

DRAFT MINUTES OF THE
MARICOPA ASSOCIATION OF GOVERNMENTS
TRANSPORTATION REVIEW COMMITTEE

August 23, 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: Jim Shano
Buckeye: Scott Lowe	Peoria: Andrew Granger
Chandler: Dan Cook for Patrice Kraus	Phoenix: Rick Naimark
El Mirage: Jorge Gastelum	Queen Creek: Troy White
Fountain Hills: Randy Harrel	Surprise: Bob Beckley
*Gila Bend: Eric Fitzer	Tempe: Chad Heinrich
*Gila River: Doug Torres	Valley Metro: John Farry
Gilbert: Leah Hubbard	Wickenburg: Rick Austin
Glendale: Bob Darr for Terry Johnson	Youngtown: Grant Anderson for Lloyce Robinson
Goodyear: Cato Esquivel	
*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

Monique De Los Rios-Urban, MAG	Mike Sabatini, Baker
Maureen DeCindis, MAG	Greg Haggerty, Debbie Engineering
Bob Hazlett, MAG	Randy Harrel, Fountain Hills
Teri Kennedy, MAG	Kurt Sharp, Gilbert
Cavan Noone, MAG	Chrsitine McMurdy, Goodyear
Nathan Pryor, MAG	Bill Cowdrey, HDR
Eileen Yazzie, MAG	Clem Ligoeki, McDOT
Patrick Stone, ADOT	Art Brooks, Strand
Mindy Kimball, ASU School of Sustainability	Chris Hagen, Tolleson
Kristen Sexton, Avondale	Mark Lemon, Wickenburg

1. Call to Order

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

2. 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.

3. Transportation Director's Report

Chairman Meinhart invited Mr. Eric Anderson, MAG Transportation Director, to provide the Transportation Director's Report. Mr. Anderson stated that congress passed MAP-21, a new federal transportation authorization, in early July for Fiscal Years (FY) 2013 and 2014, at basically FY 2012 funding levels. This was possible through using savings in the general fund to fund transportation. Within the authorization, there was program consolidation in both programs, with more changes on the highway side than transit. Future funding levels are the key issues currently being discussed. The funding increase this authorization was less than 1% with; CMAQ funding 167 billion or so less than previous years. MAG staff will work with Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) and Arizona Department of Transportation (ADOT) on these implications.

Mr. Anderson continued with updates about local revenue streams. For FY 2012, Regional Area Road Fund (RARF) is down 5.1% versus 2011 although July revenue is up 7.1% versus last year. Highway User Revenue Fund (HURF) is flat versus FY 2011 and July revenue was down 3.4% versus 2011. HURF continues to be flat or declining which has been the trend in the last three or four years. Lastly, Mr. Anderson mentioned that as a result of the Southeast Corridor Major Investment Study (SE Corridor MIS), ADOT and FHWA have put I-10 and I-17 EIS on hold.

Chairman Meinhart asked if there was any information regarding the reprogramming of FHWA funds that were unobligated throughout the country. Mr. Anderson said that 500 million is available nationally at the discretion of the Secretary of Transportation. Mr. Kang added that ADOT did not have any additional information, only that Arizona is expected to receive some funds but the amount is currently unknown.

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

4. Consent Agenda

Addressing the next item of business, Chairman Meinhart directed the Committee's attention to the consent agenda. He asked the Committee if there were any questions or comments regarding consent agenda 4a on the December 2012 Transportation Review Committee Meeting Reschedule, 4b on the Arizona Department of Transportation Red Letter Process, 4c on the Local Match Consideration for Glendale Right of Way Costs for Northern

Parkway, 4d on the Pedestrian and Bicycle Facilities Design Assistance Program. Mr. Fitzhugh requested to hear item 4c on the Local Match Consideration for Glendale Right of Way Costs for Northern Parkway. Chairman Meinhart moved to remove the item and requested to act on the remaining items. Mr. Naimark motioned to approve the remaining consent agenda. Mr. Fitzhugh seconded, and the motion passed with a unanimous voice vote of the Committee.

