

May 13, 2014

TO: Members of the Transportation Policy Committee

FROM: Mayor Jackie Meck, Buckeye, Chair

SUBJECT: NOTIFICATION OF MEETING AND TRANSMITTAL OF TENTATIVE AGENDA

Meeting - 12:00 noon
Wednesday, May 21, 2014
MAG Office, Suite 200 - Saguaro Room
302 N. First Avenue, Phoenix

A meeting of the Transportation Policy Committee is scheduled for the time and place noted above. Members of the Committee may attend the meeting either in person, by videoconference, or by telephone conference call. As determined at the first meeting of the Committee, proxies are not allowed. Members who are not able to attend the meeting are encouraged to submit their comments in writing, so that their view is always a part of the process.

For those attending in person, please park in the garage under the building. Bring your ticket to the meeting, parking will be validated. For those using transit, the Regional Public Transportation Authority will provide transit tickets for your trip. For those using bicycles, please lock your bicycle in the bike rack in the garage.

Pursuant to Title II of the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA), MAG does not discriminate on the basis of disability in admission to or participation in its public meetings. Persons with a disability may request a reasonable accommodation, such as a sign language interpreter, by contacting Valerie Day at the MAG office. Requests should be made as early as possible to allow time to arrange the accommodation.

Refreshments and a light luncheon will be provided. If you have any questions, please contact Dennis Smith, MAG Executive Director, or Eric Anderson, MAG Transportation Director, at (602) 254-6300.

c: MAG Regional Council
MAG Management Committee

**TRANSPORTATION POLICY COMMITTEE
TENTATIVE AGENDA
May 21, 2014**

		<u>COMMITTEE ACTION REQUESTED</u>
1. <u>Call to Order</u>		
2. <u>Pledge of Allegiance</u>		
3. <u>Call to the Audience</u>		3. Information.
<p>An opportunity will be provided to members of the public to address the Transportation Policy Committee on items not scheduled on the agenda that fall under the jurisdiction of MAG, or on items on the agenda for discussion but not for action. 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. Please note that those wishing to comment on agenda items posted for action will be provided the opportunity at the time the item is heard.</p>		
4. <u>Approval of Consent Agenda</u>		4. Recommend approval of the Consent Agenda.
<p>Prior to action on the consent agenda, members of the audience will be provided an opportunity to comment on consent items that are being presented for action. Following the comment period, Committee members may request that an item be removed from the consent agenda. Consent items are marked with an asterisk (*).</p>		

ITEMS PROPOSED FOR CONSENT*

*4A. <u>Approval of the February 19, 2014, Meeting Minutes</u>	4A. Review and approval of the February 19, 2014, meeting minutes.
*4B. <u>Project Changes - Amendment and Administrative Modification to the FY 2014-2018 MAG Transportation Improvement Program, 2014 Arterial Life Cycle Program, and as Appropriate to the 2035 Regional Transportation Plan</u>	4B. Recommend approval of the amendments and administrative modifications to the FY 2014-2018 MAG Transportation Improvement Program, the 2014 Arterial Life Cycle Program, and as appropriate to the 2035 Regional Transportation Plan.

The Fiscal Year (FY) 2014-2018 MAG Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) and 2035 Regional Transportation Plan were approved by the MAG Regional Council on January 29, 2014, and the second amendment to the TIP was approved on March 26, 2014. Since then, there is a need to modify projects in the programs. The project changes include modifications to the Highway and Transit programs and to projects in the Arterial Life Cycle Program. These modifications do not require a conformity determination. On April 24, 2014, the Transportation Review Committee recommended the changes as noted in the TRC columns of Tables A and B. This item is on the May 14, 2014, MAG Management Committee agenda. An update will be provided on action taken by the committee. Please refer to the enclosed material.

*4C. Revisions to the Arterial Life Cycle Program Policies and Procedures

The Arterial Life Cycle Program (ALCP) is the financial management tool for the arterial component of the Regional Transportation Plan. The program is guided by the ALCP Policies and Procedures (Policies), which were last approved by the MAG Regional Council on December 9, 2009. In April 2013, the Managers Working Group held a meeting to address project commitment and the program's annual development. There was general consensus that additional project commitment requirements should be put in place and that any program rebalancing caused by a deficit or surplus should first go to the Managers Working Group for direction. The ALCP Working Group was tasked to develop specific policy revisions to accomplish these ends. The ALCP Working Group met a total of seven times from August 2013 through February 2014. In addition to new project commitment requirements and documentation of the annual program development process, proposed revisions to the Policies include institution of programming principles, establishment of advancement priorities, clarification of eligible match for federally funded projects, and simplification of administrative

4C. Recommend approval of the proposed revisions to the Arterial Life Cycle Program Policies and Procedures.

requirements. These revisions were presented to the Managers Working Group on March 25, 2014. On April 24, 2014, the Transportation Review Committee recommended approval of the proposed revisions to the Arterial Life Cycle Program Policies and Procedures. This item is on the May 14, 2014, MAG Management Committee agenda. An update will be provided on action taken by the committee. Please refer to the enclosed material.

ITEMS PROPOSED TO BE HEARD

- 5. Introduction of a Near-Term Improvements Strategy for the Interstate 10/Interstate 17 Corridor

On October 31, 2012, representatives from the Arizona Department of Transportation (ADOT), Federal Highway Administration (FHWA), the Cities of Chandler, Phoenix, and Tempe, and Valley Metro/RPTA met in a workshop to identify the steps forward for improving the 35-mile north-south Interstate 10/Interstate 17 corridor between the Loop 202 Pecos Stack and the Loop 101 North Stack. As presented to the Transportation Policy Committee on November 14, 2012, a multi-phase process was identified for improving the corridor that included a Near-Term Improvements Strategy to address bottleneck locations, and a Corridor Master Plan to establish a long-term vision for a corridor that has been referred to as the transportation “Spine” of the Valley. Planning efforts for both phases have begun. This presentation will focus upon the Near-Term Improvements Strategy that recommends additional intelligent transportation system (ITS) improvements, new ‘ramp weaves,’ collector-distributor lanes, and additional lanes for meeting present travel demands in the corridor to untangle some existing bottlenecks. Additional information about the strategies that are under consideration is provided in the attached summary transmittal.

- 5. Information and discussion.

6. Overview of the Development of the Regional Transportation Plan

Moving Ahead for Progress in the 21st Century (MAP-21), the federal transportation legislation that became law in 2012, sets forth a new requirement that the performance measurement be a key part of the development of long range transportation plans. Although the current Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) for the MAG region incorporates performance factors, MAP-21 requires that the goals and objectives of the RTP, the performance measurements and targets tied to the goals and objectives, and the selection of programs and projects in the plan be more explicitly tied together. MAG staff will present an overview of the RTP development process. The first steps will be to review and revise the goals and objectives in the RTP to reflect current policy and the development of the performance measurement component of the plan including the definition of the specific measures to be tracked, future performance targets, and outline the link to the project selection process.

7. Vacancy in the Business Seat Representing Transit Interests on the Transportation Policy Committee

Proposition 400, passed by the voters of Maricopa County in 2004, authorizes the President of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives to each appoint three business members to six-year terms on the Transportation Policy Committee (TPC). One of these business members must represent transit interests. In January 2010, the Speaker of the House of Representatives appointed Mr. Ron Barnes of Total Transit as the TPC business member representing transit. On April 17, 2014, Mr. Barnes notified MAG that he would be resigning his seat on the TPC. It is anticipated that the Speaker will appoint a member representing transit interests to fulfill the term of Mr. Barnes' term that will expire on December 31, 2016. State law also provides that the Chairman of the Regional Planning Agency may submit names to the President and Speaker for consideration in the

6. Information and discussion.

7. Information, discussion, and possible action.

TPC appointments. On April 24, 2014, the Chair of the MAG Regional Council sent a memorandum requesting the names and bios of individuals to be considered in the appointment be submitted to MAG by May 9, 2014. It is anticipated that input on these names will be provided at the May 21, 2014, TPC meeting and a recommendation to the Speaker of the House be made at the May 28, 2014, Regional Council meeting. Please refer to the enclosed material.

8. Legislative Update

An update will be provided on legislative issues of interest.

9. 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 will be requested.

10. Comments from the Committee

An opportunity will be 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.

Adjournment

8. Information, discussion, and possible action.

9. Information.

10. Information.

MINUTES OF THE
MARICOPA ASSOCIATION OF GOVERNMENTS
TRANSPORTATION POLICY COMMITTEE MEETING

February 19, 2014
MAG Office, Saguaro Room
Phoenix, Arizona

MEMBERS ATTENDING

- | | |
|--|--|
| Mayor Jackie Meck, Buckeye, Chair | Joseph La Rue, State Transportation Board |
| Councilmember Jack Sellers, Chandler,
Vice Chair | * Lt. Governor Stephen Roe Lewis, Gila River
Indian Community |
| # F. Rockne Arnett, Citizens Transportation
Oversight Committee | * Mayor Georgia Lord, Goodyear |
| Ron Barnes, Total Transit | * Mayor Mark Mitchell, Tempe |
| * Dave Berry, Swift Transportation | # Garrett Newland, Macerich |
| * Jed Billings, FNF Construction | Mayor Tom Rankin, Florence |
| # Councilmember Cathy Carlat, Peoria | # Mayor Marie Lopez Rogers, Avondale |
| * Councilmember Ben Cooper, Gilbert | * Mayor Scott Smith, Mesa |
| Supervisor Clint Hickman, Maricopa County | * Mayor Greg Stanton, Phoenix |
| * Mark Killian, The Killian Company/Sunny
Mesa, Inc. | Karrin Kunasek Taylor, DMB Properties |
| * Mayor W. J. "Jim" Lane, Scottsdale | Mayor Jerry Weiers, Glendale |
| | * 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 Mayor Jackie Meck at 12:15 p.m.

2. Pledge of Allegiance

The Pledge of Allegiance was recited.

Mayor Marie Lopez Rogers, Councilmember Cathy Carlat, Mr. Roc Arnett, and Mr. Garrett Newland participated in the meeting by telephone.

Chair Meck announced that at each place was a Legislative Summary for agenda item #9.

Chair Meck 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. He stated that hearing assisted devices,

parking garage validation, and transit tickets for those who purchased transit tickets to attend the meeting were available from staff.

3. Call to the Audience

Chair Meck 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 Meck stated that agenda items #4A, #4B, and #4C 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 Meck asked members if they would like to remove any of the consent agenda items or have a presentation. No requests were noted.

Mr. Ron Barnes moved to recommend approval of agenda items #4A, #4B, and #4C on the consent agenda. Vice Chair Jack Sellers seconded, and the motion carried unanimously.

4A. Approval of the January 29, 2014, Meeting Minutes

The Transportation Policy Committee, by consent, approved the January 29, 2014, meeting minutes.

4B. MAG Federally Funded Locally Sponsored Project Development Status Report: January 2014, and Project Changes

The Transportation Policy Committee, by consent, recommended approval of federal fund projects to be deferred, deleted, and changed; and of the necessary amendments and administrative modifications to the FY 2014-2018 Transportation Improvement Program, 2035 Regional Transportation Plan, and to the FY 2011-2015 Transportation Improvement Program as appropriate. The MAG Federal Fund Programming Guidelines and Procedures, approved by the MAG Regional Council on October 26, 2011, outlines the requirements for local agencies to submit status information on the development of their federally funded projects. This Project Development Status Report focuses mainly on projects funded with Congestion Mitigation and Air

Quality Improvement (CMAQ), and Transportation Alternatives program funds that are programmed in the Fiscal Year (FY) 2011-2015 Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) as of November 2013 to authorize in federal fiscal year (FFY) 2014 and FFY 2015. The Project Development Status Workbook for each project that was sent to member agencies requires that a project development schedule be completed and allows project changes to be requested. This item was recommended by the MAG Street Committee on January 14, 2014, the MAG Transportation Review Committee on January 30, 2014, and the MAG Management Committee on February 12, 2014.

4C. Project Changes - Amendment and Administrative Modification to the FY 2014-2018 MAG Transportation Improvement Program, the Regional Transportation Plan, and the FY 2011-2015 Transportation Improvement Program

The Transportation Policy Committee, by consent, recommended approval of amendments and administrative modifications to the FY 2014-2018 Transportation Improvement Program, the Regional Transportation Plan, and the FY 2011-2015 Transportation Improvement Program as appropriate. On January 28, 2014, the MAG Regional Council approved the MAG Transportation Alternatives program ranked order of projects (for fiscal years 2015-2017), the Fiscal Year (FY) 2014-2018 MAG Transportation Improvement Program, and the Regional Transportation Plan. Since then, member agencies have requested general project changes. The detailed listing of work phases for the Transportation Alternatives program and the detailed work phase listings of the proposed PM-2.5 Paving Unpaved Road Projects are included in Table B. The MAG Management Committee recommended approval on February 12, 2014.

5. Interstate 10/Interstate 17 Corridor Master Plan

Bob Hazlett, MAG staff, stated that the Interstate 10/Interstate 17 Corridor Master Plan is underway. Mr. Hazlett noted that the master plan is building upon that which is contained in the Regional Transportation Plan. He added that \$1.47 billion is included in the Regional Transportation Plan for improvements to I-10 and I-17.

Mr. Hazlett explained that conducting this master plan is in response to the 2012 decision for suspending the two environmental impact statement studies for the corridor between the SR-101L/Agua Fria-Pima and SR-202L/Santan-South Mountain traffic interchanges. Mr. Hazlett stated that issues affected the environmental impact statement studies: New airspace regulations at Phoenix Sky Harbor International Airport that impact the I-10/I-17 interchange would make the planned improvements difficult to implement and the environmental impact statement process had taken too long – it had been about 11 years since the process began – and new ideas to meet travel demand have emerged.

Mr. Hazlett stated that at a Corridor Master Plan workshop in October 2012, study participants re-examined what needed to be done in the corridor, also known as “The Spine.” He said that the path forward was defined, which includes identifying some near term improvements that could be made,

conducting the Corridor Master Plan, carrying out the environmental studies, and implementing the design, construction and operations.

Mr. Hazlett reported that the seven major tasks in the Corridor Master Plan were developed by MAG, ADOT, and FHWA, and he added that the Regional Council has approved the selection of HDR, Inc., as the study consultant. Mr. Hazlett advised that consensus and concurrence summaries are going to be extremely important aspects in the Corridor Master Plan. He explained that many times in the past, decisions were made without full consultation of the stakeholders. Mr. Hazlett stated that there will be deliberate points when requests for consensus and concurrence on recommendations will be sought in order to have buy-in on the ultimate recommendation. He referenced the 25 lanes at the Broadway Curve and 18 lanes on I-17 recommended in previous studies, which would have taken out a lot of businesses.

Mr. Hazlett stated that the Corridor Master Plan study area is 35 miles long and covers one mile to either side of I-10 between the I-17 Split interchange and the SR-202L Pecos Stack, and I-17 between the I-10 interchange and the SR-101L North Stack. He noted that the Corridor Master Plan will also look at the parallel arterial corridors to maximize opportunities for accommodating some of the travel demand. Mr. Hazlett stated that technology will also be a part of the Corridor Master Plan to look at improving operations rather than just adding another lane.

Mr. Hazlett reported on project direction. He stated that MAG, ADOT, and FHWA are the management partners in the Corridor Master Plan and will receive guidance from the charter partners (elected officials and the executive directors of the management partners). He said that this is the same approach as that used for the US-60 COMPASS study and was found to be very effective. Mr. Hazlett stated that agency partners and planning partners (cities, Valley Metro, and the freight community) will also be contributing to the Corridor Master Plan. He added that another important element in the process is the project stakeholders (focus groups, Phoenix Village Councils, affected interest groups, and the general public).

Mr. Hazlett stated that tentative project goals and objectives have been drafted: (1) Establish a system of overall corridor operating principles to effectively identify the Spine's long-term character. (2) Optimize the corridor to improve its travel time reliability to accommodate existing and long-term demand. (3) Examine opportunities for incorporating alternative transportation modes wherever possible. (4) Establish an implementation strategy for delivering this project's recommendations. (5) Coordinate with the project's Partners and Stakeholders on a continuing basis to receive consent for the project's proposed actions.

Mr. Hazlett stated that near-term improvements are under development by ADOT. One option under consideration includes technological improvements that will improve traffic flow, such as coordinating ramp metering with arterials. Mr. Hazlett stated that potential projects must rapidly meet the environmental requirements and a near-term construction timeframe. He added that a package of projects is anticipated to be developed by May 2014, at which time it will be brought to the Transportation Policy Committee.

Mr. Hazlett stated that 43 percent of all travel that takes place in the region uses I-10 and I-17. He added that this is the most heavily traveled corridor in the Valley.

Mr. Hazlett stated that kickoff meetings with ADOT, FHWA, Valley Metro, Chandler, Guadalupe, Phoenix, and Tempe are underway, and meetings with the charter partners are being scheduled. Mr. Hazlett noted that a progress report will be brought back to the Transportation Policy Committee this summer.

Chair Meck thanked Mr. Hazlett for his report. No questions from the Committee were noted.

6. Interstate 11 and Intermountain West Corridor Study

Mr. Hazlett then provided an update on the Interstate 11 and Intermountain West Corridor Study for the congressionally designated Interstate 11 corridor between Phoenix and Las Vegas. The corridor study is determining the needs for upgrading the existing US-93 between Wickenburg, Arizona, and Henderson, Nevada; providing further research for connections in the metropolitan Phoenix area; and determining how to extend the corridor beyond Phoenix to the south toward Mexico and north of Las Vegas to Canada. He explained that this corridor study is a joint project of the Arizona Department of Transportation (ADOT) and the Nevada Department of Transportation (NDOT). He noted that MAG and its counterpart in Nevada, the Regional Transportation Commission of Southern Nevada, are partners in the project. Mr. Hazlett stated that the two-year study is in phase three.

Mr. Hazlett stated that alternatives for the location of Interstate 11 were screened in Level One and then further screened in Level Two. He stated that potential alternatives for Interstate 11 in the MAG region were divided into those north of Interstate 10 and those south of Interstate 10.

Mr. Hazlett stated that two alternatives for north of Interstate 10 are being brought forward for further study: (1) a corridor that is approximately in the Hassayampa Freeway corridor and (2) a corridor that is approximately in the Turner Parkway area.

Mr. Hazlett stated that five alternatives for south of Interstate 10 are being brought forward for further study: (1) a corridor that is approximately the Hassayampa Freeway corridor; (2-5) Corridors that utilize portions of the existing MAG Freeway System.

Mr. Hazlett stated that the alternatives screening process utilized 21 criteria. He stated that staff went back and reviewed the approved MAG framework studies to see how they would overlay the potential alternatives.

Mr. Hazlett stated that the Interstate 10/Hassayampa Valley Roadway Framework Study was accepted by the MAG Regional Council in February 2008 and the corridors in the MAG region were adopted as illustrative corridors in the Regional Transportation Plan. He noted that Buckeye, Goodyear, Surprise, ADOT, and Maricopa County contributed to the study to identify the roadway framework. Mr. Hazlett stated that more than 175 meetings took place, and resource agencies, such

as Arizona Game and Fish, Bureau of Land Management, US Fish and Wildlife, were consulted. He showed an overlay of the Interstate 10/Hassayampa Valley Roadway Framework Study with the alternatives for Interstate 11 that are north of Interstate 10. Mr. Hazlett pointed out that one alignment was eliminated because it was too close to the White Tank Mountains, wildlife corridors, and entitled developments.

Mr. Hazlett stated that the Interstates 8 and 10/Hidden Valley Transportation Framework Study was accepted by the MAG Regional Council in February 2009 and the corridors in the MAG region were adopted as illustrative corridors in the Regional Transportation Plan. He then displayed an overlay of the Interstates 8 and 10/Hidden Valley Transportation Framework Study map with the alternatives for Interstate 11 that are south of Interstate 10. Mr. Hazlett noted concerns for the Sonoran Desert Monument and the Estrella Mountains that are in the area. He remarked that based on feedback from the resource agencies, there is only one area in which a corridor could be located. Mr. Hazlett reported that participants in the Interstates 8 and 10/Hidden Valley Transportation Framework Study included ADOT, Buckeye, Goodyear, and the City of Maricopa.

Mr. Hazlett summarized overall concerns and comments. He noted that there is support for the congressionally designated route of Interstate 11 to be on US-93 from Wickenburg to the Colorado River. Mr. Hazlett remarked that the emphasis should be on how Interstate 11 is built rather than on why it should be built, because Congress has already made the case.

Mr. Hazlett stated that there are numerous distractions for north and south segments outside the congressionally designated route from the metro Phoenix area to Las Vegas. He urged increasing the accuracy by ADOT of the Hassayampa Freeway corridor, which has been adopted by the MAG Regional Council as an illustrative corridor, and he noted that too many alternatives are moving forward. Mr. Hazlett noted that the MAG Regional Council is the recognized planning body and is the ultimate authority in this region. He added that the Hassayampa Freeway corridor was determined through a study that cost approximately \$1.7 million in which ADOT was a participant.

Mr. Hazlett stated that there has been a focus on narrow goals versus broader goals for construction of Interstate 11. He said there has been discussion of locating the Vulture Mine Joint Recreational Management Area where a roadway already has been drawn. He said that the overall goal is the construction of Interstate 11.

Chair Meck thanked Mr. Hazlett for his report. No questions from the Committee were noted.

7. Designing Transit Accessible Communities Study

Alice Chen, MAG staff, provided a report on the recently completed Designing Transit Accessible Communities Study. She said that this study is relevant to many communities because of the aging population. Ms. Chen noted that seniors can face isolation, reduced quality of life, or economic hardship if they do not have access to affordable transportation options. She noted that the age 65 and older age group is projected to at least double in this region by 2030.

Ms. Chen stated that the majority of another age group, the Millennials (ages 18 to 34), prefer to live in communities that are walkable and they highly value having bus routes and rail lines within walking distance of their homes. She said that knowledge workers are drawn to mass transit and dense, lively neighborhoods. Ms. Chen stated that historically, workers have lived in the suburbs and commute to work in the city, but in Silicon Valley this practice is reversed. She noted that Google operates a shuttle from San Francisco where its employees reside to its offices in San Jose. Ms. Chen added that rental prices within a walkable distance of these shuttles are increasing at a faster rate than those outside the walkable distance.

Ms. Chen stated that big box retailers are changing their design practices to more compact facilities in order to fit in with the urban lifestyles being chosen by younger adults.

Ms. Chen stated that transit accessibility is defined by the American Public Transit Association as the segment of an individual trip that occurs between an origin or destination point and the transit system. She said that the goal of the Designing Transit Accessible Communities Study was to better understand transit accessibility for this region given the unique geography and built environment. Ms. Chen stated that they began the study with a stakeholder workshop that was attended by approximately 40 people, composed of facilities staff, transportation planners, human services planners, and special needs coordinators.

Ms. Chen stated that they also conducted surveys of transit users at five transit locations in the region and asked them what they felt were critical issues. She noted that all of the findings and recommendations were included in the final report.

Ms. Chen stated that the report includes the areas identified and for each area, what makes it important, improvement considerations, and planning and policy guidance. She said they specifically focused on best practices with MAG member agencies. And while the report included cost to mitigate some of the concerns identified, they also tried to put forth examples of how some of these issues could have been mitigated during design and planning stages at a much lower cost than a retrofit.

Chair Meck thanked Ms. Chen for her report. He noted that there would be no action since a quorum was not present. He asked members if they had questions.

Mayor Rogers reported that the City of Avondale will be utilizing this study to look at its transit and how they can reach and move people better. She expressed her appreciation for this very valuable study.

Mr. Barnes commended the study as well. He asked how the information would be disseminated once it is accepted. Ms. Chen replied that the study has no specific guidelines to include in any MAG documents and it does not have any illustrative corridors. She said that at the end of the study process they held a workshop of interested parties, such as transportation planners and engineers, to introduce them to the study's concepts. Ms. Chen stated that she would be glad to go to any community and conduct a workshop on how to utilize the study.

Chair Meck recognized public comment from Marvin Rochelle, who stated that this study was doing a good job, but not enough is being done to keep up with the large number of Baby Boomers who are turning 65 every day. Mr. Rochelle stated that a regional Dial-A-Ride system is needed to get people across the region seamlessly. He added that this type of system has not been possible due to funding. Chair Meck thanked Mr. Rochelle for his comments.

8. Progress Report on Regional Freeway and Highway Program Construction

Mr. Hazlett noted that Brent Cain, who was planned to give the report, had an unavoidable conflict. He introduced Madhu Reddy from ADOT to provide the progress report on regional freeway and highway program construction.

Mr. Reddy stated that there currently are 24 projects under construction, which includes five regionally funded projects, 19 federally funded projects, and 10 local public agency projects, with an overall contract cost of \$366 million.

Mr. Reddy stated that projects on Loop 303 began in July 2011 with projects extending from Interstate 10 to Grand Avenue. He noted that these five segments represent a \$500 million construction program.

Mr. Reddy stated that the I-10/Loop 303 traffic interchange project, at a construction cost of \$158 million, began construction in November 2011. He said it is approximately 94 percent complete and is expected to be complete in early fall of 2014.

Mr. Reddy stated that the two-mile segment on Loop 303 from Thomas Road to Camelback Road is substantially complete. He said that the construction cost was \$38 million and all lanes are open to traffic.

Mr. Reddy stated that the segment on Loop 303 from Camelback Road to Glendale Avenue is approximately 70 percent complete. He noted that construction cost is \$50 million and is expected to be completed in late summer 2014.

Mr. Reddy stated that the segment on Loop 303 from Glendale Avenue to Peoria Avenue is substantially complete at a construction cost of \$79 million.

Mr. Reddy stated that the segment on Loop 303 from Peoria Avenue to Mountain View Boulevard, at a construction cost of \$148 million, is substantially complete.

Mr. Reddy stated then described the landscaping projects on Loop 303, all the way from Mountain View Boulevard to the traffic interchange with I-10. He said that two projects are underway and four to begin in 2014 and 2015.

Mr. Reddy stated that the direct high occupancy vehicle ramp project on Loop 101 and Maryland Avenue is a design build project that is approximately 71 percent complete. He said that the construction cost is \$13 million and the project is expected to be complete in April 2014.

Mr. Reddy stated that the SR-24 (Gateway Freeway) project is approximately 95 percent complete. He noted that the construction cost is \$82 million and is expected to be complete in May 2014.

Mr. Reddy stated that the US 60 (Grand Avenue) project, from 19th Avenue to 71st Avenue, has a construction cost of \$18 million. He noted that the project is approximately 70 percent complete and is projected to be complete in late spring 2014.

Mr. Reddy then described upcoming 2014 projects. The US-60/Meridian Road half-diamond interchange; the Loop 202/Loop 101/Broadway Road design build project, which includes construction of a general purpose lane and a high occupancy vehicle lane; the Loop101/Loop 202/Shea Boulevard project scheduled to be advertised in April 2014; the SR-51/Black Mountain Boulevard project, expected to start construction in May 2014; the Loop 303/US-60 traffic interchange project to build interim ramps will begin construction in July or August 2014; the Loop 303/US-60/Happy Valley Parkway design build project will complete the 303 freeway loop; the Loop 303/El Mirage Road traffic interchange is scheduled to be advertised in July 2014.

Chair Meck thanked Mr. Reddy for his report. No questions from the Committee were noted.

9. Legislative Update

Nathan Pryor, MAG staff, provided an update on legislative issues of interest. Mr. Pryor stated that last month, the Transportation Policy Committee recommended to the MAG Regional Council that they send a letter to Governor Brewer and the State Legislators encouraging that the Highway User Revenue Fund (HURF) be kept intact at the statutory limit. He noted that the Regional Council approved sending the letter. Mr. Pryor stated that a related bill was introduced by Speaker Tobin and cosponsored by 55 Legislators taking the same position to limit the HURF sweeps this year and next year.

Mr. Pryor stated that the State Legislature has a number of bills focused on new funding mechanisms. He explained that two bills would establish a task force to explore new means of replacing the motor fuel tax and use tax. Mr. Pryor stated that these two bills have not moved to date, but it is encouraging to see that legislators are considering alternatives.

Mr. Pryor stated that another bill introduced would create a county option tax on fuel up to three percent. Again, this bill has yet to move but he will monitor this legislation.

Mr. Pryor stated that related to the Interstate 11 discussion, an update on Interstate 11 will be provided to congressional staff members on Thursday, February 27. He explained that this meeting is being coordinated by the Nevada DOT, ADOT, the Regional Transportation Commission (MPO in Las Vegas), MAG staff, and the I-11 Coalition.

Chair Meck thanked Mr. Pryor for his report. No questions from the Committee were noted.

10. 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.

11. 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.

No comments were noted.

Adjournment

There being no further business, the meeting adjourned at 1:00 p.m.

Chair

Secretary

MARICOPA ASSOCIATION OF GOVERNMENTS

INFORMATION SUMMARY... for your review

DATE:

May 13, 2014

SUBJECT:

Project Changes - Amendment and Administrative Modification to the FY 2014-2018 MAG Transportation Improvement Program, FY 2014 Arterial Life Cycle Program, and as Appropriate, to the 2035 Regional Transportation Plan

SUMMARY:

The Fiscal Year (FY) 2014-2018 MAG Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) and 2035 Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) were approved by the MAG Regional Council on January 29, 2014. The FY 2014 Arterial Life Cycle Program update was approved January 29, 2014. The last modification was approved by the MAG Regional Council on March 26, 2014, and agencies have requested project changes. This will be the third request for an amendment to the FY 2014-2018 MAG Transportation Improvement Program.

