

DRAFT MINUTES OF THE
MARICOPA ASSOCIATION OF GOVERNMENTS
TRANSPORTATION REVIEW COMMITTEE

January 30, 2014

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

MEMBERS ATTENDING

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

EX-OFFICIO MEMBERS ATTENDING

*Street Committee: Charles Andrews, Avondale	*Bicycle/Pedestrian Committee: Denise Lacey, Maricopa County
*ITS Committee: Catherine Hollow, City of Tempe	*Transportation Safety Committee: Renate Ehm, City of Mesa
* FHWA: Ed Stillings	
* Members neither present nor represented by proxy.	+ - Attended by Videoconference # - Attended by Audioconference

OTHERS PRESENT

Eric Anderson, MAG	Steve Tate, MAG
John Bullen, MAG	Eileen Yazzie, MAG
Alice Chen, MAG	Ungyo Lynn Sugonama, ADOT
Micah Henry, MAG	Clem Ligocki, MCDOT
Sarath Joshua, MAG	Dana Owsiany, Phoenix
Teri Kennedy, MAG	Mike Sabatini, Baker
David Massey, MAG	Art Brooks, Strand Associates, Inc.
Alex Oreschak, MAG	
Monique de los Rios Urban, MAG	
Brian Rubin, MAG	

1. Call to Order

Chairman David Fitzhugh from the City of Avondale called the meeting to order at 10:02 a.m. Chairman Fitzhugh noted that the quorum requirement for the January 30, 2014 TRC meeting was 13 committee members.

2. Approval of Draft October 24, 2013 Minutes

John Hauskins from Maricopa County motioned to approve the minutes. Debbie Albert from the City of Glendale seconded, and the motion passed by a unanimous voice vote of the Committee.

3. Call to the Audience

There were no public comments from the audience.

4. Transportation Director's Report

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

Mr. Anderson noted that the half-cent sales tax for December had 8.4% growth compared to 2012. The year to date (YTD) growth for the tax was 6.8%, which was slightly above projections. Highway User Revenue Fund (HURF) revenues were up 2.5% YTD. Almost all of that increase was through the Vehicle License Tax (VLT) and a small bump in motor vehicle fees, while fuel tax revenues remain flat or are declining. Mr. Anderson stated that the Governor released a budget that included transferring \$126 million of HURF money to the Public Safety budget, which is \$106 million above the statutory cap. However, there is support in the legislature to spend \$100 million in general fund revenues to shore up the Public Safety budget and return dedicated funding to the HURF. Mr. Anderson also introduced David Massey, who will work with Teri Kennedy at MAG in the transportation programming department.

Mr. Rick Naimark from the City of Phoenix asked what the specific change in VLT revenue was. Mr. Anderson noted that VLT revenue increased about 5.3% compared to December 2012.

5. Consent Agenda

Addressing the next item of business, Chairman Fitzhugh noted that there were no items on the consent agenda.

6. MAG Federally Funded Locally Sponsored Project Development Status Report: January 2014

Chairman Fitzhugh invited Ms. Teri Kennedy from MAG to present on the MAG Federally Funded Locally Sponsored Project Development Status Report: January 2014.

Ms. Kennedy noted that the status report is produced twice a year, providing an update on project schedules for Congestion Mitigation and Air Quality (CMAQ) projects and Transportation Alternatives (TA) projects. Ms. Kennedy explained that, for CMAQ projects, two requests for

deferrals and two cancellations were included in the status report. There are 24 CMAQ projects expected to obligate in 2014, with 34 CMAQ projects expected to obligate in 2015. For the TE projects, there was one deferral in 2014, six projects expected to obligate in 2014 and two projects expected to obligate in 2015. Ms. Kennedy remarked that there were many fewer deferrals than in previous years, and that the MAG region was making improvements with project schedules and keeping projects on track.

Ms. Kennedy summarized MAG programming priorities. The top priority is to address current year project requests for first time deferrals, deletions, and modifications. The second priority is to allow projects to advance if requested and if funding is available, subject to the project's ability to meet schedule criteria; projects must be submitted to ADOT, and ready to authorize, no later than June 30. Ms. Kennedy noted that ADOT will sweep remaining funds on June 30, and funding that is swept would be lost from the region. If more funding is available after advancing existing projects, MAG would then look at additional funding requests for existing projects programmed for the current fiscal year. If funding is still available after that step, MAG would look at requesting new projects.

