

DRAFT MINUTES OF THE
MARICOPA ASSOCIATION OF GOVERNMENTS
TRANSPORTATION REVIEW COMMITTEE

July 31, 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): Paul Jepson
ADOT: Brent Cain for Floyd Roehrich	Maricopa County: John Hauskins
Buckeye: Scott Lowe	Mesa: Scott Butler
*Cave Creek: Ian Cordwell	*Paradise Valley: Jim Shano
Chandler: Mike Mah for Dan Cook	Peoria: Dan Nissen for Andrew Granger
El Mirage: Jorge Gastelum	Queen Creek: Mohamed Youssef
*Fountain Hills: Randy Harrel	Scottsdale: Paul Basha
Gila Bend: Ernie Rubi	#Surprise: Mike Gent for Dick McKinley
Gila River Indian Community: Tim Oliver	Tempe: Shelly Seyler
Gilbert: Kristin Myers for Leah Hubbard	Valley Metro: John Farry
Glendale: Bob Darr for Debbie Albert	*Wickenburg: Vince Lorefice
Goodyear: Cato Esquivel	Youngtown: Grant Anderson

EX-OFFICIO MEMBERS ATTENDING

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

OTHERS PRESENT

John Bullen, MAG	Eileen Yazzie, MAG
Alice Chen, MAG	Ungyo Lynn Sugiyama, ADOT
Monique de los Rios Urban, MAG	Christine McMurdy, City of Goodyear
DeDe Gaisthea	Aryan Lirange, FHWA
Bob Hazlett, MAG	Suparna Dasgupta, MCDOT
Roger Herzog, MAG	Laurie Kattreh, MCDOT
Chaun Hill, MAG	Maria Deeb, City of Mesa
Teri Kennedy, MAG	Eve Ng, City of Scottsdale
David Massey, MAG	Janeen K. Gaskins, City of Surprise
Alex Oreschak, MAG	Mike Sabatini, Baker
Brian Rubin, MAG	Philip Pajak, Nobody's Perfect, Inc.
Steve Tate, MAG	Art Brooks, Strand and Associates

1. Call to Order

Chairman David Fitzhugh from the City of Avondale called the meeting to order at 10:04 a.m. Chairman Fitzhugh noted that the quorum requirement for the May 29, 2014 TRC meeting was 13 committee members.

2. Approval of Draft April 24, 2014 Minutes

Mr. Grant Anderson from the Town of Youngtown motioned to approve the minutes. 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. Roger Herzog, Senior Project Manager at MAG, to provide the Transportation Director's Report.

Mr. Herzog noted that Fiscal Year 2014 has ended, and that the Arizona Highway User Revenue Fund (HURF) increased 2.6% over Fiscal Year 2013, the largest growth since the recession. Total HURF revenues were similar to Fiscal Year 2005 levels. Mr. Herzog noted that the ½ cent sales tax increased 7% over Fiscal Year 2013, the largest growth since 2008. Total ½ cent sales tax collections were \$366 million, compared to \$391 million in 2007.

Mr. Herzog noted that the U.S. Senate amendment to the U.S. House version of the Highway Trust Fund bill would receive a vote on July 31, 2014. It is anticipated that the Senate amendment will be rejected, and returned to the Senate to either accept the original House version or reject the bill. The House bill calls for an additional \$10.8 billion through May 2015. The Senate version calls for an extension only through December 2014. Mr. Herzog noted that the USDOT explained that payments to state and local governments would need to be cut by as much as 28% if a bill is not passed.

Mr. Anderson asked when the USDOT would start cutting back payments. Mr. Herzog noted that this would likely occur in October 2014. Mr. Tim Oliver from Gila River Indian Community asked whether the payments would be delayed by USDOT, but still paid in full eventually, or whether payments would actually be cut. Mr. Herzog replied that it is possible that FHWA could possibly keep full payment levels through the end of the fiscal year, but there was still much uncertainty. Mr. John Farry from Valley Metro noted he had heard that payments could slow as soon as August.