4c. Local Match Consideration for Glendale Right of Way Costs for Northern Parkway

Chairman Meinhart invited Eric Anderson, Transportation Director, to present on Local Match Consideration for Glendale Right of Way (ROW) Costs for Northern Parkway. Mr. Anderson began with some background information regarding the project. Glendale has requested \$516,000 to be used as local match for the Northern Parkway project. He explained that the City of Glendale a few years ago acquired some right of way related to Northern Avenue. Due to the pace of development, they wanted to protect the corridor. This advanced ROW was acquired prior to completing the Findings of No Significant Impact (FONSI) environmental assessment. FHWA is very sensitive to ROW acquisition prior to the completion of final environmental assessment as they do not want it to be to be pre-decisional. Upon review of all the information provided by Glendale, almost all the costs were accepted by FHWA with the exception of \$516k. It was work related to technical issues. Mr. Anderson surmised that if it had been acquired after environmental it may have been allowed. FHWA took a very stringent view of this. MAG staff reviewed the records to make sure expenditures related to Northern Parkway acquisition and they were. One was related to cost to procure and the other was related to discrepancy of the appraisal value of improvements. MAG is recommending Glendale be allowed to use \$516k as part of the local match although it would not be part of the minimum match. It would be between the 5.7% and 30% local match requirements. Mr. Anderson said he had been asked if this was going to be a precedence in the region and he replied that he did not believe it will due to the uniqueness of this case. Staff believes it is appropriate and the expenditures were directly related to acquisition of ROW. MAG staff recommends approval.

Mr. Fitzhugh explained his reasoning for hearing the item was a better understanding of the logic behind the exception to the guidelines. Chairman Meinhart stated he wanted the information as well and was satisfied with the explanation.

Mr. Rick Naimark from the City of Phoenix motioned to approve. Mr. Martin seconded, and the motion passed with a unanimous voice vote of the Committee.

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

Chairman Meinhart invited Teri Kennedy, MAG Transportation Improvement Program Manager, to present on Project Changes to the Transportation Improvement Program (TIP). Ms. Kennedy reviewed project changes to the TIP. City of Phoenix held a competitive JARC and New Freedom process and they have requested to add projects to the TIP using funds from SAFETEA-LU 2012. She explained that ADOT had minor project modifications and additions in the Maricopa County area. She directed the committee to the agenda material.

There was one project name change within the City of Mesa as it was obligated. Chairman Meinhart asked if there were any questions or comments. There were none. Mr. Martin motioned to approve the amendments and administrative modifications to the FY 2011-2015 MAG Transportation Improvement Program, and to the Regional Transportation Plan 2010 Update, as appropriate. Mr. Cook seconded, and the motion passed with a unanimous voice vote of the Committee.

6. Draft Fiscal Year (FY) 2013 Arterial Life Cycle Program (ALCP)

Chairman Meinhart invited Teri Kennedy, MAG Transportation Improvement Program Manager, to discuss the Draft Fiscal Year (FY) 2013 Arterial Life Cycle Program. Ms. Kennedy stated that this item was on the agenda for information, discussion and possible recommendation to approve the draft FY 2013 Arterial Life Cycle Program (ALCP). She explained that the ALCP is required to be fiscally balanced by Arizona revised statute. MAG has a process where they review the program and produce a fiscal analysis and this year they identified a deficit of about 40 million. Upon identification, a memo sent to members of the TRC, Intergovs and the working group.

Ms. Kennedy then reviewed the historical financials of the ALCP. It has experienced a 30% cut since inception. Prior to today there was a rebalancing of approximately 190M deficit. There is currently an additional 40 Million dollar deficit. Ms. Kennedy presented a graph depicting overall program deficit and said it was mostly related to the ½ sales tax. The graph indicated deficits in program years 2013, 2015, 2016, 2018 and 2019. The fluctuations are the reason the program needs to be rebalanced. MAG staff produced 3 scenarios and 3 mock drafts of program for a working group held May 22nd. Each scenario was reviewed along with requests for additional ones. Scenario 1 kept everything in place which leads to cuts of \$35-40 million. Scenario 2 eliminated bonding which is a large deficit the program carries. Scenario 3 cut bonding and inflation from the program. This allowed the program to not cut any funds but defer reimbursement years. An alternative scenario which would cut all necessary reimburse by 1% was suggested during the meeting. But this scenario meant some cities would be cut more than others based on program years and this was deemed unacceptable. The working group recommended balancing scenario #3 which eliminated bonding and inflation for future until revenues were recovered. A draft was produced in July. A 2nd working group meeting was held to review the draft scenario. No additional viable scenarios were received during the 2nd working group. Agencies were asked if they wanted to swap projects and there were no volunteers. Agencies were allowed to shift priorities to advance and defer and those requests were included in the draft currently in agenda packet. The results meant most of the projects were deferred 1-3 years rather than the 2-4 years as expected. No project was removed or unfunded and there were no reimbursement cuts. Ms. Kennedy stated that this was the best possible scenario given the need to cut \$40 million to the program.

Mr. Anderson added that he appreciated all member agencies for all the work they did to help. He reiterated that given revenue declines in the last few years, there were very few contingencies for balancing the program. Removing inflation and bonding allowed them to keep the program intact. He shared that ADOT sales tax forecast are to be released this fall and hopefully will indicate higher revenues. However, with sales tax revenue stabilizing

there is now concern about federal transportation revenue growth. Mr. Anderson thanked the committee for their understanding.