The attachment listings in Table A include requested changes and modifications to highway and transit projects in the FY 2014-2018 MAG TIP and include changes to the Arterial Life Cycle Program and related projects in Table B. A "Received by" column has been added to the right-hand side of the Tables to note the committees that have reviewed the proposed changes for individual listings. Conformity consultation on these projects is considered under a separate agenda item.

Highway Changes:

The Arizona Department of Transportation (ADOT) has included project changes related to updates in the Statewide Five Year Program, changes to the Regional Transportation Plan Freeway Program, and to maintenance and sub-programs. Member agencies have submitted various local and federally funded project changes.

The MAG Safety Committee has approved projects for advancement and deferrals based on agency requests, and some safety projects have added additional funding based on updated engineering estimates. Funding through the sub-allocated Highway Safety Improvement Program (HSIP-MAG) is available to meet these requests. MAG is requesting TIP amendments to consolidate funding based on federal and state guidance, and to make clerical corrections to the TIP. Placeholders for the actual (FFY 2014) and estimated (FFY 2015, 2016, 2017, and 2018) Congestion Mitigation and Air Quality Improvement Funds (CMAQ) Flex transfer to transit as noted in the Regional Transportation Plan are included for accounting and planning purposes. The detail of the TIP listings for the proposed Transportation Alternatives Non-Infrastructure Safe Routes to School eligible activities projects are included, approval of projects will be considered under a separate agenda item; FY 2015-2017 MAG Transportation Alternatives Non-Infrastructure Safe Routes to School Projects.

Transit Changes:

Transit related TIP changes include new projects funded by the ADOT 5310 and 5311 programs. ADOT administered projects are FY 2013 apportioned funds that were awarded to MAG agencies through a competitive process and work will progress through 2015. FTA Section 5310 program of projects detailed TIP listing for the Phoenix-Mesa urbanized area are included and the project approval is listed under agenda item; FFY 2014 FTA Section 5310, Enhanced Mobility of Seniors and Individuals with Disabilities

Grant Program Recommendations for the Phoenix/Mesa Urbanized Area. Project updates and clerical corrections in the Valley Metro Transit Life Cycle Program and the MAG Program of Projects for the 5307, 5309, and 5337 programs are also included.

ALCP Changes:

The amendments include the correction of an administrative error on the Frank Lloyd Wright Blvd. at 76th/78th/82nd Streets project and the reassignment of FY 2012 Northern Parkway reimbursement totaling \$495,970 from the Northern Parkway: Sarival to Dysart landscaping project (ACI-NOR-10-03-A) to the Northern Parkway: Sarival to Dysart construction project (ACI-NOR-30-03-A). The reassignment is necessary to match the federal obligation. ADOT requested changes to HSIP funded work activities. Listings with a notation of "related to NACOG loan" in the Notes Column are for the advancement of three projects which are contingent on approval of the separate agenda item; please see Northern Arizona Council of Governments Loan Request, and Proposed Project Advancements.

PUBLIC INPUT:

None has been received.

PROS & CONS:

PROS: Approval of this TIP amendment and administrative modification will allow the projects to proceed in a timely manner.

CONS: None.

TECHNICAL & POLICY IMPLICATIONS:

TECHNICAL: Projects that wish to utilize transportation federal funds or are regionally significant need to be shown in the TIP in the year that they expect to commence and may need to undergo an air quality conformity analysis or consultation.

POLICY: This amendment and administrative modification request is in accordance with MAG guidelines.

ACTION NEEDED:

Recommend approval of the amendments and administrative modifications to the FY 2014-2018 MAG Transportation Improvement Program, the 2014 Arterial Life Cycle Program, and as appropriate to the 2035 Regional Transportation Plan.

PRIOR COMMITTEE ACTIONS:

This item is on the May 14, 2014, MAG Management Committee agenda. An update will be provided on action taken by the committee.

On April 24, 2014, the Transportation Review Committee (TRC) recommended the changes as noted in the TRC columns of Tables A and B.

MEMBERS ATTENDING

Avondale: David Fitzhugh, Chair
Phoenix: Rick Naimark, Vice Chair
ADOT: Kwi-Sung Kang for Floyd Roehrich
Buckeye: Jose Heredia for Scott Lowe
Cave Creek: Ian Cordwell
Chandler: Dan Cook
El Mirage: Jorge Gastelum
Fountain Hills: Randy Harrel
Gila Bend: Ernie Rubi
* Gila River: Tim Oliver
Gilbert: Kristin Myers for Leah Hubbard

Glendale: Debbie Albert
Goodyear: Cato Esquivel
Litchfield Park: Julius Diogenes for Woody Scoutten
Maricopa (City): Paul Jepson
Maricopa County: John Hauskins
Mesa: Jeff Martin for Scott Butler
* Paradise Valley: Jim Shano
Peoria: Andrew Granger
Queen Creek: Mohamed Youssef
Surprise: Martin Lucero for Dick McKinley

Tempe: Marge Zylla for Shelly Seyler
Valley Metro: John Farry

* Wickenburg: Vince Lorefice
Youngtown: Grant Anderson

EX-OFFICIO MEMBERS ATTENDING

- * Street Committee: Charles Andrews, Avondale
- * ITS Committee: Catherine Hollow, Tempe
FHWA: Ed Stillings

- * Bicycle/Pedestrian Committee: Denise Lacey, Maricopa County
- * Transportation Safety Committee: Renate Ehm, Mesa

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

Approval of the increased funding and project advancements for Highway Safety Improvement Program (HSIP-MAG) was recommended at the April 9, 2014, Transportation Safety Committee meeting.

MEMBERS ATTENDING

- # Linda Gorman, AAA Arizona
- * Tom Burch, AARP
- # Kohinoor Kar, ADOT
- # Shane Kiesow, City of Apache Junction
- * Dana Chamberlin, City of Avondale
- * Thomas Chlebanowski, Town of Buckeye
Martin Johnson, City of Chandler
Bob Senita, City of El Mirage
- # Kelly LaRosa, FHWA
Kristen Meyers for Erik Guderian,
Town of Gilbert
- # Kiran Guntupalli for Chris Lemka,
City of Glendale

- * Alberto Gutier, GOHS
- # Hugh Bigalk, City of Goodyear
Nicolaas Swart, Maricopa County
Renate Ehm (Chair), City of Mesa
- * Jeremy Knapp, Town of Paradise Valley
- + Mannar Tamirisa for Jamal Rahimi,
City of Peoria
- * Kerry Wilcoxon, City of Phoenix
- # George Williams, City of Scottsdale
- * Martin Lucero for Jason Mahkovtz,
City of Surprise
- # Julian Dresang, City of Tempe
- * Gardner Tabon, RPTA

* Those members neither present nor represented by proxy.
Participated by telephone conference call. + Participated by videoconference call.

CONTACT PERSON:

Stephen Tate, Transportation Improvement Program Planner, (602) 254-6300, or
Teri Kennedy, Transportation Improvement Program Manager, (602) 254-6300

**TABLE A: Requested amendments and administrative modifications to the
FY 2014-2018 MAG Transportation Improvement Program (TIP), FY 2014 Arterial Life Cycle Program, and the 2035 Long Range Plan¹**

Sort: Section, Agency, Location, Work Year

TIP Amendment #3																				Reviewed By ²				
Agency	Section	Work Year ⁴	TIP ID	MAG ID	Location	Work	Miles	Lanes Before	Lanes After	ALI	In ALCP	TRACS	MAG Mode	Funding	Apport. Year ³	Federal	Regional	Local	Total	TIP Change Request	T R C	M C	T P C	R C
ADOT	Highway	2014	DOT14-431	TBD	10: 67th Ave & SR101L/SR51	Construct noise walls	0.5	10	10	-----	No	-----	Freeway	RARF	2014	-	800,000	-	800,000	Amend: Add a new noise wall construction project in FY 2014 for \$800,000.	✓	✓		
ADOT	Highway	2015	DOT15-411	TBD	10: Dysart Rd - Black Canyon Hwy	Design pavement preservation	13.0	10	10	----	No	----	Freeway	NHPP	2015	301,760	-	18,240	320,000	Amend: Add a new pavement preservation design project in FY 2015 for \$320,000.	✓	✓		
ADOT	Highway	2017	DOT17-417	TBD	10: Dysart Rd - Black Canyon Hwy	Construct pavement preservation	13.0	10	10	----	No	----	Freeway	NHPP	2017	4,432,100	-	267,900	4,700,000	Amend: Add a new pavement preservation construction project in FY 2017 for \$4,700,000.	✓	✓		
ADOT	Highway	2015	DOT15-415D	TBD	10: Fairway Dr (El Mirage Rd) TI	Design traffic interchange	0.2	10	10	-----	No	-----	Freeway	RARF	2015	-	1,000,000	-	1,000,000	Amend: Add a new traffic interchange design project in FY 2015 for \$1,000,000.	✓	✓		
ADOT	Highway	2015	DOT15-415RW	TBD	10: Fairway Dr (El Mirage Rd) TI	Right of way acquisition	0.2	10	10	-----	No	-----	Freeway	RARF	2015	-	900,000	-	900,000	Amend: Add a new right of way project in FY 2015 for \$900,000.	✓	✓		
ADOT	Highway	2014	DOT14-421	TBD	10: Salome Rd - SR85	Construct pavement preservation	32.0	4	4	----	No	----	Freeway	NHPP	2014	1,291,910	-	78,090	1,370,000	Amend: Add a new pavement preservation construction project in FY 2014 for \$1,370,000.	✓	✓		
ADOT	Highway	2014	DOT14-422	TBD	10: SR101L/I-10 Ramp #2201 and Ramp SE #2202	Design bridge deck rehabilitation	1.0	10	10	-----	No	FTA	Freeway	NHPP	2014	235,750	-	14,250	250,000	Amend: Add a new bridge deck rehabilitation design project in FY 2014 for \$250,000.	✓	✓		
ADOT	Highway	2015	DOT12-118	TBD	10: SR101L (Agua Fria) I-17	Utility relocation design	9.0	10	10	-----	No	-----	Freeway	RARF	2015	-	1,000,000	-	1,000,000	Amend: Defer project from FY 2014 to FY 2015.	✓	✓		
ADOT	Highway	2017	DOT17-418	TBD	10: SR101L/I-10 SW/SE Ramps	Bridge rehabilitation	0.2	10	10	----	No	----	Freeway	NHPP	2017	Federal	-	22,800	22,800	Amend: Add a new bridge rehabilitation project in FY 2017 for \$400,000.	✓	✓		
ADOT	Highway	2014	DOT14-106	TBD	10: SR85 - Dysart Rd	Construct sign rehabilitation	18.0	6	6	-----	No	-----	Freeway	NHPP	2014	480,930	-	29,070	510,000	Amend: Increase total project budget by \$110,000 from \$400,000 to \$510,000.	✓	✓		
ADOT	Highway	2015	DOT15-412	TBD	10: SR85 - Verrado (WB)	Design pavement preservation	8.0	4	4	----	No	----	Freeway	NHPP	2015	301,760	-	18,240	320,000	Amend: Add a new pavement preservation design project in FY 2015 for \$320,000.	✓	✓		

**TABLE A: Requested amendments and administrative modifications to the
FY 2014-2018 MAG Transportation Improvement Program (TIP), FY 2014 Arterial Life Cycle Program, and the 2035 Long Range Plan¹**

Sort: Section, Agency, Location, Work Year

TIP Amendment #3																				Reviewed By ²				
Agency	Section	Work Year ⁴	TIP ID	MAG ID	Location	Work	Miles	Lanes Before	Lanes After	ALI	In ALCF	TRACS	MAG Mode	Funding	Apport. Year ³	Federal	Regional	Local	Total	TIP Change Request	T R C	M C	T P C	R C
ADOT	Highway	2017	DOT17-419	TBD	10: SR85 - Verrado (WB)	Construct pavement preservation	8.0	4	4	----	No	----	Freeway	NHPP	2017	4,243,500	-	256,500	4,500,000	Amend: Add a new pavement preservation construction project in FY 2017 for \$4,500,000.	✓	✓		
ADOT	Highway	2014	DOT14-423	TBD	10: University Dr TI Underpass, Str #2004	Design bridge rehabilitation	1.0	10	10	----	No	----	Freeway	NHPP	2014	235,750	-	14,250	250,000	Amend: Add a new bridge rehabilitation design project in FY 2014 for \$250,000.	✓	✓		
ADOT	Highway	2015	DOT98-111	TBD	101 (Pima Fwy): Pima Rd Extension (JPA)	Design roadway extension	3.0	0	4	----	No	----	Freeway	RARF	2015		297,000	-	297,000	Amend: Defer project from FY 2014 to FY 2015.	✓	✓		
ADOT	Highway	2014	DOT14-424	TBD	101(Pima Fwy): Marlboro Ave	Utility relocation	0.1	8	8	----	No	----	Freeway	Slate	2014		-	50,000	50,000	Amend: Add a new utility relocation project in FY 2014 for \$50,000.	✓	✓		
ADOT	Highway	2017	DOT17-420	TBD	17: 19th Ave TI Overpass	Bridge rehabilitation	0.2	6	6	----	No	----	Freeway	NHPP	2017	471,500	-	28,500	500,000	Amend: Add a new bridge rehabilitation project in FY 2017 for \$500,000.	✓	✓		
ADOT	Highway	2014	DOT14-425	TBD	17: 19th Ave TI Overpass, Str #717	Design bridge rehabilitation	1.0	6	6	----	No	----	Freeway	NHPP	2014	254,610	-	15,390	270,000	Amend: Add a new bridge rehabilitation design project in FY 2014 for \$270,000.	✓	✓		
ADOT	Highway	2014	DOT14-426	TBD	17: Jefferson St Underpass, Str #554	Design bridge rehabilitation	1.0	6	6	----	No	----	Freeway	NHPP	2014	253,667	-	15,333	269,000	Amend: Add a new bridge rehabilitation design project in FY 2014 for \$269,000.	✓	✓		
ADOT	Highway	2017	DOT17-421	TBD	17: Jefferson Street Underpass	Bridge rehabilitation	0.2	6	6	----	No	----	Freeway	NHPP	2017	707,250	-	42,750	750,000	Amend: Add a new bridge rehabilitation project in FY 2017 for \$750,000.	✓	✓		
ADOT	Highway	2017	DOT17-415	TBD	17: Mores Gulch	Bridge replacement	0.2	4	4	----	No	----	Freeway	NHPP-AZ	2017	4,243,500	-	256,500	4,500,000	Amend: Add a new bridge replacement project in FY 2017 for \$4,500,000.	✓	✓		
ADOT	Highway	2016	DOT15-407	26407	17: MP 198 - MP 208.9	Construct pavement preservation	10.9	4	8	-----	No		Freeway	NHPP	2016	3,583,400	-	216,600	3,800,000	Amend: Increase total project budget by \$1,554,000 from \$2,246,000 to \$3,800,000.	✓	✓		
ADOT	Highway	2014	DOT14-430	TBD	17: New River Bridges Str. #1290 and #1291	Design scour retrofit	0.2	4	4	-----	No	-----	Freeway	NHPP	2014	148,051	-	8,949	157,000	Amend: Add a new scour retrofit design project in FY 2014 for \$157,000.	✓	✓		
ADOT	Highway	2014	DOT12-133	TBD	17: SR101L - Anthem Way	Construct FMS	14.0	8	8	----	No	----	Freeway	CMAQ	2013	7,166,800	433,200	-	7,600,000	Amend: Project authorized in FY 2013, defer work from FY 2013 to FY 2014. Project will be rebid, need additional funding; See DOT12-133C2.	✓	✓		

**TABLE A: Requested amendments and administrative modifications to the
FY 2014-2018 MAG Transportation Improvement Program (TIP), FY 2014 Arterial Life Cycle Program, and the 2035 Long Range Plan¹**

Sort: Section, Agency, Location, Work Year

TIP Amendment #3																				Reviewed By ²				
Agency	Section	Work Year ⁴	TIP ID	MAG ID	Location	Work	Miles	Lanes Before	Lanes After	ALI	In ALCP	TRACS	MAG Mode	Funding	Apport. Year ³	Federal	Regional	Local	Total	TIP Change Request	T R C	M C	T P C	R C
ADOT	Highway	2014	DOT12-133C2	TBD	17: SR101L - Anthem Way	Construct FMS	14.0	8	8	----	No	----	Freeway	NHPP	2014	659,000	39,834	-	698,834	Amend: New TIP listing. Increase total project budget by \$659,000 from \$7,600,000 to \$8,259,000. Add \$659,000 of NHPP fund. Defer work phase from FY 2013 to FY 2014. Total project construction cost is \$8,259,000; see DOT12-133.	✓	✓		
ADOT	Highway	2015	DOT14-405	TBD	202 (South Mountain): I-10 Papago/SR202L system interchange (Seg 9)	Right of Way for New system traffic interchange	0.5	0	8	----	No	----	Freeway	RARF	2015	-	231,000,000	-	231,000,000	Amend: Defer project from FY 2014 to FY 2015.	✓	✓		
ADOT	Highway	2014	DOT14-151	TBD	303: Camelback Rd - Glendale Ave	Landscape construction	2.0	6	6	----	No	----	Freeway	RARF	2014	-	3,020,000	-	3,020,000	Amend: Advance project from FY 2015 to FY 2014. Increase total project budget by \$620,000 from \$2,400,000 to \$3,020,000.	✓	✓		
ADOT	Highway	2014	DOT13-172	TBD	303: El Mirage Rd	Construct traffic interchange improvement	0.2	4	4	----	No	----	Freeway	NHPP	2014	30,176,000	1,824,000	-	32,000,000	Amend: Increase total project budget by \$1,000,000 from \$31,000,000 to \$32,000,000.	✓	✓		
ADOT	Highway	2014	DOT13-138	TBD	303: Glendale Ave - Peoria Ave	Landscape construction	3.0	6	6	----	No	----	Freeway	NHPP/Local	2014	4,689,122	310,878	454,000	5,454,000	Amend: Increase total project budget by \$1,954,000 from \$3,500,000 to \$5,454,000. Use \$454,000 of City of Glendale.	✓	✓		
ADOT	Highway	2014	DOT13-153	TBD	303: I-10/303L System Interchange, Phase II	Design new freeway interchange	1.0	4	6	----	No	----	Freeway	NHPP	2013	7,064,956	427,044	-	7,492,000	Amend: Increase total project budget by \$1,992,000 from \$5,500,000 to \$7,492,000.	✓	✓		
ADOT	Highway	2014	DOT13-140	TBD	303: Thomas Rd - Camelback Rd	Landscape construction	2.0	6	6	----	No	----	Freeway	NHPP	2014	2,829,000	171,000	-	3,000,000	Amend: Increase total project budget by \$600,000 from \$2,400,000 to \$3,000,000.	✓	✓		
ADOT	Highway	2014	DOT12-127	TBD	303: US60 Grand Ave/SR303L Interchange, Interim	Design interchange	0.2	6	6	----	No	----	Freeway	NHPP	2012	7,085,702	428,298	-	7,514,000	Amend: Increase total project budget by \$4,114,000 from \$3,400,000 to \$7,514,000.	✓	✓		
ADOT	Highway	2014	DOT13-139	TBD	303: US60 Grand Ave/SR303L Interchange, Interim	R/W acquisition	0.2	6	6	----	No	----	Freeway	STP-AZ	2013	774,156	46,794	-	820,950	Amend: Decrease total project budget by \$2,450,000 from \$3,200,000 to \$820,950.	✓	✓		
ADOT	Highway	2014	DOT14-152	TBD	303: US60 Grand Ave/SR303L Interchange, Interim	Construct interim TI	0.2	6	6	----	No	----	Freeway	NHPP	2014	52,808,000	3,192,000	-	56,000,000	Amend: Increase total project budget by \$7,600,000 from \$48,400,000 to \$56,000,000.	✓	✓		
ADOT	Highway	2015	DOT14-413	TBD	303: Van Buren St - MC85	Right of Way	3.0	2	6	----	No	----	Freeway	NHPP	2015	4,054,900	245,100	-	4,300,000	Amend: Defer project from FY 2014 to FY 2015.	✓	✓		

**TABLE A: Requested amendments and administrative modifications to the
FY 2014-2018 MAG Transportation Improvement Program (TIP), FY 2014 Arterial Life Cycle Program, and the 2035 Long Range Plan¹**

Sort: Section, Agency, Location, Work Year

TIP Amendment #3																				Reviewed By ²				
Agency	Section	Work Year ⁴	TIP ID	MAG ID	Location	Work	Miles	Lanes Before	Lanes After	ALI	In ALCP	TRACS	MAG Mode	Funding	Apport. Year ³	Federal	Regional	Local	Total	TIP Change Request	T R C	M C	T P C	R C
ADOT	Highway	2015	DOT13-952	TBD	60 (Grand Ave): Bell Rd TI	R/W acquisition	0.3	6	6	----	No	----	Freeway	NHPP	2015	6,601,000	399,000	-	7,000,000	Amend: Defer project from State FY 2014 to FY 2015. Project will not have environmental clearance in time to obligate funds in State FY 2014. Anticipate Obligation Authority to remain in Federal FY 2014.	✓	✓		
ADOT	Highway	2014	DOT14-427	TBD	60 (Grand Ave): Bethany Home Rd - 163rd Ave	Traffic study	18.0	6	6	----	No	----	Freeway	STP-RGC	2014	70,725	-	4,275	75,000	Amend: Add a new traffic study project in FY 2014 for \$75,000.	✓	✓		
ADOT	Highway	2017	DOT17-416	TBD	60 (Grand Ave): New River West Bound	Bridge rehabilitation	0.2	6	6	----	No	----	Freeway	NHPP-AZ	2017	235,750	-	14,250	250,000	Amend: Add a new bridge rehabilitation project in FY 2017 for \$250,000.	✓	✓		
ADOT	Highway	2014	DOT14-155	TBD	60 (Grand Ave): SR101L (Agua Fria Fwy) - Van Buren St - Phase 2	Construct spot improvements	14.0	4	4	---	No	---	Freeway	NHPP	---	19,331,500	1,168,500	---	20,500,000	Amend: Delete project from TIP.	✓	✓		
ADOT	Highway	2015	DOT14-156	TBD	60 (Grand Ave): Thompson Ranch (Thunderbird)	R/W acquisition	0.2	6	6	----	No	----	Freeway	NHPP	2015	4,715,000	285,000	-	5,000,000	Amend: Defer project from State FY 2014 to FY 2015. Project will not have environmental clearance in time to obligate funds in State FY 2014. Anticipate Obligation Authority to remain in Federal FY 2014.	✓	✓		
ADOT	Highway	2014	DOT14-999		60 (Grand Ave): Wickenburg Area	Construct retaining walls	1.0	4	4	----	No	----	Street	NHPP	2014	297,045	17,955	-	315,000	Amend: Increase total project budget by \$65,000 from \$250,000 to \$315,000.	✓	✓		
ADOT	Highway	2016	DOT16-422	TBD	8: Bender Wash	Construct drainage improvements	1.0	4	4	----	No	----	Freeway	NHPP	2016	1,671,939	-	101,061	1,773,000	Amend: Add a new drainage improvement construction project in FY 2016 for \$1,773,000.	✓	✓		
ADOT	Highway	2015	DOT15-414	TBD	85: Gila Bend Airport - MP 130.42	Design pavement preservation	8.9			----	No	----	Street	NHPP	2014	99,958	-	6,042	106,000	Amend: Add a new pavement preservation design project in FY 2014 for \$106,000.	✓	✓		
ADOT	Highway	2014	DOT14-428	TBD	87: McDowell Rd	Traffic signal improvement	0.1	4	4	----	No	----	Street	NHPP	2014	400,775	-	24,225	425,000	Amend: Add a new traffic signal improvement project in FY 2014 for \$425,000.	✓	✓		
ADOT	Highway	2016	DOT16-423C	20301	88: Apache Junction - Tortilla Flat	Spot safety improvements and pavement preservation	9.0	2	2	----	No	----	Street	NHPP	2016	4,590,455	-	277,472	4,867,927	Amend: Add a new spot safety improvement/pavement preservation project in FY 2016 for \$7,185,000. Use \$2,185,000 of HSIP-AZ & \$4,590,455 of NHPP-AZ. See DOT16-423C2.	✓	✓		

**TABLE A: Requested amendments and administrative modifications to the
FY 2014-2018 MAG Transportation Improvement Program (TIP), FY 2014 Arterial Life Cycle Program, and the 2035 Long Range Plan¹**

Sort: Section, Agency, Location, Work Year

TIP Amendment #3																			Reviewed By ²					
Agency	Section	Work Year ⁴	TIP ID	MAG ID	Location	Work	Miles	Lanes Before	Lanes After	ALI	In ALCP	TRACS	MAG Mode	Funding	Apport. Year ³	Federal	Regional	Local	Total	TIP Change Request	T R C	M C	T P C	R C
ADOT	Highway	2016	DOT16-423C2	20301	88: Apache Junction - Tortilla Flat	Spot safety improvements and pavement preservation	9.0	2	2	----	No	----	Street	HSIP-AZ	2016	2,185,000	-	132,073	2,317,073	Amend: Add a new spot safety improvement/pavement preservation project in FY 2016 for \$7,185,000. Use \$2,185,000 of HSIP-AZ & \$4,590,455 of NHPP-AZ. See DOT16-423C.	✓	✓		
ADOT	Highway	2014	DOT14-429	TBD	MAG Regionwide	Light pole inventory and design	0.1	N/A	N/A	----	No	----	Freeway	STP-AZ	2014	280,071	-	16,929	297,000	Amend: Add a new light pole inventory and design project in FY 2014 for \$297,000.	✓	✓		
ADOT	Highway	2015	DOT15-413	TBD	MAG Regionwide	Drainage tunnel improvements	0.5	8	8	----	No	----	Freeway	STP-AZ	2015	1,487,111	-	89,889	1,577,000	Amend: Add a new drainage tunnel improvement project in FY 2015 for \$1,577,000.	✓	✓		
ADOT	Highway	2016	MAR18-403D	12942	SR347: UPRR Overpass, Phase III	Design Phase III: Grade Separation-Overpass	0.4	0	4	-----	No	-----	-----	Unfunded	2016	6,124,785	-	370,215	6,495,000	Amend: Divide project into Three segments and work phases. Programmed local cost of Phase III from regional partners. City of Maricopa requests statewide funding.	✓	✓		
ADOT	Highway	2017	MAR18-403RW	12942	SR347: UPRR Overpass, Phase III	ROW Phase III: Grade Separation-Overpass	0.4	0	4	-----	No	-----	-----	Unfunded	2017	9,264,975	-	560,025	9,825,000	Amend: Divide project into Three segments and work phases. Programmed local cost of Phase III from regional partners. City of Maricopa requests statewide funding.	✓	✓		
ADOT	Highway	2018	MAR18-403C	12942	SR347: UPRR Overpass, Phase III	Construction Phase III: Grade Separation-Overpass	0.4	0	4	-----	No	-----	-----	Unfunded	2018	25,442,140	-	1,537,860	26,980,000	Amend: Divide project into Three segments and work phases. Programmed local cost of Phase III from regional partners. City of Maricopa requests statewide funding.	✓	✓		
Apache Junction	Highway	2014	APJ12-401	TBD	IRONWOOD DR, SOUTHERN AVE & IDAHO RD IN APACHE JCT	Design concrete sidewalks, curb and gutter, ADA ramps, bike lane striping.	-	4	4	----	No	SF003 02D	Safety	SRTS	2012	86,504	-	-	86,504	Amend: Add Project to TIP	✓	✓		
Apache Junction	Highway	2015	APJ15-402	TBD	IRONWOOD DR, SOUTHERN AVE & IDAHO RD IN APACHE JCT	Construct concrete sidewalks, curb and gutter, ADA ramps, bike lane striping.	-	4	4	----	No	SF003 01C	Safety	SRTS	2015	313,094	-	-	313,094	Amend: Add Project to TIP	✓	✓		

**TABLE A: Requested amendments and administrative modifications to the
FY 2014-2018 MAG Transportation Improvement Program (TIP), FY 2014 Arterial Life Cycle Program, and the 2035 Long Range Plan¹**