5. Consent Agenda

Addressing the next item of business, Chairman Fitzhugh directed the Committee's attention to the consent agenda items 5A – FY 2015 MAG Transportation Alternatives (TA)

Non-infrastructure Safe Routes to School Projects, 5B – ADOT Red Letter Process, 5C – MAG Federally Funded PM-10 Street Sweeper Policy Revision, and 5D – Project Changes – Amendment and Administrative Modification to the FY 2014-2018 MAG Transportation Improvement Program, FY2015 Arterial Life Cycle Program and to the 2035 Regional Transportation Plan. Chairman Fitzhugh asked the Committee if there were any questions or comments. Seeing none, Chairman Fitzhugh requested a motion. Mr. Anderson moved to recommend approval. Mr. Rick Naimark from the City of Phoenix seconded the motion, and the motion passed by a unanimous voice vote of the Committee.

5A. FY 2015 MAG Transportation Alternatives (TA) Non-infrastructure Safe Routes to School Projects

The MAG Transportation Review Committee, by consent, approved the FY 2015 MAG Transportation Alternatives (TA) Non-infrastructure Safe Routes to School Projects.

5B. ADOT Red Letter Process

The MAG Transportation Review Committee, by consent, approved the ADOT Red Letter Process.

5C. MAG Federally Funded PM-10 Street Sweeper Policy Revision

The MAG Transportation Review Committee, by consent, approved the MAG Federally Funded PM-10 Street Sweeper Policy Revision.

5D. Project Changes – Amendment and Administrative Modification to the FY 2014-2018 MAG Transportation Improvement Program, FY2015 Arterial Life Cycle Program and to the 2035 Regional Transportation Plan

The MAG Transportation Review Committee, by consent, approved the Project Changes – Amendment and Administrative Modification to the FY 2014-2018 MAG Transportation Improvement Program, FY2015 Arterial Life Cycle Program and to the 2035 Regional Transportation Plan.

6. Job Access and Reverse Commute Priority Ranking and Funding Recommendations

Chairman Fitzhugh invited Ms. Alice Chen from MAG to present on the Job Access and Reverse Commute (JARC) Priority Ranking and Funding Recommendations.

Ms. Chen noted that the JARC program, by definition of the Federal Transit Administration (FTA), is for expenses supporting the development and maintenance of transportation services for low income individuals to access jobs and job related services. Eligible activities include late night and weekend expansion of fixed route service, demand response, transit-related aspects to bicycling, car loan programs, administration and marketing of transit passes, GIS, ITS, scheduling, and dispatch, or a mobility manager (typically managing non-profit programs).

Ms. Chen explained that the MAG Regional Council approved JARC programming guidelines

in March 2014. Previously, the City of Phoenix managed the JARC program for the region. This is the first year MAG has managed the JARC Program. The program goal that was approved by Regional Council is to improve access for low-income persons to jobs and job-related services. Ms. Chen noted that the FTA allows between one and three years of funding, and that MAG opened a call for projects to include two years, FY 2014 and FY 2015. The minimum project request was for \$30,000 while the maximum request was \$200,000 for a single agency application or \$400,000 for a multi-agency application.

Ms. Chen provided the committee with the four evaluation areas considered in the JARC call for projects, and their associated weights: target population (30%), performance indicators (20%), coordination and outreach (30%), and meets the program intent (20%).

Ms. Chen noted that MAG received 20 JARC applications in the call for projects, and that one project, from the City of Tempe, was determined to be ineligible. 19 projects were evaluated according to the four evaluation areas by a multi-agency evaluation team, and ranked according to a weighted final score. Ms. Chen noted that agencies who submitted projects did not evaluate their own projects.

Ms. Chen explained that the Transit Committee was presented with three programming options in July 2014. Option one was to carry forward all funding for each ranked project for 2014 and 2015, until all funding was expended. Projects one through six would receive full funding and project seven would receive partial funding. The option included an aspect that would re-evaluate the process for competitive programs for funding from 2016 onward. The reason for the recommendation to reevaluate the guidelines was to have the opportunity to improve the process and to clarify both the guidelines and application of the guidelines. The second option only carried forward funding for FY 2014, and the process would be re-evaluated for FY 2015 and beyond. Option three looked at a clustering of rankings, and not individual project rankings. Under option three, the first four projects had a natural clustering, as did the following four, and then two additional projects had a natural clustering as well. All projects above the natural break would receive partial funding. Funding requests would be normalized down to the natural break.

