

DRAFT MINUTES OF THE
MARICOPA ASSOCIATION OF GOVERNMENTS
TRANSPORTATION REVIEW COMMITTEE

September 25, 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: 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: Jorge Gastelum	*Queen Creek: Mohamed Youssef
Fountain Hills: Randy Harrel	Scottsdale: Todd Taylor for Paul Basha
*Gila Bend: Ernie Rubi	Surprise: Mike Gent
Gila River Indian Community: 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: 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: Ed Stillings	
* Members neither present nor represented by proxy.	+ - Attended by Videoconference
	# - Attended by Audioconference

OTHERS PRESENT

John Bullen, MAG	Kristin Myers, Town of Gilbert
Alice Chen, MAG	Christine McMurdy, City of Goodyear
Bob Hazlett, MAG	Erika McCalvin, FMYN
Roger Herzog, MAG	Martin Lucero, City of Surprise
Chaun Hill, MAG	Charlene Neish, City of Tempe
Teri Kennedy, MAG	Art Brooks, Strand and Associates
Alex Oreschak, MAG	Bill Cowdrey
Steve Tate, MAG	Steve Jimenez, Stanley
Julie Walker, MAG	Dan Marum, Wilson & Company
Eileen Yazzie, MAG	Randall Overmyer, CK Group
Steve Beasley, ADOT	Paul Ward, Award Consulting
Kwi-Sung Kang, ADOT	Steve Wilcox, AECOM

1. Call to Order

Chairman David Fitzhugh from the City of Avondale called the meeting to order at 10:01 a.m. Chairman Fitzhugh noted that the quorum requirement for the September 25, 2014 TRC meeting was 13 committee members.

2. Approval of Draft July 31, 2014 Minutes

Mr. Rick Naimark from the City of Phoenix motioned to approve the minutes. Mr. Grant Anderson from the Town of Youngtown 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 sales tax revenue in August 2014 increased 4.8% over August 2013, and that sales tax revenues had increased 3.8% year-to-date. Mr. Anderson explained that projections for sales tax revenue growth were estimated at 5.8% year over year, but that such an increase would still result in sales tax revenues lower than the peak in 2007. Mr. Anderson informed the committee that Highway User Revenue Fund (HURF) revenues had increased 0.6% in August 2014, while the projected HURF revenue growth was 2.3% year-over-year. Mr. Anderson announced that the South Mountain Freeway Final Environmental Impact Statement was uploaded to ADOT's website the week of September 15, 2014, and was published in the federal register the week of September 22, 2014. The record of decision is expected by the end of 2014 or in early January 2015.

5. Consent Agenda

Addressing the next item of business, Chairman Fitzhugh directed the Committee's attention to the consent agenda items 5A – Project Changes - Amendment and Administrative Modification to the FY 2014-2018 MAG Transportation Improvement Program, FY 2015 Arterial Life Cycle Program, and to the 2035 Regional Transportation Plan, 5B – ADOT LPA Training, and 5C – Pedestrian and Bicycle Facilities Design Assistance. Chairman Fitzhugh asked the Committee if there were any questions or comments. Seeing none, Chairman Fitzhugh requested a motion. Mr. Dan Cook from the City of Chandler moved to recommend approval. Mr. Naimark seconded the motion, and the motion passed by a unanimous voice vote of the Committee.

5A. Project Changes – Amendment and Administrative Modification to the FY 2014-2018 MAG Transportation Improvement Program, FY 2015 Arterial Life Cycle Program, and to the 2035 Regional Transportation Plan

The MAG Transportation Review Committee, by consent, recommended approval of the Project Changes – Amendment and Administrative Modification to the FY 2014-2018 MAG Transportation Improvement Program, FY 2015 Arterial Life Cycle Program, and to the 2035 Regional Transportation Plan.

5B. ADOT LPA Training

The MAG Transportation Review Committee, by consent, approved the ADOT LPA Training.

5C. Pedestrian and Bicycle Facilities Design Assistance Program

The MAG Transportation Review Committee, by consent, recommended approval of the Pedestrian and Bicycle Facilities Design Assistance Program.

6. MAG Bicycles Count Project

Chairman Fitzhugh invited Mr. Alex Oreschak from MAG to present on the MAG Bicycles Count Project.

