

MINUTES OF THE  
MARICOPA ASSOCIATION OF GOVERNMENTS  
TRANSPORTATION REVIEW COMMITTEE

May 27, 2010

Maricopa Association of Governments Office  
302 North First Avenue, Suite 200, Saguaro Room  
Phoenix, Arizona

MEMBERS ATTENDING

Peoria: David Moody  
ADOT: Robert Samour for Floyd Roehrich  
Avondale: David Fitzhugh  
Buckeye: Scott Lowe  
Chandler: Dan Cook for Patrice Kraus  
El Mirage: Pat Dennis for Lance Calvert  
Fountain Hills: Randy Harrel  
Gila Bend: Eric Fitzer  
Gila River: Sreedevi Samudrala for Doug  
Torres  
Gilbert: Michelle Gramley Tami Ryall  
Glendale: Terry Johnson  
Goodyear: Cato Esquivel  
Guadalupe: Gino Turrubiarres  
Litchfield Park: Paul Ward for Woody  
Scoutten

Maricopa County: John Hauskins  
#Mesa: Scott Butler  
\*Paradise Valley: Bill Mead  
Phoenix: Rick Naimark  
Queen Creek: Tom Condit  
RPTA: Bryan Jungwirth  
Scottsdale: Dave Meinhart  
Surprise: Bob Beckley  
Tempe: Chris Salomone  
Valley Metro Rail: John Farry  
\*Wickenburg: Rick Austin  
Youngtown: Grant Anderson for Lloyce  
Robinson

EX-OFFICIO MEMBERS ATTENDING

\*Street Committee: Dan Cook, City of  
Chandler  
\* ITS Committee: Debbie Albert

Bicycle/Pedestrian Committee: Peggy  
Rubach, RPTA  
\*Transportation Safety Committee: Kerry  
Wilcoxon, City of Phoenix

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

OTHERS PRESENT

Eric Anderson, MAG  
Lindy Bauer, MAG  
Alice Chen, MAG  
Maureen DeCindis, MAG  
Dean Giles, MAG  
Tim Strow, MAG  
Bob Hazlett, MAG  
Steve Tate, MAG  
Roger Roy, MAG  
Tom Remes, Phoenix

Andy Granger, Peoria  
Bob Antilla, RPTA  
Mike Sabatini, MCDOT  
Kwi-Sung Kang, ADOT  
Jeanna Goad, Glendale  
Kent Dibble, Dibble Eng.  
Lauren Neu, Strand

1. Call to Order

Chairman David Moody from the City of Peoria called the meeting to order at 10:03 a.m.

2. Approval of Draft April 1, 2010 Minutes/Approval of the April 29, 2010 Minutes

Chairman Moody asked the committee members present if any recalled who made the motion and second to approve the minutes at the April 29th committee meeting. The Committee could not recall who motioned to approve the minutes at the previous meeting and a brief discussion followed.

Mr. Grant Anderson from the Town of Youngtown motioned to approve the minutes from the April 1st and April 29th meetings of the Transportation Review Committee. Mr. Gino Turrubiarres from the Town of Guadalupe seconded, and the motion passed by a unanimous voice vote of the Committee.

3. Call to the Audience

Chairman Moody stated that he had not received any request to speak cards from the audience and moved onto the next item on the agenda.

4. Transportation Director's Report

Chairman Moody invited Mr. Eric Anderson to present the Transportation Director's report. Mr. Anderson reported that Regional Area Road Fund (RARF) revenues for April were down 0.6 percent compared to the previous year. He forecasted that total RARF revenue collection for the year would be approximately \$295 million.

Mr. Anderson expressed hope that the current revenue figures were indicators that the 31 continuous months of negative revenue collection was ending. He stated the some member agencies also had experienced anticipated or increased revenue collections recently.

Next, Mr. Anderson discussed the Regional Council meeting from the previous day. He stated that the current policy on the use of American Reinvestment and Recovery Act (ARRA) funds had been revised. He added that Ms. Lindy Bauer from MAG would address recent developments regarding the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) and air quality in the region.