Mr. Martin indicated that the working group had to make difficult choices and MAG staff made the least painful of all the choices. Nevertheless, some of the communities still had concerns. Mr. Martin moved to approve the motion.

Mr. Gastelum read a statement on behalf of the City of El Mirage. The City of El Mirage is willing to vote in favor of the "Draft ALCP" as a show of its ongoing support for regionalism and the Maricopa Association of Governments. But, we have to go on record to let the Association know that the El Mirage Road project is the linchpin for our City's economic development efforts. The City of El Mirage thanks the County and MAG for their ongoing partnership and cooperation. Simply pushing the funding out a couple of years sounds easy enough but it does impact a small City that has worked extremely hard to garner broad community and business support as well as voter approved funding for this project. Again, we support MAG and the rebalance but wanted to state a position for the record. We look forward to working with MAG staff to find alternative ways to move this project forward.

Chairman Meinhart apologized for opening the item for discussion prior to the second of the motion. Mr. Cook seconded the motion.

Mr. Granger asked if bonding had been used as an option in the past to repay the projects. Mr. Anderson responded that it takes the option out until the revenues come back. Bonding has not been used in the past; it has always been maintained through cash flow. Chairman Meinhart agreed that the recommended scenario was the best of the difficult choices. He stated support for the motion.

The motion passed with a unanimous voice vote of the Committee.

7. Update on the Southeast Corridor Major Investment Study

Chairman Meinhart invited Bob Hazlett, MAG Senior Engineer, to give an update on the Southeast Corridor Major Investment Study. Mr. Hazlett stated that it is on the agenda for recommendation for acceptance by the Committee as a courtesy. However, as the study's recommendations have been reviewed by staff, it was concluded that the findings are not ready for inclusion in the current Regional Transportation Plan (RTP), and as result, is on the agenda for information and discussion only. The study has been underway for about two years and lead by HDR staff Brent Cain with help from Scott Miller, and assistance from Burgess & Niple, and Hexagon Consultants. Mr. Hazlett began his presentation by explaining the reason for the study was due to the need to look at the part of the valley where there is a lot of employment. Thirty percent of the regions employment is in the study corridor. As well, the city of Tempe has been concerned by the Interstate 10 Corridor Study Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) study that considered widening to Interstate 10 to 25 lanes. The study addressed the need for capacity improvements as well as evaluating other transportation options in the corridor.

The base network considered for the study was consistent with the Regional Transportation Plan that included all programmed freeway widenings in 2031 and additional High Capacity Transit improvements, such as the line along Mill Avenue in Tempe. Mr. Hazlett described the study process and identified a charrette process, which included participants from Valley Metro, City of Phoenix and City of Tempe transit and street staff. The intent was to move things as bundles that included alternative modes, and not as individual projects. Throughout the bundle development process, all transit options were kept consistent with the accepted long-range MAG Transit Framework Study. The participants came up with 3 bundles.

Mr. Hazlett began with Basic Mobility bundle which was a modest improvement. On the highway side, the intent was to make improvements along Interstate 10 in a narrower footprint than what is currently recommended. This included looking at possibility of managed lane corridor from the Stack interchange with Interstate 17 on the north side of Downtown Phoenix to the Pecos Stack interchange with SR-202L/Santan-South Mountain Freeway in Ahwatukee and Chandler. This included adding some previously unconsidered Direct High Occupancy Vehicle (DHOV) ramps along Interstate 10 and redeveloping Southern Avenue as an Arizona Parkway type of facility with indirect left movements to help with traffic flow. The Peer Competitive bundle included the aforementioned highway improvements, plus additional bus rapid transit corridors, commuter rail, fixed guideway transit along Rural Road, and a modern street car extension to Southern Avenue. The third and final bundle, Transit Focus, included the aforementioned highway improvements, plus fixed guideway buildout of the South Central corridor with extension along Southern Avenue, Rural Road, and Chandler Blvd (providing a continuous route between Downtown Phoenix and Downtown Chandler), the commuter rail corridors, a street car extension to Southern Avenue, and an Air Train extension from the airport south along 40th St and 48th St to Southern Avenue.

The main criteria were summarized, and the different impact evaluated along different bundles in the following areas.

1. Environmental Impacts
2. Socioeconomic Impacts
3. Capital Development Feasibility
4. Operational Feasibility
5. Performance
6. Financial Feasibility
7. Cost Effectiveness

As well, there were key findings from each bundle, which were explained.

Managed lanes operations. The Managed Lane operations along Interstate 10 and Interstate 17, including DHOV ramps, provides highest level of performance while accommodating increased traffic volumes in the freeway corridor. This improvement has been identified in a narrower footprint than what was being considered in the Interstate 10 Corridor Study EIS and has better traffic operations during morning and evening peak periods.

