

DRAFT ATTENDANCE OF THE  
MARICOPA ASSOCIATION OF GOVERNMENTS  
TRANSPORTATION REVIEW COMMITTEE

June 28, 2012

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

MEMBERS ATTENDING

Scottsdale: David Meinhart, Chair	Maricopa County: John Hauskins
Avondale: David Fitzhugh, Vice-Chair	Mesa: Jeff Martin for Scott Butler
ADOT: Kwi-Sung Kang for Floyd Roehrich	*Paradise Valley: Bill Mead
Buckeye: Scott Lowe	Peoria: Andrew Granger
Chandler: Patrice Kraus	Phoenix: Rick Naimark
El Mirage: Jorge Gastelum for Lance Calvert	*Queen Creek: Troy White
Fountain Hills: Randy Harrel	RPTA: Bryan Jungwirth
*Gila Bend: Eric Fitzer	Surprise: Nick Mascia for Bob Beckley
*Gila River: Doug Torres	Tempe: Chad Heinrich
Gilbert: Kurt Sharp for Leah Hubbard	Valley Metro Rail: John Farry
Glendale: Robert Darr for Terry Johnson	Wickenburg: Rick Austin
Goodyear: Cato Esquivel	Youngtown: Grant Anderson for Lloyce Robinson
#Guadalupe: Gino Turrubiarres	
Litchfield Park: Woody Scoutten	

EX-OFFICIO MEMBERS ATTENDING

*Street Committee: Charles Andrews, Avondale	*Bicycle/Pedestrian Committee: Katherine Coles, City of Phoenix
ITS Committee: Debbie Albert, Glendale	*Transportation Safety Committee: Julian Dresang, City of Tempe

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

OTHERS PRESENT

Eric Anderson, MAG  
Teri Kennedy, MAG  
Marc Pearsall, MAG  
Steve Tate, MAG  
Eileen Yazzie, MAG  
Nathan Pryor, MAG  
Alfonso Rodriguez, Ft. McDowell Yav. Nation  
Paul Ward,

1. Call to Order

Chairman David Meinhart from the City of Scottsdale called the meeting to order at 10:00 a.m.

2. Approval of Draft May 24, 2012 Minutes

Chairman Meinhart asked if there were any changes or amendments to the May 24, 2012 meeting minutes, and there were none.

Mr. Rick Naimark from the City of Phoenix motioned to approve the minutes as amended. Mr. John Hauskins from Maricopa County seconded, and the motion passed by a unanimous voice vote of the Committee.

3. Call to the Audience

Chairman Meinhart announced that he had not received any cards requesting to speak and moved on to the next item on the agenda.

4. Transportation Director's Report

Chairman Meinhart invited Mr. Eric Anderson, MAG Transportation Director, to provide the Transportation Director's Report.

Mr. Anderson gave a summary of the Federal transportation reauthorization bill that appears to be moving through Congress. The House and Senate Conference committee have come to an agreement. It appears that funding levels are maintained for 2013 and 2014 in bill. There had been a concern about a potential 30 percent cut, but Congress has maintained the funding levels. But there are some program changes, but not as radical as others that had been proposed. There is emphasis on performance measures and performance based planning. The last thing is I-11 in designated in the bill being considered. There had been concerns that it would be removed due to being an earmark.

Mr. Anderson reported that RARF revenue in May was up .4 percent compared to May 2011. This is a deterioration from the 5 to 6 percent increases from previous months. Year to date, revenue is up 5.3 percent compared to the 4 percent forecast. HURF revenue in May was up .4 percent. Year to date, it is flat at .2 percent compared to last year. The forecast was 1 percent growth rate which looks like it won't be attained. As well, VLT and gas tax revenues are still down compared to last year.

Mr. Anderson gave his condolences to the Mayor of El Mirage, whose husband passed away last night. He also let committee members know that Lance Calvert is moving to Portland. Chairman Meinhart inquired if there were any questions or comments. There were none, and he proceeded to the next item on the agenda.

5. MAG Federally Funded Locally Sponsored Projects Development Status Report

Randy Harrell entered the meeting

Chairman Meinhart invited Ms. Teri Kennedy, MAG Transportation Improvement Program Manager, to present MAG federally funded locally sponsored projects development status report. Ms. Kennedy addressed our current funding, stating that we are under a continuing resolution that expires on June 30th, which gives the region three-quarter of a year of funding. At the January TRC meeting, Tier 2 and Tier 3 closeout was based on the assumption that we had a full fiscal year of funding for 2012.