In closing, Mr. Anderson announced that the Brookings Institute had published an article discussing regional entities funding transportation improvements with regional and local funding sources. He stated that the Maricopa Association of Governments had been acknowledged in the article as one of the regions that using regional funds to supplement federal funding for transportation.

Chairman Moody asked if there were any questions or comments about the Transportation Director's Report. There were none, and he proceeded to the next agenda item.

5. Consent Agenda

Chairman Moody announced that ARRA Status Report, agenda item 5a, had been pulled from the consent agenda at the request of MAG Staff. He explained that ARRA would be heard later in the meeting. Chairman Moody stated the Update to the Federal Functional Classification System, agenda item 5b, remained on the consent agenda for action.

Chairman Moody asked if there were any questions or comments regarding agenda item 5b, and there were none. Mr. Dan Cook from the City of Chandler motioned to approve the consent agenda. Mr. John Farry from METRO seconded, and the motion passed by a unanimous voice vote of the Committee.

13. Update on Exceptional Events and MAG Five Percent Plan for PM

Chairman Moody informed the Committee that an addendum had been made to the agenda to include an Update on Exceptional Events and the MAG Five Percent Plan for PM-10. Chairman Moody announced the item would be heard prior to the ARRA Status Report, which had pulled from the consent agenda. Then, he invited Ms. Lindy Bauer to provide the update.

Ms. Bauer, MAG Environmental Director, reported that on May 25, 2010, a meeting occurred between MAG, EPA, and the Arizona Department of Environmental Quality (ADEQ) to discuss exceptional events and the MAG Five Percent Plan for Particle Matter (PM) 10. She announced that at the meeting, the EPA stated it did not occur with MAG and ADEQ documentation on four high wind exceptional events that occurred at the West 43rd Avenue air quality monitor. She explained that the four PM-10 exceedances at a monitor counted as an air quality violation.

Ms. Bauer stated that at the meeting the EPA announced the intention to disapprove MAG's 2007 Five Percent Plan for PM-10 although the official timing of the disapproval was unknown. She added that the EPA was in negotiations with the Arizona Center for Law in the Public Interest, which impacted the deadline of the disapproval action.

Ms. Bauer explained that in 2008, four high wind days occurred that resulted in PM-10 standard exceedances at the West 43rd monitor. She reported that a team consisting of MAG Staff and consultants from Sierra Research had gathered and analyzed additional data regarding the events and provided documentation to EPA as a supplement to the ADEQ documentation. She stated the documentation provided by the team included surface roughness and friction velocity maps, tables with maximum anthropogenic PM-10 contributions based on land use, a white paper explaining the PM-10 concentrations at the monitor, and graphs showing winds were exceptionally high.

Ms. Bauer stated that EPA's actions were disconcerting. She explained that prior to the meeting on May 25th, MAG and ADEQ had received positive feedback from the EPA

regarding the exceptional events. She stated that MAG had not anticipated the disapproval based on earlier communications. Ms. Bauer also expressed displeasure about the notification citing that the EPA had signed a letter on May 21st regarding the disapproval; however, the EPA did not notify MAG until May 25th. She added that MAG Staff was displeased that the EPA had issued a press release on the disapproval within two hours of the meeting.

Ms. Bauer explained that if the EPA had approved the justification for one of the four exceedances, then MAG would not be in violation of the Clean Air Act (CAA). Then, Ms. Bauer relayed comments made by the regional EPA Administrator acknowledging the current exceptional events rules were fatally flawed. According to Ms. Bauer, the EPA Administrator had stated the EPA was forced to use the rule and planned to disapprove the MAG Five Percent Plan. Ms. Bauer explained that if the region was not in attainment, then the EPA could not approve the Plan. She stated that the exact date of disapproval was unknown.

Moving on, Ms. Bauer addressed the consequences of a disapproval by the EPA. She stated that within 30 to 90 days of publishing of disapproval in the Federal Register a conformity freeze would be in effect. She explained that under a conformity freeze only projects in the first four years of a conforming Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) and Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) could proceed. She stated that a new TIP or RTP could not be approved until a new Five Percent Plan that fulfilled the Clean Air Act (CAA) requirements was submitted to the EPA, and the conformity budgets in the plan were deemed adequate by the EPA.

