

DRAFT MINUTES OF THE
MARICOPA ASSOCIATION OF GOVERNMENTS
TRANSPORTATION REVIEW COMMITTEE

April 23, 2015

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
ADOT: Brent Cain	Maricopa (City): Paul Jepson
Apache Junction: Emile Schmid for Giao Pham	Maricopa County: Jennifer Toth
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	Phoenix: Rick Naimark
Fountain Hills: Randy Harrel	Pinal County: Scott Bender
#Gila Bend: Ernie Rubi	Queen Creek: Mohamed Youssef
Gila River Indian Community: Sasha Pachito for Tim Oliver	Scottsdale: Todd Taylor for Paul Basha
Gilbert: Leah Hubbard	Surprise: Mike Gent
Glendale: Jenna Goad for Debbie Albert	Tempe: Mike Nevarez for Shelly Seyler
Goodyear: Cato Esquivel	Valley Metro: John Farry
	*Wickenburg: Vince Lorefice
	#Youngtown: Grant Anderson

EX-OFFICIO MEMBERS ATTENDING

*Street Committee: Maria Deeb, City of Mesa	* 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	Rob Bohr, Goodyear
John Bullen, MAG	Abhi Dayal, Valley Metro
Alice Chen, MAG	Steve Jimenez, Stanley Consultants
Monique de los Rios-Urban, MAG	Kwi-Sung Kang, ADOT
Bob Hazlett, MAG	Clem Ligocki, Maricopa County
Teri Kennedy, MAG	Mark Melnychenko, Phoenix
David Massey, MAG	Kristin Myers, Gilbert
Nathan Pryor, MAG	Randall Overmyer, The CK Group, Inc.
Brian Rubin, MAG	Tom Remes, Phoenix
Stephen Tate, MAG	Mike Sabatini, Michael Baker International
Julie Walker, MAG	Kristen Sexton, Avondale
	Marge Zylla, Tempe

1. Call to Order

Chair David Fitzhugh called the meeting to order at 10:02 a.m. Chair Fitzhugh noted that the quorum requirement for the April 23, 2015 Transportation Review Committee meeting was 14 committee members. Chair Fitzhugh informed the committee that there were three handouts at the table.

2. Approval of Draft February 26, 2015 Minutes

Chair Fitzhugh asked the committee if there were any comments on the draft February 26, 2015, meeting minutes. There were none. Mr. Rick Naimark moved to approve the February 26, 2015, meeting minutes. Mr. Woody Scoutten seconded the motion. The motion carried unanimously.

3. Call to the Audience

There were no public comments from the audience.

4. Transportation Director's Report

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

Mr. Anderson stated that Highway User Revenue Fund (HURF) revenues were strong in April and had increased by 3.2%. He noted that this is strong for HURF, as revenues have been flat or declining for the past 10 years.

Mr. Anderson stated that March half-cent sales tax revenues, which represent activity in February, showed 8.6% growth, with 4.3% growth year-to-date. He noted that this is tracking close to predicted levels. He stated that hopefully this fiscal year revenues will be close to 2007 levels and pass them in 2016. He noted that it has been a long haul to get back to where we were.

Mr. Anderson noted some items from the closeout of the state legislative session. He stated that an ADOT omnibus bill had included a provision for transferring staffing responsibilities of the Citizens Transportation Oversight Committee (CTOC) from ADOT to MAG. This provision had been stripped on the floor of the House, but the Senate adjourned without taking action on the bill.

Mr. Anderson stated that the state budget bill that passed included a provision to take \$2.5 million of Proposition 400 sales tax revenue to pay for Department of Revenue administration. He noted that MAG is working with its legal counsel to determine what remedies are available. He stated that the concern is that, similar to sweeps of HURF revenue, what may be seen as a small one-time amount may continue indefinitely. He stated that if MAG can protect the original purpose of the funds, which is to build transportation projects in Maricopa County, we will.

Chair Fitzhugh thanked Mr. Anderson for his report.