Ms. Kennedy reviewed programming guidelines that were approved in October 2011, and referenced section 500, tier 1 decisions. Workbooks were sent to member agencies to complete and on June 22, a status report was mailed out to the Committee.

Mr. Gino Turrubiarres entered by audio conference

Ms. Kennedy summarized the project updates for Fiscal years 2012-2014. For the 3 projects expected to obligate for the fiscal year 2012, there was one that requested deferment, one that MAG staff suggested for deferral for Ft. McDowell. It was at the bureau of Indian affairs under right of way review. ADOT has now said that it will make obligation this year. This project will be removed from the change sheet and allowed to move forward in 2012. For fiscal year 2013, 34 projects were expected to authorize. Out of that, 31 will obligate on time. A few projects needed schedule modifications to meet MAG policy compliance. These would need to be completed before the December -January reports. This included 3 requested deferrals, 1 requested deletion and 3 requested project changes. For fiscal year 2014, out of 34 projects expected to authorize, 31 projects will submit on time. One requested deferral to 2015. This deferral, if accepted it would impact the new TIP call for projects resulting in a reduction in 2015 projects. One project requested deletion. The Tempe 14-102 project there is a script error in the report which will be corrected in handouts for MC. That project did meet policy compliance at this time.

Ms. Kennedy stated that commitment letters were received from everyone on time and reminded the committee that the letters for 2014 projects will be due in December.

Ms. Kennedy reviewed the dynamic TIP process. For Tier 1, MAG staff is reviewing workbooks and recommended changes for 2013. If we need to make changes, this is the time to speak on that and we will revise the materials. If we recommend approval at this time, this will complete Tier 1 and we can move to Tier 2 once financials are calculated.

Ms. Kennedy discussed the Tier 2 process including requirements to advance CMAQ to 2013. This includes affirmation letters stating time constraints and staff resources. These project recommendations will be made at the TRC August meeting.

Ms. Kennedy summarized Tier 3 projects as 3rd in priority to move forward in funding consideration, currently estimated at 11-15 million dollars but subject to change with 2012 close-out projects. Policy options to be discussed include increasing funding for projects that are due to obligate in 2013 and establishing the list of projects to be funded with CMAQ. Ms. Kennedy affirmed CMAQ requirements and that MAG staff will work with ADOT regarding obligation authority. Tier 3 considerations are due to MAG buy August 21. Questions and

comments may be addressed to Steve Tate or Teri Kennedy.

Patrice Kraus entered the meeting.

Chairman Meinhart opened up the discussion for questions or comments regarding presentation or Tier 3 priorities.

Mr. Rodriguez thanked MAG staff for the correction made to the Ft McDowell project. Chairman Meinhart questioned the information in the packet and asked if there were additional funds that needed to be obligated. Ms. Kennedy explained that during the Jan Closeout, Ms. Eileen Yazzie had wrapped everything into one action and precise financial data is not available at this time.

Mr. Heinrich commented that the glitch on Tempe project was due to a technical mix up with the date that triggered the error.

Mr. Esquivel inquired if only CMAQ funds available for closeout and wanted to know if it was possible to switch out other sources of funding out with ADOT to facilitate that. Ms. Kennedy said that option had not been discussed with ADOT to date.

Mr. Martin asked if a decision needed to be made today. Ms. Kennedy responded that it would be better to do so now so when the initial projects come in we can make an initial calculation. Mr. Gino suggested it made more sense to get the projects in before we make a decision on it. Chairman Meinhart agreed the committee needed more time to decide on Tier 3 and today's focus should be on the changes currently in the packet.

Mr. Naimark from the City of Phoenix clarified the motion to recommend approval of federal fund projects to be deferred, deleted, advanced, and changed; and of the necessary amendments and administrative modifications to the FY 2011-2015 MAG Transportation Improvement Program, and as appropriate, to the Regional Transportation Plan 2010 Update with the exception of tier 3. Mr. Grant seconded, and the motion passed by a unanimous voice vote of the Committee.