Ms. Bauer reported that 18 months after the disapproval, tighter controls on major industries in the region would be subject to a two-to-one offset for emissions. She stated that 24 months after the disapproval, the region would lose federal highway funding, which she estimated at \$1.7 billion according to the draft FY 2011 – 2015 MAG TIP. In addition, a federal implementation plan would be imposed on the region. Ms. Bauer stated that the imposition of highway sanctions could trigger a conformity lapse in the region. She explained that if that occurred then major projects in the TIP could not proceed. She estimated that over \$7 billion in projects would not be able to proceed if a conformity lapse occurred.

Then, Ms. Bauer summarized MAG Staff's next steps. She stated that a new emissions inventory would be needed. She informed the Committee that the 2007 plan was based on 2005 data. She stated that the economy was robust at that time and that the downturn of the economy had a significant impact on the data specifically the mixture of sources impacting air quality. Ms. Bauer announced that MAG was working on a new emissions inventory based on 2008, which she anticipated being completed in June 2010.

Ms. Bauer cautioned that in 2009, seven exceptional events were recorded in the region according to ADEQ. She stated that MAG, ADEQ and the consultant team was working diligently to address the data. She announced a multi-agency data collection effort that included Maricopa County, ADEQ, MAG, and Arizona State University (ASU). She reported that efforts were targeted in the Salt River area, specifically during high wind events. Ms. Bauer stated that the team was working to identify sources contributing to the elevated PM-10 conditions, including nearby sources, unique soil conditions, and transport from outside the area.

Ms. Bauer reported that MAG may need to add measures to reduce emissions by five percent per year until attainment as measured at the monitors. She stated that it was increasingly difficult to find new measures because 77 measures were included in the Serious Area Plan and 53 measures were in the Five Percent Plan. She added that MAG would need to revise the modeling in the Five Percent Plan and achieve three years of clean data to demonstrate attainment of the PM-10 standards.

Ms. Bauer reported that the PM-10 standard had been exceeded at the West 43rd monitor during no-wind conditions. She stated that since then, a violation had occurred at the monitor on a no-wind day adding the high wind days counted as an exceptional event according to the EPA. Next, Ms. Bauer displayed maps that indicated wind direction and trajectories during the exceedance at the West 43rd monitor.

According to Ms. Bauer, MAG needed to attain a conformity finding on the Draft FY 2011-2015 TIP. She stated a public hearing would be held regarding the TIP on June 21st with approval slated for July 30, 2010. She explained once the TIP was approved by the MAG Regional Council, it would be forwarded to the federal government for approval. Ms. Bauer posited potential next steps to the Committee. She listed options, which included seeking assistance from the Governor and the Congressional Delegation to suspend EPA action on the Five Percent Plan until the flawed exceptional events rule was fixed. She stated a legal challenge to the ruling also was a potential option.

Mr. David Meinhart from the City of Scottsdale inquired if other regions had reached a similar level of discontent with the EPA. Ms. Bauer replied that 15 states in the western region had sent a letter to the EPA in 2009. She added that other states were upset that the EPA had turned down exceptional event documentation noting that the EPA was turning down more exceptional events documentation than it was accepting.

Ms. Bauer explained that the exceptional events rule had been challenged in court. She stated the suit contended that the EPA should not have exceptions to the PM-10 standard. Ms. Bauer reported that the courts upheld the exceptional events rule.

Mr. Meinhart asked if the worst case scenario would be a hold on anything programmed in the TIP. Ms. Bauer replied that conformity lapse would be the worst case scenario because projects in the TIP would be frozen regardless of funding source.

Mr. Paul Ward from the Town of Litchfield Park inquired if the EPA Administrator had stated they were being forced to use the exceptional events rule. Ms. Bauer replied that the exceptional events rule was enacted with the passage of the Safe, Accountable, Flexible, Efficient Transportation Equity Act: A Legacy for Users (SAFETEA-LU). She stated that after the passage of SAFETEA-LU, the rule was developed, enacted, challenged, upheld, and then enforced.