Ms. Chen explained that the Transit Committee recommended approval of option one, funding seven projects over two fiscal years.

Chairman Fitzhugh noted that the committee had received a comment card from Phillip Pajak to speak on the agenda item. Mr. Pajak introduced himself as the Executive Director of Nobody's Perfect, Inc., a small non-profit based out of Queen Creek, Arizona, which works specifically with persons with developmental disabilities. Mr. Pajak noted that Nobody's Perfect, Inc. provides job training and vocationally based programs, operates a small thrift store in Queen Creek, and offers other job placement programs. Mr. Pajak explained that funding from the JARC program was essential in Nobody's Perfect, Inc. establishing job access service programs in 2010. Through this grant opportunity, Nobody's Perfect, Inc. was able to acquire vans and provide transportation on request to job training opportunities to consumers. This program provides a service in the Queen Creek area and other surrounding communities where not much public transportation was available. Transportation is provided to consumers who may not be physically or cognitively able to take public transit to get to and from workplaces and other job programs in the area. Last year Nobody's Perfect, Inc. had three vans, while this year they had

five vans. Mr. Pajak noted that costs for the program have increased each year. Nobody's Perfect, Inc. has received requests for service from as far out as Pinal County, Florence, and Coolidge. Mr. Pajak indicated the non-profit's desire to expand out into those parts of the region to meet the needs of the vulnerable population in the community. Mr. Pajak noted that their partnership with the JARC program has been very instrumental in providing services in the Southeast area of the region.

Mr. Farry asked what would happen to Mr. Pajak's program if the JARC funding went away. Mr. Pajak answered that Nobody's Perfect, Inc. would survive without the funding, but that they would need to pull funding from other sources to implement transportation services. Mr. Paul Basha from the City of Scottsdale clarified that if option three was chosen, Nobody's Perfect, Inc. would receive funding, but under options one and two, Nobody's Perfect, Inc. would not receive funding. Ms. Kristin Myers from the Town of Gilbert asked about service in Coolidge, which is not in the MAG region, and wished to clarify that funding would only be spent in the MAG region. Ms. DeDe Gaisthea responded that Nobody's Perfect, Inc. is located in Queen Creek, Arizona, and that the funding would stay in the MAG region. Mr. Anderson observed that he believed it was necessary to discuss a great need for funding and programs in outlying areas that are either underserved or not served. Mr. Anderson noted that he preferred to look at funding transportation improvements in areas that are not served at all. Mr. Anderson noted that projects in outlying areas ranked lower because the JARC criteria put higher density areas as places of greater need in the evaluation.

Mr. Farry noted that this funding is not just for JARC projects that have been awarded in the past, and that Valley Metro projects that have previously received JARC funding are not being funded now. Mr. Farry noted that option one included language that indicates the need to evaluate guidelines going forward. Mr. Farry noted that selecting projects on annual or two-year basis for fixed-route funding could be problematic, as services rely on uncertain funding sources which could not be there year to year. Mr. Farry noted a need to look at big picture considerations going forward.

Mr. Oliver reiterated what was said by Mr. Anderson and Mr. Farry. Mr. Oliver noted that the outlying areas are least able to make up a lack of funding from other funding sources. Mr. Oliver noted an increasing focus on funding projects in the urban areas, and less focus on more rural outlying areas. Mr. Oliver noted that in order to make these programs reliable, the rural routes will never compare based on established criteria that focus on high-density urban areas. Mr. Oliver noted that two routes that go into the Gila River Indian Community will no longer receive JARC funding and the community will need to scramble to make up the funding. Mr. Basha supported Mr. Anderson's and Mr. Oliver's comments. Mr. Basha noted that the urbanized areas want funding to enhance existing operations (30 minute service to 20 minute service). But in rural communities, the funding can be the difference between no service and having service. Mr. Basha commented that he found that argument to be more compelling from a funding standpoint. Mr. Basha noted that grouping the results as in option three overcomes the difficulty of slight differences in scores making or breaking a program.

