MARICOPA ASSOCIATION of GOVERNMENTS

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

August 24, 2010

TO: Members of the MAG Transportation Review Committee

FROM: David Moody, City of Peoria, Chair

SUBJECT: MEETING NOTIFICATION AND TRANSMITTAL OF TENTATIVE AGENDA

TUESDAY, August 31, 2010, 10:00 a.m.
MAG Office, Suite 200, Saguaro Room
302 North 1st Avenue, Phoenix

A meeting of the MAG Transportation Review Committee (TRC) will be held at the time and place noted above. **Please park in the garage under the building. Bring your ticket to the meeting as parking will be validated. Bicycles can be locked in the rack at the entrance to the parking garage.**

The next meeting of the MAG Transportation Review Committee will be held at the time and place noted above. Committee members or their proxies may attend **in person, via videoconference or by telephone conference call**. Those attending video conference must notify the MAG site three business days prior to the meeting. Those attending by telephone conference call please contact MAG offices for conference call instructions.

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

Please be advised that under procedures adopted by the MAG Regional Council on June 26, 1996, all MAG committees need to have a quorum in order to conduct business. A quorum is a simple majority of the membership or twelve people for the MAG TRC. If the Transportation Review Committee does not meet the quorum requirement, members who have arrived at the meeting will be instructed a legal meeting cannot occur and subsequently be dismissed. Your attendance at the meeting is strongly encouraged. If you are unable to attend the meeting, please make arrangements for a proxy from your jurisdiction to represent you. Please contact Eric Anderson or Christina Hopes at (602) 254-6300 if you have any questions or need additional information.

TENTATIVE AGENDA

	COMMITTEE ACTION REQUESTED
1. Call to Order	
2. Approval of Draft July 1, 2010 Minutes	2. Approve Draft minutes of the July 1, 2010 meeting.
3. Call to the Audience An opportunity will be provided to members of the public to address the Transportation Review 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 Review Committee requests an exception to this limit.	3. For information and discussion.
4. Transportation Director's Report Recent transportation planning activities and upcoming agenda items for the MAG Management Committee will be reviewed by the Transportation Director.	4. For information and discussion.

ITEMS TO BE HEARD

5. Amendment of the MAG Regional Transportation Plan – 2010 Update On July 28, 2010, the MAG Regional Council approved the FY 2011-2015 Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) and the MAG Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) – 2010 Update. In late July, transit service level adjustments due to reductions in revenues, including repeal of the Local Transportation Assistance Fund (LTAF), were finalized by transit service providers and reflected in transit schedules published in July 2010. These changes impacted the transit service levels in the RTP and the corresponding transportation network modeling assumptions.	5. Information, discussion, and possible recommendation to amend the MAG Regional Transportation Plan – 2010 Update to incorporate public transit service level adjustments resulting from reductions in revenues, including repeal of the Local Transportation Assistance Fund, that were reflected in public transit service schedules published in July 2010. This action would be contingent upon a finding of conformity of the FY 2011-2015 MAG Transportation Improvement Program and the MAG Regional Transportation Plan – 2010 Update with applicable air quality plans.

An air quality conformity regional emissions analysis reflecting the new modeling assumptions has been conducted and indicates that the TIP and RTP will not contribute to violations of federal air quality standards.

6. Programming of FY 2011 Highway Safety Improvement Projects

The Arizona Department of Transportation (ADOT) distributes 20 percent of the federal Highway Safety Improvement Program (HSIP) funds the State receives to all Metropolitan Planning Organizations and Council of Governments. The share received by MAG, starting in Fiscal Year (FY) 2010, is $1 million each year and needs to be programmed for qualifying safety projects. For FY2011, MAG-HSIP funded safety projects must be obligated by the ADOT deadline of May 1, 2011. The Transportation Safety Committee has reviewed the availability of federal HSIP funds for road safety improvements in the MAG region , the urgency for FY 2011 MAG-HSIP project obligation and has generated a recommendation for the programming of safety projects in FY 2011. The Safety Committee recommendation not only addresses FY 2011 but will be helpful in developing a systematic multi-year program for implementing road safety improvements across the MAG region. Please refer to Attachment One for additional information.

6. For information, discussion and possible action to recommend the programming process for FY 2011 safety projects: The $1million in FY 2011 MAG HSIP and $200,000 in MAG FY 2011 planning funds to be programmed as follows: (1) $800,000 for systematic safety improvements involving projects that are classified as Categorical Exclusion Group 1; and (2) $400,000 for performing Road Safety Assessments (RSAs) or developing Project Assessment (PAs)/Design Concept Reports (DCRs) for high risk intersections identified through the network screening process based on the Top 100 Intersection List and the state's Top Five Percent Report.

7. Update on Exceptional Events, the MAG Five Percent Plan for PM-10, and Possible Effects on Transportation Programming

On May 25, 2010, the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) Region IX Administrator announced that EPA would not concur with the Arizona Department of Environmental Quality (ADEQ) documentation regarding four exceptional events at the West 43rd Avenue monitor. It is MAG's and ADEQ's position that the exceedances at the West 43rd Avenue monitor are caused by high winds and the surface

7. For information and discussion

conditions in the vicinity of the monitor. EPA does not concur with ADEQ and MAG's technical analysis, resulting in a potential disapproval of the MAG Five Percent Plan for PM-10. EPA has to propose action on the Five Percent Plan for PM-10 by September 3, 2010, and finalize the action by January 28, 2011. If EPA proposes disapproval of the Plan, in whole or in part, the sanctions process will be triggered. MAG Staff will brief the Committee.