Mr. Turrubiarres question if the issue was the monitors. Ms. Bauer replied that if one monitor was in violation, then the entire year of data was ruined. Mr. Ward stated that under the worst case scenario, projects that were not required in the TIP could move forward as well as certain

types of federally funded projects. Ms. Bauer replied that there was a detailed protocol that would need to be followed for those projects to proceed. She added that non-capacity projects, such as transit and paving projects, could proceed.

Mr. Grant Anderson inquired if MAG intended to challenge the finding or resubmit information to the EPA. Ms. Bauer replied that MAG was reviewing the information provided by the EPA at the meeting. She explained that once the EPA finding was published in the Federal Register, then MAG could comment on the finding. She added that MAG was reviewing the Clean Air Act in detail to determine what options were available.

Ms. Pat Dennis from the City of El Mirage inquired what industries had an impact on the West 43rd monitor. Ms. Bauer stated that several types of industries were located in the area, including sand and gravel operations. Ms. Bauer reported that Maricopa County was responsible for permitting the industries in the area, which also included agriculture. She added that a property near the monitor had been cited for open burning.

Mr. Eric Anderson stated that MAG and member agencies had spent in excess of \$20 million in the area on improvements to address air quality. He expressed frustration that the sanctions impacted the transportation sector, which had little impact on the PM-10 readings at the monitor.

Ms. Bauer informed that Committee that MAG Staff had reviewed data to determine why the 43rd monitor recorded higher levels compared to two adjacent monitors. She determined that the terrain near the West 43rd monitor was smooth with few features, natural or man-made, to disperse the wind and particles before reaching the monitor. She explained that the adjacent monitors were located in more urbanized areas with buildings and other features that could disperse the wind. Ms. Bauer also reported that MAG had analyzed the wind speed to determine the minimum wind speed for fine silt particles to become airborne. Ms. Bauer reported that the analysis determined winds at a minimum of 13 miles per hour would produce airborne fine silt. A brief discussion followed.

Moving on, Ms. Bauer explained the attainment date for the MAG Five Percent Plan was 2010. She stated that the Plan's measures were designed to bring the region into attainment by 2010; however, the region should achieve attainment sooner where feasible. Ms. Bauer stated that the MAG Region needed three years of clean data to achieve attainment. She announced that data from 2009 was problematic as well due to air quality exceedances.

Mr. Gino Turrubiarres inquired if the 43rd Avenue monitor had failed continuously. Ms. Bauer stated that the 43rd Avenue monitor had been problematic for a while. She reported that roads had been paved near the monitor in an attempt to reduce the particulate matter in the area. Mr. Gino Turrubiarres inquired what actions were underway to address burning near the monitor. Ms. Bauer replied that Maricopa County had increased oversight and enforcement activities in the area and that in 2007, the Arizona Legislature had increased the fine for burning. Mr. Eric Anderson stated that although the air quality problem being discussed was localized that sanctions applied region-wide. He reported that the City of Scottsdale had received complaints from residents regarding the air quality measures. Mr. Anderson added that there was a disconnect between a reasonable policy and one monitor in non-compliance resulting in

regionwide ramifications . He quipped that he was unsure a solution existed unless the region paved the riverbed.

Next, Ms. Bauer discussed a project in the City of Phoenix that might help the situation. She discussed the Rio Salado Oeste project, which in 2009 had received a 404 permit to begin excavation. Ms. Bauer reported that the project included trails, vegetation, drainage, etc. She explained project has the potential for long term stabilization for the area.

Mr. Hauskins informed the Committee that County officials had met with MAG Staff regarding the property. He explained that the County had reviewed the size of the property and the appraisal value. He stated that acquiring the property was complicated because the property had one owner that leased the land to 50 or more individuals. Mr. Hauskins reported that the access route in and out of the property was not paved yet highly traveled. A brief discussion followed.

Mr. David Meinhart inquired if the Committee could receive copies of Ms. Bauer's presentation. She replied yes. Chairman Moody inquired if there were additional questions or comments regarding the agenda item. There were none, and Chairman Moody proceeded to the next agenda item.