Ms. Chen noted that all three options include a reevaluation of the guidelines moving forward. Mr. Naimark noted that when criteria are set up and projects are evaluated based on that criteria, Mr. Naimark felt uncomfortable overturning a solid 15-3 vote from the modal committee, having

not heard any overly compelling reasons at the Transportation Review Committee to overturn that vote. Ms. Myers noted that she had similar concerns about funding for rural routes being lost, but also heard the Transit Committee, which heard the item over two months due to questions about how projects were ranked. Ms. Myers liked having the opportunity to reevaluate criteria in the future, but did not want to retroactively apply new criteria to an existing process.

Mr. Anderson noted that option two was similar to option one, except that it covers only one year of funding and allows for an earlier reevaluation of the process. Mr. Anderson suggested looking at option two as a good compromise between the other two options. Mr. Basha appreciated the idea of using option two, but noted that from a continuity perspective, a two year program is preferable to a one year program. Mr. Basha also noted that option three includes all options from options one and two, but includes four additional projects (Route 685, 96, 72 and Nobody's Perfect, Inc.). Mr. Basha noted that choosing option three would allow for additional projects to be funded, with only slight reductions in funding for projects selected under option one.

Mr. Naimark asked whether the Transit Committee considered all three options, and then chose option one. Ms. Chen replied that was correct. Mr. Naimark would prefer option one to be respectful of the process that led to that result. Mr. Youssef noted that an existing process was in place, and those participating in the process made the decision to make a priority ranked list, beginning the process in March, and voting on it at the Transit Committee in July.

Mr. Mike Gent from the City of Surprise noted that Surprise opposed option one at the Transit Committee, and would continue to oppose option one at the Transportation Review Committee. Mr. Brent Cain from ADOT asked for clarification on how funding levels for the projects varied from option one and two to option three. Ms. Chen noted that option one and two funded each project in its entirety until the last funded project, and awarded the balance of funding to the last funded project. Option three applied a factor to each project, and normalized the funding, resulting in a larger amount for some project and a smaller amount for others.

Chairman Fitzhugh asked for a motion. Mr. Rick Naimark from the City of Phoenix moved to recommend approval of Option One. Mr. Scott Butler from the City of Mesa seconded the motion, and the motion passed by a 17-4 voice vote of the Committee, with the City of Scottsdale, City of Surprise, Gila River Indian Community, and Town of Youngtown opposed.

7. Locally Preferred Alternative (LPA) and Proposed Major Amendment to Add the Light Rail Transit Extension on Central Avenue: Washington/Jefferson to Baseline Rd. to the 2035 MAG Regional Transportation Plan

Chairman Fitzhugh invited Ms. Eileen Yazzie from MAG to present on the Locally Preferred Alternative (LPA) and Proposed Major Amendment to Add the Light Rail Transit Extension on Central Avenue: Washington/Jefferson to Baseline Rd. to the 2035 MAG Regional Transportation Plan (RTP).

Ms. Yazzie noted this item included a two part motion. The first part was to recommend approval of a LPA, and the second part was to recommend approval of a proposed major amendment to the 2035 RTP. Ms. Yazzie noted that state laws defined what actions required a major amendment to the RTP. A major amendment process would be triggered by the addition

or deletion of a freeway or fixed transit segment that changes over a mile in length or costs over \$40 million. Ms. Yazzie noted that the South Central corridor was initially shown in Proposition 400 as a Bus Rapid Transit corridor. In 2012, Valley Metro and the City of Phoenix initiated an alternatives analysis process to develop a recommendation for high capacity transit improvements in the study area. Ms. Yazzie noted the alternatives analysis report made a recommendation through rigorous analysis of the mode, alignment, station locations, and the street configuration.