5. Consent Agenda

Chair Fitzhugh directed the Committee's attention to the consent agenda items

Chair Fitzhugh asked the Committee if there were any questions or comments. There were none. Mr. Jeff Martin moved to approve the consent agenda. Mr. Dan Cook seconded the motion. The motion carried unanimously.

5A – Project Changes – Amendment and Administrative Modification to the FY 2014-2018 MAG Transportation Improvement Program and to the 2035 Regional Transportation Plan

The MAG Transportation Review Committee, by consent, recommended approval of amendments to the FY 2014-2018 MAG Transportation Improvement Program and, as appropriate, to the 2035 Regional Transportation Plan.

5B – Amendment to the Regional Programming Guidelines for Federal Transit Formula Funds - Preventive Maintenance/Operating/Complementary ADA

The MAG Transportation Review Committee, by consent, recommended approval of the Amendment to the Regional Programming Guidelines for Federal Transit Formula Funds to incorporate language allowing the utilization regionally allocated funds for Complementary ADA Service.

6. Arterial Life Cycle Program Status Report: October 2014 - March 2015

Chair Fitzhugh invited Mr. John Bullen to present this item.

Mr. Bullen stated that the Arterial Life Cycle Program (ALCP) is the financial management tool for the arterial section of the Regional Transportation Plan. He noted that it contains 201 projects across 13 jurisdictions and is guided by the ALCP Policies and Procedures. The Policies and Procedures require status reports to be given to MAG committees, and this report is the second for fiscal year 2015.

Mr. Bullen stated that total sales tax revenue for February 2015 was just over \$26 million, which is slightly under a \$1 million increase over 2014 and amounts to 3.4% growth. He noted that this is about \$500,000 short of the fall 2013 forecast.

Mr. Bullen stated that there are 46 projects scheduled for work or reimbursement in fiscal year 2015, and that 15 are open to traffic or anticipated to be open to traffic by July 2015.

Mr. Bullen stated that agencies have been doing a terrific job of getting project overviews and agreements into MAG. He noted that this is the first fiscal year where all project requirements have been submitted to MAG by the end of the year.

Mr. Bullen stated that agencies have been behind schedule in submitting reimbursement

requests. He noted that \$53.2 million was scheduled for RARF reimbursements, but that he had only received \$20.6 million in reimbursement requests. He also noted that \$12.2 million in federal funds had been programmed and only \$0.3 million had been obligated. He stated that reimbursement requests are due on May 15. He added that there are 8 projects scheduled for reimbursement that he has not received reimbursement requests for, and that this make it difficult to calculate cash flow and funding availability for closeout.

Mr. Bullen stated that the revised Fiscal Year 2016 ALCP had been distributed to the ALCP working group and that it will be presented to the Transportation Review Committee in May and submitted to the Regional Council for approval in June. He added that the ALCP working group is working on revisions to the Policies and Procedures and that those revisions will be heard by the Transportation Review Committee in May and submitted for approval by the Regional Council in June.

Chair Fitzhugh thanked Mr. Bullen for his presentation.

7. Arterial Life Cycle Program Regional Area Road Fund Fiscal Year 2015 Closeout Process

Chair Fitzhugh invited Mr. John Bullen to present this item.

Mr. Bullen stated that projects in the Arterial Life Cycle Program (ALCP) are funded by half-cent sales tax revenue known as the Regional Area Road Fund (RARF) and by Federal funding. He noted that there is about a 50/50 split between these types of funding.

Mr. Bullen stated that the ALCP Policies and Procedures establish a closeout process to advance reimbursements from future years to the current year if a fund balance is available. He added that a fund balance is anticipated this year, which has not been the case for the last 3 years.

Mr. Bullen stated that the Policies and Procedures provide a priority list, which he showed as part of his presentation. He noted that two elements determine whether or not there is a RARF closeout process each year: the availability of funds in the current year and the impact this has on the draft ALCP for the next fiscal year.

Mr. Bullen noted that \$57.6 million in RARF revenue is expected and that \$53.2 million in reimbursements have been programmed, which leaves a fund balance of about \$4.4 million to account for variance in sales tax collections. He stated that to date he had only received \$20.6 million in reimbursement requests for the \$53.2 million programmed.