Sort: Section, Agency, Location, Work Year

TIP Amendment #3																				Reviewed By ²				
Agency	Section	Work Year ⁴	TIP ID	MAG ID	Location	Work	Miles	Lanes Before	Lanes After	ALI	In ALCP	TRACS	MAG Mode	Funding	Apport. Year ³	Federal	Regional	Local	Total	TIP Change Request	T R C	M C	T P C	R C
Apache Junction	Highway	2014	APJ14-403	28237	SR88 at Old West Highway	Construct Roadway Safety Improvements	0.3	6	6	----	No	----	Safety	HSIP-MAG	2014	343,970	-	34,868	378,838	Amend: Add \$161,746 additional HSIP-MAG funding to work phase. Cost increase due to updated construction cost estimates; due to unit cost increases from original project estimate (FY2011). Total of \$14,077 of non-eligible costs, \$364,761 of eligible costs.	✓	✓		
Avondale	Highway	2014	AVN14-109	17590	Avondale (Citywide)	Preliminary Engineering for Pedestrian Countdown Signals	0	0	0	----	No	----	Safety	HSIP-MAG	2014	45,000	-	-	45,000	Amend: Increase budget by \$30,000 from AVN15-103	✓	✓		
Avondale	Highway	2014	AVN15-103	17590	Avondale (Citywide)	Construct Pedestrian Countdown Signals	0	0	0	----	No	----	Safety	HSIP-MAG	2014	105,840	-	-	105,840	Amend: Transfer \$30,000 to AVN14-109	✓	✓		
Chandler	Highway	2014	CHN12-118C2	6240	Various Locations - Citywide	Street Name Sign Upgrade to Clearview font	0	0	0	----	No	SH5470 1C	Safety	HSIP-MAG	2014	39,286	-	-	39,286	Amend: FY 2012 project, add \$39,286 HSIP-MAG to address square inch calc. Total workphase cost is \$110,526.	✓	✓		
Florence	Highway	2015	FLO14-402	18528	Main Street: Ruggles St to Butte Ave	Construct Roadway Improvements	0.25	2	2	----	No	----	Street	STP-TEA	2015	500,000	-	30,223	530,223	Amend: Defer construction work year from FY2014 to FY2015.	✓	✓		
Fountain Hills	Highway	2016	FTH14-103	36535	Fountain Hills (Citywide)	Preliminary Engineering for Arterial Street STOP Sign Upgrade	0	0	0	----	No	----	Safety	HSIP-MAG	2016	15,000	-	-	15,000	Amend: Defer from FY2014 to FY2016	✓	✓		
Fountain Hills	Highway	2017	FTH15-101	36535	Fountain Hills (Citywide)	Procure and Install Arterial Street STOP Sign Upgrade	0	0	0	----	No	----	Safety	HSIP-MAG	2017	31,800	-	-	31,800	Amend: Defer from FY2015 to FY2017	✓	✓		
Gilbert	Highway	2014	GLB11-104	38425	Gilbert Schools	Crossings and sidewalk safety improvement	0	0	0	----	No	----	Safety	SRTS		300,000	-----	-----	300,000	Amend TIP: Delete project. Project was cancelled by ADOT in 2013.		✓		
Gilbert	Highway	2016	GLB16-401	41961	Northwest Gilbert Area	Fiber Installation and ITS Components	0	0	0	----	No	----	ITS	CMAQ	2016	1,095,671	-	66,309	1,161,980	Amend TIP: Increase total project budget by \$579,080 to reflect combination of project with GLB16-402.		✓		
Gilbert	Highway	2016	GLB16-402	14262	Northwest Gilbert Area	Fiber Installation and ITS Components	0	0	0	----	No	----	ITS	CMAQ	2016	546,072	-----	33,008	579,080	Amend TIP: Delete project. The project is now combined with GLB16-401.		✓		

**TABLE A: Requested amendments and administrative modifications to the
FY 2014-2018 MAG Transportation Improvement Program (TIP), FY 2014 Arterial Life Cycle Program, and the 2035 Long Range Plan¹**

Sort: Section, Agency, Location, Work Year

TIP Amendment #3																				Reviewed By ²				
Agency	Section	Work Year ⁴	TIP ID	MAG ID	Location	Work	Miles	Lanes Before	Lanes After	ALI	In ALCP	TRACS	MAG Mode	Funding	Apport. Year ³	Federal	Regional	Local	Total	TIP Change Request	T R C	M C	T P C	R C
Gilbert	Highway	2014	GLB12-102D	23182	Various Gilbert School Locations	Design pedestrian crossing improvements	0	0	0	----	No	SF039 03D	Safety	SRTS		130,000	-	-	130,000	Amend TIP: Reinstate project and create a design phase. This SRTS project was awarded in 2012, Cycle 6, and was removed in error from the TIP.		✓		
Gilbert	Highway	2016	GLB12-102C	23182	Various Gilbert School Locations	Construct pedestrian crossing improvements	0	0	0	----	No	SF039 03D	Safety	SRTS		270,000	-	-	270,000	Amend TIP: Reinstate project and create a construction phase. This SRTS project was awarded in 2012, Cycle 6, and was removed in error from the TIP.		✓		
Gilbert	Highway	2014	GLB14-104C2	45276	Various Locations - Town Wide	Pedestrian Countdown Signal Heads- Phase 2	0	0	0	----	No	SH545 01C	Safety	HSIP-MAG	2014	23,579	-	-	23,579	Amend: Add new project phase. Change work year from 2015 to FY2014. Portion of this project authorized early in FFY2013 with GLB13-105. Adjust federal and total cost to reflect updated actual engineering cost (decrease by \$13,101 for FFY2014.)	✓	✓		
MAG	Highway	2014	MAG14-103		Region wide	Purchase PM-10 certified street sweepers FY2014 and program implementation.	0	0	0	-----	0	0	Air Quality	CMAQ	2014	1,880,769	-	113,684	1,994,453	Amend: Update TIP listing to match partial cost of FY2014 Call For Street Sweepers and change description to include "program implementation". Add \$10,000 from RRST program for implementation. Split project to accommodate federal authorization timeline.	✓	✓		
MAG	Highway	2014	MAG14-104	31336	Region wide	Regional rideshare and telework program	0	0	-----		No	-----	Air Quality	CMAQ	2014	500,032	-	-	500,032	Amend: Decrease funding by \$10,000.	✓	✓		
MAG	Highway	2015	MAG14-103C2		Region wide	Purchase PM-10 certified street sweepers FY2014 and program implementation.	0	0	-----		No	-----	Air Quality	CMAQ	2015	647,262	-	39,124	686,386	Amend: Add new TIP listing for FY2014 Call for Street Sweepers approved by RC on 3-25-14 (moved to FFY2015 to accommodate federal authorization timeline.).	✓	✓		
MAG	Highway	2015	MAG14-107	23273	Region wide	Transportation planning and air quality studies and support	0	0	0	----	No	-----	Other	STP-MAG	2015	5,400,000	-	326,405	5,726,405	Amend: add in FY2015 listing. Inadvertently omitted from listings.	✓	✓		
MAG	Highway	2015	MAG15-109	44443	Region wide	MAG Intelligent Transportation System (ITS) Program	0	0	0	----	No	-----	ITS	CMAQ	-----	7,276,000	-----	3,118,286	10,394,286	Amend: Delete placeholder listing. Programming completed.	✓	✓		
MAG	Highway	2015	MAG15-110	32136	Region wide	MAG Bicycle and Pedestrian Program	0	0	0	----	No	-----	Bicycle	CMAQ	-----	9,231,000	-----	3,956,143	13,187,143	Amend: Delete placeholder listing. Programming completed.	✓	✓		

**TABLE A: Requested amendments and administrative modifications to the
FY 2014-2018 MAG Transportation Improvement Program (TIP), FY 2014 Arterial Life Cycle Program, and the 2035 Long Range Plan¹**

Sort: Section, Agency, Location, Work Year

TIP Amendment #3																				Reviewed By ²				
Agency	Section	Work Year ⁴	TIP ID	MAG ID	Location	Work	Miles	Lanes Before	Lanes After	ALI	In ALCP	TRACS	MAG Mode	Funding	Apport. Year ³	Federal	Regional	Local	Total	TIP Change Request	T R C	M C	T P C	R C
MAG	Highway	2015	MAG15-432	23273	Region wide	Regional Rideshare and Telework Program	0	0	0	----	No	----	Air Quality	CMAQ	2015	660,000	.	.	660,000	Admin: Corrected amount return to \$660,000. Change MAG Mode to Air Quality, incorrectly noted in database as "Other".	✓	✓		
MAG	Highway	2015	MAG15-433	23273	Region wide	Travel Reduction Program	0	0	0	----	No	----	Air Quality	CMAQ	2015	135,000	.	.	135,000	Clerical: Change from "other" to "Air Quality".	✓	✓		
MAG	Highway	2015	MAG15-434	23273	Region wide	Trip Reduction Program	0	0	0	----	No	----	Air Quality	CMAQ	2015	962,347	.	.	962,347	Admin: Corrected amount return to \$962,347. Change MAG Mode to Air Quality, incorrectly noted in database as "Other".	✓	✓		
MAG	Highway	2016	MAG16-432	23273	Region wide	Regional Rideshare and Telework Program	0	0	0	----	No	----	Air Quality	CMAQ	2016	660,000	.	.	660,000	Clerical: Change from "other" to "Air Quality".	✓	✓		
MAG	Highway	2016	MAG16-433	23273	Region wide	Travel Reduction Program	0	0	0	----	No	----	Air Quality	CMAQ	2016	135,000	.	.	135,000	Clerical: Change from "other" to "Air Quality".	✓	✓		
MAG	Highway	2016	MAG16-434	23273	Region wide	Trip Reduction Program	0	0	0	----	No	----	Air Quality	CMAQ	2016	962,347	.	.	962,347	Clerical: Change from "other" to "Air Quality".	✓	✓		
MAG	Highway	2017	MAG17-432	23273	Region wide	Regional Rideshare and Telework Program	0	0	0	----	No	----	Air Quality	CMAQ	2017	660,000	.	.	660,000	Clerical: Change from "other" to "Air Quality".	✓	✓		
MAG	Highway	2017	MAG17-433	23273	Region wide	Travel Reduction Program	0	0	0	----	No	----	Air Quality	CMAQ	2017	135,000	.	.	135,000	Clerical: Change from "other" to "Air Quality".	✓	✓		
MAG	Highway	2017	MAG17-434	23273	Region wide	Trip Reduction Program	0	0	0	----	No	----	Air Quality	CMAQ	2017	962,347	.	.	962,347	Clerical: Change from "other" to "Air Quality".	✓	✓		
MAG	Highway	2014	MAG14-480	5339	Regionwide	FHWA Funding: Flex to Transit. Annual Amount Placeholder. See Program of Projects for Detail when developed.	0	0	----	----	No	FTA	Transit	CMAQ	2014	16,456,512	994,720	.	17,451,232	Amend: Add placeholder to TIP. Actual Allocation.	✓	✓		

**TABLE A: Requested amendments and administrative modifications to the
FY 2014-2018 MAG Transportation Improvement Program (TIP), FY 2014 Arterial Life Cycle Program, and the 2035 Long Range Plan¹**

Sort: Section, Agency, Location, Work Year

TIP Amendment #3																				Reviewed By ²				
Agency	Section	Work Year ⁴	TIP ID	MAG ID	Location	Work	Miles	Lanes Before	Lanes After	ALI	In ALCP	TRACS	MAG Mode	Funding	Apport. Year ³	Federal	Regional	Local	Total	TIP Change Request	T R C	M C	T P C	R C
MAG	Highway	2015	MAG15-188	16566	Regionwide	MAG Air Quality & Travel Demand Management Programs	0	0	0	---	No	---	Air Quality	CMAQ	---	7,928,000	---	479,211	8,407,211	Amend: Delete placeholder listing. Programming completed.	✓	✓		
MAG	Highway	2015	MAG15-431	23273	Regionwide	Purchase PM-10 Certified Street Sweepers	0	0	0	----	No	----	Air Quality	CMAQ	2015	1,404,238	-	84,880	1,489,118	Admin: Corrected amount to balance annual allocation. Change from "other" to "Air Quality".	✓	✓		
MAG	Highway	2015	MAG15-480	5339	Regionwide	FHWA Funding: Flex to Transit. Annual Amount Placeholder. See Program of Projects for Detail when developed.	0	0	----	----	No	FTA	Transit	CMAQ	2015	16,404,489	991,576	-	17,396,065	Amend: Add placeholder to TIP. Projected Allocation.	✓	✓		
MAG	Highway	2016	MAG16-431	23273	Regionwide	Purchase PM-10 Certified Street Sweepers	0	0	0	----	No	----	Air Quality	CMAQ	2016	924,057	-	55,855	979,912	Admin: Corrected amount to balance annual allocation. Change from "other" to "Air Quality".	✓	✓		
MAG	Highway	2016	MAG16-480	5339	Regionwide	FHWA Funding: Flex to Transit. Annual Amount Placeholder. See Program of Projects for Detail when developed.	0	0	----	----	No	FTA	Transit	CMAQ	2016	16,404,489	991,576	-	17,396,065	Amend: Add placeholder to TIP. Projected Allocation.	✓	✓		
MAG	Highway	2017	MAG17-480	5339	Regionwide	FHWA Funding: Flex to Transit. Annual Amount Placeholder. See Program of Projects for Detail when developed.	0	0	----	----	No	FTA	Transit	CMAQ	2017	16,404,489	991,576	-	17,396,065	Amend: Add placeholder to TIP. Projected Allocation.	✓	✓		
MAG	Highway	2017	MAG18-431	23273	Regionwide	Purchase PM-10 Certified Street Sweepers	0	0	0	----	No	----	Air Quality	CMAQ	2017	1,715,058	-	103,667	1,818,725	Admin: Corrected amount to balance annual allocation. Change from "other" to "Air Quality".	✓	✓		
MAG	Highway	2018	MAG18-480	5339	Regionwide	FHWA Funding: Flex to Transit. Annual Amount Placeholder. See Program of Projects for Detail when developed.	0	0	----	----	No	FTA	Transit	CMAQ	2018	16,404,489	991,576	-	17,396,065	Amend: Add placeholder to TIP. Projected Allocation.	✓	✓		

**TABLE A: Requested amendments and administrative modifications to the
FY 2014-2018 MAG Transportation Improvement Program (TIP), FY 2014 Arterial Life Cycle Program, and the 2035 Long Range Plan¹**

Sort: Section, Agency, Location, Work Year

TIP Amendment #3																				Reviewed By ²				
Agency	Section	Work Year ⁴	TIP ID	MAG ID	Location	Work	Miles	Lanes Before	Lanes After	ALI	In ALCP	TRACS	MAG Mode	Funding	Apport. Year ³	Federal	Regional	Local	Total	TIP Change Request	T R C	M C	T P C	R C
Maricopa (City)	Highway	2015	MAR15-407		Hartman Road: Maricopa Casa Grande Highway to approximately 1.5 miles north.	Pave Unpaved Roadway.	1.5	2	2	-----	No	-----	Street	CMAQ-2.5	2015	529,522	-	32,007	561,529	Amend: Increase local match to minimum 5.7% (additional \$23,384).	✓	✓		
Maricopa (City)	Highway	2017	MAR17-404	12942	SR347: Union Pacific Railroad Overpass	Design Overpass	1	3	3	-----	No	-----	Local		2017	-----	-----	-----3,000,000	-----3,000,000	Amend: Delete project. Replaced by MAR15-491D, MAR17-404D, and MAR18-403D.	✓	✓		
Maricopa (City)	Highway	2018	MAR18-403	12942	SR347: Union Pacific Railroad Overpass	Construct Overpass	1	3	3	-----	No	-----	Local		2018	-----	-----	-----30,000,000	-----30,000,000	Amend: Delete project. Replaced by MAR14-591RW, MAR15-491C, MAR17-404RW, MAR17-404C, MAR18-403RW, and MAR18-403C.	✓	✓		
Maricopa (City)	Highway	2015	MAR15-491D	12942	SR347: UPRR Overpass, Phase I	Design Phase I: AMTRAK Relocation	0.2			-----	No	-----	Local		2015			412,000	412,000	Amend: Divide project into Three segments and work phases. Programmed full cost of Phase I from City CIP:\$3.9 m City of Maricopa & \$300k GRIC .	✓	✓		
Maricopa (City)	Highway	2016	MAR15-491RW	12942	SR347: UPRR Overpass, Phase I	ROW Phase I: AMTRAK Relocation	0.2			-----	No	-----	Local		2016			2,000,000	2,000,000	Amend: Divide project into Three segments and work phases. Programmed full cost of Phase I from City CIP:\$4.0 m City of Maricopa & \$282,975k GRIC .	✓	✓		
Maricopa (City)	Highway	2016	MAR15-491C	12942	SR347: UPRR Overpass, Phase I	Construction Phase I: AMTRAK Relocation	0.2			-----	No	-----	Local		2016			2,000,000	2,000,000	Amend: Divide project into Three segments and work phases. Programmed full cost of Phase I from City CIP:\$4.0 m City of Maricopa & \$282,975k GRIC .	✓	✓		
Maricopa (City)	Highway	2015	MAR17-404D	12942	SR347: UPRR Overpass, Phase II	Design Phase II: Arterial & Intersection Improvements Honeycutt	0.4	2	3	-----	No	-----	Local		2015			1,050,000	1,050,000	Amend: Divide project into Three segments and work phases. Programmed full local cost of Phase II from City of Maricopa CIP for Design, ROW and partial Construction phases (\$4.7 m). Agency requests Statewide funding for Construction phase.	✓	✓		
Maricopa (City)	Highway	2016	MAR17-404RW	12942	SR347: UPRR Overpass, Phase II	ROW Phase II: Arterial & Intersection Improvements Honeycutt	0.4	2	3	-----	No	-----	Unfunded		2016	1,889,225		2,003,420	3,892,645	Amend: Divide project into Three segments and work phases. Programmed full local cost of Phase II from City of Maricopa CIP for Design, ROW and partial Construction phases (\$4.7 m). Agency requests Statewide funding for Construction phase.	✓	✓		
Maricopa (City)	Highway	2018	MAR17-404C	12942	SR347: UPRR Overpass, Phase II	Construction Phase II: Arterial & Intersection Improvements Honeycutt	0.4	2	3	-----	No	-----	Unfunded		2018	2,920,075		176,505	3,096,580	Amend: Divide project into Three segments and work phases. Programmed full local cost of Phase II from City of Maricopa CIP for Design, ROW and partial Construction phases (\$4.7 m). Agency requests Statewide funding for Construction phase.	✓	✓		

**TABLE A: Requested amendments and administrative modifications to the
FY 2014-2018 MAG Transportation Improvement Program (TIP), FY 2014 Arterial Life Cycle Program, and the 2035 Long Range Plan¹**

Sort: Section, Agency, Location, Work Year

TIP Amendment #3																				Reviewed By ²				
Agency	Section	Work Year ⁴	TIP ID	MAG ID	Location	Work	Miles	Lanes Before	Lanes After	ALI	In ALCP	TRACS	MAG Mode	Funding	Apport. Year ³	Federal	Regional	Local	Total	TIP Change Request	T R C	M C	T P C	R C
Maricopa County	Highway	2015	MMA15-403	4374	Countywide at Clovis Campbell, Loma Linda & EAGLE College Prep Elementary Schools	Purchase educational materials, incentives and services	0	0	0	----	No	----	Safety	TAP-MAG	2015	40,548	-	4,451	44,999	Amend: Add Project to TIP		✓		
Maricopa County	Highway	2016	MMA16-402	4374	Countywide at Clovis Campbell, Loma Linda & EAGLE College Prep Elementary Schools	Purchase educational materials, incentives and services	0	0	0	----	No	----	Safety	TAP-MAG	2016	40,548	-	4,451	44,999	Amend: Add Project to TIP		✓		
Maricopa County	Highway	2017	MMA17-405	4374	Countywide at Clovis Campbell, Loma Linda & EAGLE College Prep Elementary Schools	Purchase educational materials, incentives and services	0	0	0	----	No	----	Safety	TAP-MAG	2017	40,548	-	4,451	44,999	Amend: Add Project to TIP		✓		
Maricopa County	Highway	2015	MMA15-404	2415	Countywide at Madison Rose, Madison Heights & Joseph Zito Elementary Schools	Purchase educational materials, incentives and services	0	0	0	----	No	----	Safety	TAP-MAG	2015	40,548	-	4,451	44,999	Amend: Add Project to TIP		✓		
Maricopa County	Highway	2016	MMA16-403	2415	Countywide at Madison Rose, Madison Heights & Joseph Zito Elementary Schools	Purchase educational materials, incentives and services	0	0	0	----	No	----	Safety	TAP-MAG	2016	40,548	-	4,451	44,999	Amend: Add Project to TIP		✓		
Maricopa County	Highway	2017	MMA17-406	2415	Countywide at Madison Rose, Madison Heights & Joseph Zito Elementary Schools	Purchase educational materials, incentives and services	0	0	0	----	No	----	Safety	TAP-MAG	2017	40,548	-	4,451	44,999	Amend: Add Project to TIP		✓		
Mesa	Highway	2013	MES15-441D	40596	Rio Salado Segment 3: SR101 to Wrigleyville West Entrance	Design shared-use path project	0.75	0	0	----	No	----	Bicycle	CMAQ		146,500	-	86,354	232,854	Amend TIP: Revise location description to match that used in development documents. Adjust local cost to match recent cost estimates and adjust mileage slightly. This change does not affect the actual location of the project.		✓		
Mesa	Highway	2015	MES15-441C	40596	Rio Salado Segment 3: SR101 to Wrigleyville West Entrance	Construct multi-use pathway	0.75	0	0	----	No	----	Bicycle	CMAQ		999,999	-	549,801	1,549,800	Amend TIP: Revise location description to match that used in development documents. Adjust local cost to match recent cost estimates and adjust mileage slightly. This change does not affect the actual location of the project.		✓		
Mesa	Highway	2014	MES14-141	6518	Rio Salado Segment 4: (Wrigleyville West connection to Dobson Road/SR 202-MP-11)	Design shared-use path project	0.6	0	0	----	No	----	Bicycle	Local				140,000	140,000	Delete project. Project has been replaced by project added in February		✓		

**TABLE A: Requested amendments and administrative modifications to the
FY 2014-2018 MAG Transportation Improvement Program (TIP), FY 2014 Arterial Life Cycle Program, and the 2035 Long Range Plan¹**

Sort: Section, Agency, Location, Work Year

TIP Amendment #3																				Reviewed By ²				
Agency	Section	Work Year ⁴	TIP ID	MAG ID	Location	Work	Miles	Lanes Before	Lanes After	ALI	In ALCP	TRACS	MAG Mode	Funding	Apport. Year ³	Federal	Regional	Local	Total	TIP Change Request	T R C	M C	T P C	R C
Mesa	Highway	2014	MES14-404	42749	Rio Salado Segment 4 (Wrigleyville West connection to Dobson Road/SR 202 MP 11)	Design multi use path.	0.6	0	0	----	No	----	Bicycle	Local				203,784	203,784	Amend TIP: Revise location description to match that used in development documents. Adjust local cost to match recent cost estimates and adjust mileage slightly. This change does not affect the actual location of the project.		✓		
Mesa	Highway	2015	MES15-141	6518	Rio Salado Segment 4 (Wrigleyville West connection to Dobson Road/SR 202 MP 11)	Construct shared-use path project	0.6	0	0	----	No	----	Bicycle	Local				1,000,000	1,000,000	Delete project. Project has been replaced by project added in February		✓		
Mesa	Highway	2015	MES16-404	42749	Rio Salado Segment 4 (Wrigleyville West connection to Dobson Road/SR 202 MP 11)	Construct multi use path.	0.6	0	0	----	No	----	Bicycle	TA-MAG		1,585,674		138,434	1,724,108	Amend TIP: Revise location description to match that used in development documents. Adjust local cost to match recent cost estimates and adjust mileage slightly. This change does not affect the actual location of the project.		✓		
Mesa	Highway	2016	MES16-401	48684	Various Locations	Procure and Install: East Valley Arterial Congestion Monitoring: Wireless detectors.	0	0	0	----	No	----	ITS	CMAQ		655,835		39,642	695,477	Amend TIP: City of Chandler has requested to be removed from this project. Minor scope change clarification recommended by ITS Committee on May 7th.		✓		
Phoenix	Highway	2014	PHX12-113C2	41934	Dunlap: 31st - 43rd Ave and at 35th Ave	Install additional street lights on south side of Dunlap, and add a second left-turn lane for north and southbound approaches on 35th	1.5	6	6	----	No	----	Safety	HSIP-MAG	2012	70,000		311,807	381,807	Amend: FY2012 Project, Add additional 70,000 HSIP funding to work phase, Cost increase due to city lighting standards changed to LED, cost increase to reflect new std. Balance of project funded with HSIP-AZ.	✓	✓		
Phoenix	Highway	2014	PHX14-109	33107	Various Locations	AASHTOWare Bridge Rating Software for bridge inspections	0	0	0	----	No	----	Street	STP-BR	2014	88,072		5,324	93,396	Amend: ADOT Federal funding award. Change work description.		✓		
Phoenix	Highway	2014	PHX14-110	33174	Various Locations	Equipment Rental for bridge inspections	0	0	0	----	No	----	Street	STP-BR	2014	182,471		11,030	193,500	Amend: Change work year from FY2016 to FY2014. ADOT Federal funding award.		✓		
Phoenix	Highway	2014	PHX14-141	46556	Various locations	Bridge inspection program	0	0	0	----	No	----	Street	STP-BR	2014	377,200		22,800	400,000	Amend: Change work year from FY2016 to FY2014. ADOT Federal funding award.		✓		
Phoenix	Highway	2016	PHX16-422	46556	Various locations	Bridge inspection program	0	0	0	----	No	----	Street	Local	2016			500,000	500,000	Amend: Add new work phase.		✓		
Phoenix	Highway	2016	PHX16-423	33174	Various Locations	Equipment Rental for bridge inspections	0	0	0	----	No	----	Street	Local	2016			11,029	11,029	Amend: Add new work phase.		✓		

**TABLE A: Requested amendments and administrative modifications to the
FY 2014-2018 MAG Transportation Improvement Program (TIP), FY 2014 Arterial Life Cycle Program, and the 2035 Long Range Plan¹**

Sort: Section, Agency, Location, Work Year

TIP Amendment #3																				Reviewed By ²				
Agency	Section	Work Year ⁴	TIP ID	MAG ID	Location	Work	Miles	Lanes Before	Lanes After	ALI	In ALCP	TRACS	MAG Mode	Funding	Apport. Year ³	Federal	Regional	Local	Total	TIP Change Request	T R C	M C	T P C	R C
Surprise	Highway	2015	SUR15-402	3193	Arizona Charter Academy - Surprise	Procure consultant services to conduct SRTS Study	0	0	0	-----	No	-----	Safety	TAP-MAG	2015	21,218	-	3,283	24,500	Amend: Add Project to TIP		✓		
Tempe	Highway	2014	TMP10-620C3	9367	Broadway Rd: Rural Rd to Mill Ave	Procure and Install Roadway Safety Improvements	1	5	5	-----	No	SS73401C	Safety	HSIP-MAG	2014	637,317	-	38,523	675,840	Amend: Project can advance to FFY2014 from FFY2015 based on developed project schedule.	✓	✓		
Tempe	Highway	2014	TMP11-111C2	28746	Various Locations - Citywide	Install New Signal Pre-emption Cards for EMS Access	0	0	0	-----	No	-----	Safety	HSIP-MAG	2011	38,000	-	-	38,000	Amend: FY2011 Project, Add \$38,000 additional HSIP-MAG funding to work phase. Cost increase due to requirement of 2 cards per location, add two cards. (Total work phase cost is \$84,000).	✓	✓		
ADOT	Transit	2014	PNP13-122T		Southwest Valley, portion of Avondale, Litchfield Park, Tolleson, and Phoenix.	Portable Practical Educational Preparation, Inc./Encompass: One Cutaway Van with Lift (FY 2013 Funds)	-	-	-	11.12.04	No	-----	Transit	5310-AZ	2013	60,826	6,083	-	66,909	Amend: Inclusion of ADOT awarded Section 5310 agency request of 1 Cutaway Van with Lift in the MAG planning area.	✓	✓		
Avondale	Transit	2014	AVN14-410T	10195	Regionwide	Transit Security	-	-	-	11.42.09	No	-----	Transit	5307-AVN UZA	2014	29,889	-	7,472	37,361	Amend: Update ALI Code. Change federal amount to 2014 apportionment. Change federal/local amount from \$28,807/\$7,202 to \$29,889/\$7,472	✓	✓		
Avondale	Transit	2014	VMT14-425T	4760	Regionwide	Operating: Operating Assistance TBD	-	-	-	30.09.01	No	-----	Transit	5307-AVN UZA	2014	2,485,518	-	2,485,518	4,971,031	Amend: Change federal amount to 2014 apportionment. Update Local match to 50%. Change federal/local amount from \$2,378,490/\$0 to \$2,485,518/\$2,485,518	✓	✓		
Glendale	Transit	2014	GLN14-101T	30308	Glendale: Citywide Paratransit & GUS	Preventive Maintenance	-	-	-	11.7A.00	No	-----	Transit	5307	2014	213,693	-	53,423	267,116	Amend: Update PM with NTD data. Change federal/local amount from \$204,303/\$51,076 to \$213,693/\$53,423	✓	✓		
MAG	Transit	2014	PNP14-401T	30897	ARCH: Regionwide	Procure: Minivan & Cutaway	-	-	-	11.12.04	No	-	Transit	5310-MAG	2014	71,850	-	14,150	86,000	Amend: New Project. FY 2014 Section 5310 Phoenix-Mesa UZA.		✓		
MAG	Transit	2014	PNP14-402T	30897	Arizona Spinal Cord Injury Assoc: Regionwide.	Procure: 2 Minivans with Ramp	-	-	-	11.13.04	No	-	Transit	5310-MAG	2014	64,600	-	11,400	76,000	Amend: New Project. FY 2014 Section 5310 Phoenix-Mesa UZA.		✓		
MAG	Transit	2014	PNP14-403T	30897	Beatitudes: Glendale, Paradise Valley, Phoenix.	Procure: Cutaway	-	-	-	11.13.04	No	-	Transit	5310-MAG	2014	51,850	-	9,150	61,000	Amend: New Project. FY 2014 Section 5310 Phoenix-Mesa UZA.		✓		

**TABLE A: Requested amendments and administrative modifications to the
FY 2014-2018 MAG Transportation Improvement Program (TIP), FY 2014 Arterial Life Cycle Program, and the 2035 Long Range Plan¹**