Mr. Oreschak explained that the action requested from the committee was to recommend acceptance of the MAG Bicycles Count project final report. Mr. Oreschak noted that the MAG Bicycle and Pedestrian Committee previously recommended acceptance of the final report on September 16, 2014. Mr. Oreschak explained that bicycle count data collection is needed because there is a lack of data available; the few available resources, such as U.S. Census commute data, the National Household Travel Survey, and some bike-on-bus data from Valley Metro do not show a complete picture of bicycling in the region.

Mr. Oreschak thanked the consultant team (Chen Ryan Associates, Wilson & Company, TRA, Inc., and Coffman Studio) for their work on the project and the final product. Mr. Oreschak explained that the study lasted 18 months, from February 2013 to June 2014, and had multiple components: determining the ideal methodology to conduct the counts, identifying where the counts would occur, collecting the data, analyzing the data, preparing a final report, and setting the foundation for future counts.

Working with the MAG Bicycle and Pedestrian Committee, two count methodologies were selected for the study. Manual counts were conducted at 84 locations during two hour peak periods. In addition to counting bicyclists at intersections, these counts identified whether people were riding on the sidewalk or in the street, and whether individuals were riding in the wrong direction. Temporary automated counts, using pneumatic tube technology, were conducted at 44 locations in October and November 2013. These counts collected two weeks of continuous, 24-hour data. Combined, the 128 count locations covered a broad cross-section of the region.

One of the primary findings of the project was that off-street paths generally experienced higher average hourly bike volumes compared to bike lines and roadways with no bike lanes. Another key finding was that between 30% and 94% of cyclists in the region were observed riding on the sidewalk at the 84 manual count sites. Mr. Oreschak noted that the wide variation in sidewalk riding percentages was directly related to the roadway characteristics: sidewalk riding was

highest on streets with six vehicle lanes, no bike lanes, and right-turn pockets at intersections.

Mr. Oreschak displayed two graphs indicating bike volumes by time of day, and noted that during weekdays, there was a morning and evening peaking effect on bike paths and bike lanes, which was indicative of commuting trips. On the weekends, peak patterns occurred in the morning, around 10:00 a.m., for bike paths and bike lanes, which is consistent with what is seen throughout the country. Mr. Oreschak noted that data on average daily bicycle volumes indicates similar weekday volumes between bike paths and bike lanes, and higher weekend volumes on bike paths as compared to bike lanes.

Mr. Oreschak explained that there are many potential uses for bicycle volume data. The data can be used to analyze regional bicycle trends over time, to understand how bicycle mode use varies by type of facility, and to calculate cycling-related emissions reductions in air quality analysis. The data can also be incorporated into the transportation planning process and transportation safety studies, to perform before-and-after counts when new bike facilities are built, and to improve the evaluation of project applications.

Mr. Oreschak outlined how MAG plans to continue collecting data in the future. In 2014 and 2015, MAG will use pneumatic tube technology to continue conducting temporary automatic counts at the same 44 locations included in the MAG Bicycles Count project. Mr. Oreschak noted that MAG will also work with member agencies to coordinate manual counts to supplement the automatic counts, and explained that the City of Tempe was a good template for conducting manual counts. In Tempe, the Tempe Bicycle Action Group coordinates yearly manual bike counts, and shares the collected data with the city.

An additional component of future data collection will be a new initiative by MAG to loan pneumatic tube counters to MAG member agencies for their use at additional sites beyond the 44 locations MAG will be analyzing. This equipment will likely be available beginning in January 2015. Mr. Oreschak also encouraged member agencies to install permanent bike counters with new projects, and to retrofit older facilities with permanent bike counters. For example, Mesa has installed two permanent bike counters at locations along the Consolidated Canal.

Mr. Oreschak concluded his presentation by providing the committee with information on where MAG would be installing temporary bike counters in 2014 and 2015, with the first installations scheduled for September 29, 2014.

Chairman Fitzhugh thanked Mr. Oreschak for his presentation. Mr. John Hauskins from Maricopa County asked if it would be appropriate to install a permanent counter when an agency has a new bicycle lane project. Mr. Oreschak replied that new projects would be a good opportunity to install permanent bike counters.

