transit Committee web page if people would like to download the materials.

Ms. Yazzie reviewed approvals to date: Recommendations for high capacity transit improvements in the Interstate 10 right-of-way west of Interstate 17 - Phoenix City Council, April 2008; METRO Board, June 2008; and MAG Regional Council, July 2008. Recommendations for acceptance for the Alternatives Analysis Locally Preferred Alternative: Phoenix City Council, May 15, 2012, and the METRO Board, May 17, 2012.

Ms. Yazzie then described the Phoenix West extension study area, which is bounded on the north by Thomas Road, on the south by Buckeye Road, on the west by Loop 101, and on the east by 7th Street. For the purposes of alternatives development and analysis, the corridor was divided into two sections: the mainline and downtown alignments. Ms. Yazzie noted that there was extensive community involvement and input in the development of the recommended route, especially by the St. Matthew's neighborhood. She stated that hundreds of people attended City of Phoenix and METRO stakeholder meetings. Ms. Yazzie stated that community leaders spoke at the METRO Board meeting when the alignment was approved, and indicated they were pleased with the alignment. Ms. Yazzie then noted that the recommended alignment will utilize the western frontage road of Interstate 17. She stated that the light rail passes by the state capitol complex.

Ms. Yazzie stated that light rail transit and bus rapid transit technologies were studied. She advised that over the duration, light rail has lower costs. Ms. Yazzie stated that the number of projected 2030 daily boardings for light rail is almost 33,000, for bus rapid transit it is 9,200; hourly capacity one-way of light rail is 5,000 and bus rapid transit is 1,000; the travel time for light rail is 19 minutes and for bus rapid transit is 26 minutes.

Ms. Yazzie reviewed the funding sources for capital costs, which include the Public Transportation Fund, the City of Phoenix Transit 2000 tax, Congestion Mitigation and Air Quality Improvement funds, and FTA Section 5309 New Starts funds.

Ms. Yazzie stated that the opening year (2023) annual operating cost for the Phoenix West extension LRT project from 79th Avenue to Downtown Phoenix is \$17 million and from 79th Avenue to 19th Avenue/Dunlap is \$29.3 million.

Ms. Yazzie stated that four elements along this corridor, called corridor advanced transit opportunities, will be built as a part of this light rail project. She noted that the elements include adding HOV ramps, expanding the 79th Avenue park and ride lot, adding a park and ride lot at 59th Avenue, and building a direct access ramp to the Interstate 17 southbound frontage road. Ms. Yazzie noted that these improvements will provide better transit times for bus riders in the West Valley. She added that if any opportunities for funding arise, any of these four projects could be done in advance of light rail and be of benefit to the region.

Mr. Berry asked if benefit meant saving money or moving more people. Ms. Yazzie stated that these four components are in the light rail analysis. She said that a number of bus users would benefit timewise and these projects would not be throwaway projects.

Ms. Yazzie concluded her presentation by displaying the three-part motion on screen. She advised that Tom Callow, who works with METRO, was present to assist with technical questions.

Chair Lane thanked Ms. Yazzie for her report and asked if there were questions.

Eric Anderson, MAG Transportation Director, stated that there was extensive coordination with ADOT throughout the study process because much of this project was in the ADOT right-of-way. He noted that ADOT agreeing with having light rail in its right-of-way prompted the Regional Council action in 2008 to have light rail in the right-of-way corridor. Mr. Anderson said that they also coordinated with ADOT to ensure that the future construction of the South Mountain Freeway would not negatively impact light rail. He added that the 59th Avenue park and ride lot came out of that coordination activity. Mr. Anderson stated that they worked with ADOT engineers to add additional highway capacity in the I-10 corridor, in particular, an HOV lane or managed lane. He advised that they wanted to ensure that whatever happened with transit, it would not negatively impact the additional capacity of I-10. Mr. Anderson noted that the I-10 median was reserved for possible transit use in the environmental impact statement done for I-10 in 1977 or '78.