6. Project Changes - Amendment and Administrative Modification to the FY 2011-2015 MAG Transportation Improvement Program

Chairman Meinhart invited Ms. Teri Kennedy, MAG Transportation Improvement Program Manager, to present Project Changes - Amendment and Administrative Modification to The FY 2011-2015 MAG Transportation Improvement Program.

Ms. Kennedy referenced updated handouts provided. She summarized the changes, which included 2013 and 2014 requests, plus ALCP changes related to Northern Parkway. She congratulated MCDOT on 1st advanced construction joint project agreement for a local project. Other updates include, lead agency change request, Northwest light rail extension moved up to 2016, and minor modifications to the Mesa light rail extension.

Mr. Martin asked if the changes were made to balance out the Freeway lifecycle program. Ms.

Kennedy affirmed that and that the program was approved by Regional Council in the previous month.

Mr. Farry moved to approve amendments and administrative modifications to the FY 2011-2015 MAG Transportation Improvement Program, and as appropriate, to the Regional Transportation Plan 2010 Update. Mr. Anderson seconded, and the motion passed by a unanimous voice vote of the Committee.

#### 7. Phoenix West Extension Locally Preferred Alternatives Report Recommendations

Chairman Meinhart invited Ms. Eileen Yazzie, MAG Transportation Planning Project Manager, to present Phoenix West Extension Locally Preferred Alternatives Report Recommendations. Ms. Yazzie introduced Mr. Callow to assist with technical questions. This item was recommended previously at Transit Committee to move forward. Ms. Yazzie began with the study purpose and location, explaining that it is in the Regional Transportation Plan as an I-10 high capacity transit corridor project. The Alternatives Analysis (AA) process started five years ago and that the overall project divided into two sections; there is a freeway and a downtown section.

Ms. Yazzie summarized the purpose of an AA and related documents. She explained that the AA determines where the project should go as well as what technology would be the best fit. She said the documents total 600 pages and are available on the MAG Transit Committee webpage if people are interested in downloading the materials.

Ms. Yazzie explained that in 2008, METRO and MAG went through the City Council to approve the mainline alignment for the 1-10/freeway section and this study segment is for the downtown section. For the downtown section, the team evaluated McDowell Road and Thomas Rd. Metro and City of Phoenix did heavy public involvement in the St. Matthews and capital neighborhood on the project because of the impacts to those areas. The St. Matthews leaders were present at the METRO Board when the alignment was approved and were appreciative of the public involvement efforts and outcomes.

Ms. Yazzie displayed a map of the proposed alignment. It indicated that at one point the alignment is on the north side of I-10 and then moves into the corridor median.

Ms. Yazzie provided approval dates related to the LPA:

Recommendation for High Capacity Transit Improvements in the I-10 Right-of-Way west of I-17:

- Phoenix City Council - April 2008
- METRO Board - June 2008
- MAG Regional Council - July 2008
- Acceptance for AA, Locally Preferred Alternative (LPA) and recommendations:
- Phoenix City Council - May 15, 2012
- METRO Board - May 17, 2012

Ms. Yazzie presented the cost analysis the findings related to cost, boarding, ridership potential, travel time using two different end points. She stated that the final recommended technology

is LRT. Summary slides were displayed with the following information:

- Capital Costs: LRT (1 Billion); and BRT (496M)
- Total Cost per Boarding (Annualized Capital + Operating Costs)/Annualized Boardings: LRT 16.2; BRT 40.8
- Ridership Potential (2030 ADT), LRT 32,900;BRT 9,200
- Hourly Capacity in one direction (number of passengers per hour per direction): LRT 5,000; BRT 1,000
- Travel Times (79th Avenue to Central Avenue/Washington) : LRT 19 minutes; BRT 26 minutes
- The operating costs match the proposed capital expenditures, including: bus feeder connections to the light rail end-of-line station, and interlining with the existing 20-mile system.
- The annual opening year operating costs, in 2023 dollars, are:
  - 79th Avenue to Downtown Phoenix - \$17.0 Million
  - 79th Avenue to 19th Avenue/Dunlap - \$29.3 Million

Ms. Yazzie discussed the Capital Advance Transportation Opportunity (CATO) Program and its' intent to capitalize on opportunities within the study area at strategic locations. Improvements could potentially be eligible for near-term federal funding opportunities. The objectives of the CATO Program include: ROW coordination and preservation, improved mobility, investment for the future, multi-modal coordination, enhanced connectivity to the state capitol.