Mr. Cook indicated that a previous slide showed a range of people riding on sidewalks between 30% and 94%. Mr. Cook asked if this range was dependent on the type of facilities – i.e. highway vs arterial street. Mr. Oreschak replied that the range is highly dependent on the roadway characteristics – bike lane on the road, right turn lanes, and number of travel lanes. Mr. Oreschak noted that the full report breaks down the variation by type of roadway.

Chairman Fitzhugh noted that volumes on 107th Avenue at Thomas Road in Avondale seemed high, and that while Avondale did not have any hard evidence to dispute the numbers, Chairman Fitzhugh wanted to bring this to the attention of MAG staff. Chairman Fitzhugh also asked Mr. Oreschak who committee members should contact if they had questions about the final report or the data. Mr. Oreschak replied that he could be contacted for any questions or issues with the report or data. Mr. Oreschak also noted that MAG would be conducting data collection at all 44 locations, including 107th Avenue and Thomas Road, over the next two years, and that with three years of data, it would be easier to identify outliers or anomalies.

Mr. Hauskins moved to recommend acceptance of the MAG Bicycles Count project Final Report. Mr. Grant Anderson seconded the motion, and the motion passed by a unanimous voice vote of the Committee.

7. FY 2015 Regional Freeway and Highway Program Update

Chairman Fitzhugh invited Mr. Bob Hazlett from MAG to present on the FY 2015 Regional Freeway and Highway Program Update.

Mr. Hazlett noted that the Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) was adopted in 2003 and that Proposition 400 was passed in 2004. The Regional Freeway and Highway Program was authorized to begin in 2006, through 2026. Mr. Hazlett noted that the initial cost opinion from ADOT for the program was \$8.1 billion. During the recession in 2007-2008, the cost opinion increased to \$15.9 billion. In 2009, the program was rebalanced back down to a \$9.4 billion cost opinion, and an additional \$300 million was rebalanced out of the program in 2012. Today, the cost opinion for the program stands at \$8.9 billion.

Mr. Hazlett explained that the program is approximately half completed. A number of significant projects have been accomplished by ADOT, MAG, and FHWA. Completed new corridors include Loop 303 from I-10 to US-60, a 13 mile segment of Loop 303 north of US-60, and the first mile of SR-24 in Mesa. Many widenings were completed on US-60/Superstition, I-17, Loop 101, I-10, SR-51, and Loop 202, including HOV lane additions. Mr. Hazlett noted that the MAG region now has the fourth largest HOV network in the country. A major reconstruction of Grand Avenue was also completed, with the corridor now timed for a 45 mph speed limit. Four direct HOV connections were added at SR-51/Loop 101, Loop 101/Loop 202, I-10/Loop 202 and Maryland Ave/Loop 101, making the MAG region's direct HOV ramp network the largest in the country.

Mr. Hazlett noted that 375 general-purpose lane miles have been opened out of the 720 general-purpose lane miles in the program, and 215 of 360 HOV lane miles have been opened, making the program 54% complete.

Mr. Hazlett overviewed the remaining projects in the program through 2026. These include the final stretch of Loop 303, with interchanges at El Mirage Road and Grand Avenue, additional widening of Loop 101/Pima-Price and Loop 202/Red Mountain widening, and improvements to I-10 and I-17 as a part of the I-10/I-17 Corridor Master Plan. New facilities include the Loop 202 South Mountain Freeway and Loop 303 from I-10 to MC-85. On Grand Avenue, intersection improvements are planned at Bell Road, and Thunderbird Road-Thompson Ranch Road.

Mr. Hazlett explained that the program has expended approximately \$3.6 billion since 2006, with an additional \$400-\$500 million for Loop 303 not included in that total. Between 2015 and 2019, total expenditures will increase to \$5.3 billion, as these years include the heaviest period of construction in the program. Mr. Hazlett noted that there will still be more projects completed after 2019, including the I-10/I-17 Corridor projects, which will bring total expenditures to \$8.9 billion by 2026. Mr. Hazlett noted that the next step is to re-evaluate the program, with an October 2014 workshop to identify cost savings and unspent revenue in the program, with the next update provided to the MAG committees in January 2015.