#### 5a. American Recovery and Reinvestment Act (ARRA) Status Report

Chairman Moody invited Mr. Eric Anderson to discuss the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act (ARRA). Mr. Anderson reported that \$86 million in ARRA funded projects had been awarded or gone to bid. He stated that MAG and ADOT anticipated the final projects going to bid by Friday with the exception of one Wickenburg project that hinged on another project.

Mr. Anderson discussed the impact of bid amounts on the ARRA funded projects. He stated that if bids came in higher than anticipated that member agencies would need to reduce the scope of the project or increase the local funds allocated to the project. He emphasized that member agencies should not count on the availability of additional ARRA or regional funds to address any funding gaps.

Mr. Anderson stated that if bids came in lower than anticipated that member agencies could request change orders. He explained that any change orders would need to stay within the existing environmental clearances. Mr. Anderson stated that any change orders could not include new rights-of-way or utility clearances. He added that the change order also must be consistent with the original scope of the project and should not include new work elements.

Mr. Anderson encouraged member agencies to apply ARRA bid savings to supplement existing ARRA or federally funded projects. He expressed appreciation to member agencies that had applied ARRA savings to Congestion Mitigation and Air Quality (CMAQ) projects. He explained that by applying the ARRA funds to CMAQ funded projects, member agencies were obligating the ARRA and CMAQ funds and advancing projects deemed ready-to-go.

Moving on, Mr. Anderson discussed the Regional Council meeting the previous evening. He announced that the MAG Regional Council had voted to eliminate the \$200,000 threshold on the reallocation of ARRA bid savings. He displayed the action as amended by the Regional Council, which read (deleted text stricken out; new text underlined):

The local agency with the ARRA project savings will have local discretion to move the project savings to another existing ARRA project in that jurisdiction; and/or swap the ARRA funds with ADOT-STP funds and move the project savings to an eligible project that is above \$200,000 and if all of the required documents and clearances for the project can be completed by July 30, 2010 ~~can obligate before September 30, 2010~~, including new projects. Any jurisdiction that cannot meet the ~~\$200,000 threshold and obligation~~ deadline of July 30 ~~September 30~~, 2010 will return the project savings to the regional pool for reallocation.

Next, Mr. Anderson summarized key ARRA deadlines. He announced that all ARRA projects in the MAG Region had obligated by March 2, 2010, and that all ARRA projects had gone to bid by May 30, 2010. He informed the Committee that ADOT and the Federal Highway Administration would de-obligate bid savings by June 28, 2010 and that ADOT was requiring all clearances and bid package materials to be submitted by July 30, 2010. Mr. Anderson emphasized that the July 30<sup>th</sup> date was a hard deadline established by ADOT.

Mr. Anderson then addressed the required progress of projects to receive ARRA funds. He stated that projects must be in the approved MAG Transportation Improvement Program, the Statewide Transportation Improvement Program, and be assigned an ADOT TRACS number by the end of the day to be eligible for ARRA funds. He stated the review of environmental documents must be underway at ADOT. Mr. Anderson added that a Joint Project Agreement (JPA) between ADOT and the member agency must be executed and the local funds deposited with ADOT by the July 30<sup>th</sup> deadline. He announced that given the deadlines no new projects could be added to the MAG TIP for ARRA funding.

Ms. Pat Dennis from the City of El Mirage inquired if a project would be eligible if the project was listed in an approved TIP, but had not been assigned a TRACS number by ADOT. Mr. Anderson replied that the project needed to be assigned a TRACS number by the end of the day. Ms. Dennis asked if that was the responsibility of the local agency, and Mr. Anderson replied yes.

Mr. Terry Johnson from the City of Glendale questioned the July 30<sup>th</sup> deadline for an executed JPA. He stated that for most projects a project needed to go out to bid to obligate not have an executed JPA in place. Mr. Anderson replied that ADOT preferred that a JPA be in place before obligating a project. He stated that ADOT might make exceptions on a case-by-case basis depending on the status of the other requirements. He added that the JPA was required before a project could go out to bid. Mr. Johnson stated that Glendale had not received a JPA from ADOT for a project, which was included in the MAG TIP in April 2010.