Sort: Section, Agency, Location, Work Year

TIP Amendment #3																				Reviewed By ²				
Agency	Section	Work Year ⁴	TIP ID	MAG ID	Location	Work	Miles	Lanes Before	Lanes After	ALI	In ALCP	TRACS	MAG Mode	Funding	Apport. Year ³	Federal	Regional	Local	Total	TIP Change Request	T R C	M C	T P C	R C
MAG	Transit	2014	PNP14-404T	30897	Chandler Gilbert Arc: Chandler, Gilbert, Mesa, Tempe, Queen Creek, Phoenix.	Procure: 3 Minivans	-	-	-	11.12.04	No	-	Transit	5310-MAG	2014	60,000	-	15,000	75,000	Amend: New Project. FY 2014 Section 5310 Phoenix-Mesa UZA.		✓		
MAG	Transit	2014	PNP14-423T	30897	Chandler Gilbert Arc: Chandler, Gilbert, Mesa, Tempe, Queen Creek, Phoenix.	Mobility Manager Position	-	-	-	11.7L.00	No	-	Transit	5310-MAG	2014	44,000	-	11,000	55,000	Amend: New Project. FY 2014 Section 5310 Phoenix-Mesa UZA.		✓		
MAG	Transit	2014	PNP14-429T	30897	City of Glendale: Regionwide.	Taxi Voucher Program	-	-	-	30.09.00	No	-	Transit	5310-MAG	2014	62,500	-	62,500	125,000	Amend: New Project. FY 2014 Section 5310 Phoenix-Mesa UZA.		✓		
MAG	Transit	2014	PNP14-431T	30897	City of Phoenix: Regionwide.	Program Administration Funds	-	-	-	11.79.00	No	-	Transit	5310-MAG	2014	290,884	-	-	290,884	Amend: New Project. FY 2014 Section 5310 Phoenix-Mesa UZA.		✓		
MAG	Transit	2014	PNP14-405T	30897	City of Tolleson: Regionwide	Procure: Cutaway	-	-	-	11.13.04	No	-	Transit	5310-MAG	2014	51,850	-	9,150	61,000	Amend: New Project. FY 2014 Section 5310 Phoenix-Mesa UZA.		✓		
MAG	Transit	2014	PNP14-424T	30897	Foothills Caring Corps: Cave Creek, Carefree, North Phoenix, North Scottsdale.	Mobility Manager Position	-	-	-	11.7L.00	No	-	Transit	5310-MAG	2014	71,352	-	17,838	89,190	Amend: New Project. FY 2014 Section 5310 Phoenix-Mesa UZA.		✓		
MAG	Transit	2014	PNP14-427T	30897	Foothills Caring Corps: Regionwide	Add Vehicle Steps	-	-	-	11.42.20	No	-	Transit	5310-MAG	2014	829	-	146	975	Amend: New Project. FY 2014 Section 5310 Phoenix-Mesa UZA.		✓		
MAG	Transit	2014	PNP14-406T	30897	Friendship Village: Phoenix, East Valley.	Procure: Minivan with Ramp & Cutaway	-	-	-	11.13.04	No	-	Transit	5310-MAG	2014	84,150	-	14,850	99,000	Amend: New Project. FY 2014 Section 5310 Phoenix-Mesa UZA.		✓		
MAG	Transit	2014	PNP14-407T	30897	Gompers: Avondale, Glendale, Goodyear, Litchfield Park, Peoria, Phoenix, Surprise, Sun City.	Procure: 5 Cutaways	-	-	-	11.12.04	No	-	Transit	5310-MAG	2014	259,250	-	45,750	305,000	Amend: New Project. FY 2014 Section 5310 Phoenix-Mesa UZA.		✓		
MAG	Transit	2014	PNP14-408T	30897	Hacienda Healthcare: Regionwide	Procure: 5 Cutaways	-	-	-	11.13.04	No	-	Transit	5310-MAG	2014	259,250	-	45,750	305,000	Amend: New Project. FY 2014 Section 5310 Phoenix-Mesa UZA.		✓		

**TABLE A: Requested amendments and administrative modifications to the
FY 2014-2018 MAG Transportation Improvement Program (TIP), FY 2014 Arterial Life Cycle Program, and the 2035 Long Range Plan¹**

Sort: Section, Agency, Location, Work Year

TIP Amendment #3																				Reviewed By ²				
Agency	Section	Work Year ⁴	TIP ID	MAG ID	Location	Work	Miles	Lanes Before	Lanes After	ALI	In ALCP	TRACS	MAG Mode	Funding	Apportionment Year ³	Federal	Regional	Local	Total	TIP Change Request	T R C	M C	T P C	R C
MAG	Transit	2014	PNP14-409T	30897	Horizon Human Services: Mesa, Phoenix, Tempe	Procure: 2 Passenger Vans	-	-	-	11.12.04	No	-	Transit	5310-MAG	2014	44,800	-	11,200	56,000	Amend: New Project. FY 2014 Section 5310 Phoenix-Mesa UZA.	✓			
MAG	Transit	2014	PNP14-410T	30897	Lifewell: Regionwide	Procure: 5 Passenger Vans	-	-	-	11.12.04	No	-	Transit	5310-MAG	2014	112,000	-	28,000	140,000	Amend: New Project. FY 2014 Section 5310 Phoenix-Mesa UZA.	✓			
MAG	Transit	2014	PNP14-411T	30897	Lura Turner Homes: Central Phoenix.	Procure: 2 Minivan with Ramp; 1 Minivan NO Ramp; 1 Passenger Van	-	-	-	11.12.04	No	-	Transit	5310-MAG	2014	107,000	-	22,000	129,000	Amend: New Project. FY 2014 Section 5310 Phoenix-Mesa UZA.	✓			
MAG	Transit	2014	PNP14-412T	30897	Marc Community Resources: Chandler, Gilbert, Mesa, Tempe, North Phoenix, San Tan Valley.	Procure: 2 Cutaways	-	-	-	11.13.04	No	-	Transit	5310-MAG	2014	103,700	-	18,300	122,000	Amend: New Project. FY 2014 Section 5310 Phoenix-Mesa UZA.	✓			
MAG	Transit	2014	PNP14-413T	30897	Marc Community Resources: Chandler, Gilbert, Mesa, Tempe, North Phoenix, San Tan Valley.	Procure: 3 Cutaways	-	-	-	11.12.04	No	-	Transit	5310-MAG	2014	155,550	-	27,450	183,000	Amend: New Project. FY 2014 Section 5310 Phoenix-Mesa UZA.	✓			
MAG	Transit	2014	PNP14-425T	30897	Marc Community Resources: Chandler, Gilbert, Mesa, Tempe, North Phoenix, San Tan Valley.	Mobility Manager Position	-	-	-	11.7L.00	No	-	Transit	5310-MAG	2014	44,000	-	11,000	55,000	Amend: New Project. FY 2014 Section 5310 Phoenix-Mesa UZA.	✓			
MAG	Transit	2014	PNP14-414T	30897	Native American Connections: Regionwide.	Procure: Minivan with Ramp	-	-	-	11.13.04	No	-	Transit	5310-MAG	2014	32,300	-	5,700	38,000	Amend: New Project. FY 2014 Section 5310 Phoenix-Mesa UZA.	✓			
MAG	Transit	2014	PNP14-415T	30897	One Step Beyond: Avondale, Glendale, Litchfield Park, Peoria, Phoenix, Surprise, Sun City, Anthem, Wickenburg, Morristown.	Procure: Minivan & Passenger Van	-	-	-	11.13.04	No	-	Transit	5310-MAG	2014	42,400	-	10,600	53,000	Amend: New Project. FY 2014 Section 5310 Phoenix-Mesa UZA.	✓			
MAG	Transit	2014	MAG14-419T	5800	Regionwide	JARC apportionment	-	-	-	30.09.01				5307-JARC	2014	1,875,527	468,882	-	2,344,409	Amend: Update JARC Suballocation. Change federal/local amount from \$1,815,300/\$453,825 to \$1,875,527/\$468,882	✓	✓		

**TABLE A: Requested amendments and administrative modifications to the
FY 2014-2018 MAG Transportation Improvement Program (TIP), FY 2014 Arterial Life Cycle Program, and the 2035 Long Range Plan¹**

Sort: Section, Agency, Location, Work Year

TIP Amendment #3																				Reviewed By ²				
Agency	Section	Work Year ⁴	TIP ID	MAG ID	Location	Work	Miles	Lanes Before	Lanes After	ALI	In ALCP	TRACS	MAG Mode	Funding	Apport. Year ³	Federal	Regional	Local	Total	TIP Change Request	T R C	M C	T P C	R C
MAG	Transit	2014	PNP14-416T	30897	Scottsdale Training and Rehabilitation Services (STARS): Chandler, Gilbert, Mesa, Tempe Apache Junction, Ahwatukee.	Procure: 2 Minivans with Ramp	-	-	-	11.12.04	No	-	Transit	5310-MAG	2014	64,600	-	11,400	76,000	Amend: New Project. FY 2014 Section 5310 Phoenix-Mesa UZA.	✓			
MAG	Transit	2014	PNP14-417T	30897	Southern AZ Assoc for Visually Impaired (SAAVI): Regionwide	Procure: 1 Minivan NO Ramp: 1 Minivan with Ramp	-	-	-	11.13.04	No	-	Transit	5310-MAG	2014	52,300	-	10,700	63,000	Amend: New Project. FY 2014 Section 5310 Phoenix-Mesa UZA.	✓			
MAG	Transit	2014	PNP14-418T	30897	Stand Together and Recover (S.T.A.R.): Apache Junction, Chandler, Gilbert, Mesa, Tempe, Phoenix, North Gila River Indian Community.	Procure: Passenger Van	-	-	-	11.12.04	No	-	Transit	5310-MAG	2014	22,400	-	5,600	28,000	Amend: New Project. FY 2014 Section 5310 Phoenix-Mesa UZA.	✓			
MAG	Transit	2014	PNP14-419T	30897	Stand Together and Recover (S.T.A.R.): Apache Junction, Chandler, Gilbert, Mesa, Tempe, Phoenix, North Gila River Indian Community.	Procure: Cutaway	-	-	-	11.13.04	No	-	Transit	5310-MAG	2014	51,850	-	9,150	61,000	Amend: New Project. FY 2014 Section 5310 Phoenix-Mesa UZA.	✓			
MAG	Transit	2014	PNP14-428T	30897	Stand Together and Recover S.T.A.R.: Apache Junction, Chandler, Gilbert, Mesa, Tempe, Phoenix, North Gila River Indian Community.	Procure and Replace Vehicle Steps	-	-	-	11.42.20	No	-	Transit	5310-MAG	2014	689	-	121	810	Amend: New Project. FY 2014 Section 5310 Phoenix-Mesa UZA.	✓			
MAG	Transit	2014	PNP14-426T	30897	Terros: Regionwide	Mobility Manager Position	-	-	-	11.7L.00	No	-	Transit	5310-MAG	2014	66,058	-	16,515	82,573	Amend: New Project. FY 2014 Section 5310 Phoenix-Mesa UZA.	✓			
MAG	Transit	2014	PNP14-420T	30897	The Centers for Habilitation (TCH): Chandler, Tempe, Mesa, Phoenix.	Procure: 3 Cutaway	-	-	-	11.12.04	No	-	Transit	5310-MAG	2014	155,550	-	27,450	183,000	Amend: New Project. FY 2014 Section 5310 Phoenix-Mesa UZA.	✓			
MAG	Transit	2014	PNP14-421T	30897	United Cerebral Palsy (UCP): North Central Phoenix, Paradise Valley, Glendale, Peoria	Procure: 5 Cutaways	-	-	-	11.12.04	No	-	Transit	5310-MAG	2014	259,250	-	45,750	305,000	Amend: New Project. FY 2014 Section 5310 Phoenix-Mesa UZA.	✓			

**TABLE A: Requested amendments and administrative modifications to the
FY 2014-2018 MAG Transportation Improvement Program (TIP), FY 2014 Arterial Life Cycle Program, and the 2035 Long Range Plan¹**

Sort: Section, Agency, Location, Work Year

TIP Amendment #3																				Reviewed By ²				
Agency	Section	Work Year ⁴	TIP ID	MAG ID	Location	Work	Miles	Lanes Before	Lanes After	ALI	In ALCP	TRACS	MAG Mode	Funding	Apport. Year ³	Federal	Regional	Local	Total	TIP Change Request	T R C	M C	T P C	R C
MAG	Transit	2014	PNP14-422T	30897	Valley Life: Regionwide	Procure: Minivan with Ramp	-	-	-	11.13.04	No	-	Transit	5310-MAG	2014	32,300	-	5,700	38,000	Amend: New Project. FY 2014 Section 5310 Phoenix-Mesa UZA.	✓			
MAG	Transit	2014	PNP14-430T	30897	Valley Metro RPTA: Regionwide	Alternatives Project - WV DAR, EV Taxi Subsidy, Scottsdale Trolley	-	-	-	30.09.00	No	-	Transit	5310-MAG	2014	657,050	-	657,050	1,314,100	Amend: New Project. FY 2014 Section 5310 Phoenix-Mesa UZA.	✓			
Peoria	Transit	2014	PEO14-421T	47404	Peoria	Purchase bus: < 30-foot - 2 replace (dial-a-ride)	-	-	-	11.12.04	no	-	Transit	STP-AZ-Flex	2014				163,958	Delete. Unprogrammed buses in FY 2011.	✓	✓		
Peoria	Transit	2014	PEO14-404T	8403	Peoria: Citywide-Paratransit	Preventive-Maintenance	-	-	-	11.7A.00	no	-	Transit	5307	2014					Amend: Delete. PM Overage in previous grants.	✓	✓		
Phoenix	Transit	2014	PHX11-104T	14264	79th Avenue/Thomas Road	Land for regional park-and-ride (Desert Sky)	-	-	-	11.32.04	no	-	Transit	5309-FGM	2011	1,136,892	284,223	-	1,421,115	Amend TIP: Land price lower than programmed. Decrease cost from \$2,243,325/\$560,830 to \$1,136,892/\$284,223 due to lower land price. \$1,106,433 moved to VMR14-110T.	✓			
Phoenix	Transit	2014	PHX13-909T	39152	Laveen/59th Avenue	Pre-design regional park-and-ride (Laveen/59th Avenue)	-	-	-	11.31.04	no	-	Transit	5307	2014	115,497	28,874	-	144,371	Amend: Funding is showing 85%/15%. Should be 80%/20%. Change federal/local amount from \$122,129/\$22,242 to \$115,497/\$28,874.	✓	✓		
Phoenix	Transit	2014	PHX14-103T	47717	Regionwide	Preventive Maintenance	-	-	-	11.7A.00	no	-	Transit	5307	2014	10,991,787	-	2,747,947	13,739,733	Amend: Update PM with NTD data. Reduce total FY 14 PM by close out funds of \$26,390 Change federal/local amount from \$11,613,337/\$2,903,334 to \$10,991,787/\$2,747,947.	✓	✓		
Phoenix	Transit	2014	PHX14-106T	21472	Regionwide	Purchase bus: Articulated - 10 replace	-	-	-	11.12.06	no	-	Transit	5307	2014	6,698,000	1,182,000	-	7,880,000	Admin: Update ALI Code.	✓	✓		
Phoenix	Transit	2014	PHX14-409T	8434	Regionwide	Purchase bus: standard 40 foot - 7 replace	-	-	-	11.12.01	no	-	Transit	5307	2014	3,314,150	584,850	-	3,899,000	Amend: Increase by from 2 to 7 buses due to under programming in FY 2013. Change federal/local amount from \$946,900/\$167,100 to \$3,314,150/\$584,850.	✓	✓		
Phoenix	Transit	2014	PHX14-412T	3018	Regionwide	Preventive Maintenance	-	-	-	11.7A.00	no	-	Transit	5339	2014	224,671	-	56,168	280,839	Amend: Update PM with NTD data and to balance the program. Change federal/local amount from \$50,861/\$12,715 to \$224,671/\$56,168.	✓	✓		

**TABLE A: Requested amendments and administrative modifications to the
FY 2014-2018 MAG Transportation Improvement Program (TIP), FY 2014 Arterial Life Cycle Program, and the 2035 Long Range Plan¹**

Sort: Section, Agency, Location, Work Year

TIP Amendment #3																			Reviewed By ²					
Agency	Section	Work Year ⁴	TIP ID	MAG ID	Location	Work	Miles	Lanes Before	Lanes After	ALI	In ALCP	TRACS	MAG Mode	Funding	Apport. Year ³	Federal	Regional	Local	Total	TIP Change Request	T R C	M C	T P C	R C
Phoenix	Transit	2014	PHX14-413T	3018	Regionwide	Preventive Maintenance	-	-	-	11.7A.00	no	-	Transit	STP-AZ-Flex	2014	407,980	-	101,995	509,975	Amend: Balances the STP program. Change federal/local amount from \$77,190/\$19,298 to \$407,980/\$101,995.	✓	✓		
Phoenix	Transit	2014	PHX14-414T	3018	Regionwide	Preventive Maintenance	-	-	-	11.7A.00	no	-	Transit	5337-HI	2014	646,511	-	161,628	808,139	Amend: Update PM with NTD data and to balance the program. Change federal/local amount from \$557,261/\$139,315 to \$646,511/\$161,628.	✓	✓		
Phoenix	Transit	2014	PHX14-416T	8434	Regionwide	Purchase bus: standard 40 foot - 2 replace	-	-	-	11.12.01	no	-	Transit	5307	2014	911,200	160,800	-	1,072,000	Amend: New project. To account for buses not programmed in FY2013.	✓	✓		
Phoenix	Transit	2014	PHX14-418T	8434	Regionwide	Purchase bus: standard 40 foot - 3 replace	-	-	-	11.12.01	no	-	Transit	5307	2014	1,366,800	241,200	-	1,608,000	Amend TIP: New project utilizing 5307 funds originally programmed for VMR14-110T.			✓	
Phoenix	Transit	2015	PHX14-417T	8434	Regionwide	Purchase bus: standard 40 foot - 4 replace	-	-	-	11.12.01	no	-	Transit	5307	2015	1,968,600	347,400	-	2,316,000	Amend: New project. Utilize funds from deferring VMT14-105T to FY 2015 and moving \$682,523 from MES10-808T to VMR15-433T. Decrease PHX15-421T by 4 buses.	✓	✓		
Phoenix	Transit	2015	PHX15-421T	8434	Regionwide	Purchase bus: standard 40 foot - 11 replace	-	-	-	11.12.01	no	-	Transit	5307	2015	5,413,650	955,350	-	6,369,000	Amend: Four buses moved to PHX14-417T. Reduce from 15 to 11 buses.	✓	✓		
Scottsdale	Transit	2014	SCT14-101T	29060	Scottsdale: Fixed Route	Preventive Maintenance	-	-	-	11.7A.00	no	-	Transit	5307	2014	285,307	-	71,327	356,634	Amend: Update PM with NTD data. Change federal/local amount from \$150,811/\$38,203 to \$285,307/\$71,327	✓	✓		
Surprise	Transit	2014	SUR13-902T	40702	Regionwide	Purchase bus: <30-foot - 2 Replace (dial-a-ride)	-	-	-	11.12.04	no	-	Transit	5307	2014					Amend: Delete. Surprise no longer operates service	✓	✓		
Surprise	Transit	2014	SUR14-101T	5099	Surprise: Citywide-Paratransit	Preventive Maintenance	-	-	-	11.7A.00	no	-	Transit	5307	2014					Amend: Delete. Surprise no longer operates service	✓	✓		
Valley Metro Rail	Transit	2014	VMR14-110T	19572	Central Phoenix / East Valley (CP/EV) 20-mile light rail transit starter line	Preventive Maintenance	-	-	-	11.7A.00	no	-	Transit	5309-FGM	2011	1,106,433	-	276,608	1,383,041	Amend: Change funding source from 5307 to 5309-FGM to reflect funds moved from PHX11-104T. Change work year to 2011. Update PM with NTD data. Reduce by close out funds of \$924,800 Change federal/local amount from \$2,146,533/\$536,633 to \$1,106,433/\$276,608.			✓	

**TABLE A: Requested amendments and administrative modifications to the
FY 2014-2018 MAG Transportation Improvement Program (TIP), FY 2014 Arterial Life Cycle Program, and the 2035 Long Range Plan¹**

Sort: Section, Agency, Location, Work Year

TIP Amendment #3																				Reviewed By ²				
Agency	Section	Work Year ⁴	TIP ID	MAG ID	Location	Work	Miles	Lanes Before	Lanes After	ALI	In ALCP	TRACS	MAG Mode	Funding	Apport. Year ³	Federal	Regional	Local	Total	TIP Change Request	T R C	M C	T P C	R C
Valley Metro Rail	Transit	2014	MES09-805T	39320	Main St/Mesa Dr	Design regional transit center (6-bay) Main St/Mesa Dr (FY 13 FGM Funds)	-	-	-	11.31.01	no	-	Transit	5309-FGM	2014	161,273	40,318	-	201,591	Admin: Change lead Agency to Valley Metro Rail.	✓	✓		
Valley Metro Rail	Transit	2014	MES10-808T	39320	Main St/Mesa Dr	Construct regional transit center (6-bay) (Main ST/Mesa Dr)	-	-	-	11.33.01	no	-	Transit	5307	2014	272,744	68,186	-	340,930	Amend: Change lead Agency to Valley Metro Rail. \$682,523 moved to VMR15-433T. Change federal/local amount from \$818,762/\$204,691 to \$272,744/\$68,186	✓	✓		
Valley Metro Rail	Transit	2015	VMR15-433T	14195	Main Street/Gilbert Road Bus Turn-Around (Construct)	Main Street/Gilbert Road bus turn-around (construct)	-	-	-	11.33.01	no	-	Transit	5307	2015	2,519,790	629,948	-	3,149,738	Amend: Moved \$682,523 from Main ST/Mesa Dr (MES10-808T). Change federal/local amount from \$1,973,772/\$493,443 to \$2,519,790/\$629,948.	✓	✓		
Valley Metro Rail	Transit	2014	VMR14-437T	27383	NW LRT Extension - 19th Avenue: Bethany Home to Dunlap	NW LRT Extension - 19th Avenue: Bethany Home to Dunlap - Right of way acquisition	-	-	-	13.22.01	no	-	Transit	PTF	2014	-	6,000,000	-	6,000,000	Admin: Update ALI Code.	✓	✓		
Valley Metro Rail	Transit	2014	VMR14-404T	23739	Regionwide	Overhaul friction brakes - Phase 2	-	-	-	12.17.00	no	-	Transit	5337-FGM	2014	340,563	542,572	-	883,135	Amend: Update federal amount to match apportionment. Total Cost unchanged. Change federal/local amount from \$331,125/\$552,010 to \$340,563/\$542,572.	✓	✓		
Valley Metro/ RPTA	Transit	2014	PHX14-101T	12809	Citywide	Install bus stop improvements (1% enhancement)	-	-	-	11.92.02	no	-	Transit	5307	2014	492,001	-	123,000	615,001	Amend: Adjust to 1% of apportionment. Change federal/local amount from \$475,160/\$118,790 to \$492,001/\$123,000	✓	✓		
Valley Metro/ RPTA	Transit	2014	PEO13-902T	6338	Peoria	Pre-design regional transit center (4-bay) Peoria	-	-	-	11.31.02	no	-	Transit	5307	2014	40,132	10,033	-	50,165	Admin: Change lead Agency to Valley Metro/RPTA.	✓	✓		
Valley Metro/ RPTA	Transit	2014	VMR14-399T	21692	Regionwide	Purchase bus: standard 35 foot - 3 Expand (Scottsdale)	-	-	-	11.13.02	no	-	Transit	5307	2014	1,721,250	303,750	-	2,025,000	Amend: Update ALI code. Change description to 35 foot bus. Change federal/local amount from \$1,541,079/\$271,955 to \$1,721,250/\$303,750.	✓	✓		
Valley Metro/ RPTA	Transit	2014	VMT14-106T	16655	Regionwide	Purchase vanpools: 19 expand	-	-	-	11.13.15	no	-	Transit	STP-AZ-Flex	2014	722,152	-	-	722,152	Amend: Reduce vanpool buses by 6 to be purchased with close-out funds. Change federal/local amount from \$950,200/\$0 to \$722,152/\$0.	✓	✓		
Valley Metro/ RPTA	Transit	2015	VMT14-105T	22488	Regionwide	Purchase bus: standard - 3 expand (Scottsdale/Rural BRT)	-	-	-	11.13.01	no	-	Transit	5307	2015	1,593,888	281,274	-	1,875,162	Amend: Move from FY 2014 to FY 2015.	✓	✓		
Valley Metro/ RPTA	Transit	2014	VMT14-101T	36312	Regionwide: Fixed Route	Preventive Maintenance	-	-	-	11.7A.00	no	-	Transit	5307	2014	4,329,488	-	1,082,372	5,411,860	Amend: Update PM with NTD data. Reduce by close out funds of \$924,800 Change federal/local amount from \$3,979,663/\$994,916 to \$4,329,488/\$1,082,372	✓	✓		

**TABLE A: Requested amendments and administrative modifications to the
FY 2014-2018 MAG Transportation Improvement Program (TIP), FY 2014 Arterial Life Cycle Program, and the 2035 Long Range Plan¹**

Sort: Section, Agency, Location, Work Year

TIP Amendment #3																			Reviewed By ²					
Agency	Section	Work Year ⁴	TIP ID	MAG ID	Location	Work	Miles	Lanes Before	Lanes After	ALI	In ALCP	TRACS	MAG Mode	Funding	Apport. Year ³	Federal	Regional	Local	Total	TIP Change Request	TRC	MC	TPC	RC
Valley Metro/ RPTA	Transit	2014	VMT14-108T	New	Southwest Valley	Operating Assistance: Rural Route 685 (Scope 30000)	-	-	-	30.09.02	no	-	Transit	5311	2014	109,272	79,128	-	188,400	Amend: New project. ADOT awarded project.	✓	✓		
Valley Metro/ RPTA	Transit	2014	VMT14-109T	New	Southwest Valley	Operating Assistance-Intercity: Rural Route 685 (Scope 63400)	-	-	-	30.09.02	no	-	Transit	5311	2014	213,542	154,633	-	368,175	Amend: New project. ADOT awarded project.	✓	✓		
Valley Metro/ RPTA	Transit	2014	VMT14-110T	New	Southwest Valley	Administration: Rural Route 685	-	-	-	11.79.00	no	-	Transit	5311	2014	56,352	14,088	-	70,440	Amend: New project. ADOT awarded project.	✓	✓		
Valley Metro/ RPTA	Transit	2014	TMP14-101T	6633	Tempe: Fixed Route	Preventive Maintenance	-	-	-	11.7A.00	no	-	Transit	5307	2014	2,638,896	-	659,724	3,298,620	Amend: Update PM with NTD data. Change federal/local amount from \$2,925,470/\$731,368 to \$2,638,896/\$659,724.	✓	✓		

Notes

1. Rows in the report are sorted in order by the following columns: Section, Agency, Year and TIP ID. Changes are in bold red font. Deletions are show in strike through font.
2. The following are used to indicate MAG Committees reviewing these TIP listings for amendment: TRC = Transportation Committee, MC = Management Committee, TPC = Transportation Review Committee, RC = Regional Council
3. The year the funds were apportioned by Congress. This item is included only for informational purposes.
4. For federal projects this is the year the project will authorize. For transit this is the year the project will appear in a grant.