Ms. Kennedy explained that Congress and the President signed a funding bill that includes federal transportation funding for the balance of fiscal year 2014. ADOT will review the funding distribution and post sub-allocations for the region, and then MAG will update funding revenue projections with actual federal funding amounts. Using ADOT's existing projections from December 2013, MAG is currently over-programmed. Those projections do not take into consideration final vouchers MAG expects to see. Last year, MAG had over \$8 million in final vouchers. If the same amount were to appear this year, MAG would be very close to being balanced. While MAG does not anticipate any additional funding, MAG is entertaining requests for advancement in case funding is available. The Tier 2 memo was included in the committee packet.

Mr. Grant Anderson from Youngtown asked if a deferment request by Youngtown was included in the list of deferred projects. Ms. Kennedy replied that the Youngtown project was included in that list.

Chairman Fitzhugh asked for a motion. Mr. Naimark moved to recommend approval. Mr. Grant Anderson seconded the motion, and the motion passed by a unanimous voice vote of the Committee.

7. Programming of Projects for MAG Federal Congestion Mitigation and Air Quality Funding in the 2014-2018 MAG Transportation Improvement Program

Chairman Fitzhugh invited Ms. Teri Kennedy from MAG to present on the Programming of Projects for MAG Federal Congestion Mitigation and Air Quality Funding in the 2014-2018 MAG Transportation Improvement Program.

Ms. Kennedy noted that MAP-21 contained a CMAQ suballocation to the state of \$1.2 million in PM-2.5 funding, designated specifically for the PM-2.5 non-attainment areas of Nogales and Pinal County. MAG receives \$672,000 annually for Pinal County. Ms. Kennedy displayed a map of the PM-2.5 non-attainment area. MAG has five years of funding, and announced applications

for paving of unpaved dirt roads projects in October 2013, with three applications received in November 2013. The Street committee and Air Quality committee reviewed the projects. Ms. Kennedy displayed a map of submitted projects. The Air Quality technical committee reviewed air quality scores and made a recommendation to forward the projects and air quality scores to the Transportation Review Committee, and staff has provided a programming methodology for recommended approval by the Transportation Review Committee. The total amount would be \$3.4 million for the three projects.

Ms. Kennedy noted that the programming would result in \$28,000 carried forward to 2018 when a new call for projects is initiated based on the current federal funding estimates. Ms. Kennedy noted that the figures presented were old estimates provided by ADOT in December 2013, and that new estimates would be provided in about five weeks. Ms. Kennedy noted that there was also sufficient funding to provide funds for approximately six street sweepers, and provided a recommended rank order of applications. If additional funding became available, MAG could fund projects in rank order from highest priority on the list.

Mr. Dan Cook asked about a discrepancy between the handout provided to the committee (which indicated seven street sweepers) and the presentation (which indicated six street sweepers). Ms. Kennedy noted that the seventh sweeper identified in the handout, for the City of Phoenix, would not be fully funded with existing funds, and that only six street sweepers would be fully funded. Mr. Dick McKinley from the City of Surprise asked if the motion being considered by the TRC included both the PM-2.5 projects and the street sweepers, or only the PM-2.5 projects. Ms. Kennedy noted that the motion would only include the PM-2.5 projects, and that the information on the street sweepers was being provided for the committee's information only, as the MAG Management Committee is the committee that would recommend the ranked list of street sweepers for approval.

Chairman Fitzhugh asked for a motion. Mr. McKinley moved to recommend approval. Mr. Andy Granger from the City of Peoria seconded the motion, and the motion passed by a unanimous voice vote of the Committee.

8. Road Safety Assessments (RSAs) and Project Assessments (PAs) at Intersections/Corridors

Chairman Fitzhugh invited Mr. Sarath Joshua from MAG to present on the Road Safety Assessments (RSAs) and Project Assessments (PAs) at Intersections/Corridors.

Mr. Joshua noted that a call for projects to perform RSAs or develop PAs at intersections or arterial corridors was issued in November 2013. A total of 14 project applications were received; one application was subsequently withdrawn from consideration, while a different project from a prior year was deferred and recommended with this call for projects, leaving the total number of projects at 14. The total estimated cost for the 14 projects is \$440,000, while MAG has \$446,000 available in funding. Projects that are approved would be carried out using MAG On-Call consultants.