Mr. Grant Anderson from the Town of Youngtown addressed the use of ARRA funds for design. He stated that design did not require the same clearances as other work phases however ADOT was not allowing design to be funded with ARRA. Mr. Eric Anderson replied that a local agency could swap ARRA funds with State Surface Transportation Program (STP-AZ) funds to fund design. Mr. Grant Anderson inquired if the deadlines applied to projects funded

with STP-AZ. Mr. Eric Anderson replied yes emphasizing that the deadlines applied to all federally funded projects.

Mr. Paul Ward from the City of Litchfield Park asked if a local agency needed to apply for a TRACS number by the end of the day or be assigned a TRACS number by the end of the day. Mr. Eric Anderson replied that the projects must be assigned a TRACS number by the end of the day.

Chairman Moody inquired if there were any additional questions or comments about the agenda item. There were none, and he proceeded to the next agenda item.

6. Project Changes/Amendments and Administrative Modifications to the FY 2008-2012 MAG Transportation Improvement Program

Chairman Moody invited Ms. Eileen Yazzie, MAG Transportation Programming Manager, to present project changes to the FY 2008-2012 MAG Transportation Improvement Program (TIP). Ms. Yazzie directed the Committee's attention to a summary transmittal and handout at their places.

Ms. Yazzie explained that three of the project changes were new projects from the Arizona Department of Transportation (ADOT). She stated the projects included a new pavement preservation project, an Intelligent Transportation System (ITS) project, and a transportation enhancement project. She added that the new projects would enable ADOT to closeout their fiscal year.

Ms. Yazzie informed the Committee that the remaining changes pertain to transit projects. She stated that all but three of the transit project listed had been heard at the MAG Transit Committee meeting early in the month. She explained that three projects not heard at the meeting resulted from a timing issue. She added that MAG, the City of Phoenix, and Valley Metro/RPTA would meet during the week to discuss the projects further.

Chairman Moody inquired if there were any questions or comment regarding the agenda item. There were none. Mr. Bryan Jungwirth from Valley Metro/RPTA motioned to approve the amendments and administrative modifications to the FY 2008-2012 MAG TIP and the 2007 Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) Update as appropriate. Mr. Rick Naimark from the City of Phoenix seconded, and the motion passed by a unanimous voice vote of the Committee.

7. Draft Fiscal Year (FY) 2011 Arterial Life Cycle Program (ALCP)

Chairman Moody announced that the Draft Fiscal Year (FY) 2011 Arterial Life Cycle Program (ALCP) Update would not be heard at this time. He informed the Committee that the Draft FY 2011 ALCP would be heard at the next meeting of the Transportation Review Committee.

8. Interim Closeout of the Federal Fiscal Year (FFY) 2010 MAG Federally Funded Program

Continuing on, Mr. Moody invited Ms. Eileen Yazzie, the MAG Transportation Programming Manager, to provide an update on the Federal Fiscal Year (FFY) 2010 Interim Federal Fund Closeout. Ms. Yazzie directed the Committee's attention to a series of handouts at their places and apologized for providing the handouts.

Ms. Yazzie briefly addressed the handouts, which included a memorandum, a project deferral and deletions table, four new deferral requests, two deletion requests, a project submittal table, and a memorandum and CMAQ evaluation table from the MAG Air Quality Technical Advisory Committee. She noted two errors in the project submittal table and stated the errors should not impact any action taken by the Committee.

Ms. Yazzie summarized the FFY 2009 closeout process. She reported that MAG member agencies had spent \$28 million during the previous closeout in an effort to obligate as much as possible. She explained that in obligating a large amount in FFY 2009 that fewer funds would be available for the FFY 2010 Closeout. Ms. Yazzie directed the Committee's attention to the memorandum handout, which explained the funding available for the FFY 2010 Closeout.

Ms. Yazzie informed the Committee that the Federal Transit Administration (FTA) and FHWA had emphasized the need to tighten fiscal constraint in the MAG TIP. She explained that federal funding levels were operating under continuing resolution until the end of December 2010. She stated that MAG need to be conservative with estimates at this point because the federal funding levels were uncertain until a new appropriations bill was passed by the US Congress.