8. <u>State of Transit in the Region</u>

Through the MAG Committee process starting at the Transit Committee, MAG programs transit projects to be funded with federal funds while working cooperatively with MAG member agencies, the designated grant recipient (City of Phoenix), and the transit operators in the region: City of Phoenix, Regional Public Transportation Authority (RPTA), Valley Metro Rail (METRO), City of Surprise, City of Glendale, City of Tempe, City of Scottsdale, and the City of Peoria. Fiscal year (FY) 2010 was a transition year for transit programming. In the past, the effort was led by RPTA, using prioritized guidelines as explained in the attachment. Last year, the responsibility shifted to MAG. FY 2011 will continue to be a transition year for transit programming. MAG needs to develop regional transit programming guidelines/priorities/evaluation criteria for federal funds and a process on how to integrate Transportation Life Cycle Program (TLCP) material changes to the Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) through the MAG Committee process. An overview of the State of Transit in the Region will be presented to aid member agency leaders in providing input to staff and the Transit Committee in developing the regional transit programming guidelines/priorities/evaluation criteria for federal funds.

8. For information and discussion

9. Federal Fund Working Group

During 2009, MAG held two meetings of the Federal Fund Working Group to review how projects using federal transportation funds are managed for the Transportation Improvement Program Process. The Working Group was formed in response to the difficulty experienced by MAG in fully obligating the federal funds for which MAG is responsible for programming and managing. The focus of the Working Group discussions were for highway and street projects using Congestion Mitigation and Air Quality (CMAQ) and Surface Transportation Program (STP) funds. Subsequently, MAG has assumed the responsibility for programming Federal Transit Administration (FTA) funds including 5307 and 5309 funds. MAG staff will present the background information provided to the Working Group and a summary of the preliminary recommendations.

9. For information and discussion.

10. Update to the Federal Functional Classification System

The most recent update to the federal functional classification of roadways in Maricopa County occurred in 2005 and primarily focused on the urban area. Since then, substantial growth has occurred and the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) has modified the definitions used in the system and introduced significant data collection requirements. To address these issues, MAG Staff is proposing a two-phase update to the system in the MAG Region. The first phase will develop an updated arterial network for Regional Council approval by January 2011. The second phase will develop an updated collector network for approval by March 2011. The primary work would be performed by the MAG Street Committee with final review and approval conducted through the MAG Committee process. Please refer to Attachment Two for additional information.

10. For information and discussion.

11. Request for Future Agenda Items

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

11. For information and discussion.

12. Member Agency Update

This section of the Agenda will provide Committee members with an opportunity to share information regarding a variety of transportation-related issues within their respective communities.

12. For information.

13. Next Meeting Date

The next regular TRC meeting will be scheduled Thursday, September 23, 2010 at 10:00 a.m. in the MAG Office, Saguaro Room.

13. For information.

DRAFT MINUTES OF THE
MARICOPA ASSOCIATION OF GOVERNMENTS
TRANSPORTATION REVIEW COMMITTEE

July 1, 2010
Maricopa Association of Governments Office
302 North First Avenue, Suite 200, Saguaro Room
Phoenix, Arizona

MEMBERS ATTENDING

Peoria: David Moody
ADOT: Steve Hull for Floyd Roehrich
Avondale: Shirley Gunther for David Fitzhugh
Buckeye: Scott Lowe
Chandler: RJ Zeder for Patrice Kraus
El Mirage: Jorge Gastelum 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 Turrubiartes
Litchfield Park: Paul Ward for Woody Scoutten
Maricopa County: John Hauskins
Mesa: Jeff Martin for Scott Butler
*Paradise Valley: Bill Mead
Phoenix: Rick Naimark
Queen Creek: Tom Condit
RPTA: Bob Antilla for Bryan Jungwirth
Scottsdale: Dave Meinhart
Surprise: Bob Beckley
Tempe: Jyme Sue McLaren for 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
Alice Chen, MAG
Maureen DeCindis, MAG
Bob Hazlett, MAG
Micah, Henry, MAG
Roger Roy, MAG
Ed Stillings, FHWA
Susan Flores-Dias, FHWA
Steve Hull, ADOT
Kwi-Sung Kang, ADOT
Jeanna Goad, Glendale
Brent Stoddard, Glendale
Andy Granger, Peoria
Chris Plumb, Phoenix
Shane Silsby, Phoenix
Karen Savage, Surprise
Jeanne Sapon, Austin Bridge & Road
Tim Muller, Austin Bridge & Road
Art Brook, Strand
Andrew Matusak, Baker
Vinay Vanapalli, Stantec Inc.

1. Call to Order

Chairman David Moody from the City of Peoria called the meeting to order at 10:01 a.m.

2. Approval of Draft May 27, 2010 Minutes

Chairman Moody asked if there were any changes or amendments to the May 27, 2010 meeting minutes, and there were none. Mr. Bob Antilla from Valley Metro/RPTA motioned to approve the minutes. Mr. Paul Ward from the City of Litchfield Park 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 year-to-date Regional Area Road Fund (RARF) revenues were down 9.2 percent. He stated that actual revenue collection for fiscal year (FY) 2010 was approximately $300 million compared to the forecasted revenue collection of $315 million.

Mr. Anderson reported that RARF revenues for May were relatively flat. He stated this was positive news given the consistent decline in sales tax revenues over the previous two years. He added that some jurisdictions in the region had experienced a slight increase in revenues.

Next, Mr. Anderson addressed the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act of 2009 (ARRA). He stated that although the status report was on consent, he would like to provide additional information regarding ARRA. Mr. Anderson announced that the majority of jurisdictions had spent their respective ARRA allocation noting $292,390 in ARRA bid savings. He stated that the region had met the goal of spending all of the funds allocated to the region. Mr. Anderson stated that the ARRA process emphasized areas that needed improvement between local governments, MAG, and the Arizona Department of Transportation (ADOT). He announced that ADOT's Local Governments Section would be updating their manual. Mr. Anderson stated that MAG had offered to assist ADOT with the undertaking citing MAG's research on efforts in other states and regions.

Mr. Anderson reported that he and Ms. Eileen Yazzie, MAG Transportation Programming Manager, had met with ADOT management to discuss a local government's tracking system. He explained the system would allow agencies to determine where projects were in the federal process. He stated that the system would generate an email if a project was not progressing through the federal process in accordance with established time frames. Mr. Anderson reported

that ADOT had hired additional staff and was working to bring the department into the 21st century.