Ms. Leah Hubbard from the Town of Gilbert asked who would be at the October workshop, and whether member agencies would be invited. Mr. Hazlett noted that the workshop would include ADOT, FHWA, and MAG would be there, and not member agencies. Mr. Eric Anderson noted that the workshop was more of an internal housekeeping meeting, and that the next step after that workshop would be to meet with the member agencies,

Mr. Grant Anderson asked whether the program monies were restricted for highway uses, and asked if the money could be moved into other programs, such as light rail or bicycle and pedestrian projects. Mr. Hazlett noted that it was unlikely that the money could be moved to other programs, as much of the funding is specifically earmarked for the highway program, both federally and with Proposition 400.

Mr. Scott Lowe from the City of Buckeye asked about the widening of I-10 in the west valley, and whether that was still included in the program. Mr. Hazlett noted that this corridor was part of the RTP, but was pushed out to the unfunded Phase Five of the program during rebalancing, so the corridor improvements would not be funded as part of Proposition 400. Mr. Hazlett explained that the main criteria for bringing projects back into the program is “last out, first in.” Mr. Hazlett noted that a lot of things had changed since 2009, and that MAG would take a look at whether projects could be brought back into the program. Mr. Cato Esquivel from the City of Goodyear asked if SR-30 should be on the map. Mr. Hazlett noted that SR-30 was also pushed out to the unfunded Phase Five.

Ms. Hubbard asked if there were examples of the cost savings that have occurred in the program. Mr. Hazlett noted that some savings were captured in the 2012 RTP update, but that MAG needed to work with ADOT to identify all of the cost savings. Mr. Hazlett noted as an example that, in most projects, there has been a value analysis to see where cost savings could occur, and that MAG would work with ADOT to get the cost savings documented.

8. Outcome of the Central Phoenix Transportation Framework Study

Chairman Fitzhugh invited Mr. Bob Hazlett from MAG to present on the Outcome of the Central Phoenix Transportation Framework Study.

Mr. Hazlett noted that this would be the last presentation given for this study, and that this presentation was also given to the MAG Transportation Policy Committee previously. Mr. Hazlett noted that the study was a comprehensive look at transportation options within the boundaries of SR-101, and that the study would inform future transportation planning efforts. Mr. Hazlett informed the committee that this study was one of a series of framework studies

MAG has undertaken recently, covering topics such as the I-10/Hassayampa Valley, I-8 and I-10/Hidden Valley, Regional Transit, Freight Transportation, and Sustainable Transportation and Land Use Integration Study (STLUIS). These framework studies are meant to inform the MAG and local agency planning processes. Mr. Hazlett explained that the Central Phoenix Transportation Framework reviewed the existing foundation of transit, bicycle and pedestrian, arterial and intersection, and freeway/arterial intersection and link facilities. Through the study, over 200 possible projects were identified. Most project opportunities were the result of multiple meetings with the public, stakeholders, and member agency staff. Charette workshops were utilized to help identify what projects made the most sense. Every project was catalogued and categorized.

Mr. Hazlett noted that it became apparent during the study that it would make sense to categorize the proposed improvements into 12 subcategories: improvement strategies, “Spine Corridor,” freeway system plan, SR-30 corridor extension, DHOVs and park-and-rides, DHOVs, ATM deployment, roadway maintenance, freeway interchange options, arterial improvement strategies, transit improvement concepts, and pedestrian/bicycle concepts.

Mr. Hazlett highlighted a few projects from the study. SR-30 was identified to connect from SR-202/South Mountain to I-17 in central Phoenix. Mr. Hazlett noted that even with the construction of Avenida Rio Salado, there was still a need to relieve demand from I-10. An extension of SR-30 would help regional traffic and help southwest Phoenix with economic growth by connecting to downtown Phoenix and Sky Harbor International Airport.

Mr. Hazlett explained that direct high occupancy vehicle (DHOV) ramps were considered to create better access for buses and carpoolers to directly access the HOV lanes. The study identified that if more DHOVs existed on the system, carpoolers and buses could have better opportunities to avoid GP lanes, and could increase maneuverability on the system. The study identified 13 candidate DHOVs throughout the region, and the consultant also provided some overviews of how DHOVs could fit in to the street grid. Mr. Hazlett provided an example of a potential DHOV at I-17 by MetroCenter Mall, and how the ramps could integrate with the extension of light rail. Mr. Hazlett noted that the study reviewed case studies of best practices for park-and-ride facilities with transit on the freeway system in San Diego, Denver, and Seattle. The study established a background for development and character of such facilities in the region.