Table B. ALCP Project Changes to the Fiscal Year 2014-2018 MAG Transportation Improvement Program and the Fiscal Year 2014 ALCP

ALCP																		
TIP #	Agency	Project Location	Project Description	Fiscal Year	Est. Date Open	Length (miles)	Lanes Before	Lanes After	Fund Type	Local Cost	Federal Cost	Regional Cost	Total Cost	Reimb. Fiscal Year	Fund Type	Regional Reimb.	Notes:	RTP ID
CHN110-09C	Chandler	Chandler Blvd at Alma School Rd	Construct intersection improvement	2016	Q4 2016	0.25	4	6	HSIP-AZ	1,334,806	4,208,929	-	5,543,735	2016	HSIP-AZ	4,208,929	Amend: Defer project from 2015 to 2016 based on ADOT programming.	All-CHN-10-03
CHN14-102CZ	Chandler	Ocotillo Road: Arizona Avenue to McQueen Road	Relocate utilities and construct roadway widening.	2014	Q2 2014	1	2	4	HSIP-AZ	4,856,124	2,250,773	-	7,106,897	2014	HSIP-AZ	2,250,773	Amend: Increase total cost from \$6,081,169 to \$7,106,897 due to a new engineer's estimate. Increase local cost from \$3,830,396 to \$4,856,124.	ACI-PRC-10-03-D
MMA13-118RW2Z	Maricopa County	Northern Parkway: Dysart to 111th	Acquisition of right-of-way for roadway widening	2014	Q2 2015	2.5	2	4	STP-MAG	116,876	1,933,575	-	2,050,451	2014	STP-MAG	1,933,575	Amend: Advance reimbursement from FY2015 to FY2014 resulting from the FY2014 NACOG loan.	ACI-NOR-10-03-B
MMA13-106CLZ	Maricopa County	Northern Parkway: Sarival to Dysart	Construct and landscape roadway widening	2012	Q2 2025	4.1	4	6	STP-MAG	27,758	495,970	-	523,728	2012	STP-MAG	495,970	Amend: Funding was obligated as part of the Northern Parkway: Sarival to Dysart Phase I project. Move from RTPID ACI-NOR-10-03-A to ACI-NOR-30-03-A.	ACI-NOR-30-03-A
PHX14-101CZ	Phoenix	Avenida Rio Salado: 51st Avenue to 7th Street	Construct roadway widening	2014	Q3 2015	6	0	6	STP-MAG	629,732	10,418,197	-	11,047,929	2014	STP-MAG	10,418,197	Amend: Advance \$2,000,000 of STP-MAG funds from FY 2015 to FY 2014 as part of the FY 2014 NACOG loan. Increase total costs in listing from \$9,811,710 to \$11,047,929.	ACI-RIO-10-03
PHX15-101CZ	Phoenix	Avenida Rio Salado: 51st Avenue to 7th Street	Construct roadway widening	2015	Q3 2015	6	0	6	STP-MAG	236,837	3,918,197	-	4,155,034	2015	STP-MAG	3,918,197	Amend: Advance \$2,000,000 of STP-MAG funds from FY 2015 to FY 2014 as part of the FY 2014 NACOG loan. Decrease total costs in listing from \$12,984,790 to \$4,155,034.	ACI-RIO-10-03
SCT11-123DZ	Scottsdale	Frank Lloyd Wright at 76th/78th/82nd St: Intersection Improvements	Design intersection improvement	2012	Q2 2014	0.5	4	6	RARF	27,778	-	64,816	92,594	2014	RARF	64,816	Amend: Correct clerical error to match FY 2014 approved ALCP. Regional amount should be \$70,141.51 not \$70,414.51. Update project costs (completed project) and transfer savings to the Northsight Blvd: Hayden to Frank Lloyd Wright Blvd project (ACI-SAT-10-03-C)	ACI-SAT-10-03-H
SCT13-123RWZ	Scottsdale	Frank Lloyd Wright at 76th/78th/82nd St: Intersection Improvements	Acquisition of right-of-way for intersection improvement	2013	Q2 2014	0.5	4	6	RARF	142,679	-	332,918	475,598	2014	RARF	332,918	Amend: Correct clerical error to match FY 2014 approved ALCP. Regional amount should be \$70,141.51 not \$70,414.51. Update project costs (completed project) and transfer savings to the Northsight Blvd: Hayden to Frank Lloyd Wright Blvd project (ACI-SAT-10-03-C)	ACI-SAT-10-03-H
SCT13-123RWZ	Scottsdale	Frank Lloyd Wright at 76th/78th/82nd Street: Intersection Improvements	Acquisition of right-of-way for intersection improvement	2013	Apr-14	0.5	4	6	Local	100,592	---	---	100,592	2014	RARF	70,415	Amend: Delete project right-of-way phase (completed project, no right-of-way was needed)	ACI-SAT-10-03-H
SCT14-105CRB	Scottsdale	Northsight Blvd: Hayden to Frank Lloyd Wright	Construct roadway widening	2014	Jun-14	0.4	2	4	RARF	(446,694)	-	446,694	-	2014	RARF	446,694	Amend: New TIP listing. Transfer project savings from the Frank Lloyd Wright at 76th/78th/82nd St: Intersection Improvements project (ACI-SAT-10-03-H) to the Northsight Blvd: Hayden to Frank Lloyd Wright project construction phase.	ACI-SAT-10-03-C

Table B. ALCP Project Changes to the Fiscal Year 2014-2018 MAG Transportation Improvement Program and the Fiscal Year 2014 ALCP

5/8/2014

ALCP																		
TIP #	Agency	Project Location	Project Description	Fiscal Year	Est. Date Open	Length (miles)	Lanes Before	Lanes After	Fund Type	Local Cost	Federal Cost	Regional Cost	Total Cost	Reimb. Fiscal Year	Fund Type	Regional Reimb.	Notes:	RTP ID
VMR14-101DZ	Valley Metro Rail	Mesa Main Street: Mesa Dr to Gilbert Rd LRT	Design light rail extension	2014	Q4 2020	2	4	2	CMAQ	34,545	571,500	-	606,045	2014	CMAQ	571,500	Amend: Add new TIP listing. Accelerate \$571,500 from FY2019 to FY 2014 as part of the FY 2014 NACOG loan.	ACI-LRT-10-03
VMR17-101FZ	Valley Metro Rail	Mesa Main Street: Mesa Dr to Gilbert Rd LRT	Gilbert Road Light Rail Extension - Finance Charges	2017	Q4 2020	2	4	2	STP-MAG	207,261	3,428,895	-	3,636,156	2019	STP-MAG	3,428,895	Amend: Advance \$571,500 of federal funds from FY 2019 to FY2014 as part of the FY 2014 NACOG loan. Reduce TIP listing from \$4,242,200 to \$3,636,156.	ACI-LRT-10-03

Sorted by: Agency, Project Location, Work Year

MARICOPA ASSOCIATION OF GOVERNMENTS

INFORMATION SUMMARY... for your review

DATE:

May 13, 2014

SUBJECT:

Revisions to the Arterial Life Cycle Program Policies and Procedures

SUMMARY:

The Arterial Life Cycle Program (ALCP) is the financial management tool for the arterial street component of the Regional Transportation Plan (RTP). Management of the program is guided by the ALCP Policies and Procedures (Policies), which were last approved by the MAG Regional Council on December 9, 2009.

On April 29, 2013, the MAG Managers Working Group held a meeting to discuss potential changes to the Policies. At the meeting, there was general consensus to strengthen project commitment, better define the annual program development/budget process, and develop a toolkit of program rebalancing methodologies. The Managers Working Group requested that the ALCP Working Group develop specific revisions to accomplish these ends. The ALCP Working Group met a total of seven times from August 2013 through February 2014. To address project commitment, proposed revisions to the Policies include the annual submission of a project commitment letter signed by an agency's city/county/town manager (page 4) and establishment of programming principles to require attainment of certain milestones before reimbursement can be programmed (pages 5-6). Further, the proposed revisions provide for the establishment of advancement priorities that give reimbursement priority to completed projects and projects underway (page 15).

Proposed revisions also include refinements to the annual program/budget process. Proposed revisions state that decisions relating to program funding – such as a program deficit or surplus – should first go to the Managers Working Group for direction (page 16). A toolbox of rebalancing methodologies was developed to provide the Managers Working Group with options for such occasions (page 7).

Lastly, proposed revisions to the Policies include updates to language pertaining to federally funded ALCP projects and changes to administrative requirements. The federal fund invoice approval and payment process, as has been practiced for several years, was documented in Appendix B (page 46). Proposed revisions also address requirements relating to the 30 percent ALCP match for federally funded projects; under current policies, the federal reimbursement amount and the entire 30 percent match must be federally eligible. Under the revised policies, only the federal reimbursement and minimum federal match must be federally eligible while the remaining match must meet the eligibility requirements stated in the Policies. This policy would apply to expenditures retroactively so long as they are consistent with Section 340. The Policies also include revisions to streamline administrative requirements of agencies.

Please refer to the revised Policies; text added to the Policies has been underlined, text removed from the Policies has been ~~struck-out~~, and notes are denoted by "NOTE." Notes will not be contained in the approved version.

PUBLIC INPUT:

None has been received.

PROS & CONS:

PROS: Proposed revisions to the Arterial Life Cycle Program will strengthen project commitment, ensure reimbursements are programmed in an efficient manner, improve development of the annual update, improve delivery of federally funded projects, and streamline administrative requirements.

CONS: None.

TECHNICAL & POLICY IMPLICATIONS:

TECHNICAL: MAG will be able to continue implementation of the Arterial Life Cycle Program.

POLICY: A.R.S. 28-6352 (B) requires that MAG performs life cycle management for the arterial street component of the Regional Transportation Plan.

ACTION NEEDED:

Recommend approval of the proposed revisions to the Arterial Life Cycle Program Policies and Procedures.

PRIOR COMMITTEE ACTIONS:

This item is on the May 14, 2014, MAG Management Committee agenda. An update will be provided on action taken by the committee.

On April 24, 2014, the Transportation Review Committee recommended approval of the proposed revisions to the Arterial Life Cycle Program Policies and Procedures.

MEMBERS ATTENDING

- | | |
|---|---|
| Avondale: David Fitzhugh, Chair | Litchfield Park: Julius Diogenes for Woody Scoutten |
| Phoenix: Rick Naimark, Vice Chair | Maricopa (City): Paul Jepson |
| ADOT: Kwi-Sung Kang for Floyd Roehrich | Maricopa County: John Hauskins |
| Buckeye: Jose Heredia for Scott Lowe | Mesa: Jeff Martin for Scott Butler |
| # Cave Creek: Ian Cordwell | * Paradise Valley: Jim Shano |
| Chandler: Dan Cook | Peoria: Andrew Granger |
| El Mirage: Jorge Gastelum | Queen Creek: Mohamed Youssef |
| Fountain Hills: Randy Harrel | Surprise: Martin Lucero for Dick McKinley |
| Gila Bend: Ernie Rubi | Tempe: Marge Zylla for Shelly Seyler |
| * Gila River: Tim Oliver | Valley Metro: John Farry |
| Gilbert: Kristin Myers for Leah Hubbard | * Wickenburg: Vince Lorefice |
| Glendale: Debbie Albert | Youngtown: Grant Anderson |
| Goodyear: Cato Esquivel | |

EX-OFFICIO MEMBERS ATTENDING

- | | |
|---|---|
| * Street Committee: Charles Andrews, Avondale | * Bicycle/Pedestrian Committee: Denise Lacey, Maricopa County |
| * ITS Committee: Catherine Hollow, Tempe | * Transportation Safety Committee: Renate Ehm, Mesa |
| FHWA: Ed Stillings | |

* Members neither present nor represented by proxy.

+ Attended by Videoconference

Attended by Audioconference

CONTACT PERSON:

John Bullen, Transportation Planner II, (602) 254-6300.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

BACKGROUND	I
I. ARTERIAL LIFE CYCLE PROGRAM MANAGEMENT AND ADMINISTRATION	- 1 -
SECTION 100: PROGRAM OBJECTIVES	- 1 -
SECTION 110: APPLICABILITY OF ARTERIAL LIFE CYCLE PROGRAM POLICIES AND PROCEDURES....	- 2 -
SECTION 120: PROGRAM REPORTING	- 2 -
SECTION 130: MAG COMMITTEE PROCESS	- 3 -
II. PROGRAMMING THE ARTERIAL LIFE CYCLE PROGRAM	- 4 -
SECTION 200: PROGRAMMING THE ALCP	- 4 -
SECTION 210: UPDATING ALCP PROJECTS IN THE ALCP	- 8 -
SECTION 220: TYPES OF ALCP PROJECT UPDATES	- 8 -
SECTION 230: PROGRAM OR PROJECT AMENDMENTS AND ADMINISTRATIVE ADJUSTMENTS	- 11 -
SECTION 240: INFLATION IN THE ALCP.....	- 12 -
SECTION 250: ALCP RARF CLOSEOUT (PREVIOUSLY 260)	- 13 -
SECTION 260: USE OF SURPLUS OR DEFICIT PROGRAM FUNDS (PREVIOUSLY 270).....	<u>- 15 -</u>
SECTION 270: REALLOCATION OF PROJECT SAVINGS (PREVIOUSLY SECTION 350)	<u>- 16 -</u>
III. PROJECT DETAILS	<u>- 18 -</u>
SECTION 300: LEAD AGENCIES	<u>- 18 -</u>
SECTION 310: ALCP PROJECT BUDGETS	<u>- 19 -</u>
SECTION 320: PROJECT ELIGIBILITY	<u>- 20 -</u>
SECTION 330: REIMBURSABLE EXPENDITURES	<u>- 24 -</u>
SECTION 340: LOCAL MATCH AND INELIGIBLE EXPENDITURES (NEW SECTION)	<u>- 27 -</u>
SECTION 350: PUBLIC INVOLVEMENT AND INPUT (NEW SECTION)	<u>- 29 -</u>
IV. ALCP PROJECT REQUIREMENTS	<u>- 31 -</u>
SECTION 400: PROJECT OVERVIEW	<u>- 31 -</u>
SECTION 410: PROJECT AGREEMENT	<u>- 32 -</u>
SECTION 420: PROJECT REIMBURSEMENT REQUESTS	<u>- 34 -</u>
SECTION 430: PROGRESS REPORTS (NEW SECTION)	<u>- 38 -</u>
APPENDIX A. GLOSSARY AND ACRONYMS	<u>- 39 -</u>
APPENDIX B. ADOT FEDERAL FUND INVOICE APPROVAL & PAYMENT PROCESS -	<u>39 -</u> -38-
APPENDIX C. EXAMPLE OF FEDERALLY-FUNDED PROJECT AND MATCH REQUIREMENTS	

BACKGROUND

In 2004, the Maricopa Association of Governments (MAG) initiated the development of the Arterial Life Cycle Program (ALCP, or the “Program”) to provide management and oversight for the implementation of the arterial component of the Regional Transportation Plan (RTP, or the “Plan”). MAG is the designated Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO) for the Maricopa region. MAG serves the role designated in ARS: 28-6308 as the “regional planning agency” for this region.

The Policies and Procedures were developed in coordination with the Transportation Review Committee in workshops held in 2004 and early 2005 and are consistent with the requirements in House Bill 2456, passed in 2004 in association with the development of the Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) and Proposition 400. House Bill 2456 allocated 10.5 percent of Regional Area Road Funds collected for arterial streets, including capital expenses and implementation studies.

The original version of the ALCP Policies and Procedures were approved by the Transportation Policy Committee on June 21, 2006 and by the Regional Council on June 28, 2006. ~~The current version of the ALCP Policies and Procedures was approved by the Regional Council on April 22, 2009. Since then, the ALCP Policies and Procedures have been periodically updated five times. All updates to the ALCP Policies and Procedures are submitted to the are generated with input from the ALCP Working Group and/or Managers Working Group for review and input before revisions are presented through the MAG Committee Process for approval.~~

The ALCP relies upon two main elements:

1. Policies and Procedures. Policies, which provide direction to decisions and processes, in conjunction with procedures, which specify the steps needed to implement these specified policies; and,
2. Project Requirements. Project Agreements (PA), which define the roles and requirements for agencies participating in the implementation of each Project; Project Overviews (PO), which define the scope of the project and ensure that it aligns with the intent of the Regional Transportation Plan; and Project Reimbursement Requests (PRR), which define the reimbursements for the project per the program amount and fiscal year.

I. ARTERIAL LIFE CYCLE PROGRAM MANAGEMENT AND ADMINISTRATION

SECTION 100: PROGRAM OBJECTIVES

A. The ALCP has five key objectives:

1. Effective and Efficient Implementation of the RTP: Facilitate the effective and efficient implementation of the arterial component of the RTP. In support of this objective, the Program should:
 - a. Ensure Projects are implemented in a manner consistent with the RTP, including any updates or amendments;
 - b. Include the means to track Project implementation against requirements established in the RTP and the ALCP; and,
 - c. Be administratively simple.
2. Fiscal Integrity: Ensure the fiscal integrity of the regionally funded arterial component of the RTP. In support of this objective, the Program should:
 - a. Establish comprehensive financial and reporting requirements for each Project; and
 - b. Coordinate with the RTP and the other modal programs on key financial, accounting and reporting policies, procedures and practices.
3. Accountability: Provide the means to track and ensure effective and efficient Project implementation. In support of this objective, the Program should:
 - a. Employ comprehensive Project Agreements, or other legal instruments, that detail agency roles and responsibilities in the implementation of specific Projects; and
 - b. Provide the means within each Project Agreement, Project Overview and Project Reimbursement Request to track Project implementation, performance and successful completion of individual Projects and the Program.
4. Transparency: Provide members of the public, elected officials, stakeholders, participating agencies and others with ready access to information on the Program and on each Project. In support of this objective, the Program should:
 - a. Include substantial public and stakeholder consultation as part of the implementation process for each Project; and
 - b. Require that material project changes to Projects in the Program be subject to public and stakeholder consultation-involvement through the MAG Committee Process ~~as well as any other consultation processes, including within the community or communities affected, as specified in the associated Project Agreements.~~
5. Compliance: Comply with all applicable federal, state and local requirements in the implementation of Projects.

B. Consistency with the RTP generally means that an ALCP Project meets Project the eligibility requirements specified in Section 300, the Project regional reimbursement is fiscally constrained, and the reimbursement is in the original RTP phase.

- C. The Program must be flexible and allow adjustments as needed in support of meeting the key objectives.

SECTION 110: APPLICABILITY OF ARTERIAL LIFE CYCLE PROGRAM POLICIES AND PROCEDURES

- A. The requirements established in this document are limited to arterial street and/or intersection Projects ~~(including arterial intersections)~~ as specified in the RTP that receive regional funds, including federal, state and regional (including half-cent) funds.
- B. Projects receiving any federal funding in the ALCP must satisfy all federal, state, and local requirements as defined by FHWA, ADOT, and local parties, in addition to the requirements in addition to the requirements established in this document.
 - 1. Only select Projects will have federal funding allocated to them. Federally funded ALCP Projects will be identified and the Lead Agency designated for that Project will work with MAG, ~~and~~ the ADOT Local Government Section, and the Federal Highway Administration to ensure ~~conformity compliance to~~ with federal and ALCP requirements.
- C. To make changes to the ALCP Policies and Procedures:
 - 1. MAG staff will suggest new provisions, additions, and revisions to the ALCP Policies and Procedures, when necessary.
 - 2. Member agencies may submit suggested changes to MAG and /or the chairperson of the Transportation Policy Committee.

SECTION 120: PROGRAM REPORTING

- A. Prior to the beginning of each fiscal year, the Arterial Life Cycle Program will be approved through the MAG Committee Process unless otherwise prohibited due to outstanding issues.
 - 1. MAG Staff will notify MAG Member Agencies if there will be a delay in approving the ALCP.
- A-B. The adopted Arterial Life Cycle Program will:
 - 1. ~~It will Provide~~ the status of the Projects: Project additions, Project deletions, changes to Project schedules, Program and Project financing and other necessary components.
 - 2. ~~It will also e~~ Certify the revenues and regional reimbursement costs in the ALCP.
 - 3. Be incorporated into the MAG will use this information for the Annual Report on the Implementation of Proposition 400, the Transportation Improvement Program, the State Transportation Improvement Program, RTP updates or revisions, the ALCP Status Report, and other documents. Programmed amounts shall match the adopted ALCP.
- B-C. The ALCP Status Report will provide the MAG committee members an update on all Project requirements and ALCP financial information. Information provided in the status report will include the number of Project Overviews, Project Agreements, and Project Reimbursement Requests submitted and processed by MAG Staff.

~~C~~.D. Audits: All participating agencies must cooperate and provide requested information, if available, as part of the performance audit to be conducted by the Auditor General beginning in 2010, and every fifth year thereafter. ARS: 28-6313.A

1. All participating agencies will provide information to meet the minimum requirements for the audit report by way of the Project Overview and Project Reimbursement Request.

SECTION 130: MAG COMMITTEE PROCESS

- A. The MAG Committee Process is defined in Appendix A - Glossary and Acronyms.
- B. Final decisions regarding the ALCP rest with the MAG Regional Council with recommendations from the Transportation Review Committee (TRC), MAG Management Committee and the Transportation Policy Committee (TPC). Variations to the MAG Committee Process may be applied. These include, but are not limited to:
 1. Other committees, including MAG modal committees, MAG Street Committee, and the MAG ITS Committee, or bodies outside this process may consider and advise on the same item; and
 2. Consultation with the Citizens Transportation Oversight Committee (CTOC), which will be conducted as appropriate and consistent with requirements in ARS: 28-6356(F) & (G).
- C. The MAG Committee Process will apply for the:
 1. Approval of amendments to the ALCP Policies and Procedures;
 2. Adoption of the Arterial Life Cycle Program;
 3. Approval of amendments to the ALCP, TIP, and RTP; and,
 4. ~~Approval of administrative adjustments to the ALCP.~~ Approval of projects selected for RARF Closeout
 - 4.5. Approval of projects selected for ALCP Federal Funds closeout

II. PROGRAMMING THE ARTERIAL LIFE CYCLE PROGRAM

SECTION 200: PROGRAMMING THE ALCP

- A. The RTP establishes regional funding limits, reimbursement phases, as well as general locations, scopes, and priorities for all ALCP Projects.
1. The regional funding is guided by the funding recommendations set forth in the MAG Regional Transportation Plan (RTP).
 - a. House Bill 2456 allocated 10.5 percent of Regional Area Road Funds collected for arterial streets, including capital expenses and implementation studies.
 - i. The RTP allocates 10.2-96.5305 percent of the Regional Area Road Funds (RARF) dedicated to arterials for ~~to~~ capital expenses for streets.
 - ii. The RTP allocates 0.33.4695 percent of the RARF funds dedicated to arterials for implementations studies.
 2. The regional funding for the ALCP is comprised of three revenue sources: the regional area road fund (RARF), otherwise known as the 1/2 cent sales tax, federal surface transportation program (STP) funds targeted for the MAG region, and federal congestion mitigation and air quality (CMAQ) targeted for the MAG region.
 3. The RARF funding distribution to the ALCP is bound by the requirements set forth in House Bill 2456 (2004).
 - a. The RTP and ALCP include four reimbursement phases as outlined below.
 - i. Phase I - Fiscal Years 2006 - 2010
 - ii. Phase II - Fiscal Years 2011 - 2015
 - iii. Phase III - Fiscal Years 2016 - 2020
 - iv. Phase IV - Fiscal Years 2021 -2026
- B. All ALCP Projects must be programmed in the local government agencies Capital Improvement Program (CIP) and the approved MAG Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) before they may be ~~implemented or~~ reimbursed.
1. ~~During the annual update of the ALCP, MAG Staff will review and analyze the Lead Agency's, and partnering agency's approved and/or draft Capital Improvement Program when programming ALCP Projects for reimbursement in the current and following fiscal year for fiscal commitments.~~
- C. The certification of Local Funds and required supporting documentation serve as the basis for ~~A commitment letter from the City/County/Town Manager or designee will be the basis of~~ programming decisions for work and/or reimbursement in the first two years of the ALCP.
- D. ~~For a project to~~ Before a project may be programmed for work and/or reimbursement in the first two years of the current or draft ALCP, the Lead Agency must:
1. Demonstrate sufficient local funding for the project is programmed in the Lead Agency's CIP or TIP

- a. For multi-jurisdictional projects, the Lead Agency is responsible for collecting CIP and other budgetary documents from the project partners that demonstrate the availability of local funds.
2. Submit a completed Certification of Local Funds form commitment letter signed by the City/County/Town manager or designee, and supporting documentation as outlined in 200.D.3, and and copies of the current draft of the agency's CIP that demonstrates local funding for the project.
- a. The Certification of Local Funds commitment letter form must be signed by the City/County/Town Manager or designee. The designee must be department director level or higher.
 - ~~—The Certification of Local Funds form will be provided by MAG.~~
 - b. A commitment letter template will be provided by MAG. Modifications to the Certification of Local Funds form will not be accepted.
 - c. The commitment letter shall certify that that local funds, staff time, and resources are committed to develop, obligate, implement, and complete the project as requested.
- ~~—Submit the necessary supporting documentation as outlined below.~~
- ~~—An ALCP Progress Report must be submitted for requests to program:

 - ~~—Design work in excess of \$500,000; or~~
 - ~~—Design work in excess of 50% of the total programmed reimbursement for design.~~
 - ~~—Any work and/or reimbursement for Right-of-Way acquisition or construction activities.~~~~
 - ~~—A Project Overview must be submitted for requests to program work for Right-of-Way acquisition activities.~~
 - ~~—A Project Overview and Project Agreement must be submitted and accepted as complete for requests to program:

 - ~~i. Work and reimbursement for Right-of-Way acquisition activities.~~
 - ~~ii. Work and/or reimbursement for construction activities.~~~~
- E. During the annual ALCP update, Project Reimbursements will be programmed in accordance with the following guidelines:
1. RARF Funded Projects:
- a. Design must be programmed in the local government agency's Capital Improvement Program (CIP) before any regional reimbursement may be programmed within the next two fiscal years.
 - b. A project overview must be submitted and accepted by MAG before any regional right-of-way reimbursement may be programmed in the next fiscal year.
 - c. A project must have substantial design and any right-of-way acquisition (if applicable) in process or completed before any regional construction reimbursement may be programmed in the next fiscal year.

2. Federally Funded Projects:

- a. Before federal funds may be programmed within the next two fiscal years, the lead agency must develop a project work schedule that demonstrates a reasonable expectation of project obligation. The timeline should be consistent with the standard development timeline of federally funded projects.
- b. A project must have an ADOT project number before any federal right-of-way or construction funds can be programmed in the next fiscal year.
- c. If a project programmed to receive federal funds fails to obligate, and funds are swept from the region as a result, those funds will be lost from the project.
- d. MAG will work with ADOT and the Lead Agency to make any funding adjustments to ensure all federal funds committed to the ALCP are obligated in the year for which they are programmed.

3. Exceptions to the programming guidelines may be approved through the MAG committee process.

- a. Requests should go to the MAG Street Committee for a technical review and recommendation.

~~— For a project to be programmed in the ALCP and the MAG Transportation Improvement program, the Lead Agency must demonstrate the commitment of local funds and progress on the project.~~

- ~~a. Once a project has been initiated, the Lead Agency must show continuous progress towards the completion of the project. Failure to work continuously on a project may result in the deferral of the project:~~
 - ~~a. Outside the approved and/or draft TIP period; and,~~
 - ~~b. Outside the first five years of the current or draft ALCP.~~

~~D.F.~~ Programming of Projects funded by the ALCP must be consistent with the ALCP Program and the ALCP Policies and Procedures. The Maricopa Association of Governments (MAG) is the agency designated by law to implement the Arterial Life Cycle Program ensuring the estimated cost of the program improvements does not exceed the total amount of available revenues.

~~2.1.~~ Initially, Projects will be programmed based on the regional funding specified in the RTP plus local match contributions, as well as scopes and termini as described in the RTP.

- a. In order to support the development of Project Agreements that include a scope and schedule for each Project, programming of each ALCP Project shall include a separate scoping or design phase that precedes right-of-way acquisition and construction, unless otherwise agreed to by MAG. Environmental clearances may be funded as part of the scoping or design phase.

3-2. All ALCP Projects will be updated annually and the ALCP will be programmed and produced at the beginning of each fiscal year.

a. The Lead Agency for each ALCP Project will be responsible for Project updates.

b. MAG Staff will produce an ALCP update schedule at the beginning of each fiscal year.

c. If a program deficit occurs, MAG will consult the Managers Working Group and may use the following strategies to balance the program:

i. Elimination of program bonding

ii. Elimination or reduction of program inflation

iii. Elimination of projects

iv. Percentage reduction in project funding

d. If a program surplus occurs, MAG will consult the Managers Working Group and may use the following strategies to balance the program:

i. Restoration of program bonding

ii. Restoration of program inflation

iii. Restoration of projects

iv. Percentage increase in project funding

4-3. All ALCP Project Reimbursements are dependent upon the availability of regional funds.

a. During the annual update, all project change requests will be reviewed by MAG Staff for compatibility with Section 110(-A) and ~~the current, and~~ projected regional funding sources (-RARF, STP, and CMAQ).

b. MAG Staff will coordinate with Lead Agency Staff to resolve project change requests that are not compatible with the availability of regional funds or Section 110(-A). Methods to resolve these issues may include the:

i. Advancement/deferral of project reimbursements, projects, project segments, or work phases per Section 250, Section 260, and Section 270~~Section 270~~260;

ii. Change in fund type allocated to a project or work phase based on available funding;

iii. Change in the reimbursement amount allocated to a project, project segment, and/or work phase over multiple fiscal years.

5-4. Federal funds will be allocated to Projects, considering:

a. A request from the Lead Agency.

- b. It is on a new alignment, has a potential impact on sensitive areas and/or populations or that it may readily accommodate the federal process given the length, amount of Project Regional budget or schedule.
- c. Project eligibility under federal requirements.
- d. The availability of federal funds.

6-5. _____ If a Project programmed to receive federal funds is deferred (Project A) and another Project programmed to receive federal funds is able to use the federal funds that year (Project B), then Project B may be accelerated to expend the maximum amount of committed federal funds in the ALCP that year. It is the ALCP's goal to expend the maximum amount of committed STP-MAG and CMAQ funds for a given year in the ALCP.

- a. Projects programmed to receive federal funds can be accelerated from one phase to another to use federal funds. This does not pertain to Projects programmed to receive RARF funds.
- b. If a Project is programmed to receive both, federal and RARF, funds, the portion of the Project that is programmed to receive federal funds may be accelerated. The portion of the Project programmed to receive RARF funds cannot be accelerated from one phase to another.
- c. MAG staff will work with the Lead Agency on the Project's new schedule and reimbursement matters.

SECTION 210: UPDATING ALCP PROJECTS IN THE ALCP

- A. All ALCP Projects will be updated annually (refer to Section 200(F)C-2).
- B. Any necessary changes to an ALCP Project must be submitted by a written request stating the new updated schedule and budget and any other necessary justifications.
 - 1. Requests will be approved through the MAG Committee Process by the approval of the ALCP.
 - 2. Update forms will be provided by MAG.
- C. All ALCP Projects that are moved, changed or updated from their original schedule in the RTP must consider the impact of the proposed changes on other RTP Projects and on neighboring communities.
- D. MAG, the Lead Agency, and other agency (ies)/jurisdiction(s) listed in the Project Agreement must agree to the proposed changes or updates.

SECTION 220: TYPES OF ALCP PROJECT UPDATES

- A. Projects may be advanced by the Lead Agency and other agency(ies)/jurisdiction(s) listed in the Project Agreement, who must pay the costs of advancing the Project and wait for reimbursement from the Program in the fiscal year the Project or Projects are scheduled in the ALCP to receive regional funds. To do so, it is required that:
 - 1. In advancing a Project, the Lead Agency and other agency(ies)/jurisdiction(s) listed in the Project Agreement must bear all costs and risks associated with advance design, right-of-way acquisition, construction and any related activities for ALCP Projects.