Mr. Bullen stated that the deadline for reimbursement requests is in three weeks, and that he anticipates to receive \$36.4 million in reimbursement requests. He stated that he expects to receive a little less than that amount, but that he wants to be conservative in estimating any fund balance. He noted that this estimate would leave a \$16.8 million balance for RARF closeout. He stated that for projects to be eligible for closeout they must be programmed with RARF funds and have been completed and all project requirements turned in according to the ALCP schedule.

Mr. Bullen stated that he has received a total of 4 requests for closeout. He showed a presentation slide with the amount of reimbursement and the amount of closeout funding each project can receive. He then showed a list of the recommended projects for closeout by priority, stating that the first three would receive full funding and the fourth would be partially funded. He added that he recommends the last project reimbursement be increased up to the full amount if reimbursement requests come in less than anticipated.

Mr. Bullen stated that, with respect to impacts to the Fiscal Year 2016 ALCP, for the last two years the adopted ALCP has had a slight deficit at the end of the program. He noted that it is anticipated that this will be within the variance of sales tax revenue. He stated that there is a healthy fund balance through 2021 and a slight deficit afterward, but that it should take care of itself.

Mr. Bullen presented a scenario without closeout. He stated that factoring in the advanced reimbursements that would occur with closeout, there would be little change. He noted the budget would be tight in 2017 but that there should be enough cash available and no issues are anticipated.

Responding to an inquiry by Mr. Rick Naimark, Mr. Bullen stated that the anticipated rate of growth is determined by the sales forecast and varies from year to year. He added that the forecast anticipates conservative growth up front. Mr. Eric Anderson added that the forecast growth rate is under 5%.

Mr. Dan Cook inquired whether the growth was based on ADOT projections. Mr. Bullen responded that it is, and that MAG consults with ADOT to develop its projections. He added that the projections are using the Fall 2014 updated forecast.

Mr. Cook asked if ADOT's forecast growth rate is 2%. Mr. Eric Anderson responded that it is about 5%. He stated that MAG is using the official forecast for the sales tax that ADOT updates every year. He noted that the panel used to inform the inputs continued to be very conservative, projecting under 5% for future growth.

Mr. Jeff Martin moved to recommend approval of the proposed Fiscal Year 2015 Regional Area Road Fund Closeout list and the necessary amendments and administrative modifications to the FY 2014-2018 MAG Transportation Improvement Program, the FY 2015 Arterial Life Cycle Program, and as appropriate, to the 2035 Regional Transportation Plan. Mr. Cato Esquivel seconded the motion.

Mr. Eric Anderson stated that the requested motion includes that a difference in reimbursement requests may change the funding level for the fourth project on the list. Mr. Rick Naimark inquired whether the funding level would only potentially increase. Mr. Eric Anderson replied that that was the case.

There being no further discussion of the motion, Chair Fitzhugh called for a vote. The motion carried unanimously.

8. Programming of Pinal County Surface Transportation Program Projects in the FY 2014-2018 MAG Transportation Improvement Program

Chair Fitzhugh invited Ms. Teri Kennedy to present this item.

Ms. Teri Kennedy stated that MAG received last minute information the previous week and that an update was provided as a handout to the Committee members. She noted that the funding levels for the Pinal County STP program are estimated as a full year funding level for Federal funds has not been received. She stated that MAG staff have done their best to make the estimates as tight as possible using a conservative estimate based on 2014 funding levels.

Ms. Kennedy stated that the Pinal County STP program was developed as new Pinal County members joined MAG. It was determined that RARF funding could not be spent in Pinal County, and the portion of STP allocated to the Pinal County members that they brought with them was approximately \$1.2 million per year. She noted that there were only two existing projects in the Pinal County portion of the MAG region that had been previously programmed by Central Arizona Governments (CAG).

Ms. Kennedy stated that MAG developed a Pinal County STP program over a nine month period working with the Pinal County managers. The program was approved by Regional Council in February and a call for projects was issued.