Chair Lane stated that his question would have been whether there would be any restriction or limitation to existing traffic lanes and Mr. Anderson had said that transit had already been planned for that application. Mr. Anderson replied that was correct. Chair Lane asked for confirmation that there would be no reduction in the number of traffic lanes, either in the median or north of I-10. Mr. Anderson replied that was correct.

Chair Lane asked the thought process for using the existing right-of-way. Mr. Anderson explained that early in the alternatives analysis, other alignments were looked at for light rail in the vicinity of I-10, including McDowell and Van Buren, but the alternatives analysis determined there were limited opportunities along arterials and I-10 was the best place.

Mr. Berry asked if the cost per trip of light rail was offset by the farebox. Ms. Yazzie replied that the fares are reduced from the total cost. Mr. Berry asked the source for some of the \$16.20 cost per boarding is Proposition 400. Mr. Anderson replied that the operating cost for light rail is the responsibility of the operating agency.

Mr. Berry asked if the cities were aware of their responsibilities for the operating costs. Mr. Callow replied that the cities are aware of the cost. He went on to explain that the \$16.20 is the capitalized cost spread over the lifetime plus the operating cost, which is currently \$13.60 per rider and does not include capital costs. Mr. Callow said that they are recovering 25 percent of the operating cost through the fare system and there is a 75 percent subsidy.

Mr. Berry asked if this project was located entirely in Phoenix. Mr. Callow replied that was correct. He said Phoenix does know this will be a burden to the future extension of Transit 2000 and he noted that this project is not in the current Transit 2000 plan. Mr. Callow stated that Transit 2000 would need to be extended for this project to be built. He advised that having a secured funding source in place for operations is required by the federal government or it will not participate.

Mr. Berry commented that he thought the use of the drainage channel was a clever solution because it was a bit of an eyesore, and he was appreciative of ADOT's cooperation.

Mr. Arnett asked if there was a sense for future cost projections. Mr. Callow replied that they update the life cycle program each year. Mr. Anderson stated that the FTA does extensive due diligence on its own by having an independent financial consultant review the capital and operating plans that are also subject to risk assessments. Mr. Anderson stated that the federal government wants to ensure that the project will be completed and the agency can afford to operate it. Mr. Callow advised that an agency cannot get a full funding grant agreement without fully vetting finances.

Mr. Arnett asked if the technology that would be used to make the crossover at the drainage channel at 43rd Avenue. He also asked if the crossings at north-south arterials would be at-grade or above grade with crossings looking down onto neighborhoods. Mr. Callow said that it is somewhat of a misnomer to describe the crossover at the drainage channel. He said there are a few tight spots they would have to put the drainage channel in a box culvert, but for the most part runs adjacent to the drainage channel in a maintenance road. Mr. Callow noted there are maintenance roads on either side of the channel and ADOT has agreed to allow the use of one of the roads. He added that it would not be elevated, but at-grade. Mr. Callow pointed that there is an agreement with ADOT that an elevated crossing with a station would be constructed at 51st Avenue, which is the most heavily traveled road crossing I-10. He noted that this is an entirely industrial area and not a residential area. Mr. Callow stated that the other crossings would be at-grade, similar to those crossings at SR-153 and Loop 101.

Mr. Arnett remarked that the criticism of light rail coming from the southeast will be the expense due to the three at-grade crossings that will be required. Mr. Arnett also asked if this would impede traffic at all. Mr. Callow replied that it actually works in sync with the existing traffic signal.

Mr. Anderson stated that MAG has been working with METRO and ADOT on this issue for a couple of years and includes running a computer simulation model of present day to year 2030. He said that he was convinced that 51st Avenue was one of the most heavily traveled roads crossing I-10 after observing the traffic flows from ADOT's cameras. Mr. Anderson stated that additional grade separations might be required as engineering work proceeds. He commented on the significant amount of commercial truck traffic in this area and he stated that safety is paramount.