Moving on, Ms. Yazzie provided an overview of closeout funding priorities established in the Draft Federal Fund Programming Principles. According to Ms. Yazzie, the priorities, in sequential order, included advancing projects from a later year to the current year, adding funds to an existing federally funded project, and adding federal funds to a new projects.

Ms. Yazzie informed the Committee that four new project deferral requests had been submitted to MAG Staff. She stated the deferrals requested were first time deferrals that totaled \$4.7 million. She also announced that MAG Staff had received a request from the City of Glendale to delete two projects in the amount of \$196,035. Ms. Yazzie explained that \$2,141,307 in CMAQ funds were available from projects deleted by the City of Mesa in an effort to reprogram and prioritization projects in the City.

Ms. Peggy Rubach inquired about an asterisk next to a City of Surprise project listed in the project submittal table. Ms Yazzie replied that the handout had been cutoff and apologized. She explained that the City of Surprised had requested to advance a portion of funds from the construction phase of a federally funded project to design phase, which was not federally funded. A brief discussion followed.

Ms. Dennis inquired if the agencies requesting to advance federal funds for a project had

committed local funding in the current budget for the projects. Ms Yazzie replied that MAG Staff could verify local funding if the Committee decided to advance the federal funds. She added that ADOT required local agencies to deposit local funds with ADOT before a project could obligate.

Chairman Moody inquired if the representatives from the agencies requesting to advance federal funds could verify local funding. Mr. Bob Beckley from the City of Surprise replied yes. Mr. Paul Ward from the City of Litchfield Park also replied yes.

Mr. David Meinhart from the City of Scottsdale inquired if the change in budget for the City of Surprise project was due to a scope change or lower cost estimates. Ms. Yazzie explained that originally the project was programmed for \$1.7 million; however, the project scope had changed after the project location was altered.

Mr. Johnson stated that the City of Glendale had deleted two federally funded projects and requested those funds be transferred from the deleted projects to the project submitted by the City. Ms. Yazzie replied that the request would not be problematic adding the MAG Staff would look to the Committee for input regarding the request.

Mr. Cato Esquivel noted that a project was listed under CMAQ table and STP table for an identical amount. He inquired if the Committee was being asked to approve the same request twice. Mr. Anderson replied no explaining the seconded table referenced the air quality score for the project. A brief discussion followed.

Mr. Scott Butler from the City of Mesa joined the meeting via audio conference. He was provided a brief update on the agenda item. Mr. Butler expressed support for Mr. Johnson's sentiment and requested that the City of Mesa be allowed to move federal funds from the City's deleted projects to new projects.

Mr. Jungwirth suggested the Committee review the CMAQ scores in light of the air quality issue presented earlier. He inquired how much of the closeout funds for FFY 2010 were CMAQ funds. Ms. Yazzie replied all of the funds. Mr. Jungwirth encouraged the Committee to focus on the PM-10 issue and follow Air Quality Technical Advisory Committee recommendations.

Mr. Ward agreed with Mr. Jungwirth. He stated that the Committee had established specific procedures and policies and encouraged the Committee to review CMAQ scores within the procedures in place. A brief discussion followed. Ms. Yazzie informed the Committee that deferring projects to a later year in the TIP and advancing projects to FFY 2010 would not have a negative impact on the TIP if the amount deferred and advanced balanced.

Mr. Dan Cook noted that a project from the City of Chandler was listed as priority 1-2 although no new funds were included. Ms. Yazzie apologized for the confusion. She explained that the project was listed as a priority 1-2 because the City had informed MAG Staff that the City could not advance the project unless another project, which needed funding, also moved forward.

Mr. Eric Anderson stated that if the first three projects (the Priority 1 projects) were advanced

then \$2.3 million in funding was available for Priority 2 and 3 project. He explained that MAG had encouraged member agencies to review and revise, as needed, federally funded projects in the program. He stated that the cities of Glendale and Mesa had honored that request and were asking to reprogram those funds. Mr. Anderson explained that the city's requests were in line with what MAG had asked.

Mr. Ward motioned to defer the requested federally funded projects from FFY 2010 to FFY 2011 or later year and to advance the priority 1 projects to FFY 2010. Mr. Beckley seconded the motion, and the motion passed by a unanimous voice vote of the Committee.