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

Addressing the next item of business, Chairman Moody directed the Committee's attention to the consent agenda. He asked the Committee if there were any questions or comments regarding the consent agenda item 5a on the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act (ARRA) Status Report. There were none. Mr. John Hauskins from Maricopa County motioned to approve the consent agenda. Mr. Grant Anderson from the Town of Youngtown seconded, and the motion passed with a unanimous voice vote of the Committee.

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 handouts at their places.

Ms. Yazzie announced that MAG Staff has received a request from the Town of Buckeye for a one-time deferral a federally fund project to a later year. She explained that MAG had not received the request before the agenda had been mailed, which was why a Federal Fund Closeout item was not on the agenda. She added that a closeout item would be included on agendas as the request proceeded through the MAG Committee process for approval.

Ms. Yazzie noted another project change. She stated that as staff worked to closeout Federal Fiscal Year (FFY) 2010 that an issue had been noted with the 5309 discretionary funds. She stated that a project needed to be re-added to the TIP for tracking and to ensure those funds were available.

Chairman Moody inquired if there were any questions or comment regarding the agenda item. There were none. Mr. Jeff Martin from the City of Mesa motioned to approve the amendments and administrative modifications to the FY 2008-2012 MAG TIP. Mr. Hauskins seconded, and the motion passed by a unanimous voice vote of the Committee.

Before moving on to the next agenda item, Ms. Peggy Rubach, the Bicycle/Pedestrian Committee representative, thanked MAG Staff for their efforts in developing the Draft FY 2011-2015 Transportation Improvement Program and Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) - 2010 Update. She stated that staff efforts had reduced the work required by local agencies, which made the process relatively painless for the local agencies.

7. L101 High Occupancy Vehicle (HOV) Lane Budget Increase

Moving on, Chairman Moody invited Mr. Anderson to discuss the Loop 101 High Occupancy Vehicle (HOV) budget increase request. Before addressing the request, Mr. Anderson provided a summary of the project's history. He stated that in January 2010, the Regional Council approved a design–build project to construct HOV lanes on L101 from Tatum Boulevard to the junction with Interstate-10 in the West Valley as a project to use a potential second round of stimulus funding.

Mr. Anderson reported that in May 2010, the Regional Council was informed that the prospects for the second round of stimulus funding had diminished, but that ADOT and MAG had determined the $138.5 million project could be funded from the available cash flows of the Freeway Life Cycle Program. He explained that since then, ADOT recommended the proposed project budget be increased by $9 million to include the realignment of the freeway in the vicinity of the Maryland Overpass as part of the design-build project in order to accommodate planned direct access ramps in the future. Mr. Anderson stated that the initial plan for the Maryland Overpass included direct connection ramps to provide access to a nearby park-and-ride lot and the Westgate and the University of Phoenix stadium complex.

Mr. Anderson announced that through a review of program cashflows with ADOT, MAG Staff was recommending that the project budget be increased by $9.0 million to $147.5 million. He explained that as the HOV lanes were being built, ADOT determined it would be cost-effective to bow out the alignment for future ramps. Mr. Anderson stated that it was important to make cost-effective adjustments to the freeway alignments. He added that in conversations with Mr. Steve Hull from ADOT that there was a significant possibility that the project would come in below budget anyway.

Mr. Hauskins recommended that the Loop 101 HOV project budget be increased by $9 million to include the proposed realignment of the freeway in the vicinity of Maryland Avenue. Mr. Zeder seconded the motion. Mr. Rick Naimark from the City of Phoenix inquired about the source of the additional $9 million in funding. Mr. Anderson replied that the funding was available through cash flows and project savings on other projects, such as the right-of-way acquisition for Loop 303.

Chairman Moody asked if there were any additional questions or comments about the agenda item, and there were none. Chairman Moody called for a vote on the motion, and the motion passed unanimously.

8. Public Hearing on Draft FY 2011-2015 MAG Transportation Improvement Program, Draft Regional Transportation Plan – 2010 Update, and Draft 2010 MAG Conformity Analysis

Continuing on, Mr. Moody invited Mr. Jason Stephens from MAG to present on the public hearing on the Draft MAG FY2011-2015 TIP, the Draft RTP 2010 Update, and the Draft 2010 MAG Conformity Analysis. Mr. Stephens reported that a public hearing was held on June 21, 2010 to receive comments on the draft documents.

Mr. Stephens stated that majority of comment received pertained to transit. He explained that the public was concerned about transit service cuts, especially dial-a-ride services. He stated the individuals also expressed concerns about safety on the bus and light rail systems. Mr. Stephens added that the public had requested a review of the RTP to determine how transit could play a larger role in the Plan.

Mr. Stephens reported that several comments had been made about the Transit Life Cycle Program (TLCP). He stated that the public questioned why some TLCP projects were programmed after FY 2025. He also reported that concerns were expressed about transit cuts in the west valley.

Ms. Rubach stated that Valley Metro/RPTA also had held public hearings. She stated that if the comments from the MAG public hearings were published that they would be helpful to the Valley Metro/RPTA. Mr. Stephens stated he would get the comments to Ms. Rubach that week.

Mr. Martin inquired in the comments from the public hearings would be provided to the elected officials in the region. Mr. Stephens replied that the comments would be provided to the officials at the Management Committee, Transportation Policy Committee, and Regional Council meetings.

Mr. Martin stated that it was important for the elected officials to receive the comments. He stated that sometimes the region focused too much on freeways when transit system were poor. Mr. Martin suggested that MAG review the coverage of transit service across the valley. He stated that while some areas have good coverage other areas do not have transit service at all. He added that he was unsure if current state of the transit system had been adequately conveyed to elected officials.