Ms. Yazzie explained that the Locally Preferred Alternative (LPA) includes multiple components, similar to historic LPA approvals in the region such as the Tempe Street Car and the Mesa extensions. As such, the motion includes, the preferred alignment, technology, and CATO, and future considerations of increased transit services.

Mr. Naimark thanked staff and everyone else involved in getting the neighborhoods supportive of the proposed scenario.

Chairman Meinhart requested background on the CATO part of it. Mr. Callow explained the evaluation produced recommendations to make the LRT successful. The direct access HOV ramp, if built, would improve vehicular access to the 79th Ave Park and Ride from the west. It would allow the RAPID bus to directly access the Capital without backtracking through the historic districts. Travel time to downtown will remain unchanged. In the future, the ramps can be converted to light rail use although the ramp would improve transit service regardless.

Mr. Jungwirth asked if the direct access HOV ramps will allow SOV to utilize and exit at the Park-and-Ride. Mr. Callow says the issue will be addressed with ADOT.

Mr. Farry congratulated the METRO planning and public involvement staff in addressing neighborhood issues.

Mr. Naimark from City of Phoenix moved to recommend to accept the Phoenix West Alternatives Analysis for the (1) A Locally Preferred Alternative (LPA) for the Phoenix West project, including a light rail alignment along I-10 from 79th Avenue to I-17; southbound along

the I-17 southbound frontage road; east along Van Buren Street to 18th Avenue; southbound along 18th Avenue to Jefferson Street and then east to downtown Phoenix along Jefferson Street; (2) Inclusion of the Corridor Advanced Transit Opportunities (CATO) Program that consists of near term improvements and investments to improve existing mobility, enhance transit service and lay the groundwork for future HCT service within the study area. The set of proposed projects, include: construction of a direct HCT access ramp from I-10 to I-17, expansion of the 79th Avenue Park-and-Ride, identification and development of new park and ride stations, and construction of direct connection I-10 HOV ramps on the west side of 79th Avenue; and (3) Future consideration for increased transit service for areas within and west of the study area, per the long range transit needs identified in MAG's Regional Transit Framework Study, through the regional transportation system planning process. Mr. Martin seconded, and the motion passed by a unanimous voice vote of the Committee.

#### 8. ADOT Passenger Rail Corridor Study Update

Chairman Meinhart invited Mr. Mike Keis, ADOT, to present the ADOT Passenger Rail Corridor Study Update

Mr. Kies introduced the study and stated that it has been referred to as the inner city rail study or the high speed rail between phoenix and Tucson. Project now official called Passenger Rail Corridor Study. The FTA wants us to look at commuter trips while the FRA were more concerned with inner city trips. They didn't just want the study to focus on downtown to downtown travel.

Gino Turribate left the conference

Mr. Kies explained a few years ago, ADOT began BQAZ process which recognized the need to focus on multimodal transportation elements. The Statewide rail plan by ADOT was approved in 2011 and it looked at how to link Tucson and phoenix. A map of corridor ideas developed during the BQAZ process was presented. It included sharing facilities and the possibility of new facilities on new alignments.

Mr. Kies said that over 3000 surveys were conducted as part of the public involvement process. This information helped develop the draft purpose and needs statements. The process included stakeholder interview with agencies throughout Maricopa, Pima and Pinal Counties, and State Agencies. He explained that the study comprises completing three major documents: AA, EIS, and service development Plan. It is currently in the AA process. And the first step which is the initial screening the study is now in second step, conceptual analysis. The steps are as follows:

- Initial Screening
- Conceptual Analysis
- Final Analysis
- Results in a Locally Preferred Alternative

Mr. Kies explained that part of the conceptual analysis including working with agencies. So far the analysis has been discussed with 41 different stakeholder groups. After the screening will be the final analysis. The screening of route locations reduced the number of potential

alignments as well the most appropriate mode to address travel between Tucson and Phoenix was evaluated. FTA was not comfortable with stating that only one mode is needed to address travel needs. One of the findings was air mode considered not feasible to deal with traffic issues between the cities. Mr. Kies directed the committee to maps of alternatives considered which included color coding to indicate which ones were no longer feasible.