Chairman Moody stated that another motion was needed to address the remaining \$2.3 million in funding. Mr. Johnson motioned to allocate the closeout funds deleted from FFY 2010 projects by the cities of Glendale and Mesa to those cities respectively. Mr. Johnson requested the Glendale allocation of \$196,035 be programmed for the Skunk Creek project adding that the City of Mesa should coordinate with MAG on programming Mesa's allocation of the \$2,141,307. Mr. Naimark seconded the motion.

Mr. Butler agreed that Mesa would coordinate with MAG on the specific projects if the motion passed. Ms. Yazzie stated that the specific projects must be listed in table before the Committee. Ms. Dennis inquired if the specific project had to be in the MAG TIP. Ms. Yazzie replied yes. Mr. Grant Anderson inquired if the motion as presented would use all of the remaining \$2.3 million. Ms. Yazzie replied yes.

Chairman Moody called for a vote on the motion. The motion passed by a unanimous voice vote of the Committee.

#### 9. Interstate 11 Proposal Update

Chairman Moody invited Mr. Bob Hazlett, MAG Senior Transportation Engineer, to provide an update on the Interstate 11 proposal. Mr. Hazlett informed the Committee that a similar update had been provided to the MAG Transportation Policy Committee and Regional Council previously.

Mr. Hazlett announced that Interstate 11 (I-11) has not received a congressional designation to-date as an official interstate corridor. He explained that I-11 was hypothetical and was not included in the time frame or funds associated with Proposition 400. He added that a movement was underway to have the US Congress designate I-11 as a corridor.

Moving on, Mr. Hazlett provided the background on the development of I-11. He reported that 62 percent of all freight movement in the US traveled through Arizona. He stated a significant amount of through freight could be attributed to coal.

Then, Mr. Hazlett discussed the origins of freight movements. He reported that Long Beach, California was the busiest port in the United States and the fifth busiest port in the world. Mr. Hazlett stated that as globalization continued, the freight activities numbers would increase. He informed the Committee that freight activity at the Long Beach port was projected to triple.

Mr. Hazlett also discussed at port at Punta Colonet, Mexico. He reported that Punta Colonet was under development and that opening accommodations would be one million container units. Mr. Hazlett explained that the accommodations would exceed existing ports, such as Charleston, Houston, and Seattle. He added that by 2030, the capacity of Punta Colonet would exceed New York/New Jersey.

Next, Mr. Hazlett discussed the relationships between the Hassayampa Framework Study, the Union Pacific and BNSF railroads and the interstate system in the western region. He stated the area continued to develop, which required additional infrastructure. He informed the Committee that I-11 would connect Phoenix to Reno and serve as a spine to Mexico. Mr. Hazlett stated I-11 would provide an alternative to Interstate 5. He reported that many in California were in support of I-11 because it would serve as a reliever to Interstate 5, a congested route.

Moving on, Mr. Hazlett summarized gaps and issues. He cited the Boulder City Bypass, bridging the Colorado River at Hoover Dam, and the US-93 widening. He explained that I-11 to Phoenix would need to be addressed. He posited whether the interstate should include an extension into the region. He stated an extension could follow an existing roadway, such as Grand Avenue. He also posited the idea of bypassing Phoenix. A brief discussion followed.

Chairman Moody inquired if there were any additional questions or comment regarding the agenda item. There were none, and Chairman Moody proceeded to the next agenda item.

10. Request for Future Agenda Items

Chairman Moody inquired if the members had any topics or issues of interest they would like to have considered for discussion at a future Committee meeting. There were none, and Chairman Moody moved onto the next agenda item.

11. Member Agency Update

Chairman Moody asked members of the Committee if they would like to provide updates, address any issues or concerns regarding transportation at the regional level, and asked if any members in attendance would like to address recent information that was relevant to transportation within their respective communities. There were none.

12. Next Meeting Date

Chairman Moody informed members in attendance that the next regularly scheduled meeting of the Committee would be held on July 1, 2010. There be no further business, Chairman Moody adjourned the meeting at 12:03 p.m.