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

9. DRAFT FY 2011-2015 MAG Transportation Improvement Program

Chairman Moody invited Ms. Eileen Yazzie, MAG Transportation Programing Manager, to present the Draft Fiscal Year (FY) 2011-2015 MAG Transportation Improvement Program (TIP). Ms. Yazzie stated that full copy of the Draft TIP was not sent out with the agenda packet due to printing costs. She explained that an electronic copy of the current draft was available for download from the MAG-TIP website for those interested. Ms. Yazzie informed the Committee that minor modifications may be made to the Draft TIP as the document proceeded through the MAG Committee process.

Ms. Yazzie stated that the Safe, Accountable, Flexible, Efficient Transportation Equity Act: A Legacy for Users (SAFETEA-LU) required Metropolitan Planning Organizations to report on transportation investments within their region. She announced that the Act had expired; however, Congress had approved continuing resolutions until a new bill was enacted. Ms.

Yazzie explained that the TIP may need to be revisited depending on the provisions of the new Act.

Ms. Yazzie explained that under the current legislation, an approved TIP must report on all federally funded and regionally significant projects as well as provide information of the air quality analysis. She stated the federal regulations mandated that the TIP cover a four-year period and must be updated every four years at a minimum. Ms. Yazzie informed the Committee that the MAG TIP currently covered a five-year period and had been updated every one to two years.

Ms. Yazzie stated that MAG Staff worked with federal, state, and local agencies through the TIP Guidance Report process. She stated that local agencies updated project data through the TIP Data Entry System, which was then incorporated into the Draft TIP. Ms. Yazzie explained that while gathering and analyzing data for the TIP, MAG Staff accounted for public and technical input through an established process.

Next, Ms. Yazzie discussed the number and type of projects programmed in the Draft TIP. She stated the Draft TIP included over 1,200 projects. She detailed the projects programmed by category, which included 568 street projects, 208 transit projects (bus & rail), 166 freeway projects, 82 ITS projects, 75 bicycle/pedestrian projects, 92 air quality or transportation demand management projects, 11 bridge projects, 10 safety projects, and 20 maintenance projects.

Then, Ms. Yazzie discussed funding commitments in the Draft TIP. She reported that approximately $7 billion in funding was committed between FY2011 and FY 2015. She stated that the funding commitment had decreased by 6 percent in comparison to the approved FY 2008-2012 TIP. Ms. Yazzie noted that the two largest funding commitments were from local agencies and the Regional Area Road Fund. She stated the two sources accounted for 66 percent of the $5.9 billion of committed Highway project funds.

Ms. Yazzie moved on to discuss transit project funding. She explained that federal transit funds accounted for 45 percent of transit funding in the Draft TIP. She stated the Public Transit Funds, which were the half cent sales tax funds designated for transit projects, comprised 23 percent of the total $1.43 billion committed to fund transit projects in the region. Ms. Yazzie noted that $358 million of the $413 million in local transit funding was associated with the City of Phoenix's Airport Sky Train project. She added that without that project, the local commitment to transit would be approximately $50 million.

Mr. John Farry from METRO noted that highway projects included state funding while transit projects did not. He stated the lack of transit funding from the State was a critical point. He informed the Committee that Arizona was one of five states in the country that did not fund transit at the state level. Chairman Moody encouraged Ms. Yazzie to make a notation on the slide as the presentation proceeded through the Committee process.

Mr. Meinhart inquired about the $11 million in funding from ADOT. He asked if the funding was proportionally based on population or had the formula changed since the region had a

transportation sales tax. Ms. Yazzie stated she would look into the issue further and report back to the Committee.

Ms. Yazzie announced that MAG Staff would seek approval of the Draft TIP throughout July with presentations being made to the Management Committee, Transportation Policy Committee, and the MAG Regional Council. She explained that once the Draft TIP was approved by the Regional Council, MAG Staff would submit the TIP to the State for approval. She stated that after the State's approval, the TIP would be sent to the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) and Federal Transit Administration (FTA) for approval of the conformity analysis. Ms. Yazzie explained that pending FHWA and FTA approval, the TIP would then be incorporated into the State Transportation Improvement Program (STIP).

Mr. Anderson provided a brief update on the air quality particulate matter issue. He stated that MAG had not received additional information on the disapproval timeline. He reported that MAG Staff anticipated being unsuccessful in overcoming the Environmental Protection Agency's objections. Mr. Anderson explained that if MAG was unsuccessful, the region would be under a conformity freeze in January 2011. He added that between now and January, MAG Staff would be very aggressive about amending the TIP.

Chairman Moody inquired if Ms. Lindy Bauer, MAG Environmental Director, should provide a status update to the Committee. Mr. Anderson replied that Ms. Bauer would probably provide an update to the Committee at the next meeting. A brief discussion followed about the air quality and the potential conformity freeze.

Mr. David Meinhart from the City of Scottsdale expressed concerns about the allocation of transit funding for preventive maintenance. Ms. Yazzie replied that the preventive maintenance programmed was inherited from RPTA. She added that MAG Staff did not have sufficient time in open up the rationale behind the existing allocations stating that it was a priority in the upcoming year. Ms. Yazzie stated that MAG Staff would review preventative maintenance for all operators. A brief discussion followed.

Mr. Meinhart motioned to recommend approval of the Draft FY2011-2015 MAG Transportation Improvement Program, contingent on a finding of conformity of the TIP and Regional Transportation Plan 2010 Update with applicable air quality plans and that the programming of transit preventative maintenance be reviewed for potential amendments and administration modifications no later than December 2010. Mr. Hauskins seconded, and motion passed by a unanimous voice vote of the Committee.

10. Draft FY 2011 Arterial Life Cycle Program (ALCP)

Chairman Moody invited Ms. Christina Hopes from MAG to present on the Draft Fiscal Year (FY) 2011 Arterial Life Cycle Program (ALCP). Ms. Hopes announced that her presentation would address the development of the Draft FY2011 ALCP, revenue streams, inflation, and project changes in the ALCP. She informed the Committee that the annual update process was initiated in November 2009 with the release of customized annual update workbooks. She

stated the MAG Staff and Lead Agency Staff coordinated over the following months to update project schedules and costs in the Draft FY11 ALCP and Draft FY11-15 MAG Transportation Improvement Program (TIP).