Ms. Yazzie explained that the City of Phoenix appointed a community working group to help determine the alignment, station locations, and street configuration, and approved the light rail mode alternative, in May 2013. Ms. Yazzie displayed the study area, indicating that the study area was six miles in length, and looked at Central Avenue plus one mile in either direction east and west to analyze the corridor. In part due to a desire to hook in to the existing light rail system, three alternatives were advanced for further study. The next level of analysis involved ten evaluation categories, analysis of technologies, extensive public involvement, and evaluation of engineering constraints, such as bridges and a need to cross Union Pacific Railroad tracks and the I-17 with grade separation. Ms. Yazzie noted that the locally preferred alternative (LPA) was for light rail on Central Avenue south of Buckeye Road, and on 1st Avenue and Central Avenue north of Buckeye Road, to connect to the existing light rail system. The Phoenix City Council approved the LPA in December 2013. In April 2014, the City of Phoenix formed a community-based committee to prepare a plan for an extension of the Transit 2000 sales tax, to include capital, operations, and maintenance funding for the South Central corridor. In June 2014, Valley Metro Rail approved the LPA.

Ms. Yazzie noted that the project's capital cost was estimated at \$680 million, which meant that the funding also triggered a major amendment process for the RTP. Ms. Yazzie explained that the anticipated revenue sources for the South Central corridor would be the Phoenix transit tax and possible federal transit funds. No regional Public Transportation Funds (Proposition 400 funds) would be used for the capital expenses. Ms. Yazzie noted that the schedule anticipates an opening in 2034, with an 8-10 year window of project development, which would begin around 2024.

Ms. Yazzie explained that the next steps were approval in the MAG process and then approval by the Maricopa County Board of Supervisors, RPTA, and the State Transportation Board. Following these approvals, action would return to the MAG process for a recommendation to perform an air quality conformity analysis, and finally approval of the RTP amendment and air quality conformity analysis.

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

8. Update of the Federal Functional Classification and National Highway System Designation of Principal Arterial Roadways in the MAG Urbanized Area

Chairman Fitzhugh invited Ms. Teri Kennedy from MAG to present on the Update of the Federal Functional Classification and National Highway System Designation of Principal Arterial Roadways in the MAG Urbanized Area

Ms. Kennedy noted that there were two updated handouts at the table. Ms. Kennedy explained that under MAP-21, all principal arterials nationwide were added into the National Highway System (NHS), as of October 1, 2012. Numerous regulations are associated with NHS designation, including design and design exceptions, materials certification, quality assurance program, warranties, and sign and junkyard control. The exact meaning of how to implement new measures is unclear until ADOT develops implementation policies. Ms. Kennedy displayed a map of the existing principal arterial network as of October 1, 2012, noting that all the principal arterials must comply with NHS rules and regulations.

Ms. Kennedy explained that the Transportation Review Committee looked at the NHS issue previously. In February 2013, MAG submitted a proposal to remove the principal arterials from the NHS. In May 2013, FHWA issued new guidance for functional classification. In October 2013, FHWA notified MAG that the request to remove principal arterials from NHS would not be approved, and that principal arterials cannot be removed from the NHS solely to avoid NHS requirements.

Ms. Kennedy detailed two problems with the principal arterial network being included in the NHS. The first problem is that the functional classification of the MAG arterial network was last updated in 1992, but there have been many changes to the freeway and arterial network since then. This has led to many redundant corridors, and the MAG region having 22% more principal arterials than the national average. Additionally, population and employment patterns have matured, and new FHWA guidance on functional classification was released in 2013. The second problem is that NHS experienced automatic expansion without MPO or COG concurrence, meaning that the principal arterials that were automatically incorporated do not meet NHS requirements or goals. This means that all new projects on the NHS must comply, while national performance standards for the NHS have not yet been released. Additionally, the quantity of principal arterials that was included in the NHS is inordinately burdensome to the state and local agencies, with little to no increase in funding available.

Ms. Kennedy provided the committee with the federal definition of the National Highway System, and noted that a fact sheet handout on NHS was provided to committee members. Ms. Kennedy explained that MAG's locally owned principal arterials are unique in the nation, as most principal arterials are owned by many state agencies.