2. Financing costs and any other incremental costs associated with the advancement are not eligible for reimbursement.
 3. The reimbursement for the advanced Project must be in the currently approved programmed ALCP.
 - a. Reimbursement for a Project will be the amount listed, plus inflation to the year the Project is programmed for reimbursement in the ALCP.
 - i. MAG Staff will use inflation factors as noted in Section 240.
 4. ~~The Lead Agency and other agency(ies)/jurisdiction(s) listed in the Project Agreement may request to revert to the original Project schedule as long as all non-recoverable costs incurred or committed are paid for by the Lead Agency and/or other agency(ies)/jurisdiction(s) listed in the Project Agreement, and there are no other unacceptable adverse impacts associated with the reversion.~~
 5. ~~For Projects advanced as segments of a larger RTP Project, the amount of regional reimbursement will be determined following the completion of the process for segmenting Projects and must be specified in the Project Overview and Project Agreement.~~
 6. Upon completion of an advanced Project, all Project Reimbursement Requests must be submitted to MAG. Reimbursement payments will follow the schedule established in ~~the Project Agreement and Project Overview~~ the currently approved ALCP.
 - a. Reimbursement payments may be accelerated for projects approved for RARF Closeout Funds through the MAG Committee Process, per Section ~~260~~250.
- B. Lead Agencies may ~~An ALCP Project has the option of~~ segmenting an original RTP Project as long as the resulting Project segments would provide for the completion of the original Project as specified in the RTP.
1. A Design Concept Report or equivalent may be used to determine major Project elements within each jurisdiction and to develop recommendations for budget allocations.
- C. Projects may be deferred at the request of the Lead Agency and other agency(ies)/jurisdiction(s) listed in the Project Agreement and/or MAG.
1. If a Project is deferred, other Projects will be moved in priority order at that time, taking into account: Project readiness, local match available and funding source preferences.
- D. A Lead Agency may exchange two Projects in the ALCP if:
1. Project 1 is deferred from Phase I, II or III to Phase II, III, or IV, AND Project 2 is advanced from Phase II, III or IV to Phase I, II, or III.
 2. When Projects are exchanged, the advanced Project 2 may receive regional reimbursement up to the maximum of the budgeted reimbursement amount of Project 1 or the maximum budget of Project 2, whichever is less.
 3. Funding for all Projects involved in a Project exchange must be documented for the ALCP Program both before and after the proposed exchange in order to demonstrate that there will be no negative fiscal impact on the ALCP.

- E. If an original ALCP Project is deemed not feasible, a substitute Project may be proposed for substitution in the same jurisdiction as the original Project.
 - 1. The Lead Agency may propose a substitute Project that would use the regional funds allocated to the original Project. The substitute Project shall relieve congestion and improve mobility in the same general area addressed by the original Project, if possible.
 - 2. Substitute projects may not be completed prior to inclusion in the Arterial Life Cycle Program.
 - 3. The Lead Agency must submit a written request to MAG. The written request must include:
 - a. Justification, such as a feasibility study, level of service justification, or other documents explaining why the Project is deemed not feasible, and the description of steps to overcome any issues related to deleting the original Project from the ALCP and RTP.
 - b. How the proposed project would relieve congestion and improve mobility; and,
 - c. The proposed substitute project budget and schedule.
 - d. MAG Staff will work with jurisdictions on a case-by-case basis to ensure proper justification.

- F. An original ALCP Project can change its original Project scope due to environmental issues, public concerns, costs and other factors.
 - 1. The Lead Agency must submit a written request to MAG. The written request must include justification, such as a feasibility study, level of service justification, revised budget and/or other documents explaining why the change to the original Project is required, and the description of steps to overcome any issues related to changing the original scope of the ALCP Project.
 - a. MAG Staff will work with jurisdictions on a case-by-case basis to ensure proper justification.
 - 2. The scope change should relieve congestion and improvement mobility in the same area addressed by the original planned Project, if possible.
 - 3. Project scope changes may not include completed portions of a project or project segment, which are not included in an Arterial Life Cycle Program approved through the MAG Committee process.

- G. All Material Project Change requests ~~to change original ALCP project scope or a substitute a project in the ALCP~~ must meet all requirements established in Sections 200, Section 210, and Section 220.
 - 1. Before being approved through the ~~standard~~ MAG Committee Process, the requests:
 - a. Must be reviewed and approved by MAG for consistency with the ALCP Policies and Procedures and the Regional Transportation Plan goals and objectives
 - b. ~~Will~~ Will be presented by an employee of the Lead Agency to the MAG Street Committee for a technical review and recommendation. The presentation will address:
 - i. The reason(s) the original project was deemed not feasible;

- ii. Explain how the change the original ALCP project scope or substitute project would relieve congestion and improve mobility;
 - iii. The new/revised project cost estimate; and
 - iv. ~~And e~~Other information as requested by the MAG Street Committee.
1. After the Streets Committee technical review and recommendation on the proposed changes, the project(s) will ~~be approved presented brought forth~~ through the MAG Committee Process for approval.
 2. Requests to change original ALCP project scope or substitute a project must be made by the deadline established in the ALCP Schedule published annually in the MAG Transportation Programming Guidebook.
 3. Reimbursements for substitute projects will :
 - c. Be programmed in the same fiscal year(s) as the original project
 - d. Be programmed with the same funding amount and type as the original project
- H. To use Project Savings on another ALCP Project, a Project must follow the policies and procedures outlined in Section ~~350~~280. If those are followed, a Lead Agency is allowed to request that Project Savings be reallocated to another ALCP Project.
- a. The written request must include name of the Project with the Project Savings, the amount of Project Savings, the Project that will use the Project Savings and Project Budget showing that the Project Savings applied to the new Project will not exceed 70% of the total Project costs.

NOTE: Sections 230 (Program or Project Amendments) and 250 (ALCP Administrative Adjustments) have been consolidated into one section.

SECTION 230: PROGRAM OR PROJECT AMENDMENTS AND ADMINISTRATIVE ADJUSTMENTS

- A. If a necessary Program or Project update (Section 220) falls outside of the ALCP, TIP or RTP update schedule, then an amendment to the ALCP, RTP and the TIP, will be required, as appropriate.
 1. Proposed amendments that in whole or in part negatively impact Projects in the TIP, RTP and/or ALCP may not be approved.
 2. Amendments are subject to approval through the MAG Committee Process on a case-by-case basis.
 - ~~a. The TIP Amendment process is conducted on a quarterly basis.~~
 3. The Lead Agency and other agency(ies)/jurisdiction(s) listed in the Project Agreement must agree to the proposed changes.
- B. Amendments or administrative adjustments affecting the fiscal balance of the ALCP are prohibited outside the annual update process.
- C. The Lead Agency listed in the Project Agreement, typically initiates the amendment process by making a written request to MAG.
 1. If an amendment is approved by MAG, corresponding amendments are required for the appropriate programs.

2. The request must explain the need for the Program or Project change outside of the annual ALCP update schedule.
 - a. The request must specifically address and justify the proposed changes in scope, budget or schedule relating to:
 - i. Project length;
 - ii. Through lane capacity;
 - iii. Facility location or alignment;
 - iv. All other key Project features;
 - v. Potential negative impacts to other RTP Projects, including freeway/highway, arterial, public transportation or other mode Projects;
- D. An administrative adjustment will adjust the ALCP regional reimbursement Project budgets in the current and later fiscal years of the ALCP due to actual Project expenditures and regional reimbursements.
 1. Administrative adjustments do not require a Program or Project amendment because the adjustment does not qualify as a Project Update (Section 220) and does not cause a negative fiscal impact to the current fiscal year.
 2. Regional reimbursement budgets cannot be moved from a later fiscal year to an earlier fiscal year in an administrative adjustment. This would require an amendment.
- E. Amendments and administrative adjustments may occur each fiscal quarter. Changes will be reported in the approved ALCP, and the ALCP will be reprinted at least once per year or as needed.
- B. MAG Staff will review each request for:
 1. Funding changes identified from the original Project allocation, the contingency allowance, the overall revised budget and other key aspects of the funding, reimbursement or reallocation. Potential negative impacts to other RTP Projects, including freeway/highway, arterial, public transportation or other mode Projects;
 2. Potential negative impacts to meeting all applicable federal, state, regional and local requirements, including but not limited to, any applicable requirements for air quality conformity and any that may be imposed directly or indirectly following a performance audit.
 3. Consistency with the approved ALCP Policies and Procedures.

SECTION 240: INFLATION IN THE ALCP

- A. The original Project budgets listed in the 2003 approved RTP were expressed in 2002 dollars. The annual update of the ALCP requires that the remaining budget of ALCP Projects be carried forward to the next year and adjusted to account for the past year's inflation.
- B. Programmed reimbursements may not be inflated when there is a deficit of program funds. Any exception to this Section will be approved through the MAG Committee process.

- C. The regional funding specified in the original RTP for a Project will be adjusted annually for inflation based on the All Items United States Consumer Price Index (CPI), All Urban Consumers
 - 1. Information on the inflation factors is located on the US Department of Labor, Bureau of Labor Statistics website at <http://www.bls.gov/cpi>, under 'Get Detailed CPI Statistics.' The specific series used for calculating inflation is All Urban Consumers (Current Series), West Region All Items, 1982-84=100 - CUUR0400SA0_
 - a. The inflation rate is calculated using the month of March of the previous year and March of the current year.
- D. For prior work attributable to an ALCP Project that meets eligibility guidelines set in the ALCP Policies and Procedures, the jurisdiction is responsible for inflating the cost amounts to the current year when completing a Project Overview.
 - 1. Each year, MAG will update and release the inflation rate information to the jurisdictions.

NOTE: THE FOLLOWING HAS BEEN MOVED TO SECTION 230:

SECTION 250: ALCP ADMINISTRATIVE ADJUSTMENT

- ~~A. An administrative adjustment will adjust the ALCP regional reimbursement Project budgets in the current and later fiscal years of the ALCP due to actual Project expenditures and regional reimbursements.

 - 1. Administrative adjustments do not require a Program or Project amendment because the adjustment does not qualify as a Project Update (Section 220) and does not cause a negative fiscal impact to the current fiscal year.
 - 2. Regional reimbursement budgets cannot be moved from a later fiscal year to an earlier fiscal year in an administrative adjustment. This would require an amendment.~~
- ~~B. An administrative adjustment is needed when:

 - 1. Project expenditures for a Project work phase or a Project segment are lower than the estimate, causing the 70% regional reimbursement to be less than the amount programmed in the current ALCP.
 - 2. The remaining regional reimbursement funds may be moved within the original Project, to another work phase or a Project Segment that is programmed in that fiscal year or a later fiscal year.

At that time, the ALCP and Project budgets will be adjusted to reflect the remaining Project funds.~~
- ~~C. Administrative Adjustments may occur each fiscal quarter. Changes will be reported in the ALCP Status Report, and the ALCP will be reprinted.~~

SECTION 260250: ALCP RARF CLOSEOUT (PREVIOUSLY 260)

- A. Annually, MAG Staff will determine the availability of RARF funds to be used for the ALCP RARF Closeout.

1. MAG Staff will demonstrate the fiscal constraint of the ALCP with proposed ALCP RARF Closeout options.
 2. A Project or Project segment in the ALCP may not be adversely impacted, delayed, reduced or removed as a result of the reimbursement of RARF funds in the Closeout process to another Project, portion or segment.
 3. Lead Agencies and other agency(ies)/jurisdiction(s) listed in a Project Agreement that receive RARF Closeout funds will not be liable to reimburse the RARF funds to the Program if a Program deficit occurs in the future.
- B. Lead Agencies should submit a RARF Closeout Notification to MAG per eligible project.
- ~~1. MAG Staff will provide a RARF Closeout Notification Form on the MAG ALCP website.~~
- C. The ALCP RARF Closeout Process will begin at the April TRC and continue through the MAG Committee process in May, one month before the annual update of the ALCP.
1. The ALCP Schedule published annually in the MAG Transportation Programming Guidebook will specify all deadlines pertaining to the ALCP RARF Closeout Process, including relevant due dates ~~to submit RARF Closeout Notification forms and ALCP Project Requirements.~~
 2. MAG Staff will notify the ALCP Working Group, in advance, if a change in the ALCP Project Schedule is required.
- D. To be considered as an eligible project for reimbursement with RARF Closeout funds:
1. The Project or Project segment must be completed/closed out at the time the project is submitted for consideration.
 2. The Lead Agency must have completed and submitted final copies the following Project Requirements:
 - a. Project Overview;
 - b. Project Agreement, ~~;~~ and;
 - c. Project Reimbursement Request.
 3. All three requirements must be accepted by MAG Staff as complete.
- E. The determination and allocation of ALCP RARF Closeout funds for eligible completed projects will be made according to the following priorities (in sequential order):
1. Projects scheduled for reimbursement in the next fiscal year;
 2. All other Projects according to the chronological order of the programmed reimbursements.
- F. If two or more eligible projects are programmed for reimbursement in the same fiscal year, the reimbursement of the eligible projects will be made according to the following additional priorities (in sequential order):
1. The payment date by the Lead Agency of the ~~P~~project's final invoice.
 2. The date the Project Reimbursement Request was accepted by MAG Staff.

SECTION 260: ALCP FEDERAL FUNDS CLOSEOUT

- A. Annually, MAG staff will determine the availability of federal funds to use in the ALCP Federal Funds Closeout.
 1. MAG Staff will demonstrate the fiscal constraint of the ALCP with proposed ALCP federal fund Closeout options.
 2. A Project or Project segment in the ALCP may not be adversely impacted, delayed, reduced or removed as a result of the award of federal funds in the Closeout process to another Project, portion or segment.
 3. Lead Agencies and other agency(ies)/jurisdiction(s) listed in a Project Agreement that receive federal Closeout funds will not be liable to reimburse the federal funds to the Program if a Program deficit occurs in the future.

SECTION 270: ~~AVAILABILITY OF PROGRAM FUNDS~~ ~~USE OF SURPLUS OR DEFICIT PROGRAM FUNDS~~

- A. If there is a balance of program funds in a given year~~If a surplus of Program funds occurs,~~ existing Projects may be accelerated. Any acceleration will occur according to priority order of the ALCP.
 1. For Projects to be accelerated, matching local funds must be committed.
 - ~~2. If there are no current Projects ready for acceleration, the next Project scheduled for reimbursement may be accelerated.~~

~~If there are surplus funds available upon the full completion of the ALCP, the MAG Transportation Policy Committee will discuss options regarding additional Projects.~~
- ~~B. 2. If a surplus of program funds occurs within the first two-year programming window, and the Program cash flow does not support RARF closeout, reimbursements will be advanced in the following order:~~
 1. Completed Project
 2. Completed Phase
 3. Construction Underway
 4. Construction Ready/Bonded
 5. Construction Ready
 6. Right-of-Way Underway
 7. Right-of-Way Ready
 8. Design underway
 9. Design Ready
3. If there are surplus funds available upon the full completion of the ALCP, the MAG Transportation Policy Committee will discuss options regarding additional Projects.

~~B. ALCP Projects may be delayed if there is a deficit of Program funds. ALCP Projects will be delayed in priority order of the ALCP. If a deficit of program funds occurs, MAG Staff will request guidance from the Managers Working Group ALCP Working Group and the MAG Transportation Policy Committee on the appropriate methodology to restore the fiscal balance to the ALCP.~~

1. The methodology used to balance the program will be addressed in the Annual Report of the Implementation of Proposition 400 and the Regional Transportation Plan.

SECTION 280: REALLOCATION OF PROJECT SAVINGS

- A. Project Savings from the ALCP will not be determined by MAG to be eligible for reallocation, unless and until:
 1. Construction has been completed and the work satisfies the original intent and scope of the Project, as included in the Project Agreement and Project Overview, and there are remaining regional funds allocated to the Project; OR,
 - a. A high degree of certainty is obtained that construction for the original ALCP Project will be completed consistent with the Project Agreement and Project Overview specified scope and schedule.
 2. If applicable, right-of-way or other capital assets acquired with ALCP funds not used in the ALCP Project are disposed of at market rates and the funds returned to the ALCP.
 3. The project segment has been reimbursed or the Final PRR documenting all project costs has been accepted by MAG.
- B. ALCP regional funds found by MAG to be surplus to an ALCP Project, and for which certain criteria as established below are met, may be noted as Project Savings and reallocated to another ALCP Project depending on the availability of Program funds. Project savings may be applied:
 1. To another ALCP Project or Projects to address a budget shortfall, not to exceed 70% of the actual total Project costs.
 2. To advance a portion or entire existing ALCP Project or Projects up to the amount of available Project Savings.
- C. If there are ALCP Project Savings that are not reallocated to another project or project segment currently programmed in the ALCP and the ALCP is completed, then new Project(s) for that jurisdiction may be funded.
 1. Project savings may not be reallocated to a new Project when there is:
 - a. A deficit of program funds in the ALCP; or
 - b. Unfunded reimbursements in the program
- D. Project savings may be reallocated after the completion of an ALCP Project segment.
 1. For project savings from completed ALCP project segments contained and administered wholly within one jurisdiction:

- a. The Lead Agency responsible for the project segment may reallocate the project savings to another project currently programmed in the ALCP.
2. When project savings occurs on a completed ALCP project segment located in multiple jurisdictions:
 - a. The project savings must be reallocated to another project segment located on the same corridor unless:
 - i. All project segments located on the corridor are completed. If all project segments pertaining to a corridor currently programmed in the ALCP are complete, then the Lead Agency may reallocate the project savings to another project or project segment currently programmed in the ALCP under the Lead Agency's jurisdiction.
 - b. An exception to ~~270280(D)2.a-D-2.a~~ may be granted by MAG to a Lead Agency requesting the reallocation of project savings to another corridor prior to the completion of the original corridor where the funds were programmed for reimbursement if the Lead Agency obtains consensus from the partnering agencies from each project segment on the corridor.
 - i. The Lead Agency must submit a formal request in writing requesting the exception and documenting the requested reallocation of project savings. The written request must include the signed endorsement of a designated signer from each partnering agency before the reallocation will be programmed in the ALCP.

III. PROJECT DETAILS

SECTION 300: LEAD AGENCIES

- A. A Lead Agency must be identified for each ALCP Project in the RTP.
1. The Lead Agency is expected to be a MAG member agency.
 2. One Lead Agency per Project will be accepted. For segmented Projects, please refer to Section 300(D)(~~b~~).
 3. The designation of a Lead Agency for each Project will be accomplished through the signed Project Agreement with MAG.
- B. The Lead Agency is responsible for all aspects of Project implementation, including, but not limited to, Project management, financing, risk management, public involvement, design, right-of-way acquisition and construction.
1. The Lead Agency and MAG will be signatories to the Project Agreement.
 2. The Lead Agency and the agency(ies)/jurisdiction(s) listed in the Project Agreement are expected generally to use accepted financial and project management policies, practices and procedures in the use of funds received from the ALCP and in the implementation of the ALCP Project.
- C. Projects in One Jurisdiction
1. If a Project falls entirely within one jurisdiction, then that jurisdiction is expected to be the Lead Agency.
 - a. If there is change in jurisdictions due to annexation that affects a Project, the Lead Agency designated at the time of Project implementation will continue to serve as the Lead Agency.
 2. An alternative agency may be specified as the Lead Agency if the local jurisdiction in which the Project is located agrees.
 - a. An agreement between the local jurisdiction and the Lead Agency must be documented in writing between the respective Town/City Managers, County/Community Administrator or designees.
 - b. A copy of that written agreement must be provided to MAG.
- D. Projects in Multiple Jurisdictions
1. In cases where the RTP Project is located in more than one jurisdiction, the Project may be implemented as either:
 - a. One Project with a single Lead Agency as agreed to by the agency(ies)/jurisdiction(s) listed in the Project Agreement.
 - i. The agreement to this effect between the local jurisdictions and the Lead Agency must be documented in writing between the respective Town/City Managers, County/Community Administrator or designees in a Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) and/or an Intergovernmental Agreement (IGA).
 - A The agreement will be used to explain multi-jurisdictional roles, responsibilities, local and regional funding, the reimbursement process

between the project partners, and other terms of the Project, which will be referenced in the Project Agreement signed by the Lead Agency.

B A copy of this agreement must be provided to MAG, who must agree to the proposed Lead Agency designation.

b. The Project may be segmented and implemented as separate Projects by local jurisdictions, if agreed to by all agencies/jurisdictions listed in the Project Agreement, and following the Project Update process specified in Section 220.

E. Lead Agency responsibilities may be transferred from one agency to another MAG Member Agency.

1. The currently approved Lead Agency must submit a formal request to MAG.

a. The request must address the project segment name, location, and regional funding to be transferred.

b. The request must be signed by the Transportation/Public Works Director or City/Town Manager from each partnering agency on the segment.

2. Lead Agency change requests must be approved through the MAG Committee process before the change will be incorporated into an approved ALCP.

SECTION 310: ALCP PROJECT BUDGETS

A. The regional funding for each ALCP Project as specified in the RTP establishes the maximum amount payable from regional funds for that Project.

1. Every payment obligation of MAG under the RTP, ALCP and any Project Agreement or related legal agreement is conditional upon the availability of funds appropriated or allocated for the payment of such obligation.

2. The ALCP budget and timeline may change to account for surplus or deficit Program funds.

B. The budget for each ALCP Project:

1. Is limited to the regional contribution amount specified in the ALCP for the Project, or 70% of the total Project expenditures, whichever is less; ~~and,~~

2. ~~Will be established in the Project Agreement and Project Overview.~~

3. The Lead Agency is responsible for all of the Project costs over the regional contribution and, if applicable, will need to work with the other agency(ies)/jurisdiction(s) listed in the Project Agreement to cover those costs consistent with any Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) or Intergovernmental Agreement (IGA) that may be in place; and -

4. Will be published in the approved Arterial Life Cycle Program.

C. Credits for local match requirements are not transferable between Projects.

D. For federally funded projects, FHWA and/or ADOT will be responsible for determining credits for local match requirements except as provided in Section 340(H).-

E. If the total reimbursement for a project and/or project segment exceeds either 70% of eligible expenditures or the project budget as established in this Section, then:

1. MAG Staff will notify the Lead Agency that a fiscal adjustment is required to maintain the fiscal balance and integrity of the program, as originally established in the RTP; and,
2. The Lead Agency will be responsible for restoring the fiscal balance in the program by:
 - a. Reducing the Project Budget of another project programmed in the ALCP led by that agency;
 - b. Applying unused expenditures from a completed or closed out project; or.
 - c. Applying unused expenditures from a project or project programmed for reimbursement in the first two years of the currently approved or draft Arterial Life Cycle Program.
3. The fiscal adjustment will not exceed the amount of the excess reimbursement.
4. MAG Staff will coordinate with Lead Agency Staff to determine the appropriate method to restore the fiscal balance of the program.

E.F. _____ The ALCP Project Budget for a Project(s) or Project segment(s) in the ALCP that is approved as a High Priority Project (HPP) and receives an 'earmark' of federal funds in a federal authorization or federal appropriations bill will be reprogrammed, as needed.

SECTION 320: PROJECT ELIGIBILITY

A. To be funded or constructed under the ALCP Program, Projects must:

1. Have a scope, budget (including amounts of regional funding and local match contributions) and a schedule consistent with the Project as included in the RTP, ALCP, and as appropriate, the TIP. In addition, Projects must be consistent with federal requirements, where applicable.
2. Be considered new in keeping with voter expectations, and as such:
 - a. Cannot include costs for any pre-existing, programmed or planned element or improvement that is not part of the specific improvement Project described or included in the RTP as of November 25, 2003 or later.
 - b. Cannot have started design, acquired right-of-way or started construction before the date specified in Section ~~330340~~ or the date of the Project addition to the RTP.
 - c. Must address ~~congestion and mobility~~ congestion, mobility, and safety in the region.

B. Facilities eligible for improvements under the ALCP include:

1. Major arterials as defined in Appendix A. Major arterials include:
 - a. Roadway facilities on the regional arterial or mile arterial grid system;
 - b. Roadway facilities that connect freeways, highways or other controlled access facilities; and,
 - c. Other key arterial corridors.
2. Intersections of eligible major arterials.

- C. All Projects must be designed to the standards agreed to by the designated local jurisdictions and the Lead Agency established in the Project Agreement.
1. The agreed standards, which may be higher than the standards used in the local jurisdiction(s), must be specified or referenced in the Project Agreement.
 2. Standards for multi-jurisdictional Projects should be consistent to the extent feasible.

NOTE: THE FOLLOWING HAS BEEN MOVED TO SECTION 330:

~~D. Reimbursable items for regionally funded Projects are limited to:~~

- ~~1. Design, right-of-way and construction, as required in ARS: 28-6304(C)(5) and ARS: 28-6305(A). Design Concept Reports, planning studies and related studies, such as environmental and other studies, are also eligible.~~
- ~~2. Capacity Improvement Projects.~~
- ~~3. Safety Improvement Projects.~~
- ~~4. Projects or components directly related to capacity and safety improvements, including:
 - ~~a. Intelligent Transportation Systems (ITS);~~
 - ~~b. Signals;~~
 - ~~c. Lighting;~~
 - ~~d. Transit stops and pullouts, as well as queue jumper lanes, for example, for bus rapid transit;~~
 - ~~e. Bicycle/pedestrian facilities integral to the roadway, including wide sidewalks separated from curbs;~~
 - ~~f. Utility relocations, including under grounding of utility lines where required for safety or other reasons relating to function, and not purely for aesthetic reasons, and not otherwise considered an enhancement;~~
 - ~~g. Drainage improvements for the Project (with limitations), such as retention basins required for the Project that would not normally be handled through County or other drainage funds, within reasonable limits (and generally not exceeding typical practice for the local jurisdiction);~~
 - ~~h. Landscaped medians, shoulders, and other improvements within reasonable limits (and generally not exceeding typical practice for the local jurisdiction);~~
 - ~~i. Reconstruction Projects, as identified in or supported by the RTP and as specified in Project Agreements, for eligible Project elements;~~
 - ~~j. Access management;~~
 - ~~k. Rubberized asphalt and concrete paving;~~
 - ~~l. Staff time directly attributable to Project; and,~~
 - ~~m.a. Noise, privacy and screen wall, and other buffers, if found to be necessary to meet applicable local, state or federal standards.~~~~

NOTE: THE FOLLOWING HAS BEEN MOVED TO SECTION 340:

~~E. Notwithstanding findings or recommendations from the Design Concept Report or a similar study, Projects, Project components or other costs that are not reimbursable from the ALCP include:~~

- ~~1. Enhancement Projects or enhancement components of Projects.
 - ~~a. If a Lead Agency and other agency(ies)/jurisdiction(s) listed in the Project Agreement request an enhancement to a Project funded in the ALCP, the local jurisdiction and/or Lead Agency shall pay all costs associated with the enhancement.~~~~
- ~~2. Right-of-way not used by the ALCP Project, with potential exceptions on a case-by-case basis for land that is identified by the Lead Agency and/or the local jurisdiction or jurisdictions as not marketable for sale.~~
- ~~3. Any Project or Project element that exceeds the reasonable limits or typical practice for the local jurisdiction in which the Project or Projects are located.~~
- ~~4. Administrative overhead costs by the Lead Agency and other agency(ies)/jurisdiction(s) listed in the Project Agreement that are not attributed to the Project.~~
- ~~5. Other expenses, such as bad debts and lump-sum incentives, as determined by MAG.~~
- ~~6. Expenditures that occur after a project or project segment is completed. This includes salaries, applied overhead, record keeping and facility maintenance.~~
- ~~7. Salaries and other administrative expenditures pertaining to the completion of ALCP Project Requirements.~~

~~F.D. The use of federal funds or other funding sources may involve further restrictions on the use of funds or eligible matching contributions.~~

~~G. Since the primary sources of regional transportation funding have been included in the MAG RTP, funds that are the result of specific earmarks of either federal or state funds that have already been accounted for in the RTP (“below the line funding”) are not eligible for reimbursement or the local match under the Arterial Life Cycle Program. Any previous commitments to provide local funding for arterial projects included in the TIP, RTP, or ALCP should be maintained.~~

- ~~1. If a Project or Project segment in the ALCP is approved as a High Priority Project that receives an ‘earmark’ of federal funds in a federal authorization act, which reduces the distribution of federal funds to the region, the Project will be restricted as follows:
 - ~~a. The earmarked federal funds will be ineligible for reimbursement through the ALCP.~~
 - ~~b. The earmark federal funds will not be applicable towards the ALCP Project local match requirement.~~~~
- ~~2. If a Project or Project segment in the ALCP is approved as a High Priority Project that receives an ‘earmark’ of federal funds in a federal appropriations act, which does not reduce the distribution of federal funds to the region, the Project will be restricted as follows:~~

- a. ~~The earmarked federal funds will be ineligible for reimbursement through the ALCP.~~
- b. ~~The earmark federal funds may be applied to towards the ALCP local match requirement.~~

~~H. Eligible local match contributions include:~~

1. ~~Locally funded expenditures on eligible Projects or elements as listed above in this section; or~~
2. ~~Third party contributions, which must have supporting documentation. Third party contributions will be taken at market value at the time of the donation and mutually agreed upon between the Lead Agency and other agency(ies)/jurisdiction(s) listed in the Project Agreement and MAG.~~

~~I. Determining the value of third party contributions:~~

1. ~~The jurisdiction's real estate department will value and appraise any right-of-way given to a Project by a developer.~~
2. ~~Costs related to the construction of a road must be documented and certified for the value of the road by the authorized representative of the jurisdiction. To do so, a jurisdiction shall do the following in priority order:~~
 - a. ~~First, work with the developer(s) to turn in cost documentation related to the road improvement as soon as a jurisdiction is aware the improvement is being made to an ALCP Project, even if the ALCP Project is not scheduled for construction or reimbursement until a later date. If this cannot be done, then;~~
 - b. ~~Second, generate cost figures from known developer fees, final construction documents, as-built documents, et cetera. If this cannot be done, then;~~
 - c. ~~Third, use cost figures from the actual ALCP Project construction bid for a cost per unit figure, which then could be applied the developer contribution to generate a total cost. If this cannot be done, then;~~
 - d. ~~Fourth, use cost figures from a similar Project in location, size, and scope, which then could be applied to the developer contribution to generate a total cost.~~
3. ~~MAG Staff will review the valuation method and documentation for quality assurance purposes.~~
- 4.1. ~~_____ All documents used to determine the value of third party contributions shall be kept in accordance with Section 320H.~~

E. The Project Overview for each Project must identify all Project components for which reimbursement of the regional share is sought from the ALCP, including the components of the Project that will be funded locally or by third parties.