Ms. Hopes discussed decreasing program revenues over the past two years. She addressed the deferral of $22 million in programmed reimbursement to FY2027 or later in the during the development of the FY2010 ALCP. Ms. Hopes announced that no additional funds were deferred to FY2027 or later in the Draft FY2011. However, she noted that programmed reimbursements shifted in the Draft FY2011 ALCP due to revenue stream changes in STP-MAG funds.

Next, Ms. Hopes addressed inflation in the ALCP. She reported that the Draft FY2011 ALCP had been inflated from 2009$ to 2010$ using an inflation factor of 1.588 percent. She explained that all programmed reimbursements were inflated in accordance with the ALCP Policies and Procedures approved by the MAG Regional Council on December 9, 2009.

Then, Ms. Hopes discussed reimbursements and deferrals in the FY2010 ALCP. She announced that $55.9 million had been reimbursed in FY2010. She attributed 57 percent of the reimbursements for the year to the FY2010 Regional Area Road Fund (RARF) Closeout Process. Ms. Hopes reported that $37.3 million in programmed reimbursements had been deferred to FY2011 or a later year. She stated that 36 projects were deferred to another phase during the annual update. She attributed the number of deferrals to economic hardships encountered by member agencies as well as declining local revenues.

Ms. Hopes summarized project changes made in the Draft FY2011 ALCP. She informed the Committee that the ALCP Policies and Procedures required significant project changes, such as substitute projects and changes in project scope, to be presented to the MAG Street Committee for approval before inclusion in the Draft ALCP. She reported that the cities of Chandler, Peoria, and Phoenix had requested project changes that required Street Committee approval. Ms. Hopes provided a brief overview of those changes, which included adding substitute projects and changes in project scope. She also noted that in the Draft ALCP eight project advanced, four projects changed in scope, two project segments were combined, and two projects were exchanged. A brief discussion followed.

Chairman Moody asked if there were any questions or comments about the agenda item. There were none. Mr. RJ Zeder from the City of Chandler motioned to approve the Draft FY 2011 Arterial Life Cycle Program contingent on a new Finding of Conformity for the Regional Transportation Plan 2010 Update and FY2011-2015 MAG Transportation Improvement Program with the applicable State and Federal air quality implementation plans. Mr. Meinhart seconded the motion, and the motion passed by a unanimous voice vote of the Committee.

11. <u>The Draft MAG Regional Transportation Plan - 2010 Update</u>

Chairman Moody invited Mr. Roger Herzog from MAG to present on the Draft MAG Regional Transportation Plan 2010 Update. Mr. Herzog stated that only the executive summary of the

Draft Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) 2010 Update was sent out with the agenda packet due to costs. He stated that an electronic copy of the full report was available for download from the MAG-RTP website for those interested.

Mr. Herzog informed the Committee that the RTP Update addressed a wide range of projects, such as freight, transportation demand management, and safety projects. He explained that the RTP Update was a comprehensive document that extended out to FY 2031. He stated the plan was divided into phases with each phase covering a period of five years.

Mr. Herzog announced that the major planning issues addressed in the update was declining revenues. He stated the region had faced a historic decline over the past few years. He explained that declining revenues required adjustments to the three life cycle programs in the RTP: the Freeway Life Cycle Program (FLCP), the Transit Life Cycle Program (TLCP), and the Arterial Life Cycle Program (ALCP). Mr. Herzog reported that adjustments to these life cycle programs had been made through MAG Committee process over the last year.

Next, Mr. Herzog addressed public input in the update process. He informed the Committee that MAG Staff had conducted a series of public hearings to receive input for the update. He stated the first public hearing occurred in June 2009 and focused on transportation planning issues and the programming outlook. He stated the second public hearing was held in October 2009 and focused on cost and revenue factors and plan/program adjustments. He reported that the third meeting, which was held in March 2010, reviewed the Draft RTP Update. Mr. Herzog announced that the final public hearing was held on June 21, 2010, and included the Draft RTP, TIP, and air quality conformity analysis.

Chairman Moody asked if there were any questions or comments about the presentation, and there were none. Mr. Meinhart motioned to recommend approval of the Draft MAG Regional Transportation Plan - 2010 Update, contingent upon a finding of conformity with the applicable State and Federal air quality implementation plans and that the programming of transit preventative maintenance as included in the RTP Update be reviewed for potential amendments and administration modifications no later than December 2010. Mr. Grant Anderson seconded the motion, and the motion passed by a unanimous voice vote.

Mr. Johnson stated that part of the intent of agenda item seven was that the RTP would include the ramps as an illustrative project. Chairman Moody concurred that it was the intent adding that language of the intent had not been included in the motion for agenda item seven. Mr. Hauskins motion to reconsider the vote for agenda item seven. Mr. Johnson seconded the motion, and the motion passed by a unanimous voice vote.

Then, Mr. Johnson motioned that the previous motion for agenda item seven stand with the addition in the Regional Transportation Plan 2010 Update of the ramps at Loop 101 and Maryland as an illustrative project. Mr. Grant Anderson seconded the motion, and the motion passed by a unanimous voice vote.

12. 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.

Mr. Grant Anderson inquired when MAG would provide an update on the Federal Fund Working Group efforts. Mr. Eric Anderson apologized for the delay citing pressing issues, including the potential conformity freeze. He stated an update would provided at the next meting.

Mr. Grant Anderson also inquired if a report on the ARRA allocations could be made. Mr. Eric Anderson replied that a presentation could be made to the Committee once all the information was available.