Mr. Kies further elaborated that the station evaluation included 38 Potential Station Locations. The screening analysis determined what was needed to serve inner city and commuter routes. A top 10 list for areas that would best serve a commuter system as well as the top 10 for an inner city system was displayed.

Mr. Kies described the seven conceptual alternatives from initial screening, of which six of seven are Rail Alternatives. They are as follows:

- 1) I-10 Express Bus Alternative
- 2) UPRR Alternative - Share R/W
- 3 and 4) Non-UPRR Alternatives: I-10 N-S Corridor & US60
- 5-7) Combination Alternatives: UPRR Southeast Branch; UPRR Tempe Branch; UPRR Chandler Branch

The plan is to take seven alternatives and analyze potential benefits and issues with a focus on commuter and inner city issues. As well, MAG Area considerations are also examined such as System Hub Locations including the termini of the system with considerations for:

- Downtown Phoenix
- Sky Harbor
- System Enhancements
- West Valley cities would like an extension to the West Valley. All of our alternatives are taking this into consideration
- Commuter/Intercity extensions
- Chandler Ave BRT
- Gateway Airport Connection

Mr. Kies displayed a graph of the process showing the next launch of the conceptual alternatives analysis. he hope is to go to public in the fall with the alternatives and in 2013, public hearings on the LPA that is recommended.

Mr. Naimark left the meeting.

Mr. Anderson asked if the disruption of service was considered when looking at the bus service given the issues on 1-10 during the monsoon season. Mr. Keis said that analysis was not done yet and can be taken into consideration.

Mr. Hauskins questioned the assumptions made with looking at the BTU and asked where the figures came from and if there were standardized. Mr. Keis replied that the consultant provided the figures to the FTA and FRA. Looking at cost, ridership and travel time. He said that they reviewed 27 peer systems. that include inner city bus, inner city rail, and commuter rail. The figures were probably an average. Mr.Hauskin said that his calculations produced different

numbers and it was something he would like to discuss later.

Mr. Fitzhugh asked about the significance of travel time and how much of a component it was in the evaluation. Mr. Kies explained that travel time will be evaluated in two different ways - using local and regional stations. The regional train would operate at high speeds than the local train. Travel times and ridership for both options will be looked at and when the recommendation comes forward it will be a blended option.

Mr. Farry asked if one of the alternatives to look at operating buses in a dedicated lane as the HOV lane or a dedicated BRT lane. Mr. Keis stated that the FTA has asked us to consider the most successful bus option therefore they were looking at the HOV or exclusive bus. However, the addition of exclusive bus lane would be quite costly.

Mr. Martin asked if costs had been evaluated. Mr. Keis replied no, they were in the process of doing that right now in conjunction with project partners. There were a lot of conversations with Union Pacific. There is perception with the public the UP is under used and we should just use that. However, that option would be quite costly. Chairman Meinhart asked if the documents are available. Mr. Kies responded that they this information is available on the ADOT website under the planning website. Mr. Hauskins suggested that a preliminary cost analysis be done to look at what would be more feasible when reviewing the analyses. Mr. Keis said it was a three step process with the alternatives, the details are evaluated after initial batch of alternatives have been decided.

#### 9. Request for Future Agenda Items

Chairman Meinhart 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 Meinhart moved onto the next agenda item.

#### 10. Member Agency Update

Chairman Meinhart 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.

Chairman Meinhart shared recent accolades given to the city for its bicycling system from Bicycling Magazine and Sunset Magazine. The City was ranked 15 for cities over 95,000 people for the bike program by Bicycling Magazine and put in the 10 top Burb-in-the-West for cycling by Sunset Magazine. He acknowledged the MAG process and Federal funding for helping to create the network.

Mr. Hauskins added that MCDOT has a pool ride project for connected corridor going on right now. The test corridor is in Anthem around Daisy Mountain Road that is working very well. If anyone is interested, he offered to do demonstration or a presentation.

11. Next Meeting Date

Chairman Meinhart informed members in attendance that the next regularly scheduled meeting of the Committee would be held on Thursday July 26, 2012, at MAG. There being no further business, Chairman Meinhart adjourned the meeting at 11:00 a.m.