Mr. Joshua explained that the development of Project Assessments, a new addition to the Road Safety Assessment program, refines and further develops safety information from RSAs to the 15 percent design level, which can help projects contend for Highway Safety Improvement Program (HSIP) funds through ADOT. Mr. Joshua noted that RSAs are assessments of safety

at areas of high crash risk utilizing a law enforcement officer, traffic engineer, safety planner, and human factors specialist over a three-day period, with the full completion of the project occurring over approximately 11 weeks.

Mr. Paul Basha from the City of Scottsdale complimented Mr. Joshua for the inclusion of Project Assessments as eligible projects. Chairman Fitzhugh asked Mr. Joshua to clarify the number of projects, including the one project deferred from a previous year. Mr. Joshua responded that the total number of projects being considered, including the one project deferred from a previous year, was 14 projects. Mr. John Farry from Valley Metro asked for clarification that none of the crashes noted along the light rail system involved a light rail vehicle. Mr. Joshua noted that Mr. Farry's clarification was correct, but that the crashes were along the light rail alignment and may have involved pedestrians who were using the light rail system.

Chairman Fitzhugh asked for a motion. Mr. Basha moved to recommend approval. Mr. Mohamed Youssef from the Town of Queen Creek seconded the motion, and the motion passed by a unanimous voice vote of the Committee.

9. Designing Transit Accessible Communities Study Final Report

Chairman Fitzhugh invited Ms. Alice Chen from MAG to present on the Designing Transit Accessible Communities Study Final Report.

Ms. Chen noted that the study does not provide any funding initiatives or project recommendations. The request is that the committee recommends acceptance of the study, that the study is complete and meets the objectives of the work program, and that the committee accepts the information provided in the final document. Acceptance would allow the study tools to be used by MAG member agencies. The report was recommended for acceptance by Transit Committee at their January 9, 2014 meeting.

Ms. Chen explained the background for the study. There is a sense that aging baby boomers can no longer drive, and/or are choosing lifestyle change that involves taking more transit. Current evidence also suggests a shift toward multi-modalism and living in compact walkable communities, a trend that seems to exist beyond the recent recession; a generational shift in preferences. Ms. Chen noted that, from a car driver's perspective, the act of accessing the car is not always closely considered, while a transit user must consider the trip to the transit stop in addition to the transit trip itself. Therefore, the trip to the transit stop needs to be considered as part of the overall transit trip.

Stakeholder outreach was conducted to determine what transit accessibility means in the MAG region and in individual communities. The next step for the project was for volunteers and MAG staff to interview transit users at transit stops at five locations around the region. Bus stops were categorized into five locations based on the surrounding built environment. The final survey results, with 221 responses, indicated that providing certain amenities, such as street trees, bus information, streetlights, and landscaping, would encourage respondents to ride transit more often.

The responses were taken to the study working group, to determine the issues most critical to the MAG region. The issues that received the most responses included shade trees, bus schedule

information, streetlights, landscaping, bicycle lanes, bicycle parking, curb extensions, medians, decorative pavement, and art. The goal of the study was not to produce illustrative projects; rather, to produce a MAG region specific tool for member agencies to have available for their use. The study recognized that there are constraints in the built environment and funding, and looked at ways to leverage amenities and address issues in the planning and design phase to reduce the need to go back and retrofit.

Ms. Chen detailed the different elements addressed in the final report. Shelter can be provided for protection from the elements and can provide seating. Landscaping can be coordinated with shelter to maximize benefits. Ms. Chen showed an example of a shelter from the City of Scottsdale that can be placed in a southwestern climate to provide shade throughout the day. Seating can be provided in many ways, including through benches or short street walls. Landscape shading was the most critical factor in the survey. Different ways to provide shading include sidewalk-oriented buildings, and building entrances that minimize the distance pedestrians need to walk in the sun to access buildings.

Ms. Chen noted that there are different stages at which transit accessibility can be considered in the planning and policy process. Guidance might be introduced at the plan review stage, or may involve more comprehensive zoning or other changes. The study attempted to provide a variety of options for achieving greater transit accessibility. Adjacent land use was also noted as an important factor in transit accessibility. Informational signage best practices were evaluated during the study, including updating bus stop signage to provide more information. An example produced in the study was a bus stop sign that provides bus route information that is more related to destinations instead of street names, and may provide a greater sense of place to a transit user. Wayfinding, including bike-to-transit wayfinding initiatives, can provide more information to users to make transit more accessible.