Mr. Callow stated that with the design of the South Mountain interchange with I-10, 59th Avenue will no longer have direct access to I-10, and it would interface with access roads.

Mr. Berry stated that the area south of I-10 from 43rd Avenue to 91st Avenue and beyond is primarily a heavy warehouse district. Mr. Berry suggested that westbound trucks on 75th Avenue being unable to turn right on red at 6:00 a.m. will cause a backup onto the freeway. He noted that from what he has seen, turning right on red with light rail is a problem. Mr. Anderson replied that this was an issue in the early analysis, but the alignment being on the north side is better than on the south side.

Mr. Berry indicated his support for the project and added that a good plan is needed so that business and commerce in that area are not affected negatively.

Mr. Callow stated that early in the design they looked at adding an additional right turn lane.

Mr. Billings asked about the transition of light rail from the north side to the middle of I-10. Mr. Callow described it as a flyover, similar to that of Loop 101 to SR-51 where the HOV ramps come up from the middle and cross over.

Chair Lane referenced the comparison of light rail to bus rapid transit. He noted that the total cost per boarding is substantially impacted by the fact that there is one-third the number of passengers and that a trip would take one-third more time on bus rapid transit than light rail. Chair Lane asked about the attractiveness factors in making the choice to use transit.

Mr. Callow stated that the total valleywide ridership on the existing Rapid bus system is 3,400 on all alignments and light rail is close to 20,000 ridership on just one alignment. He noted there is a perception issue and some people will ride light rail but will not ride buses.

Chair Lane asked about the farebox return. He noted that at one time there was concern for paying passengers versus the cost for inspectors aboard the trains. Mr. Callow replied that the farebox return is currently at 28 percent.

Mayor Scruggs stated that the farebox return is a source of discussion at the Valley Metro board meetings. She said that they have an imposed limit, which she thought was 26 percent, that they will not increase riders' rates as long as that limit is met or exceeded. Mayor Scruggs asked if a similar threshold had been established for light rail. Mr. Callow replied that the fares are established for the entire system and what applies to bus would apply to light rail.

Mayor Scruggs suggested that having a discussion of a ceiling on farebox recovery might be appropriate moving forward. She stated that to get people to use mass transit, an incentive was needed through lower rates, but if transit is going to become the mode of transportation for the Valley, it will become unrealistic to say we never want to recover more than 26 percent of costs through the farebox.

With no further questions, Chair Lane called for a motion. Mayor Stanton moved to recommend acceptance of the Phoenix West Alternatives Analysis for (1) A Locally Preferred Alternative (LPA) for the Phoenix West project, including a light rail alignment along I-10 from 79th Avenue to I-17; southbound along I-17 southbound frontage road; east along Van Buren Street to 18th Avenue; southbound along 18th Avenue to Jefferson Street and then east to downtown Phoenix along Jefferson Street; (2) Inclusion of the Corridor Advanced Transit Opportunities (CATO) Program that consists of near term improvements and investments to improve existing mobility, enhance transit service and lay the groundwork for future high capacity transit (HCT) service within the study area. The set of proposed projects includes: construction of a direct HCT access ramp from I-10 to I-17, expansion of the 79th Avenue Park-and-Ride, identification and

development of new park and ride stations, and construction of direct connection I-10 HOV ramps on the west side of 79th Avenue; and (3) Future consideration for increased transit service for areas within and west of the study area, per the long range transit needs identified in MAG's Regional Transit Framework Study, through the regional transportation system planning process.

Councilman Esser, seconding the motion, expressed his support for the project.

Before a vote was taken, Mayor Stanton stated that it was important to note that the alignment through the St. Matthew's neighborhood that was shown onscreen is not the original alignment. He said that City and METRO staff worked with the neighborhood to make the appropriate changes and residents now support the project. Mayor Stanton stated that the project will add some economic development opportunities for Van Buren Street, and he expressed his appreciation for the great leadership demonstrated by neighborhood leaders in this process.