The study also analyzed growing maintenance and operations needs throughout the region. Mr. Hazlett noted that, on the freeway system alone, 38.6% of maintenance and operations needs were unfunded, and in the central Phoenix study area, 38.7% of the maintenance and operations needs were unfunded. The study included an overview of local agency operations and maintenance, as well as known bottlenecks in the system. One question to arise from the study is whether there should be a distinction to identify some surface street improvements as regionally significant. Mr. Hazlett explained that the study also analyzed arterial improvement strategies, such as railroad crossing grade separations, of which nine locations were determined as feasible opportunities

Mr. Hazlett informed the committee that all the information from the study summarized in a brochure, and that it was important to note that the Central Phoenix Framework helped inform

other projects such as Grand Avenue COMPASS, 99th Ave COMPASS, Managed Lanes, the I-10/I-17 Near-Term Improvements, arterial corridor improvements, and inner loop micro-simulation, along with the STLUIS study.

Mr. Hazlett explained that one significant project out of the Central Phoenix Framework Study was the Downtown Phoenix Core Connections and Operations Study, which analyzed special topics related to downtown: one way versus two way streets, restriping roadways for bike lanes, the future of Central Avenue, a potential new turnaround for light rail, modifications to even management, complete streets, and parking strategies. Mr. Hazlett noted that downtown Phoenix is a major source of events, a hub of transit operations, and home to a lot of people, and that there is a desire to see more livable streets in downtown. The study recommends a number of improvements over a short-term (one to five years), mid-term (six to ten years), and long-term (ten plus years) time period.

Mr. Cook commented that MAG and the consultants did a wonderful job, delivered great outcomes, and set a nice vision for the study area. Mr. Cook noted that some ideas presented in this study could also be applicable in the outer reaches of the metro area, such as the DHOV ramps and transit facilities, and that DHOVs are great additions to the system. Mr. Grant Anderson asked if events in the west valley, such as in Glendale, were looked at to see the impacts they would have in the future. Mr. Hazlett noted that the the west valley was looked at, specifically the stadium district in Glendale. Mr. Hazlett noted that the study discussed the DHOV lane at Maryland and the 99th Avenue COMPASS study looking further at the west valley, and that there are opportunities to consider as transit and carpools are expanded that can improve flexibility and reliability in the system.

Mr. Naimark noted that this study is a great example of thinking differently about the transportation network and really integrating all the elements in an important way. Mr. Naimark highlighted the DHOV ramps and their advantage to avoiding getting stuck in non-HOV lanes, also mentioning that connections to park and rides and transit locations are critical to more modern thinking of how the system works. Mr. Naimark also noted that the Downtown Phoenix connection to the study was important to include in the process, as Phoenix is moving from car-oriented to a transit, bicycle, and pedestrian focus. Mr Naimark noted trade-offs of such a change, like converting great traffic-moving one-way streets on 3rd Avenue and 5th Avenue to two-way streets that are better for neighborhoods, bicyclists, and pedestrians, and that the plan did a good job balancing conflicting needs.

9. Near-Term Improvements Strategy for the Interstate 10/Interstate 17 Corridor

Chairman Fitzhugh invited Mr. Bob Hazlett from MAG to present on the Near-Term Improvements Strategy for the Interstate 10/Interstate 17 Corridor.

Mr. Hazlett noted that the last update on this item to the Transportation Review Committee was in May 2014. Mr. Hazlett explained that near-term improvements for the corridor are currently under development and study by ADOT, and that candidate projects will need to meet environmental requirements and a near-term construction timeframe. ADOT is thinking creatively about how to move forward with the corridor.

Mr. Hazlett reviewed projects under consideration for near-term improvements to the corridor. The first improvement is the addition of an extra lane outbound from downtown Phoenix, from SR-51/SR-202 to US-60/Superstition in Tempe. ADOT completed a feasibility study which found that enough pavement currently exists to stripe the additional lane. As part of this project, a new sound wall for the condo complex near 48th Street will be installed. This project warrants a categorical exclusion.