Ms. Kennedy informed the committee that NHS designation can be removed by reclassifying principal arterials to minor arterials. The NHS designations are addressed on a case-by-case basis, must meet federal guidelines, should be a rational classification system, and can be periodically updated in the future. Ms. Kennedy explained that removing NHS designation would have no impacts on funding currently, though future legislation could change that. Historically, the amount of arterials played an important factor in funding. Additional impacts would include reduced data collected for HPMS/Asset Management for ADOT. Removing principal arterials from the NHS could reduce the impact of future regulations on the NHS system, and reduces the amount of data collection that may need to be done by local agencies.

Ms. Kennedy noted that minor arterials would still be eligible for STP, TA, CMAQ, and HSIP funding suballocated to the MAG region, though they would lose eligibility for National

Highway Performance Program (NHPP) funds. However, NHPP funds are controlled by ADOT and currently distributed to freeways and state-owned facilities.

Ms. Kennedy explained the MAG approach to addressing the NHS issues. MAG reviewed the current Principal Arterial Network, historic Roads of Regional Significance, and updates to the freeway network. MAG surveyed other agencies in the west and made comparisons to the nationwide network. MAG then coordinated with member agencies, held Street Committee reviews, and did a modeling exercise on ADT and longest-trip lengths. As a result, MAG is recommending reclassification of principal arterials to minor arterials as appropriate, and changes specific to the NHS facilities where appropriate.

Ms. Kennedy explained that the Street Committee recommended approval of Option 2E, and after the committee meeting, Option 2F was developed by an agency request to adjust Tatum Road to a minor arterial, as Tatum Road is a very close parallel corridor to Cave Creek Road. Option 2F also downgrades Adams St from I-17 to 19th Avenue to a major collector, as proposed interchange upgrades to the area never materialized.

Ms. Kennedy noted that the pros of this action are correcting the functional classification of principal arterials, reducing the local NHS by approximately 656 miles, and allowing projects that are removed from NHS to proceed. The cons to this action are lowering the priority of the roadways removed, and possible effect on future funding to the state and the region. Ms. Kennedy noted that the requested action is for recommended approval of Option 2F, to update the functional classification for the Principal and Minor Arterial network and of the modifications in the National Highway System for the MAG region and to the 2035 Regional Transportation Plan as appropriate.

Mr. Naimark asked how often the principal arterial and NHS designations would be updated in the future. Ms. Kennedy noted that updates were not done regularly in the past, but in the future, updates would likely be completed every three to five years or when a new freeway facility is opened. Mr. Naimark asked what the likelihood of approval by FHWA was. Ms. Kennedy noted that she hoped action could be completed by end of October 2014 from FHWA. Mr. Naimark asked how much money has come to cities and towns as a result of NHS designation, or how much funding would be expected. Ms. Kennedy noted that the total funding to cities and towns as a result of NHS designation was \$0. Mr. Naimark noted that because of this lack of funding, there did not seem to be much negative to removing these roads from the NHS, and that not acting could result in an unfunded mandate to change these roads to meet NHS standards. Mr. John Hauskins from Maricopa County noted that the NHS requirements cause increased requirements with no increase in funding, and that taking many of these roadways out of the system would be wise from a financial point of view. Ms. Myers wanted to verify that no NHPP funding is already programmed to go to these routes. Ms. Kennedy verified that this was correct. Mr. Basha thanked Ms. Kennedy and Mr. Steve Tate from MAG for their work. Mr. Basha asked if the City of Phoenix was comfortable with changes from 2E to 2F. Mr. Naimark responded that the City of Phoenix was comfortable. Mr. Naimark asked MAG staff to continue working with ADOT to address funding related to implementing the new requirements.

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

9. 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.

10. Member Agency Update

Chairman Fitzhugh offered opportunities for member agencies to present updates to their community. Mr. Naimark noted that City of Phoenix was kicking off a transportation committee and engagement process for bus, rail, and street improvements leading to a likely election in August 2015 for an extension of the transportation tax. This could result in a potential tripling of light rail miles in City of Phoenix.

11. Next Meeting Date

The next regular Transportation Review Committee meeting is scheduled for Thursday, August 28, 2014 at 10:00 a.m. in the MAG Office, Saguaro Room.

There being no further business, Chairman Fitzhugh adjourned the meeting at 11:23 a.m.