With no further discussion, the vote on the motion passed unanimously.

6. MAG Federally Funded Locally Sponsored Projects Development Status Report

Teri Kennedy, MAG staff, provided a report on the MAG Federally Funded Locally Sponsored Projects Development Status Report. She stated that the MAG Federal Fund Programming Guidelines & Procedures were approved by the MAG Regional Council on October 26, 2011, and outline the requirements for local agencies to submit status information on the development of their federal funded projects. Ms. Kennedy advised that the goal is to ensure full utilization of all federal funding Obligation Authority made available to the region each year. She noted that this Project Development Status Report focuses mainly on projects that are programmed to obligate in Federal Fiscal Year (FFY) 2012, 2013, and 2014.

Ms. Kennedy pointed out that the June 2012 status report shows the projects that are on time: 28 projects in FFY 2012, 31 projects in FFY 2013, and 32 projects in FFY 2014. She stated that it is important to note that the process is working effectively; in the January 2012 report, 64 percent of FY 2012 projects and 65 percent of the FY 2013 projects were on time; in June 2012, 93 percent of the FY 2012 and 89 percent of the FY 2013 projects were on time.

Ms. Kennedy stated that the June estimate based on FFY 2012 project submittals shows an availability for the FFY 2013 of an estimated \$11-14 million. Ms. Kennedy stated that federal transportation authorization was extended through the Moving Ahead for Progress in the 21st Century (MAP-21) bill signed by President Obama on July 6, 2012. She noted that programs are being evaluated and funding levels will be adjusted and integrated into future reports. Ms. Kennedy stated that a better closeout number should be known in August.

Ms. Kennedy stated that the Dynamic TIP process includes three decision levels for each reporting cycle: Tier One, current year priorities are determined and approved; Tier Two, future year projects may advance if funding is available; and Tier Three, multiple options available to add new projects, increase funding, etc. She stated that approval of this item will allow projects programmed in the

TIP to move forward based on the agencies' schedules and complete Tier One of the process. Ms. Kennedy stated that Tier Two and Tier Three of the process can then proceed.

Chair Lane thanked Ms. Kennedy for her report and asked members if they had questions.

Mr. Berry noted that he saw several projects related to dust proofing and asked if they were a part of the MAG PM-10 Plan. Ms. Kennedy replied that was correct. Mr. Berry asked for clarification that they seemed to be moving forward on time. Ms. Kennedy noted that there were two deferrals in 2012 and three deferrals in 2013. Mr. Berry asked if any of the deferrals would impact the MAG PM-10 plan. Ms. Kennedy replied that the detail was included in the Project Status Report whether they were PM-10 projects. Mr. Berry expressed that it was important to keep the PM-10 Plan moving ahead because we are under the gun with EPA.

With no further questions, Mr. Barnes moved to recommend approval of federal fund projects to be deferred, deleted, and changed and of the necessary amendments and administrative modifications to the FY 2011-2015 MAG Transportation Improvement Program, and as appropriate, to the Regional Transportation Plan 2010 Update. Mayor Scruggs seconded, and the motion passed unanimously.

7. Legislative Update

Nathan Pryor, MAG staff, provided an update on legislative issues of interest. He reported on the new federal surface transportation legislation, Moving Ahead for Progress in the 21st Century, or MAP-21, which was signed into law by President Obama on July 6, 2012. Mr. Pryor stated that staff is still working with national associations and looking for federal guidance on final interpretation of the law and funding amounts.

Mr. Pryor stated that the legislation marks a significant bipartisan compromise that was somewhat unexpected in this election year. He noted that the previous surface transportation authorization, SAFETEA-LU, expired three years ago and has since been extended 10 times.