High Capacity Transit (HCT). Strategically focused network of high capacity transit services featuring exclusive guideway transit offers most productive transit investment. However, with the addition of HCT, there still remained a need to improve I-10 and I-17.

Transit. An east/west transit connection between Central Avenue and the East Valley in a parallel corridor to Interstate 10 and a north/south connection along Rural Rd or Arizona Ave produces the highest number of new system-wide transit riders. Modeling results indicate an exclusive guideway transit investment in either Rural Rd or Arizona Ave will not have a significantly discernible impact on traffic volumes or speeds on Interstate 10.

The recommended bundle included:

1. Managed Lanes
2. New DHOV Ramps
3. Exclusive Guideway Transit
4. Modern Streetcar

Mr. Hazlett discussed the performance findings related to a direct HOV ramp on SR-143 followed by potential ridership potential of HCT service along Arizona Avenue or Rural Road.

Mr. Anderson added that the report will be available on line.

Mr. Naimark requested that the presentation be posted online. He also inquired about the impact of these recommendations on other networks in the region's network. Mr. Hazlett responded that since Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) studies for both I-17 and I-10 have been suspended, MAG, FHWA, and ADOT will work together on evaluating the Interstate 10/Interstate 17 north-south "Spine" corridor between the North Stack (Interstate 17/SR-101L) and the Pecos Stack (Interstate 10/SR-202L) to identify a master vision for this major commuter route in the Valley.

Mr. Martin stated that he really liked the freeway recommendations for I-17 and I-10; but was uncomfortable with the transit recommendations.

Mr. Cook agreed that he liked the managed lanes. But as well, HOV can be useful in outer reaches serving express buses from park and ride lots. He noted that there were differences between these recommendations and other plans and that it may be useful to compare these findings in a table against others as a whole system.

Mr. Heinrich questioned the thought process that directed the locations of the HOV ramp locations. Mr. Hazlett responded that it was currently due to construct ability and what makes sense. The best places at the half mile streets because to add direct HOV at the mile segment would be a traffic operations problem. Mr. Anderson added that exact locations are for further studies and will include elements such as how to connect to park and rides.

Mr. Heinrich inquired about the language related to transit potential. Mr. Hazlett answered that it was left purposely vague. The finding did show however, that there still needs

additional lanes to Broadway curve even with transit investments. However, it allowed RPTA and VMR to review further options. Mr. Heinrich thanked the staff for work involved in the study. He recommended future efforts to include the Transit and possibly Street committee.

Mr. Hauskins stated truck traffic should be evaluated for future consideration. Given the amount of truck traffic, it may be useful to separate passenger and truck traffic especially since there are currently no designated truck lanes. Mr. Hazlett added that the MAG region is one of the few metropolitan areas where designated truck areas do not exist.

Mr. Naimark requested comment on the integration of this study with South Mountain Freeway. Mr. Hazlett said that South Mountain was included as an open facility by 2035, the horizon year of the study. The draft Environmental Impact Statement is expected to be completed end of year with public hearings early next year.

Mr. Farry commented that ISTEA [Intermodal Surface Transportation Efficiency Act] recommended systems' evaluations of alternatives be multi-modal and looked forward to developing some of the transit options. Mr. Meinhart added that, from a transit perspective, there are lines that stop at Loop 202 or Loop 101 that could be extended beyond by leveraging the findings from the study. He lauded the effort to address freeway solutions with transit investments and encouraged further efforts pursue those options. Mr. Hazlett said he didn't want to lose sight of MAG Transit Framework Study and tried to honor that as best as possible.

Mr. Farry inquired if the ridership numbers in the findings included either Arizona Avenue or Rural Road. Mr. Hazlett responded yes and that in the course of the study, the ridership numbers for AZ Avenue was found to be about the same for Rural Road.

Chairman Meinhart asked the committee if there were any additional questions or comments about the agenda item. There being none, he proceeded to the next item on the agenda.

8. Request for Future Agenda Items

Mr. Anderson requested a PowerPoint presentation of MAP -21 showing consolidation of the different money going to different pots. Mr. Meinhart added to that the inclusion of FTA information.

Mr. Anderson noted that Christina Hopes has left to accept a position in Portland, Oregon. Alice Chen has taken over TRC minutes temporarily.

9. Next Meeting Date

Moving on, Chairman Meinhart informed members in attendance that the next regularly scheduled meeting of the Committee would be held Thursday, September 27, 2012 at 9:30 a.m. in the MAG Office, Saguaro Room. There being no further business, Chairman Meinhart adjourned the meeting at 11:01 a.m.