Ms. Rubach inquired about the sustainability and livability grant. She asked if there was a way the Committee could assist with improving the application. Mr. Anderson replied that Ms. Amy St. Peter at MAG was the lead contact on the application. He explained that a meeting on the grant application was held the previous day and encouraged interested individuals to contact Ms. St. Peter to be added to the mailing list.

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

13. 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.

Ms. Rubach expressed gratitude to MAG Staff for their efforts on Desert Peaks. She stated the event was a success and provided encouragement to further regional activities. Chairman Moody asked if there were any additional comments, and there were none.

14. Next Meeting Date

Chairman Moody informed members in attendance that the next regularly scheduled meeting of the Committee would be held on July 31, 2010. There be no further business, Chairman Moody adjourned the meeting at 11:00 a.m.

ATTACHMENT ONE

MARICOPA ASSOCIATION of GOVERNMENTS

302 North 1st Avenue, Suite 300 ▲ Phoenix, Arizona 85003
Phone (602) 254-6300 ▲ FAX (602) 254-6490
Email: mag@mag.maricopa.gov ▲ Website: www.mag.maricopa.gov

August 24, 2010

TO: Members of the MAG Transportation Review Committee

FROM: Sarath Joshua, ITS & Safety Program Manager

SUBJECT: PROGRAMMING OF FY 2011 HIGHWAY SAFETY IMPROVEMENT PROJECTS

This memorandum describes the Transportation Safety Committee's recommendation for programming of safety projects in FY 2011. This recommendation will guide the programming of $1.0 million in federal Highway Safety Improvement Program (HSIP) funds that MAG receives from ADOT for FY 2011. The committee also recommends an additional $200,000 be included as an amendment to the MAG Work Program for FY 2011. These funds would be applied towards implementation of systematic safety improvements and for the performance of safety investigations that must precede larger safety improvement projects. The committee anticipates that this approach will be helpful in developing a multi-year program to address high priority road safety improvements in the region.

The Arizona Department of Transportation (ADOT) receives approximately $30 million in federal HSIP funds for road safety improvements each fiscal year. Ten (10) percent of the funds are used by ADOT to implement specific recommendations in the state's Strategic Highway Safety Plan (SHSP). Starting with FY 2010, twenty (20) percent of the funds are being distributed by ADOT to all MPOs and COGs, with MAG receiving $1.0 million each fiscal year, referred to as MAG-HSIP. Seventy (70) percent of the HSIP funds are available for road safety improvements on all public roads. ADOT will be establishing a process for applying these funds towards safety projects statewide. These funds are referred to as 70 Percent HSIP.

The $1.0 million in MAG-HSIP receives each fiscal year can be applied toward qualifying road safety improvement projects at the discretion of MAG. All projects need to be programed and obligated by the deadline stipulated by ADOT for each fiscal year. The deadline for obligating the FY 2011 MAG-HSIP funds is May 1, 2011. For FY 2010, ten (10) safety projects were programmed in the MAG TIP, based on a recommendation from the Transportation Safety Committee. All FY 2010 projects involved systematic safety improvements that are considered Group 1 Categorical Exclusions. They included pedestrian countdown timers and traffic signal upgrades from 9-inch to 12-inch signal heads and LED conversions.

Strategy for Developing a Road Safety Improvement Program

In addition to the immediate need to program the $1.0 million in MAG-HSIP for FY 2011, the Transportation Safety Committee also recognized the need to develop a list of larger safety improvement projects that could qualify for the 70 Percent HSIP funds from ADOT. Developing such a list of projects to meet both FHWA and ADOT criteria requires project feasibility investigations. Road Safety Assessments, or RSA, (previously known as Road Safety Audits) are increasingly being adopted across the country as a best practice for identifying road safety improvement needs. These assessments are typically performed by multi-disciplinary teams of safety professionals with sound local knowledge.

The 2005 MAG Strategic Transportation Safety Plan recommended the introduction of Road Safety Assessments in the region. ADOT has an established RSA program and have performed many RSAs across the state, including a few in the MAG region, at the request of local jurisdictions. Due to lack of resources, however, ADOT is unable to accept requests for RSAs from MAG jurisdictions at this time. MAG is currently developing on-call consulting contracts with several engineering firms that are qualified to perform RSAs. Recommendations that typically result from RSAs can lead to safety improvement projects that range from low cost improvements to major infrastructure changes, depending on site conditions. Projects that involve major infrastructure changes may require additional investigations that could lead to Project Assessments (PAs) or Design Concept Reports (DCRs).

To qualify for federal HSIP funds a safety project must demonstrate that it improves safety at a location that is ranked high for severe crash consequences. There are two lists of high crash risk sites available for use for this purpose. The first is an annual report submitted by ADOT to FHWA and is called the Five Percent Report, which is a SAFETEA-LU requirement for all state DOTs. The second is the list of top 100 intersections in the MAG region that have the most severe crash consequences. The latter is based on the MAG Network Screening Methodology for Intersections, developed by MAG staff, with oversight from the Safety Committee, to identify and rank intersections with high crash consequences. The analysis examined crashes at 17,000 intersections in the region, and is based on a well reviewed methodology currently being used by the Wisconsin DOT. Both these high crash risk lists are referred to in the recommendation below.

The MAG Transportation Safety Committee recommends that, for FY 2011, the $1million in MAG HSIP and a further $200,000 in MAG planning funds be programmed as follows:

1) $800,000 for systematic safety improvements involving projects that are classified as Categorical Exclusion Group 1 (a CE Group 1 list has been provided by ADOT). Projects will be identified through a MAG call for projects and a recommendation to be generated by the Transportation Safety Committee for a FY 2011 TIP amendment.

2) $200,000 for performing Road Safety Assessments or developing Project Assessment/Design Concept Reports at high risk intersections identified through the network screening process (possibly up to 10 locations).

3) An additional $200,000 for performing Road Safety Assessments or developing Project Assessments/Design Concept Reports at high risk intersections identified through the network screening process (possibly upto 10 locations). These funds to come from an amendment to the FY 2011 MAG Unified Planning Work Program.