Mr. Pryor stated that MAP-21 provides certainty and stability through September 30, 2014. He said that broadly, MAP-21 preserves much of the status quo. Mr. Pryor advised that a long-term sustainable funding solution was not developed, and he added that the fuel tax is not enough to cover costs. To meet MAP-21 funding requirements, in addition to fuel tax revenue, \$19 billion in general fund transfers, \$2.4 billion from the Leaking Underground Storage Tank trust fund, and ten years of offsets from the Pension Funding Stabilization Initiative and the Pension Benefit Guaranty Corporation will be needed. Mr. Pryor noted that these offsets will make it even more difficult to identify funding for the next authorization.

Mr. Pryor then reported on some of the main provisions of the legislation. He said that the National Highway System and the Highway Bridge Program were consolidated into the new National Highway Program. Mr. Pryor stated that there is a call for performance measures in MAP-21. Metropolitan Planning Organizations (MPOs) are to establish targets that address national

performance measures in coordination with the State and providers of public transportation. Mr. Pryor stated that MPO funding is taken off the top from states' total highway formula apportionment in percentages they had from the 2009 apportionments. For transit, there is a move toward formula-based allocations, and he said that a consolidation of programs may affect what types of projects are eligible for funding. Mr. Pryor stated that MAG staff is working with agency partners to better understand changes to transit funding and programs.

Mr. Pryor stated that streamlining is a significant portion of MAP-21 and provides for a four-year deadline for project approval, for exempting more categories of projects from environmental assessments, and for expedited review (for most projects, it requires agencies with oversight responsibilities to conduct environmental review concurrently). Mr. Pryor stated that there are financial penalties when agencies fail to make decisions by deadlines.

Mr. Pryor stated that the new National Freight Policy will designate a primary freight network of 27,000 miles and require the development of a national freight strategic plan, which may be truck oriented, but national associations might push for a multimodal approach. Mr. Pryor stated that freight projects are eligible for \$500 million nationwide as projects of national and regional significance. He added that staff is working to understand potential opportunities for Arizona.

Mr. Pryor stated that for tribal transportation, the name was changed from the Indian Reservation Roads Program to the Tribal Transportation Program. He noted that MAP-21 includes a new funding formula which will be population based versus lane mile based and this may benefit smaller reservations with relatively large populations such as those in the MAG region.

Mr. Pryor stated that the segment of Interstate 11 from the Phoenix area to Las Vegas officially has been designated. He advised that no funding attached to this but it is a significant designation that allows for future potential funding. Mr. Pryor acknowledged the efforts of the MAG member agencies, regional organizations, the state, Senators McCain and Kyl from Arizona, and Senator Harry Reid of Nevada for pushing to make this designation happen.

Chair Lane asked how the ten year pension offsets would work into the funding number. Mr. Pryor replied that he did not have the number in front of him at the moment, but during the compromise they were looking to preserve certain provisions and funding amounts, virtually keeping everything the same as in SAFETEA-LU. Mr. Pryor noted that the fuel tax was insufficient to meet needs, and there was a transfer from the general fund and they looked at other areas.

Chair Lane asked if it was a type of fund sweep. Mr. Pryor replied that it appeared so. Chair Lane asked if the safeguard for these funds seems to be gone. Mr. Pryor said yes, and he added that payback is uncertain at this time. He indicated that he could check the language further for a payback provision.

8. Request for Future Agenda Items

Topics or issues of interest that the Transportation Policy Committee would like to have considered for discussion at a future meeting were requested.

No requests were noted.

9. Comments from the Committee

An opportunity was provided for Transportation Policy Committee members to present a brief summary of current events. The Transportation Policy Committee is not allowed to propose, discuss, deliberate or take action at the meeting on any matter in the summary, unless the specific matter is properly noticed for legal action.

Chair Lane noted that the August 15, 2012, TPC meeting had been canceled.

Adjournment

There being no further business, the meeting adjourned at 1:03 p.m.

Chair

Secretary