The next improvement is a new collector-distributor (CD) road outbound from downtown Phoenix, from SR-143 to US-60. The new CD road will direct traffic directly onto US-60 and onto I-10 past the US-60 interchange. An additional CD road will be added in the inbound direction, with a new ramp separated from I-10 for traffic going directly to SR-143. ADOT also determined that a new bicycle and pedestrian crossing would be built at Alameda Drive over the I-10, connecting neighborhoods on either side of freeway. Another project would build an additional bicycle and pedestrian crossing along Guadalupe Road over I-10, and would involve adding additional general purpose lanes in each direction from US-60 to SR-202L/Santan-South Mountain. ADOT will look at both of these I-10 improvements as one complete project. This project also warrants a categorical exclusion, with the Design Concept Report (DCR) being completed by early 2016, and construction beginning 12-16 months after that.

The final project under consideration for near-term improvements is the addition of auxiliary lanes on I-17 between 16th Street and 19th Avenue. The next step for this project is to select a consultant, with a categorical exclusion and project assessment study likely to be completed by mid-2015.

Mr. Hazlett provided an overview of the performance of each of the projects in the MAG micro-simulation model. Individually, the model found that the projects will accommodate approximately an additional 50,000 trips during the afternoon peak travel period (3 p.m. to 7 p.m.) on the regional network. Mr. Hazlett noted that the average speeds within the micro-simulation area increase slightly over baseline speeds. Average speeds also increase over the baseline within the I-10/I-17 corridor. Mr. Hazlett stated that, from an operational perspective, the proposed projects work.

Mr. Hazlett also provided the committee on proposed traffic operations and ITS enhancements with ADOT, Avondale, Chandler, MCDOT, Phoenix, and Tempe, These projects would include ramp metering coordination, incident management, and variable speed limits. One improvement has already been enacted: incident management coordination between ADOT and the Arizona Department of Public Safety (DPS). Mr. Hazlett noted an example of the heavy rain event in mid-September, and how having the DPS officer available was a great help to managing the incident.

Mr. Hazlett provided an overview of the estimated costs for the near term improvement strategy, stating that the current estimate is about \$290 million, compared to the initial \$350 million estimate. All projects have the categorical exclusion designation, which will lead to a faster process for completion. Mr. Hazlett noted that the proposed timeline will have all project completed by FY 2017. Mr. Hazlett explained that there is \$196 million in the Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) currently, and that the remaining funding could be covered by a TIP amendment.

Mr. Hazlett explained that the Corridor Master Plan process is currently underway, and that the plan is divided into four tasks: initiating the project, conducting a corridor needs assessment, developing corridor alternatives screening, and establishing a Corridor Master Plan. There will be public meetings in early 2015, as well as a progress meeting for all the planning partners on October 27, 2014 at 1:30 p.m.

Mr. Hazlett noted that a sensitivity analysis of the corridor found that one third of all jobs in Maricopa County are located within the I-10/I-17 corridor, and that there are distinct travel markets to multiple destinations and activity centers. Mr. Hazlett explained that a critical question is how much congestion is tolerable to the region, as the region cannot continue building out lanes to reduce congestion. Mr. Eric Anderson noted that the interim improvements are all compatible with long-term improvements on the corridor, and that, with the exception of the I-17 auxiliary lanes, the interim improvements will be permanent.

Mr. Hauskins asked whether MAG looked at near-term improvements on I-17 from SR-101/Agua Fria-Pima to the I-10/I-17 interchanges. Mr. Hazlett noted that MAG did look at that section of the corridor, but that all potential improvements were either very expensive or touched on environmental issues, so those projects were determined as better fits for long-term study. Mr. Hazlett noted that the ITS improvements would also likely help in the near-term. Mr. Hauskins noted an enforcement issue on ramp metering on I-17, with a lot of people ignoring the ramp meters.

Mr. Naimark asked where the Pinnacle Peak and Happy Valley traffic circles fit into the project. Mr. Hazlett noted that both interchanges are under study and need a better cost estimate. Mr. Woody Scoutten from Litchfield Park asked whether any consideration was given to I-10 inbound and outbound on the west side. Mr. Hazlett noted that the ITS and traffic operations enhancements do incorporate that part of I-10, and also noted that there would be a number of improvements to that corridor as part of the SR-202L/South Mountain project. Mr. Hazlett explained that because of that, near term improvements on I-10 to the west would be premature. Mr. Cook asked what the timeframe was on how long the I-17 auxiliary lanes would stay in place once built. Mr. Hazlett noted that this stretch of freeway was one of the oldest in the valley, and that the corridor study would take a look at the design and environmental issues, along with the business and economic engines in the area. The Corridor Master Plan process will dictate what is done in that area. Mr. Hazlett noted that if the near-term improvements are there for 10 years, they will have been useful for the region.