F. Each ALCP Project shall have a reimbursement timeline specified in the Project Agreement and Project Overview.

1. Reimbursement timelines may shift due to project schedule changes and/or the availability of program funds.

J.G. _____ The MAG Committee Process has the final determination on the eligibility of any Project or Project component for reimbursement from the ALCP Program.

SECTION 330: ~~ELIGIBLE COSTS FOR REIMBURSEMENT~~ REIMBURSABLE EXPENDITURES

~~Reimbursable expenditures are limited to ALCP Projects meeting the requirements set forth in Section 320 (Project Eligibility).~~

- A. Reimbursable items for regionally funded Projects are limited to:
1. Design, right-of-way and construction, as required in ARS: 28-6304(C)(5) and ARS: 28-6305(A). Design Concept Reports, planning studies and related studies, such as environmental and other studies, are also eligible.
 2. Capacity Improvement Projects.
 3. Safety Improvement Projects.
 4. Projects or components directly related to capacity and safety improvements, including:
 5. Intelligent Transportation Systems (ITS);
 6. Signals;
 7. Lighting;
 8. Transit stops and pullouts, as well as queue jumper lanes, for example, for bus rapid transit;
 9. Bicycle/pedestrian facilities integral to the roadway, including wide sidewalks separated from curbs;
 10. Utility relocations, including under grounding of utility lines where required for safety or other reasons relating to function, and not purely for aesthetic reasons, and not otherwise considered an enhancement;
 11. Drainage improvements for the Project (with limitations), such as retention basins required for the Project that would not normally be handled through County or other drainage funds, within reasonable limits (and generally not exceeding typical practice for the local jurisdiction);
 12. Landscaped medians, shoulders, and other improvements within reasonable limits (and generally not exceeding typical practice for the local jurisdiction);
 13. Reconstruction Projects, as identified in or supported by the RTP and as specified in Project Agreements, for eligible Project elements;
 14. Access management;
 15. Rubberized asphalt and concrete paving;
 16. Staff time directly attributable to Project;
 17. Noise, privacy and screen wall, and other buffers, if found to be necessary to meet applicable local, state or federal standards; and,
 18. Public involvement and outreach activities.
- B. Prior right-of-way acquisitions and/or work that is part of a designated ALCP Project are eligible for reimbursement if:
1. Specified in a Project Agreement and/or Project Overview.

2. Purchased/completed after November 1, 2002, for design, environmental and related planning studies and right-of-way acquisition.
 3. Completed construction and related activities after November 25, 2003.
- C. Eligible prior right-of-way acquisition and/or work is limited to ALCP Projects scheduled or programmed for completion in Phase I of the RTP (which ends June 30, 2010), including ALCP Projects accelerated or advanced from later phases.
- D. Reimbursements for prior right-of-way acquisition and/or work will be payable only to the agency that paid for the right-of-way acquired and/or work, unless that agency assigns the payment to another party or other terms are developed in the Project Agreement for the ALCP Project.
- E. The use of federal funds or other funding sources may involve further restrictions on the use of funds or eligible matching contributions.
- F. No reimbursements will be made:
1. Prior to the execution of a Project Agreement.
 2. Prior to the approval of a Project Reimbursement Request endorsed by MAG and the ADOT Finance Division.
 3. For projects or project work phases not listed in an approved Transportation Improvement Program.
 4. Prior to the year in which the funds for that ALCP Project are programmed or would normally be received following the schedule in the TIP and RTP, unless it is part of the annual closeout of RARF funds per Section 260, or there are surplus program funds, Section 270.
 1. ~~Each ALCP Project shall have a reimbursement timeline specified in the Project Agreement and Project Overview.~~
- G. The Lead Agency shall send the Project Reimbursement Requests to MAG for payment from the Arizona Department of Transportation (ADOT). The Lead Agency is responsible for:
1. All Project expenditures.
 2. Providing all Project Reimbursement Requests to MAG for reimbursement.
 3. Distributing ALCP reimbursements to project partners per the signed and effective Project Agreement.
- H. Reimbursements will be made for expenditures paid with tax or public revenue only, including development and impact fees collected by a jurisdiction.
1. Reimbursements will not be made for Project elements donated or funded via cash or cash equivalent donations, right-of-way donations, exactions and/or other third party or non-tax funding sources.
 2. Reimbursements from the ALCP will not be made for expenditures that have already been reimbursed from other sources, either in cash or cash equivalents or through third party contributions including, but not limited to, the provision of a transportation improvement Project such as a design or related study, right-of-way acquisition or donation or construction.

- I. ~~Project elements not eligible for reimbursement under subsection 330 (A) and (B) may be eligible as credit toward matching costs if the requirements specified in Section 340 (Eligible Prior Right-of-Way Acquisition and/or Work for Reimbursement) and Section 320 (Project Eligibility) are satisfied.~~
- J. Reimbursements, including local match contributions, will generally be commensurate with progress unless otherwise agreed to in the Project Agreement, such as for specific lump sum for right-of-way acquisitions and/or work.
- K. Right-of-way or other capital assets acquired included as an eligible Project cost, but not used in the ALCP Project, must be disposed of at market rates and the funds returned to the ALCP for reallocation following the requirements contained in Section 350.

NOTE: THE FOLLOWING HAS BEEN MOVED TO SECTION 330:

SECTION 340: ELIGIBLE PRIOR ROW ACQUISITION AND/OR WORK FOR REIMBURSEMENT

- A. ~~Prior right-of-way acquisitions and/or work that is part of a designated ALCP Project are eligible for reimbursement if:~~
 - 1. ~~Specified in a Project Agreement and/or Project Overview.~~
 - 2. ~~Purchased/completed after November 1, 2002, for design, environmental and related planning studies and right-of-way acquisition.~~
 - 3. ~~Completed construction and related activities after November 25, 2003.~~
- B. ~~Eligible prior right-of-way acquisition and/or work is limited to ALCP Projects scheduled or programmed for completion in Phase I of the RTP (which ends June 30, 2010), including ALCP Projects accelerated or advanced from later phases.~~
- C. ~~Reimbursements for prior right-of-way acquisition and/or work will be payable only to the agency that paid for the right-of-way acquired and/or work, unless that agency assigns the payment to another party or other terms are developed in the Project Agreement for the ALCP Project.~~
- D. ~~The Project Overview will identify, as appropriate, the priorities for reimbursement for prior right-of-way acquisition and/or work if more than one agency is requesting such reimbursement for that Project.~~

NOTE: THE FOLLOWING HAS BEEN MOVED TO SECTION 340:

- E. ~~If prior right-of-way acquisition and/or work is not eligible for reimbursement, it may be credited toward the local match requirement if:~~
 - 1. ~~The Project or work was included in the local jurisdiction or Lead Agency CIP or in the MAG TIP approved after the start of MAG Fiscal Year 2001 (July 1, 2000).~~
 - 2. ~~The Project or work is not otherwise excluded in whole or in part elsewhere in these requirements.~~

NOTE: THE FOLLOWING HAS BEEN MOVED TO SECTION 240:

- F. ~~For prior work attributable to an ALCP Project that meets eligibility guidelines set in the ALCP Policies and Procedures, the jurisdiction is responsible for inflating the cost amounts to the current year when completing a Project Overview.~~

1. ~~Each year, MAG will update and release the inflation rate information to the jurisdictions.~~
2. ~~The inflation rate and method will be the same as mentioned in Section 240.~~

SECTION 340: LOCAL MATCH AND INELIGIBLE EXPENDITURES

- A. Notwithstanding findings or recommendations from the Design Concept Report or a similar study, Projects, Project components or other costs that are not reimbursable from the ALCP include:
1. Enhancement Projects or enhancement components of Projects.
 - a. If a Lead Agency and other agency(ies)/jurisdiction(s) listed in the Project Agreement request an enhancement to a Project funded in the ALCP, the local jurisdiction and/or Lead Agency shall pay all costs associated with the enhancement (costs in excess of reasonable limits/the local jurisdiction's typical practice).
 2. Right-of-way not used by the ALCP Project, with potential exceptions on a case-by-case basis for land that is identified by the Lead Agency and/or the local jurisdiction or jurisdictions as not marketable for sale.
 3. Any Project or Project element that exceeds the reasonable limits or typical practice for the local jurisdiction in which the Project or Projects are located.
 4. Administrative overhead costs by the Lead Agency and other agency(ies)/jurisdiction(s) listed in the Project Agreement that are not attributed to the Project.
 5. Other expenses, such as bad debts and lump-sum incentives, as determined by MAG.
 6. Expenditures that occur after a project or project segment is completed. This includes salaries, applied overhead, record keeping and facility maintenance.
 7. Salaries and other administrative expenditures pertaining to the completion of ALCP Project Requirements.
 8. Expenditures related to special events and related materials, such as t-shirt, hats, pens, food/beverages, etc.
 9. Non-project specific expenditures, such as computers, data storage devices, etc.
- B. Project elements not eligible for reimbursement under subsection ~~330-320 and 330 (F) (A) and (B)~~ may be eligible as credit toward matching costs if the requirements specified in Section ~~330(B)40~~ (Eligible Prior Right-of-Way Acquisition and/or Work for Reimbursement) and Section 320 (Project Eligibility) are satisfied.
- C. Prior right-of-way acquisition and/or work is not eligible for reimbursement, it may be credited toward the local match requirement if:
1. The Project or work was included in the local jurisdiction or Lead Agency CIP or in the MAG TIP approved after the start of MAG Fiscal Year 2001 (July 1, 2000).
 2. The Project or work is not otherwise excluded in whole or in part elsewhere in these requirements.
- D. Since the primary sources of regional transportation funding have been included in the MAG RTP, funds that are the result of specific earmarks of either federal or state funds

that have already been accounted for in the RTP (“below the line funding”) are not eligible for reimbursement or the local match under the Arterial Life Cycle Program. Any previous commitments to provide local funding for arterial projects included in the TIP, RTP, or ALCP should be maintained.

1. If a Project or Project segment in the ALCP is approved as a High Priority Project that receives an ‘earmark’ of federal funds in a federal authorization act, which reduces the distribution of federal funds to the region, the Project will be restricted as follows:
 - a. The earmarked federal funds will be ineligible for reimbursement through the ALCP.
 - b. The earmark federal funds will not be applicable towards the ALCP Project local match requirement.
2. If a Project or Project segment in the ALCP is approved as a High Priority Project that receives an ‘earmark’ of federal funds in a federal appropriations act, which does not reduce the distribution of federal funds to the region, the Project will be restricted as follows:
 - a. The earmarked federal funds will be ineligible for reimbursement through the ALCP.
 - b. The earmark federal funds may be applied to towards the ALCP local match requirement.

3. Funds awards to a member agency by the Arizona Department of Transportation will be considered “above the line” earmark unless deemed otherwise by the MAG Transportation Improvement Program Manager or the MAG Transportation Director. “Above the line” funding awards include:

- a. State Highway Safety Improvement Program (HSIP) funds
- b. State Transportation Alternatives (TA) funds
- c. Stimulus funding approved by the US Congress

E. Eligible local match contributions include:

1. Locally funded expenditures on eligible Projects or elements as listed ~~above~~ in ~~this~~ section 300; or
2. Third party contributions with supporting documentation that have been donated, which must have supporting documentation. ~~Third party contributions will be taken at market value at the time of the donation and mutually agreed upon between the Lead Agency and other agency(ies)/jurisdiction(s) listed in the Project Agreement and MAG.~~
3. “Above the line” funding awards from ADOT

F. Determining the value of third party contributions:

1. The jurisdiction’s real estate department will value and appraise any right-of-way given to a Project by a developer.
2. Costs related to the construction of a road must be documented and certified for the value of the road by the authorized representative of the jurisdiction. To do so, a jurisdiction shall do the following in priority order:

- a. First, work with the developer(s) to turn in cost documentation related to the road improvement as soon as a jurisdiction is aware the improvement is being made to an ALCP Project, even if the ALCP Project is not scheduled for construction or reimbursement until a later date. If this cannot be done, then;
 - b. Second, generate cost figures from known developer fees, final construction documents, as-built documents, et cetera. If this cannot be done, then;
 - c. Third, use cost figures from the actual ALCP Project construction bid for a cost per unit figure, which then could be applied the developer contribution to generate a total cost. If this cannot be done, then;
 - d. Fourth, use cost figures from a similar Project in location, size, and scope, which then could be applied to the developer contribution to generate a total cost.
3. MAG Staff will review the valuation method and documentation for quality assurance purposes.
 4. All documents used to determine the value of third party contributions shall be kept in accordance with Section 340(G)320H.

G. Federally funded projects

1. Projects programmed to receive federal funds must satisfy all federal requirements for the portion of expenses for which they wish to seek reimbursement
2. Projects programmed to receive federal funds must meet the minimum federal match share
3. Project costs that are not eligible for federal reimbursement, but are otherwise eligible per Sections 330, 340 (B), 340 (C), 340 (D), and 340 (E), may count toward the regional local match requirement
 - a. The project must have enough federally eligible costs to meet the minimum federal match share
 - b. Any project costs that are not eligible for federal reimbursement in excess of the regional local match requirement will not be reimbursed
 - a. Project costs that are federally eligible and federally ineligible must be clearly documented
4. Project costs that are federally eligible and federally ineligible must be clearly documented See Appendix C for a project-based example.

SECTION 350: PUBLIC INVOLVEMENT AND INPUT

- A. The Lead Agency is responsible for conducting public and stakeholder involvement as part of the development and implementation process for each Project or Project Segment
 1. For multi-jurisdictional projects, public involvement activities may be conducted by one or more of the jurisdictions or by a qualified neutral third-party, such as a consultant or other government agency.

B. The Lead Agency is responsible for public consultation and involvement on proposed material project changes.

C. MAG will provide members of the public, elected officials, stakeholders, participating agencies and others with ready access to information on the Program and on each Project or Project Segment upon request.

D. Public involvement activities conducted for a Project or Project Segment must be documented in the ALCP Project Overview. The Project Overview should address activities that have occurred and that are expected to occur during the life of the project.

E. Material Project Change Request forms developed and published by MAG will include a component regarding the public consultation and involvement conducted by the Lead Agency.

F. Proposed project change requests must be presented through the MAG Committee process.

1. Public and stakeholder input received by MAG regarding a proposed project change will be noted as the change progresses through the MAG Committee Process.

Public and stakeholder input may be submitted to MAG through the public comment period at Committee meetings or electronic and/or written communications.

IV. ALCP PROJECT REQUIREMENTS

SECTION 400: PROJECT OVERVIEW

- A. For each ALCP Project, the Lead Agency must submit a complete Project Overview to MAG before a Project Agreement will be initiated or signed.
- B. The Lead Agency must use the latest Project Overview form.
 - 1. The form will be posted on the MAG website.
 - 2. All fields must be completed and any necessary paperwork must be included at the time of submission.

~~For advanced Projects, a Project Overview must be submitted prior to the purchase of right-of-way.~~

- C. The Project Overview may be updated throughout the Project as long as it is not a material or material project change.
 - 1. MAG Staff may require a new or revised Project Overview in the event of a substantial-material project change or the termination of a project agreement per Section 410~~(-D)~~.
- D. ~~Adequate and secure funding from the local, regional, and if applicable, the federal level, must be identified in the Project Overview.~~

~~E. The Project Overview will provide at a minimum:~~

- ~~1. Lead Agency contacts and oOther agency(ies)/jurisdiction(s) involved in the Project;~~
- ~~2. Project scope, Project alignment, Project history, Project considerations, ITS components, multi-modal issues, public involvement and outreach activities, Project development process including any environmental, utility and right-of-way clearances, as needed;~~
- ~~3. A copy of the Lead Agency's current Capital Improvement Program demonstrating funding has been allocated to the project;~~
- ~~4. Funding sources;~~
- ~~5. Map/photographs;~~
- ~~6. Timeline;~~
- ~~7. Management plan;~~
- ~~8. Project data;~~
- ~~9. Cost estimates;~~
- ~~10. Contingencies;~~
- ~~11. Cost savings;~~
- ~~12. Summary of work, including: year of work, total cost, local share, federal share, regional share, year for reimbursement; and,~~

~~13. Project documents, if needed: IGA, MOU, DCR, Corridor Study, Project Assessment, supporting document for developer contributions, Project amendments, environmental overview.~~

~~F.—A Project Overview template will be provided by MAG.~~

SECTION 410: PROJECT AGREEMENT

- A. A Project Agreement between MAG and the designated Lead Agency is required for each Project before the reimbursement of expenditures will be initiated.
1. If a Project is completed and eligible for reimbursement following the stipulations in Section 330 ~~and 340~~, a Project Agreement must be in place before Project Reimbursement Requests are submitted for reimbursement.
 - a. If a Project is advanced, a Project Agreement must be in place before the completion of the Project.
 2. The scope, regional funding and schedule specified in the Project Agreement must correspond with the schedule specified in the RTP for the Project.
 - a. Project segmentation must be approved through the MAG Committee Process as described in Section 130 and the RTP and, as appropriate, the TIP amended showing those segmented Projects before Project Agreements can be executed for any of the segmented Projects.
 - i. The Project Agreement may be in a developmental stage while the amendment is being approved through the MAG Committee Process.
 - b. A Project Agreement will not be executed for segmented Projects or Projects with scopes less than that specified in the RTP, even if proposed subdivisions are already listed for preliminary programming and financial planning purposes in the TIP, unless the RTP and ALCP is amended.
 3. A Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) may be used as a bridge to a full Project Agreement.
 - a. Design studies may be initiated under a MOU to determine Project scope, costs and schedule by a jurisdiction, as needed, for multi-jurisdiction Projects.
 - b. The MOU may address other considerations, such as the roles and responsibilities for local jurisdictions in a multi-jurisdiction Project, or early right-of-way acquisition, as needed, in a preliminary manner prior to a full Project Agreement.
- B. Signed and effective Project Agreements may need to be amended or terminated due to substantial-material project changes or failing to submit a Material or Substantial Project Reimbursement Request, as outlined below.
1. Changes to project expenditures and regional reimbursements that do not require the amendment or termination of a project agreement include:
 - a. The advancement or deferral of project, project segment or work phase within the 5-year period of the TIP listed in the effective project agreement.
 - b. The reallocation of programmed funds between work phases for that project or project segment.
 - c. Changes to project work phases, such as the addition or deletion of a work phase.

- d. The annual inflation of programmed reimbursements per Section 240.
2. A signed and effective Project Agreement may require an amendment due to project amendments or administrative modifications in the TIP or ALCP, which.
 - a. Change the project limits.
 - b. Require a revised Project Overview due to a material or significant change in the project scope.
 - c. Defer the Project schedule outside the years of the approved TIP listed in the effective Project Agreement
3. An effective Project Agreement may be terminated if:
 - a. The Project undergoes a ~~substantial~~material project change. Examples of ~~substantial~~material project changes include:
 - i. The Project improvement type (arterial or intersection) listed in the agreement changes;
 - ii. The Project change affects more than one project or project segment in the ALCP
 - iii. The Project change affects more than one effective Project Agreement; or
 - iv. The Lead Agency of a Project changes.
 - b. A Material Project Reimbursement Request has not been accepted by MAG within 18 months.
 - c. A Substantial Project Reimbursement Request has not been accepted by MAG within 30 months.
- C. Each Project Agreement will be based on a standard agreement provided by MAG and customized for each Project.
 1. ~~Any material changes to the standard Project Agreement or template for a specific Project must be identified in a clear and concise manner in the summary section of the Project Overview for that Project.~~
- D. The Project Agreement will address at a minimum:
 1. Project scope, type of work, schedule of work and reimbursement, the regional share and federal funding if applicable;
 2. Lead Agency and other agency(ies)/jurisdiction(s) involved in the Project;
 3. Applicable Design Standards;
 4. Responsibilities of the Parties;
 5. Risk and indemnification;
 6. Records and audit rights;
 7. Term and termination;
 8. Availability of Funds; and,
 9. Conflicts of Interest.

- E. Upon approval of the Arterial Life Cycle Program, an update will be provided to the MAG Committees regarding the status of Projects, including active Project Agreements and new Project Agreements that will be executed during that fiscal year.
- F. RTP and/or TIP amendments will still be required to go through the MAG Committee Process for any changes involving material cost, scope or schedule changes to the Project.
- G. The Lead Agency and MAG must be signatories to the Project Agreement:
 1. To indicate their agreement to the Lead Agency designation and the terms of the agreement, the authorized representative must be the signing authority for that jurisdiction.
 2. To indicate roles and responsibilities in Project implementation.

SECTION 420: PROJECT REIMBURSEMENT REQUESTS

A. Any request for payment must use the latest MAG Project Reimbursement Request form.

1. The form will be posted on the MAG website.
2. All fields must be completed and any necessary paperwork must be included at the time of submission.

~~A. A Project Reimbursement Request must contain a request for payment and, an invoice, and a progress report.~~

- ~~1. The request for payment, invoice, and progress report forms will be provided by MAG.~~

~~B. For a current ALCP Project, the Project Reimbursement Request:~~

~~C. May be submitted by the Lead Agency to MAG as needed~~

- ~~1. must be submitted by milestone completion (Section 420(D)(4)a-k) unless otherwise agreed to in the Project Overview upon completion of the project.~~

~~D. C. If an ALCP Project is advanced, progress reports must be submitted and based on the milestones of the Project even though a full Project Reimbursement Request is not required at that time.~~

~~E.B. _____ A full Project Reimbursement Request, including request for reimbursement and invoice is due at the time of Project completion.~~

~~F.C. _____ Project Reimbursement Requests may not be submitted more than once per month.~~

~~G.D. _____ All Project Reimbursement Requests shall be submitted to MAG for authorization for payment.~~

~~H.E. _____ Participating agencies/jurisdictions may invoice the Lead Agency for any item including, but not limited to, work conducted or capital assets acquired for the Project or as part of the Project, subject to other terms in this agreement.~~

~~I.F. The work conducted and/or received must meet all the requirements of the MAG ALCP Policies and Procedures as well as any and all other applicable federal, state, regional and local requirements.~~

~~J.G.~~ The Lead Agency may inflate project expenditures to current year dollars, per Section 240. It is the responsibility of the Lead Agency to calculate the inflation for project expenditures in the ALCP project requirements submitted to MAG, including Project Reimbursement Requests.

~~K.H.~~ The Lead Agency must retain, certify, and make available all vendor receipts, invoices and as needed, any related Project records.

1. Vendor receipts or invoices must be available for five (5) years after final payment is made; auditors, MAG or its designees may make possible requests.
2. Receipts and invoices for Projects advanced by a jurisdiction may have a longer retention period.

~~L.I.~~ Project Reimbursement Requests must be signed by the Lead Agency's Transportation/Engineering Director or designee. An authorized representative of the Lead Agency must sign all Project Reimbursement Request forms: the request for payment, invoice and a progress report, certifying that the request is true and correct per the terms of the Project Agreement and Project Overview.

1. The duly authorized representative for the Lead Agency may be the respective Town/City Managers, County/Community Administrator, designee or a higher level representative of the organization that is designated to sign MAG funding request documents on behalf of that jurisdiction has signing authority. In addition, the authorized representative must be listed as a designated signatory on the Lead Agency's signature card for that fiscal year.
2. Each Lead Agency must have a signature card on file with MAG.
3. Annually, MAG will verify the validity of the signature card.
4. Lead Agencies may change the designated signatories at any time.
5. Electronic or scanned signatures on the signature card will not be accepted.

~~M.J.~~ Matching contributions, as required in the ALCP Policies and Procedures must be fully documented, invoiced and/or received, and cannot be in arrears.

~~N.~~ The request for payment shall be approved and signed by the duly authorized representative from the Lead Agency. Then, the request will be processed and approved at MAG and forwarded to ADOT for payment to the Lead Agency. The request for payment form must include the:

~~O.~~ Project name, description and RTP ID;

~~P.~~ Estimated total Project costs;

~~Q.~~ Expenditures to date;

~~R.~~ Regional fund budget;

~~S.~~ Previous Regional fund payments;

~~T.~~ Amount of Regional fund requests;

~~U.~~ Remaining Regional funds;

~~V.~~ Status of Project development/completion;

- ~~W. Type of work being requested for reimbursement;~~
- ~~X. Mailing address for payment; and,~~
- ~~Y. Signatures of authorized representatives from Lead Agency, MAG and ADOT.~~
- ~~Z. The invoice form must include:~~
- ~~AA. Invoice number;~~
- ~~BB. Project name, description and RTP ID;~~
- ~~CC. Amount of Regional fund requests;~~
- ~~DD. Remaining Regional funds;~~
- ~~EE. Type of work being requested for reimbursement;~~
- ~~FF. Signatures of authorized representatives from the Lead Agency.~~
- ~~GG. Proper documentation/description of the reimbursable items and/or work performed. Proper documentation may include:~~
- ~~HH. A copy of the invoice from the contractor is sufficient documentation for contracted work;~~
- ~~II. An administrative breakdown chart including staff name, hours on Project, hourly rate, and total costs is sufficient documentation for administrative work;~~
- ~~JJ. A copy of the Court Order;~~
- ~~KK. A copy of the Settlement Statement;~~
- ~~LL. A copy of the City's payment documentation; or,~~
- ~~MM-K. A completed Cost Attachment Form. If the Cost Attachment form is explaining dedicated right-of-way, easements, or Public Utility and Facilities Easements (PUFE), a signed letter from the appropriate department (Real Estate, Transportation, etc) must be included verifying the items in the cost attachment form. Please use costs that are relevant to the time of dedication and if necessary, use the inflation chart to inflate the costs to the current value.~~
- ~~NN.L. If an item for reimbursement (design, ROW, construction, etc.) has more than one backup invoice, a chart summary table must be provided with each reimbursement request that:~~
- ~~1. Lists each invoice/backup documentation number and/or a describes the item(s) being considered for reimbursement;~~
 - ~~2. Documents the dollar amount of item; and~~
 - ~~3. Includes the total dollar amount of all invoices, per each item for reimbursement. This total dollar amount should match the invoice;~~
 - ~~4. Includes the inflation rate and inflated amount, where applicable;~~
 - ~~5. Lists the associated work phase; and,~~
 - ~~3-6. Includes a subtotal of costs by work phase.~~

4.7. _____ MAG will provide an summary table examples and templates chart/form.

NOTE: THE FOLLOWING HAS BEEN MOVED TO SECTION 430:

~~00. _____ The progress report of the Project Reimbursement Request shall explain the status of the Project, milestones and other necessary information.~~

~~1. It is the responsibility of the jurisdiction to document the work accomplished for each invoice and/or milestone during the reporting period.~~

~~2. Advanced Projects prior to the approved ALCP Policies and Procedures, will have special progress report requirements.~~

~~3. For each progress report, the Lead Agency must provide the:~~

~~a. Percent of work complete;~~

~~b. Work accomplished;~~

~~c. Estimate v. real cost analysis;~~

~~d. Work schedule analysis;~~

~~e. Grievance/complaints reports;~~

~~f. Procurement process update (when necessary); and,~~

~~g. Documents produced.~~

~~4. Milestones may be used to trigger a Project Reimbursement Request for a current Project. Milestones must be used to trigger a progress report for an advanced Project. The milestones are:~~

~~a. Studies;~~

~~b. Preliminary Design - 60%;~~

~~c. Final Design - 100%;~~

~~d. Construction - 25%;~~

~~e. Construction - 60%;~~

~~f. Final Acceptance; and,~~

~~g. Project Closeout.~~

~~PP.M. _____ Upon MAG approval, the Project Reimbursement Request will be forwarded to ADOT for payment.~~

~~1. ADOT maintains the arterial street fund and will be responsible for issuing bonds, through the State Transportation Board, on behalf of the street program, as designated in ARS: 28-6303.D.2.~~

~~a. MAG will work with ADOT regarding budget, invoicing process and other fiscal matters.~~

~~2. MAG will work with ADOT to expedite payment dependent on availability of funds.~~

~~3. Checks will be distributed from ADOT and sent to Lead Agency.~~

~~QQ-N.~~ Lead Agencies shall not submit reimbursement requests directly to the Arizona Department of Transportation. Submitting requests directly to ADOT may result in the termination of an executed Project Agreement.

SECTION 430: PROGRESS REPORTS

~~A.~~ Lead Agencies with Projects programmed for work and/or reimbursement in the first two years of the current ALCP must submit an ALCP Progress Report to MAG ~~semi-annually.~~

~~B.~~ Lead Agencies must use the latest Progress Report form.

~~1.~~ The form will be posted on the MAG website.

~~2.~~ All fields must be completed and any necessary paperwork must be included at the time of submission.

~~B.~~ The Progress Report will address at a minimum:

- ~~1.~~ Percent of work complete;
- ~~2.~~ Work accomplished;
- ~~3.~~ Change in project scope
- ~~4.~~ Estimate v. real cost analysis;
- ~~5.~~ Work schedule analysis;
- ~~6.~~ Project Change History
- ~~7.~~ Grievance/complaints reports;
- ~~8.~~ Procurement process update (when necessary);
- ~~9.~~ Documents produced; and,
- ~~10.~~ Public involvement and outreach activities.