Ms. Chen showed a summary of a study from the Mineta Transportation Institute that explained how coordination of bicycle and transit planning, bicycle parking, bike-to-transit encouragement, and bike share programs can all encourage additional transit use. Bicycling access, treatments, bicycle parking are recognized by the FTA as improvement to the transit system, and FTA funds are eligible for bicycling improvements, including bike racks and bike lockers. 51% of respondents indicated that they would increase transit utilization if greater bicycle access were provided. Pedestrian crossings are also mentioned in the study. Midblock crossings for pedestrians at bus stops are a safety concern and an uncomfortable experience for pedestrians. Sidewalks are a pathway to transit, and continuous sidewalks with widths beyond minimum standards are recommended.

The second workshop introduced participants to the concept of transit accessibility, and encouraged participants to think about how they could work together to improve transit accessibility. The study included an implementation checklist to assist agencies in implementing each topic from the study. Ms. Chen noted that one of the best ways to improve transit accessibility is to work internally by coordinating staff from different departments. Ms. Chen noted that the draft report was available on the MAG website.

Mr. Naimark noted that the study was very timely, especially with the impending opening of bike share and an increasing desire for connectivity. Mr. Naimark stated that he had an opportunity to preview the new bike share program after not riding a bike for 20 years, and noted that

lighting, both for pedestrians and bicyclists, is critical for encouraging transit use. Mr. Naimark also asked whether there was a section of the report related to maintenance. Ms. Chen replied that maintenance was not addressed in the study, as the focus was more on the user and less on the operations and maintenance perspective. Mr. Naimark replied that cracked pavement, tree branches, and dust/dirt accumulation are all aspects that should be addressed in terms of sidewalks and bike lanes. Mr. Basha thanked Ms. Chen for the presentation and noted that he supported Mr. Naimark's remarks. Mr. Basha explained that shadows and poor maintenance, such as using asphalt to cover concrete cracks, are concerns, and asked for data on millennial and baby boomer populations and possible changes toward use of the transit system. Ms. Chen noted that she could provide that information as a follow-up after the committee meeting. Mr. Farry noted that Valley Metro conducts ridership surveys that include demographics questions.

Chairman Fitzhugh asked for a motion. Mr. Grant Anderson moved to recommend acceptance of the study. Mr. Jeff Martin from City of Mesa seconded the motion, and the motion passed by a unanimous voice vote of the Committee.

10. MAG Regional Transportation Survey Results

Chairman Fitzhugh invited Ms. Eileen Yazzie from MAG to present on the MAG Regional Transportation Survey Results.

Ms. Yazzie noted that MAG began discussions with the Transportation Policy Committee in August to launch a survey to engage voters, particularly high-efficacy voters (those who voted in the last three out of five elections, or for young voters, who voted in the last election), on their feelings and thoughts on increased taxes and fees to support transportation services in the region. Through October and November, MAG worked with the Transportation Policy Committee and Regional Council to develop the survey. The survey was conducted in December. The demographics of the high efficacy voters tend to be older and Caucasian in comparison to the general electorate and population.

The survey asked whether respondents felt they would be better or worse off next year financially, with over half of respondents saying they would be the same, and the remainder split between better and worse off. In answering the question of which methods were used to get to work, a majority responded that they drive alone. These responses influenced satisfaction with different modes, particularly high "don't know" responses to non-driving modes. There was a statistical difference in satisfaction between Maricopa and Pinal counties regarding roads. MAG staff have also heard that streets and highways are a large concern in Pinal County.

Respondents were asked what the most important transportation related issue facing greater Phoenix was; traffic congestion on freeways received 18%, and lack of transit service received around 30%. The net total of traffic safety, bad drivers, and road rage respondents was 6%. In 2008, one of the top responses was gas prices, and for this survey, respondents did not indicate that as a concern. When asked about the most important improvement in their area, a plurality indicated public transportation issues, at 40%, while traffic control issues received the second-most responses at 19%. Respondents were asked what their top priorities for the greater Phoenix area were. Top answers included the completion of the regional freeway system, expansion of the existing light-rail system, improvement of major streets and intersections, and implementation of a region-wide bus system. The light rail responses demonstrated a statistical

difference between Maricopa and Pinal Counties. On the question of funding, over 60% of respondents agreed that there is probably or definitely not enough funding for transportation improvements. A high number of respondents (78%) understood and agree that transportation is tied to the economic vitality of the region.