Mr. Fitzhugh asked what the possible action might be for this item. Mr. Hazlett noted that if any of the items needed to go into a TIP amendment, action would be required. However, it seems that this would be unnecessary at this time, and no action was recommended to be taken.

10. Regional Transportation Demand Management (TDM) Plan

Chairman Fitzhugh invited Ms. Julie Walker from MAG to present on the Regional Transportation Demand Management (TDM) Plan.

Ms. Walker explained that MAG was launching a one-year study to develop a Regional TDM plan, with limited support from an on-call consultant. Ms. Walker noted that TDM is a way to

increase person trips without increasing vehicle trips, using a variety of travel choices (walking, biking, carpool, vanpool, bus, light rail, teleworking, and alternative work weeks) as well as through the distribution of information through marketing and education. The goal is to support a balanced transportation system by making the whole system more efficient. Ms. Walker noted that the transportation system is expanding, but the region is also growing, so congestion is increasing. The purpose of TDM is to come up with regional options as an alternative to sitting in congestion.

Ms. Walker noted that 18% of all trips in the region are work trips. About 30% of those work trips are affected by the travel reduction program law in Maricopa County. Employers of 50 or more must try to reduce single-occupancy vehicle (SOV) travel every year, ultimately reducing SOV trips to about a 60% rate. The SOV trip rate is currently around 77%.

Ms. Walker said one goal of TDM could be to expand the travel reduction program to employers with fewer than 50 employees, or to cover other trips beyond commute trips. Existing partners could be utilized in expanded roles, and new partners could be invited into the conversation. Ms. Walker noted that TDM involves many partners and activities. The first step for TDM is to increase awareness of all the options available to reduce SOV trips. Ms. Walker noted that the next step for TDM is to support commuters' interest in using alternate modes with TDM programs, and to support those programs with facilities.

Ms. Walker noted that planning goals, objectives, and measures for TDM programs is now a federal requirement. Agencies also have the tools to be more strategic about TDM planning now, and can use planned and programmed facilities, existing data, and existing programs to try to achieve greater effect than they currently have. Part of TDM planning is to create a new response to new conditions, such as a technology-driven world. New capabilities can create new opportunities to increase the value of TDM programs.

Ms. Walker explained that the TDM plan will expand the reach of existing programs, beginning with transit. TDM can help build and condition a transit market and expand transit's existing reach, helping more people get to transit. The plan will help the MAG region to comply with federal regulations related to performance measures and targets.

Ms. Walker informed the committee that the study will be completed within the next year, by August 2015. The study will involve focus groups with commuters in the spring of 2015, along with reaching out to large employers and transportation coordinators in the fall of 2014. Ms. Walker explained that the plan will convene an advisory group with representatives from MAG, Valley Metro, Maricopa County, and Capitol Rideshare. Ms. Walker will return to MAG and Valley Metro committees to provide updates on the study process.

Mr. John Farry from Valley Metro commented that the study is well-timed, that TDM has not been looked at closely in the region in the last few years, and that incorporating new technologies will be important to look at. Mr. Farry noted that the drive-alone number has been reduced in the last few years with improved communications on rideshare and other option. Ms. Walker replied that there are already great successes to be celebrated and built upon.

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. Mr. Naimark requested education on design and management of freeway systems related to flood management and flood control, if appropriate.

12. Member Agency Update

Chairman Fitzhugh offered opportunities for member agencies to present updates to their community. Mr. Naimark thanked ADOT, MAG, and FHWA for their work on the South Mountain EIS. Mr. Naimark noted that the City of Phoenix received a \$1.6 million TIGER grant for the South Central transit corridor, for planning, environmental assessment, and conceptual engineering. Mr. Mike Gent from the City of Surprise introduced himself as the new representative for the City of Surprise. Mr. Hauskins noted that the Maricopa County Board of Supervisors wrote a letter of support for the South Central transit corridor.

13. Next Meeting Date

The next regular Transportation Review Committee meeting is scheduled for Thursday, October 23, 2014 at 10:00 a.m. in the MAG Office, Saguaro Room.

There being no further business, Chairman Fitzhugh adjourned the meeting at 11:35 a.m.