~~C.~~

~~C.~~ At minimum, Lead Agencies must submit a progress report annually. The annual progress report shall have the same due date as the commitment letter (section 200).

~~D.~~ The annual progress report must be turned in before the commitment letter if:

- ~~1.~~ Design has been completed.
- ~~2.~~ Right-of-Way acquisition has been completed.
- ~~3.~~ Construction has been completed.

APPENDIX A. GLOSSARY AND ACRONYMS

Acceleration	Acceleration means that all of the remaining Projects, including the reimbursements for advanced Projects, in the Arterial Life Cycle Program are moved forward in priority order.
ADOT	Arizona Department of Transportation
Administrative Adjustment	The ALCP and Project budgets will be adjusted annually to reflect the final Project reimbursement in the fiscal year. This falls after the adoption of the ALCP and will not require a program amendment.
Advancement	Advancement of a Project means that its implementation is moved earlier in time than previously scheduled in the MAG RTP and/or TIP, with the interest and any other incremental costs associated with the earlier implementation borne by the Lead and/or local agencies requesting the advancement. Reimbursement for the Project will remain in the year(s) in which the Project was scheduled before the proposed advancement.
ALCP	Arterial Life Cycle Program, or the “Program”
ALCP Regional Funds	ALCP Regional Funds are generated from the Maricopa County one-half cent sales tax extension and Federal Transportation Funds, including STP and CMAQ funds.
ARS	Arizona Revised Statutes
Certification Report	Periodic report produced, at least annually, for the ALCP to provide an update on the status of the Program, current revenue and cost projections. The report will provide supporting information for the RTP Annual Report
CIP	Capital Improvement Program
CMAQ	Congestion Mitigation and Air Quality. A categorical Federal-aid funding program that directs funding to projects that contribute to meeting National air quality standards. CMAQ funds generally may not be used for projects that result in the construction of new capacity available to SOVs (single-occupant vehicles).
CTOC	Citizens Transportation Oversight Committee as referenced in ARS 28-6356
DCR	Design Concept Report, meeting the standards established for federal aid arterial projects. Key elements of the DCR for the ALCP include,

but are not limited to:

- the development and provision of labor and material quantity based cost estimates for the entire ALCP Project, as specified in the RTP; categorized by Project phase, segment and jurisdiction, as appropriate;
- projected monthly cash flow requirements for financial planning purposes; and,
- appropriate contingency amounts for the completion of the Project.

Deficit of Program Funds

When programmed reimbursements, plus inflation if applicable) exceeds the actual and forecasted revenues for the remaining life of the program

Enhancement

“an addition that exceeds generally accepted engineering or design standards for the specific type of facility.” (HB 2456, 28-6351(2)) For the purposes of the ALCP, the term “enhancement” is defined more specifically as:

1. Projects, Project elements or Project additions that are not design, right-of-way or construction related, including any Project, Project element or addition that is not a needed study, right-of-way acquisition or capacity or safety-related infrastructure improvement. Examples include drainage in excess of typical needs for the roadway or intersection, “improvements” that tend to reduce through capacity, such as deletion of lanes and other traffic calming measures.
2. Project additions after the completion of a Design Concept Report, unless otherwise agreed to in the approved Project Agreement.
3. Additional limitations or requirements may apply, depending on the funding source.

EA Environmental Assessment

EIS Environmental Impact Statement

Federal Aid Project Any Project in which any federal aid funding is received. These Projects must follow the implementation processes established or required by the FHWA and administered through the ADOT Local Government Section.

Federal Fiscal Year October 1 - September 31, example: October 1, 2005 - September 31, 2006

FHWA Federal Highway Administration

Fiscal Year July 1 - June 30 (i.e. July 1, 2005 - June 30, 2006)

Incentives	Any expenditure, which involves a monetary reward for the inducement of behavior, as related to a project in the ALCP (i.e. Giving a contractor/consultant a bonus for completing a project ahead of schedule).
ITS	Intelligent Transportation System
MAG	Maricopa Association of Governments
MAG Committee Process	Items are placed for action on the agendas of the MAG Transportation Review Committee (TRC), Management Committee, Transportation Policy Committee (TPC), as appropriate, and Regional Council
Major Arterial	“an interconnected thoroughfare whose primary function is to link areas in the region and to distribute traffic to and from controlled access highways, generally of region wide significance and of varying capacity depending on the travel demand for the specific direction and adjacent land uses.” (ARS 28-6304(c)(5))
Material Change	<p><u>In general, significant project changes include Project or Project Segment deletions, substitutions, or changes in project scope, such as:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>A change in the alignment of the original or existing project;</u> • <u>A change in the length of the project by ½ mile or more;</u> • <u>A change in the number of lanes;</u> • <u>A change in Lead Agency;</u> • <u>A change in improvement type;</u> • <u>A change that affects more than one project, project segment or executed Project Agreement; or,</u> • <u>Another change as determined by MAG Staff.</u> <p>In general, a material change is any change that could reasonably cause a change in decision regarding a Project or an amendment to a Project.</p> <p>It is further defined as any proposed change to a Project that:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. changes a Project scope by: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a) modifying Project termini by a quarter-mile or more; b) changing a freeway or highway arterial interchange location by a quarter mile or more, or changing the location so as to cause increased costs for the freeway or highway program, or any change in the design and/or location of the arterial Project affecting the freeway or highway not agreed by ADOT; c) changing the vertical alignment at a freeway or highway interchange between at-grade, depressed and elevated, or changing the alignment in such a way so as to cause increased costs for the freeway or highway program, or any change in vertical alignment affecting an interchange or grade separation not agreed by ADOT or as appropriate, any light rail crossing not agreed by Valley Metro;

~~d) changing major design elements including, but not limited to, the number of lanes;~~

~~e) otherwise significantly modifying the scope of the Project itself or negatively impacting a freeway, highway or light rail facility as determined in consultation with MAG staff.~~

~~2. changes costs:~~

~~a) in excess of 5% of the Project budget as specified in the Project Overview or other agreement established for the Project, or in excess of \$1 million, but not less than \$200,000; and/or~~

~~b) to increase the regional share of the budget to an amount over the dollar amount specified in the RTP, or to an amount that represents over 70% of the Project costs.~~

~~3. changes the Project completion by:~~

~~a) one or more fiscal years from the year shown in the TIP or RTP;~~

~~b) changes Project completion from one phase to another in the RTP; and/or,~~

~~c) a) _____ results from a finding of a performance and/or financial audit.~~

Material Project Reimbursement Request

A Project Reimbursement Request that has been accepted by MAG Staff as complete and includes all required information, signatures, and backup documentation.

Memorandum of Understanding (MOU)

A type of agreement used as a bridge to a Project Agreement. For example, in the development of Project cost estimates and allocations across multiple jurisdictions, which then may be agreed to and incorporated into a more formal Project Agreement to be executed before further Project implementation.

MPO

Metropolitan Planning Organization

Participating Agency

Any agency involved in the implementation of an ALCP Project. All partner agencies are participating agencies.

Program

ALCP or TIP, depending on context.

Project

ALCP arterial, arterial intersection and/or ITS Project, as described in the RTP and Project-related documents. The Project description includes funding, schedule, Project termini and number of lanes added and other Project features. See also Segmented Projects.

Project Component

ALCP Projects may include several Project components or major elements, such as road widenings, grade separations, ITS applications, bike and pedestrian facilities, etc. The components together comprise the overall ALCP Project.

Project Agreement (PA)	A legally binding contract or agreement between MAG and the Lead Agency established for the ALCP Project.
Project Completion	<p>For the purposes of the material change policy, Project completion means all lanes of the roadway segment or intersection are open to traffic.</p> <p>For purposes of Project Agreements or other Project-related legal agreements, Project completion means when all requirements of the Agreements have been completed to the satisfaction of MAG (i.e. it is contract or agreement completion).</p> <p>A Project Agreement may establish dates for Project completion considering administrative requirements or other requirements or needs, as determined by MAG to be necessary.</p>
Project Overview (PO)	A managerial document Lead Agencies must complete for each ALCP Project prior to signing a Project Agreement. The Project Overview includes the Lead Agency information, Project data, summary of the Project, history and background, maps/photographs, ITS components, timeline, Project data, cost estimates, summary of work and local, regional, federal and total costs.
Project Reimbursement Request (PRR)	The guidelines and forms (request for payment, invoice and progress reports) a Lead Agency must complete when requesting reimbursement for an ALCP Project.
Project Savings	ALCP regional funds found by MAG to be surplus to an ALCP Project, and for which certain criteria as established in the ALCP Policies and Procedures is met, may be noted as Project Savings and reallocated to an ALCP Project in that jurisdiction depending on the availability of Program funds.
RARF	Regional Area Road Fund(s). Revenues collected from the half-cent sales tax extension approved through Proposition 400 went into effect on January 1, 2006. (May refer to the account or the revenues.) As specified in ARS 42-6105.E, 56.2 percent of all sales tax collections will be distributed to freeways and highways; 10.5 percent will be distributed to arterial street improvements; and 33.3 percent of all collections will be distributed to transit.
Reallocation	Re-assignment or re-programming of funds unexpended or not expected to be needed from one ALCP Project to another ALCP Project.
Reimbursement	Payment or compensation for costs incurred.
ROW	Right-of-Way

RTP	Regional Transportation Plan. Must be in conformance for air quality purposes and approved by the MAG Regional Council. The RTP may be updated or amended from time to time. Any references to the RTP means the currently approved version unless indicated otherwise. It is also referred to as the “Plan.”
STIP	State Transportation Improvement Program
STP or STP-MAG	Surface Transportation Program. A federal-aid highway funding program that funds a broad range of surface transportation capital needs, including many roads, transit, sea and airport access, vanpool, bike, and pedestrian facilities. Funds may be used by States and localities for projects on any Federal-aid highway, including the NHS, bridge projects on any public road, transit capital projects, and intra-city and intercity bus terminals and facilities
Segmented Projects	Segments of RTP Projects where the original Project as specified in the RTP is Projects segmented or proposed for subdivision into smaller, shorter segments or components that together comprise the original RTP Project in its entirety.
Substantial Project Change	Changes to a project, such as a change in Lead Agency, change in improvement type, or any change that affects more than one project, project segment or executed Project Agreement.
Substantial Project Reimbursement Request	A Project Reimbursement Request (PRR) that invoices for at least \$100,000 or 10 percent of the programmed reimbursement for the fiscal year of the invoice, whichever is less.
Third Party Contribution	Contribution made to an ALCP Project other than cash or cash equivalent funding, typically involving the donation of right-of-way, but may also include other aspects of Project implementation, such as design and construction.
TIP	MAG’s Transportation Improvement Program. The TIP must be in conformance for air quality purposes, approved by the MAG Regional Council, and approved by the Governor for inclusion in the STIP. The TIP may be amended from time to time. Any references to the TIP mean the currently approved version unless indicated otherwise.
TPC	MAG Transportation Policy Committee
TRC	MAG Transportation Review Committee
<u>Unfunded Reimbursement</u>	<u>Any regional reimbursement, plus annual inflation, where applicable, that has been removed from the funded years of the Arterial Life Cycle Program in order to maintain the fiscal balance of the program due to a</u>

deficit of program funds.

|

APPENDIX B FEDERAL FUND INVOICE APPROVAL AND PAYMENT PROCESS

This process applies only to requests for reimbursement on *federally-funded* MAG Arterial Life Cycle Program (ALCP) projects. ~~ALCP projects are identifiable by the letter "Z" at the end of the MAG TIP number.~~ In addition to the ADOT project number and federal aid number, the MAG TIP number must be included on all federal aid authorization/modification requests.

This process assumes the ALCP project was appropriately authorized for federal aid funding before any work began or costs were incurred.

1. Requests for reimbursement for all federally-funded ALCP projects are first to be submitted by the local agency to the appropriate ADOT project manager (PM) for *review and validation of eligible costs*, and must be accompanied by the MAG ALCP Cost Eligibility Form (~~attached~~) and all required backup documentation. The cost review/validation only determines the federal aid eligibility of project costs and **does not** constitute approval to pay any invoice. Additionally, such review/validation does not preclude costs later being deemed ineligible through audits conducted by ADOT, the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) or other state or federal agencies.
2. The ADOT PM will conduct a cost review within 7 days of the receipt of the request for reimbursement. If any item on the form is incorrect or ineligible for federal aid, the PM will notify the project sponsor and request a corrected/revised MAG ALCP Cost Eligibility Form to be sent reflecting the amount eligible.
3. Upon receipt of the finalized MAG ALCP Cost Eligibility Form, the ADOT PM will sign the form and scan it, along with all the backup documentation, into a single "Cost Eligibility Package" PDF. If the documentation is too large for one PDF, it should be split into two or more files with each individual part of the package identified as "Part X of Y".
4. After scanning the Cost Eligibility Package, the ADOT PM will then email the pdf document(s) to all of the following entities:
 - a. the local agency,
 - b. MAG's ALCP program (alcp@azmag.gov), and
 - c. ADOT's Contract Payables unit (Contractpayments@azdot.gov).
5. Upon receipt of the approved MAG ALCP Cost Eligibility Form from the ADOT PM, the local agency is then responsible for submitting it to MAG for approval, along with any other documentation/information required by MAG. (See ALCP Policies & Procedures IV, Section 420)
6. ADOT Contracts Payable will store the pending cost eligibility package in G\FMS\Contracts Payable\Pending Eligibility Packages awaiting receipt of MAG's approval to reimburse.
7. Upon MAG's verification and approval, MAG will submit a hard copy of the MAG ALCP Cost Eligibility Form to ADOT Financial Management Services (FMS) for approval by the CFO's office. It will then be forwarded to Contracts Payable to process and pay the reimbursement.
8. Upon release of payment, ADOT Contracts Payable will scan and merge the other documentation/information required by MAG with the corresponding Eligibility Package and save to

AIDW. In addition, ADOT Contracts payable will send out a notification of released payment via email to the ADOT PM and to the MAG ALCP email box.

~~The applicable MAG local agencies have been apprised of this process. Questions regarding this process should be directed to MAG or Contracts Payable in ADOT FMS.~~

APPENDIX C: FEDERALLY FUNDED PROJECT MATCH REQUIREMENT EXAMPLE

Agency X has \$94,300 of STP-MAG funding programmed for their Main Street project. The federal-aid requires a 5.7% match (94.3% federal).

- All \$94,300 of expenses programmed for reimbursement must be federally eligible.
- Local match totaling \$5,700 must also be federally eligible (5.7%)
- The remaining \$34,715 to meet the minimum regional match (30%) does not have to be eligible for federal reimbursement so long as it is eligible per section 330.

MARICOPA ASSOCIATION OF GOVERNMENTS

INFORMATION SUMMARY... for your review

DATE:

May 13, 2014

SUBJECT:

Introduction of a Near-Term Improvements Strategy for the Interstate 10/Interstate 17 Corridor

SUMMARY:

On October 31, 2012, representatives from the Arizona Department of Transportation (ADOT), Federal Highway Administration (FHWA), MAG, the Cities of Chandler, Phoenix, and Tempe, and Valley Metro/RPTA, met in a workshop to identify the steps forward for improving the 35-mile north-south Interstate 10/Interstate 17 corridor between the Loop 202 Pecos Stack and the Loop 101 North Stack. As presented to the Transportation Policy Committee on November 14, 2012, a multi-phase process was identified for improving the corridor that included a Near-Term Improvements Strategy to address bottleneck locations, and a Corridor Master Plan to establish a long-term vision for a corridor that has been referred to as the transportation "Spine" of Metro Phoenix.

As discussions between ADOT, FHWA, and MAG progressed on implementing this multi-phase process for Interstate 10 and Interstate 17, the agency representatives identified criteria for determining what projects constituted a "near-term" improvement. These criteria included (a) addressing the most severe bottlenecks in the corridor; (b) rapidly meeting an accelerated project-delivery schedule that included satisfying the requirements of the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) of 1969; and (c) identifying relatively low-cost measures that would stay well within programmed Regional Transportation Plan amounts for both Interstate 10 and Interstate 17 but not conflict with the yet to be determined Corridor Master Plan vision. Given these criteria, a preliminary list of projects has been identified for this effort:

- Developing a ramp braid on the inbound (westbound) segment of Interstate 10 between US-60 and SR-143 to address the significant weaving movements for traffic between these two system interchanges.
- Constructing collector-distributor lanes along the outbound (eastbound) segment of Interstate 10 between the SR-143 and Broadway Road entrance ramps and the exit to the US-60/Superstition Freeway to address another significant weaving issue between these three traffic interchanges.
- Re-striping outbound (eastbound) Interstate 10 between the SR-51/SR-202L "Mini-Stack" and the US-60/Superstition Freeway transition for an additional lane. The popularity of high occupancy vehicle (HOV) lanes in this corridor is very pronounced and further study is presently underway to determine if the additional lane could be striped in this manner to enhance multi-modal transportation options without additional impacts on the general capacity lanes. There is sufficient pavement width along this seven-mile stretch of eastbound Interstate 10 to add the extra lane without compromising safety of operations.

- Adding auxiliary lanes along the three-mile east-west segment of Interstate 17, from 16th Street to 19th Avenue, between the four existing traffic interchanges to improve traffic operations and the outflow of traffic from the Interstate 10 Split interchange.
- Expanding existing Interstate 10 between the US-60/Superstition Freeway and the SR-202L/Santan-South Mountain Freeway “Pecos Stack” for an extra general-purpose lane in each direction.
- Investing in significant intelligent transportation systems (ITS) technologies, with sufficient budget for traffic operations staffing of the Traffic Operations Centers, to provide better responses for incidents, improved traffic flows for entering freeway volumes, and expanded data for corridor users to enhance their day-to-day decisions for accessing the 35-mile segment of Interstate 10 and Interstate 17 through more than 45 traffic interchanges.

This Near-Term Improvements Strategy is considered preliminary and is still under study, Subject to final environmental clearances, as well as approvals of the MAG Regional Council for incorporation into the Transportation Improvement Program (TIP), it is anticipated that the strategy will be recommended for inclusion in the MAG TIP later this year. The Arizona Department of Transportation (ADOT) is leading the effort for implementing this near-term improvement strategy for Interstate 10 and Interstate 17.

PUBLIC INPUT:

During development of the Interstate 10 Corridor Improvement Study, the Interstate 17 Corridor Improvement Study, and the Central Phoenix Transportation Framework Study, public comment was received at a very preliminary level about the concepts behind these near-term improvement strategies. Additional public input and comment will be needed at this project-specific level during the environmental clearance process that commences during the project development process.

PROS & CONS:

PROS: The bottleneck locations that these near-term improvement strategies address are presently some of the most highly-congested locations in Metro Phoenix. According to simulation model results, these improvements, particularly those that address the current weaving difficulties along Interstate 10 between SR-143 and US-60, dramatically enhance traffic flows and facilitate improved travel times for the corridor. In addition, the significant traffic operations and intelligent transportation system (ITS) investments will provide more than 43 percent of all daily travel in Metro Phoenix with better information about accessing the 35-mile segment of Interstate 10 and Interstate 17.

CONS: The outcome of the Interstate 10/Interstate 17 Corridor Master Plan and its vision for the Metro Phoenix transportation “spine” is not known at this time. While every attempt will be made to co-op this effort into the Master Plan’s outcomes, there could be some changes to the near-term improvement strategies as the final vision for the corridor is determined.

TECHNICAL & POLICY IMPLICATIONS:

TECHNICAL: Planning for the Near-Term Improvements Strategy has been a coordinated effort between ADOT, FHWA, and MAG. As noted, there were three criteria considered for identifying a project as near-term improvement that is consistent with the current planning process for the region. Additional studies, including environmental clearances will be needed, before their implementation. This effort is being led by ADOT, with approval by FHWA, and further assistance from MAG.

POLICY: The Near-Term Improvements Strategy for Interstate 10 and Interstate 17 is well within the program recommendations for both freeways as identified in the MAG Regional Transportation Plan.

The specific projects and actions will need to be incorporated into the MAG TIP before the strategy is fully implemented. This request is anticipated later this year.

ACTION NEEDED:

Information and discussion.

PRIOR COMMITTEE ACTIONS:

This item is on the May 14, 2014, MAG Management Committee agenda. An update will be provided on discussion by the committee.

The Transportation Policy Committee received a presentation on proposed multi-phase approach for addressing improvements to the Interstate 10 and Interstate 17 corridor on November 14, 2012. At that time, no specific actions were identified for the Near-Term Improvements strategy.

CONTACT PERSON:

Bob Hazlett, Senior Engineering Manager, 602 254-6300.



302 North 1st Avenue, Suite 300 ▲ Phoenix, Arizona 85003
Phone (602) 254-6300 ▲ FAX (602) 254-6490
E-mail: mag@azmag.gov ▲ Web site: www.azmag.gov

April 24, 2014

TO: Members of the MAG Regional Council

FROM: Mayor Michael LeVault, Youngtown, Chair

SUBJECT: VACANCY IN THE BUSINESS SEAT REPRESENTING TRANSIT INTERESTS ON THE TRANSPORTATION POLICY COMMITTEE

Proposition 400, passed by the voters of Maricopa County in 2004, authorizes the President of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives to each appoint three business members to six-year terms on the Transportation Policy Committee (TPC). One of these business members must represent transit interests. In January 2010, the Speaker of the House of Representatives appointed Mr. Ron Barnes of Total Transit as the TPC business member representing transit. On April 17, 2014, Mr. Barnes notified MAG that he would be resigning his seat on the TPC. It is anticipated that the Speaker will appoint a member representing transit interests to fulfill the term of Mr. Barnes' term that will expire on December 31, 2016.

State law also provides that the Chairman of the Regional Planning Agency may submit names to the President and Speaker for consideration in the TPC appointments. **MAG is requesting names and bios of individuals to be considered in the appointment be submitted to MAG by May 9, 2014.**

It is anticipated that input on these names will be provided at the May 21, 2014, TPC meeting and a recommendation made by the Regional Council at its May 28, 2014, meeting. If you have any questions regarding this process for submitting names for consideration, please contact Dennis Smith at the MAG office.

cc: Transportation Policy Committee
MAG Management Committee
Intergovernmental Representatives

Valerie Day

Subject: FW: Nick Promponas Bio.docx
Attachments: Nick Promponas Bio.docx; ATT00001.txt

-----Original Message-----

From: Marie Lopez Rogers [<mailto:mlopezrogers@avondale.org>]

Sent: Tuesday, May 06, 2014 2:37 PM

To: Nathan Pryor

Subject: Nick Promponas Bio.docx

Please include with letters of intent. Thank you.

May 8, 2014

Please consider me to fill the vacancy of the business seat representing transit interests on the Transportation Policy Committee (TPC). My bio is attached for your reference. I am a Senior Vice President at First Transit, a full-service transportation operator with headquarters located in the Phoenix metropolitan area. I also serve as a Board member of the Arizona Transit Association.

If you have any questions or need further information to facilitate this nomination, please do not hesitate to contact me.

I look forward to the opportunity to serve the MAG region on this important committee. Thank you for your consideration.

Nick

Nicholas E. Promponas
Senior Vice President

7581 Willow Drive, Suite 103
Tempe, AZ 85283

(480) 456-5600, Ext 13
(480) 456-5603 fax

nick.promponas@firstgroup.com
www.firsttransit.com

Nick Promponas serves First Transit as Senior Vice President and is responsible for operations and customer satisfaction for fifty contracts in the western United States and Canada. First Transit operates 3,400 buses operating 106 miles by 5,300 employees in this region. He joined First Transit in 1989 as a Management Associate. He has managed all of First Transit's product lines including contracting in Southern California, transit management in Massachusetts and ADA call center management in New York City.

First Transit operates transit services locally for the City of Phoenix out of their West Transit Facility. The service is comprised of 150 Valley Metro and City of Phoenix branded buses. First Transit employs over 350 employees at this facility. First Transit has operated this service continuously since 2007.

First Transit also contracts with the RPTA to operate transit services from the City of Tempe facility and Mesa facility. The service is comprised of over 300 Valley Metro and City of Tempe branded buses. First Transit employs over 720 employees at these facilities. First Transit has operated this service since July 2013.

First Transit maintains a region office in Tempe where Nick and members of his region staff that oversee contracts in the Southwestern US. First Transit's Western US and Canadian business has been managed from this location since 2004. First Transit owns and operates Safe Ride Services from a separate office in Phoenix. Safe Ride is a contract operator for Arizona Access and for the Medicaid programs in New Mexico. Sister companies, Greyhound and First Student, also have operations in the Valley. Greyhound's bus depot is east of downtown Phoenix near the airport and Student delivers transportation services for the Fowler School District in Phoenix.

Nick currently serves as a Board member of the Arizona Transit Association, APTA's Business Member Board of Governors, and also for a non-profit serving senior citizens and the homebound in Chandler and Gilbert called About Care.

Nick has a Bachelor's degree in Industrial Psychology from Bridgewater State College in Massachusetts. Nick has lived in the Valley since 2004 and resides in Chandler. He is married to Gail and has a daughter, Sophia.



May 6, 2014

The Honorable Michael LeVault
Chairman, MAG Transportation Policy Committee
302 North 1st Avenue
Suite 300
Phoenix, Arizona 85003

Dear Chairman LeVault,

Please consider this letter a respectful request for appointment to the Maricopa Association of Government's Transportation Policy Committee. As you know, my former colleague, Ron Barnes, had actively participated on this committee until his recent relocation to the east to be closer to family. I would be honored to fill his seat and carry on Total Transit's commitment to this important regional committee.

As you may know, Total Transit is an Arizona-based, home-grown transportation company. We provide both public transit services as well as for-hire ground transportation. We strive to be innovators in the marketplace by using technology and new approaches to maximize private investment in transportation while embracing multimodal transportation options. We have established relationships with several organizations in the Valley whose interest parallels ours in terms of identifying and implementing cost effective and convenient transportation options for our community, and participation with your committee enhances that effort. Just recently, I met Anubhav Bagley from MAG who presented his analysis of the transportation/demographics impacting the West Valley, and we have agreed to meet so that we might share some of our data with him to enhance his analytics.

My role at Total Transit is to lead our strategic growth in all phases of our transportation business, as well as to invest my time in the community where I believe I can have a positive impact.

Thank you for your consideration. It would be an honor and privilege to be a member of the MAG Transportation Policy Committee.

Sincerely,

Stanton Sipes
Director, Business Development
Total Transit
4600 W Camelback
Glendale, AZ 85301

cc: Dennis Smith, Executive Director

Valerie Day

Subject: FW: Request to be considered for the vacant on the Transportation Policy Committee.
Attachments: PCH - Resume.pdf

From: Charles Huellmantel [<mailto:charles@huellmantel.com>]
Sent: Friday, May 09, 2014 4:40 PM
To: Dennis Smith
Subject: Request to be considered for the vacant on the Transportation Policy Committee.

Dennis Smith
Executive Director
Maricopa Association of Governments

Mr. Smith:

I learned today that there is an opening on the Transportation Policy Committee created from the resignation of Ron Barns (Transportation Representative). I write today with the request that I be considered for the appointment to fill the remainder of that term. I have long been involved in transportation issues and recently served as the Chair of the Transportation Commission in the City of Tempe. I still serve on that committee. While clearly these are different boards, my work in the field and in Arizona development in general would be a good foundation to participate in the many transportation issues I would learn and be involved in on the TPC. I have attached a copy of my resume.

I can be reached at 480-921-2800 with any questions you may have. Thank you for your consideration.

Charles Huellmantel

P.O. Box 1833
Tempe, Arizona 85280
(480) 921-2800
charles@huellmantel.com

EDUCATION:

ARIZONA STATE UNIVERSITY

MASTER OF PUBLIC ADMINISTRATION, 2003

JURIS DOCTOR, 1998

Truman R. Young, Jr. Prosecuting Fellow

BACHELOR OF ARTS, COMMUNICATION, 1992

Lyndon B. Johnson Congressional Fellow

ADMITTED TO PRACTICE LAW:

State of Arizona, 9th Circuit Court of Appeals, District of Columbia

EXPERIENCE:

Urban Soul Development, 2006 – current

Principal, developer of urban housing and retail

Recipient of the Arizona Forward Crescordia award for multi-family development

Recipient of RED multi-family project of the year in 2014

Developer and principal in Flagstaff Extreme adventure course in Flagstaff

HUELLMANTEL AND AFFILIATES, 2006 - current

Founder and Principal, Practice of law focused on land use and development related issues.

WITHEY, ANERSON AND MORRIS, 2004 –2006

Practice of law focused on land use and development related issues.

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE, UNITED STATES ATTORNEY'S OFFICE, ASSISTANT UNITED STATES ATTORNEY, 1999- 2003

MARICOPA COUNTY ATTORNEY'S OFFICE, DEPUTY COUNTY ATTORNEY, 1998-1999

TRUMAN R. YOUNG, JR. PROSECUTING FELLOW, 1997-1998

Selected as the Truman R. Young, Jr. Prosecuting Fellow.

WESTMARC TRUANCY PREVENTION PARTNERSHIP, SENIOR ADMINISTRATOR, 1996-1997

AWARDS, BOARDS AND COMMISSIONS:

Former Chairman and Current Member, City of Tempe Transportation Commission

Former Chairman, City of Tempe Ad Hoc Streetcar Committee

Former Chair, Arizona State Liquor Board

Member of the Board, Downtown Tempe Community

Member of the Board, Downtown Mesa Association

Former Chairman, City of Tempe Planning and Zoning Commission

Former Chairman, City of Tempe Downtown Redevelopment Commission

Former Chairman, City of Tempe Development Review Commission