One section of the survey included a preamble explaining the declining power of the gas tax and lower than expected sales tax revenue. Respondents indicated a general opposition to taxing themselves using a variety of sources, though extension of the existing transportation sales tax garnered 53% support. No other tax option received at least 50% approval. Ms. Yazzie noted that the yellow, more neutral responses shown in the graph are an opportunity area and an area of potential influence; these respondents are basically a swing vote. The survey asked whether there was more support for \$50 in new taxes or indexing the gas tax to match inflation. With the choice presented, respondents found a sales tax to be more preferable to a gas tax increase. People do not necessarily want to touch the gas tax at this point.

Ms. Yazzie noted that a big takeaway from the survey was that, when asking about support for various projects additional funding would be spent on, repairing and maintaining existing streets and freeways garnered top responses, and utilizing technologies to increase efficiencies also scored highly. Light rail, building freeways/lanes, and expanding bus service were ranked just below. On the question of likeliness to support a tax increase if money might not be used in their community, over half of respondents were somewhat or very likely to support the tax increase.

Conclusions from the survey were that high-efficacy voters do not appear to support new taxes at this time. The 53% support for a sales tax extension is positive, though 60% or higher support would be ideal. Voters do understand that there is a link between transportation and economic vitality. A large number of responses were related to improving public transit, but responses also indicated a strong need for maintaining what exists.

Mr. Eric Anderson noted that MAG would be conducting sub-regional analysis of the survey results to determine more specific responses. Mr. Woody Scoutten noted that the third largest response to transportation-related issues was “other” and asked whether there was a theme in the “other” responses. Ms. Yazzie replied that those responses were all over the map, with each scoring under 2%. Mr. Cook asked whether the survey takes into account that people may see the number of options for transportation and think that there is too much need and not enough funding, leading to reluctance to provide more funding. Mr. Cook also asked whether there was any idea to narrow the focus of the survey. Ms. Yazzie noted that the intent of the survey was to test broad views and options, and identify what respondents would most strongly support. Ms. Yazzie noted that the survey questions were randomized so that people would not always indicate support for the same first option they were read and reduce their support for projects toward the end of the list. Mr. Cook asked whether there was a question about priorities in spending between different modes. Ms. Yazzie replied that question five asked what the priorities of respondents were, and that completion of the regional freeway system and expanding the existing light rail system received the most responses.

Mr. Hauskins noted that the survey was a good temperature of transportation feelings in the region, and asked about how preferences for transportation funding compared to prioritizing funding for other areas, such as education or other areas. Mr. Eric Anderson replied that a question about that was in the draft survey, and that other surveys have shown transportation to

rank below other issues consistently, possibly because of reduced congestion and increased options in the region compared to previous years. Mr. Anderson noted that comparing, for example, education to transportation, was very difficult to do. Mr. Anderson believed the survey indicated that people are generally satisfied with the transportation system, that there is not enough funding, that people do not understand how transportation is paid for, that maintaining what exists is very important, and that expanding public transportation is very important too. The purpose of the survey was to get an understanding of public opinion at this point in time, in that any ballot initiative would need to have broad public support from the start.

Mr. Martin asked whether the next step was to develop an educational approach or outreach campaign about what is currently being funded, where funding comes from, and what funding is needed in the future. Mr. Martin noted that Valley Metro was facing some of the same challenges in terms of education, and asked whether there was an opportunity for MAG and Valley Metro to work together to educate citizens on transportation issues.

11. Request for Future Agenda Items

Chairman Fitzhugh requested topics or issues of interest that the Transportation Review Committee would like to have considered for discussion at a future meeting.

12. Member Agency Update

Chairman Fitzhugh offered opportunities for member agencies to present updates to their community.

Ms. Albert asked MAG to look at when we are programming different funding sources, such as HSIP, and how ADOT is changing their local government process, and making it more difficult for agencies to meet deadlines (see slides). Mr. Anderson noted that MAG is working closely with ADOT local government staff to coordinate the MAG and ADOT processes. Ms. Albert noted that the big issue currently is the long timeframe between MAG approval and ADOT approval.

Mr. Grant Anderson noted that Avondale is undergoing changes, and hoped that Chairman Fitzhugh would be able to continue his duties as chair of the Transportation Review Committee. Mr. Fitzhugh noted that his intention was to continue in his current role at the TRC.

Mr. Eric Anderson noted that EPA was going to approve MAG's PM-10 plan.

13. Next Meeting Date

The next regular Transportation Review Committee meeting is scheduled for Thursday, February 27, 2014 at 10:00 a.m. in the MAG Office, Saguro Room.

There being no further business, Chairman Fitzhugh adjourned the meeting at 11:25 a.m.