4) The selection of sites for RSAs and PA/DCR will be based on the Top 100 Intersection List and the state's Top Five Percent Report. The RSAs and PA/DCR will be carried out by MAG using qualified on-call consultants.

The completion of RSAs and PA/DCRs for high crash locations in the region would position these projects for 70 Percent HSIP funds from ADOT in future program years. ADOT has recently indicated to MAG that they intend to begin developing a process to accommodate such high priority road safety improvement projects across the entire state.

ATTACHMENT TWO

MARICOPA ASSOCIATION of GOVERNMENTS

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

August 24, 2010

TO: Members of the Transportation Review Committee

FROM: Stephen Tate, Transportation Planner

SUBJECT: UPDATE OF THE FEDERAL FUNCTONAL CLASSIFICATION

The federal functional classification system of roadways was last updated in 2005 and focuses on the urbanized area. Since then the roadway network in the MAG area has increased by over 1,400 miles and federal data collection requirements for functionally classified roadways have been expanded. The federal functional classification system is used for two primary reasons: federal data reporting and eligibility for FHWA federal funding (*please see Appendix B for more information on eligibility requirements*).

Working through the MAG Street Committee in coordination with the Arizona Department of Transportation (ADOT) and Federal Highway Administration (FHWA), it is proposed to update the federal functional classification system in two steps:

1. Undertake a count of public roadways, and review the arterial streets for "Principal" and "Minor" classifications. The results of this step will be forwarded through the MAG Committee process for potential approval by the Regional Council in January 2011.
2. The second step will review and expand the classification of collector roadways. Information required for re-classification of roadways include: ownership, road description, length in miles, number of through lanes, posted speed limit, average annual daily traffic, and the international roughness index (IRI) data for principal arterial classified roadways. The results of this review would then be forwarded through the MAG Committee process for potential approval by the Regional Council in March 2011.

It is anticipated that this update will have no significant funding impacts. The total federal highway funding received by the State is determined by its contribution to the Highway Trust Fund. The division between different categories of federal funding could be affected as the update will probably increase federally functionally classified mileage and potentially decrease the mileage of roadway classified as principal arterial. Both of these changes could increase total Surface Transportation Program (STP) funding (and possibly STP sub allocated to MAG) at the expense of other federal funding categories, however, based on previous communications with FHWA it is anticipated that such changes would be

very minor – somewhere in the range of $300,000 per year statewide. ***Please see the Appendix A for more information.***

Historical Background

In 1993, MAG in conjunction with the Arizona Department of Transportation (ADOT), acted to classify roadways in accord with federal guidelines. These guidelines indicated that procedures "for functional classification in urbanized areas should be developed within the framework of the continuing, comprehensive and cooperative planning process carried out pursuant to Section 134 of Title 23, U.S. Code"[1] and set ranges of vehicle miles of travel (VMT) and of centerline mileage to be carried by each system.

To meet the VMT guidelines, numerous urban area arterial roadways owned by member agencies were classified as principal arterials since the Region's freeway system was small at the time. Nationwide, approximately 90 percent of all principal arterials are owned by state.

In 2005, the federal functional classification system was updated to account for changes in the urbanized area boundary that were approved by the FHWA in 2004. This effort focused on the urbanized area, substantially increasing urban arterial street mileage and somewhat reducing member agency urban principal arterial mileage. The rural area was largely not affected by this update and the collector street network saw only minimum expansion.

Since 2005, the Region has added over 1,400 miles of publically owned roadway and federal data collection requirements for federally functionally classified roadways have been clarified and increased. These requirements include: traffic counts on all major and minor arterial and collector streets every six years, traffic counts on all principal arterial streets every three years and the collection of international roughness (IRI) data on principal arterial streets every two years. ***Please see Appendix C for detailed information.*** IRI data collection requires special equipment and the City of Phoenix and Maricopa County are the only member agencies in the Region that own and operate this equipment.

It should be noted that ultimate responsibility for collection of this data resides with ADOT[2] and that a federal funding source does exist. However, most of these facilities are on roadways owned, operated and maintained by local governments and ADOT has limited resources to perform this data collection function.

Also, the FHWA has consolidated the urban and rural functional classification system and suggested that the classification of roadways that cross urban/rural area boundaries be reviewed to eliminate unnecessarily sharp changes in classification. This FHWA consolidation also established a "Minor Collector" classification category in the urban area and a "Principal Arterial – Other Freeway & Expressway" classification in the rural area.

---

[1] Highway Functional Classification, Concepts, Criteria and Procedures (US Department of Transportation, FHWA, March 1989), pg I-2.

[2] Highway Performance Monitoring System, Field Manual (FHWA, October 2010), pg. 1-7.

APPENDIX A

Funding Impacts

The update will have little or no impact on federal funding. Per the Federal regulations, the minimum funding allotment to a state for 2009 (and as extended in continuing legislation) must equate to at least 92 percent of that State's contribution to the Highway account of the Highway Trust Fund (HTF) -- 23USC 105(a). Arizona is a minimum allocation state, so the total funding it receives is based on its contributions to the HTF.

The division of funding among the major federal highway programs is primarily driven by funding formulas for these programs. These funding formulas do strongly incorporate data based on functional classification. However, as total funding is guaranteed at a fixed level of contributions to the HTF, increased funding in one program will generally be offset by decreases in other programs. These formulas are described in the following table.

Federal Funding Formulas for Major Federal Highway Programs

Program/Recipients	Funding Formula
National Highway System (NHS) - 23USC 104(b)(1) Arizona Recipient: ADOT for use on NHS Highways	• 25% on lane miles of principal arterials excluding interstate facilities • 35% on VMT on principal arterials excluding interstate facilities • 10% on lane miles of principal arterials including interstates • 30% on diesel fuel sales
Surface Transportation Program (STP) - 23USC 104(b)(3) Arizona Recipients: ADOT with some directly distributed to local governments as Enhancement funding; MAG and PAG.	• 25% on federal-aid highways[3] lane miles • 40% on VMT on federal highways • 35% on taxes paid to Highway Trust Fund
Interstate Maintenance - 23USC 104(b)(4) Arizona Recipient: ADOT for use on Interstate Highways	• 1/3 on interstate lane miles • 1/3 on interstate vehicle miles of travel • 1/3 on taxes paid to Highway Trust Fund
Highway Improvement Safety Program - 23USC 104(b)(5) Arizona Recipient: ADOT with some distributed to MPO/COGs and local governments.	• 1/3 on federal-aid highway lane miles • 1/3 on federal-aid vehicle miles of travel • 1/3 on number of fatalities on federal-aid highways
Congestion Air Quality Mitigation (CMAQ) - 23USC 104(b)(2) Arizona Recipient: ADOT with all distributed to MAG for use redistribution per the Regional Transportation Plan	• Population in non attainment and maintenance areas

[3] The term "Federal-aid highway" means a highway eligible for assistance under Title 23, Chapter 1, other than a highway classified as a local road or rural minor collector - 23USC 101(5).

APPENDIX B

Eligibility Requirements for Major Federal Highway Programs

The Intermodal Surface Transportation Efficiency Act of 1991 (ISTEA) significantly reduced the role of functional classification in determining the eligibility of projects for federal funding. Of those programs that make funding available to local governments, only Surface Transportation Program funds retained functional classification requirements for roadway projects, and eliminating the classification requirement for bicycle, pedestrian, ITS and enhancement projects.

The following summarizes key eligibility requirements for major federal highway funding programs:

Key Eligibility Requirements for Major Federal Highway Funding Programs	
Program/Recipients	Eligibility Requirements
National Highway System – 23USC 103(b)(6) Arizona Recipient: ADOT	Limited to work related to the National Highway System (NHS). The NHS is a special roadway network designated by the Congress as specified by a FHWA map dated May 24, 1996; **the NHS may not exceed 178,250 miles and consists largely of Principal Arterials (including the Interstate, other freeways and expressways, and other categories).**
Surface Transportation Program (STP) – 23USC 133(b)-(c) Arizona Recipients: ADOT with some directly distributed to local governments as Enhancement funding; MAG and PAG.	Projects are eligible for STP funding if they are one of the following types of projects: • **Roadway projects on federally functionally classified facilities such as principal arterials, minor arterials urban collectors or rural major collectors.** • Bicycle and pedestrian projects • ITS projects • Enhancement projects (Enhancement funding is a flavor of STP) • Carpool projects and parking projects • Highway and transit safety infrastructure improvements and programs • Hazard elimination projects • Projects to mitigate hazards caused by wildlife, and railway-highway grade crossings • Transit projects eligible under Chapter 53
Interstate Maintenance - 23USC 104(b)(4) Arizona Recipient: ADOT	Limited to work related to the resurfacing, restoring, rehabilitating, and reconstructing the Interstate System. **Interstate facilities are classified as Principal Arterials.**
Highway Improvement Safety Program (HSIP) - 23USC 148 and 23CFR 924 Arizona Recipient: ADOT with some distributed to MPO/COGs and local governments.	Ninety million dollars per year of HISP funding is set aside nationally for "high risk rural roads". The term "high risk rural road" means any roadway functionally classified as a rural major or minor collector or a rural local road. Other than this amount, **functional classification is not an eligibility requirement for HSIP funding**. Eligibility for funding is to be determined largely by a data driven, technical process developed by the state highway agency.
Congestion Air Quality Mitigation (CMAQ) – 23USC 149(b) ADOT with all distributed to MAG for use redistribution per the Regional Transp. Plan	**Functional classification is not an eligibility requirement for projects using this funding source**. The primary eligibility requirements relate to location in non attainment areas.

APPENDIX C

Data Collection Requirements for Functionally Classified Routes

All data for the federal functional classification system is housed in the Highway Performance Monitoring System (HPMS). HPMS is a federally mandated, state maintained database of roadway information "for all of the Nation's public road mileage as certified by the States' Governors on an annual basis. All roads open to public travel are reported in HPMS regardless of ownership, including Federal, State, county, city, and privately owned roads such as toll facilities. Each State is required to annually furnish all data per the reporting requirements specified in" in the HPMS Field Manual.[4]

Required Data for Federally Functionally Classified Roadways[5]

Classification	Data Item	Description	Update Cycle
All classifications except rural minor collectors and local roads	AADT	Annual Average Daily Traffic.	Every 3-years for Principal Arterials; Every 6-years for Minor Arterials and Collectors
	Through Lanes	The number of lanes designated for through-traffic.	When changed
	Speed Limit	The posted speed limit.	When changed
	Facility Type	The operational characteristic of the roadway (e.g. One-Way Road, Two-Way Road, etc.)	When changed
	Structure	Roadway section that is entirely on a bridge, tunnel or causeway.	When changed
	Ownership	The entity that has legal ownership of a roadway.	When changed
Principal and minor arterial roads	Route Number	The signed route number.	When changed
	Route Signing	The type of route signing.	When changed
	Route Qualifier	The route signing descriptive qualifier.	When changed
	Alternative Route Name	A familiar, non-numeric designation for a route.	When changed
Principal arterial roads	International Roughness Index	A statistic used to estimate the amount of roughness in a measured longitudinal profile. The IRI is computed from a single longitudinal	Every 2-years
Urban principal arterial roads	Access Control	The degree of access control for a given section of road.	When changed

The focus of data collection is for roadways classified as principal arterials. Nationwide state highway agencies own approximately 90 percent of all principal arterial roadways.

[4] Highway Performance Monitoring System, Field Manual (FHWA, February, 2010), pg. 1-1.

[5] The table does not include data: items that are required only for HPMS sample panels or National Highway System roadways, data items that are not applicable such as those related to toll and HOV facilities; and items that may be obtained from GIS boundary files such as County and Urban Area Code.