Ms. Kennedy stated that there was an estimated \$5.7 million available which has been rolled up since 2014 and covers through 2019. She noted that under the call for projects, MAG received four project applications.

Ms. Kennedy presented a table showing how funding was loaned in and out of the ALCP and noted that it has been tracked to ensure all of the funding stays within the program.

Ms. Kennedy stated that the Pinal County Managers Working Group, met and developed the program that created six goals and objectives: expand capacity on existing roadways or intersections of high demand, maintain and preserve the region's transportation system, address safety concerns in the existing roadway/intersection conditions, promote connectivity between high demand/capacity roadways and activity centers to advance economic viability, maintain consistency with stated jurisdictional policy, and achieve a significant reduction in congestion on the region's transportation system.

Ms. Kennedy noted that the application collected both quantitative and qualitative information and that weights were applied to each of the criteria in evaluating and ranking the projects.

Ms. Kennedy stated that after the call for projects was issued on February 27, MAG received four applications requesting a total of \$7.9 million. The applications were presented to the Street Committee for a technical evaluation and given a priority rank order. Two days later, Pinal County withdrew one of its applications.

Ms. Kennedy showed a presentation slide giving a comparison of the data at a high level. She noted that MAG staff performed a travel demand modeling analysis on the Germann Road project. The application showed a projected AADT of 20,000 vehicles per day, while the model showed a projected AADT of 12,000 vehicles per day. This change did not affect the rank order of projects, but gave a slight overall decrease in the project score. Ms. Kennedy then presented a map showing the location of the proposed projects.

Ms. Kennedy stated that there was \$5.697 million of estimated funding available and that after the three applications, \$300,000 was left over. She stated that the proposal is to continue to loan this funding to the ALCP and hold it until the call for projects for fiscal year 2020.

Ms. Kennedy presented two line items showing existing funding programmed for the Maricopa-Casa Grande Highway and noted that these projects were programmed by CAG for partial funding and that the Pinal County member agencies brought this funding with them when they joined MAG.

Ms. Kennedy noted that TIP listings for construction of these projects will be added after the next air quality conformity modeling run in spring 2016, but that design phases can be added now as they are not contingent on conformity.

Mr. Paul Jepson moved to recommend approval of adding the Pinal County Surface Transportation Program (PC-STP) Projects to the FY 2014-2018 MAG Transportation Improvement Program contingent on a finding of air quality conformity. Mr. Jeff Martin seconded the motion. The motion carried unanimously.

9. USDOT TIGER Grant Round 7 - FY2015

Chair Fitzhugh invited Mr. Nathan Pryor and Ms. Teri Kennedy to present this item.

Mr. Nathan Pryor stated that he would focus on the TIGER grant process as identified by MAG staff, and that Ms. Kennedy would discuss the potential projects collected to date.

Mr. Pryor stated that on April 3rd, a Notice of Funding Availability (NOFA) was issued for TIGER VII, with \$400 million available for urban areas and \$100 million for rural areas. Projects in urban areas must have a minimum of \$10 million and projects in rural areas must have a minimum of \$1 million. He noted that the USDOT is emphasizing transformative and innovative projects and that potential projects should be ones that will compete nationally.

Mr. Pryor stated that in the last round, TIGER VI, Arizona received funding for two projects: the South Central light rail planning study in Phoenix and road construction on Hopi tribal land. He noted that the application process is very competitive.

Mr. Pryor showed an outline of the process to date. He noted that he presented this outline to Regional Council the previous day. He stated that a list of projects had been compiled from a call for projects and that pre-applications are due on May 4th. He noted that pre-applications are mandatory this year, which is new as the previous two years did not have a pre-application requirement.

Mr. Pryor stated that the discussion today is so the Committee can identify projects that could warrant regional support. If the Committee recommends projects today, those recommendations would be brought to Management Committee and then Regional Council in May to approve regionally supported projects so a letter could be included in the application for those projects.

Mr. Pryor noted that if a project application does not receive regional support, but an agency feels strongly about submitting the project, every agency can submit 3 projects on their own. He stated that member agencies did apply alone in earlier rounds of TIGER grants, but that USDOT looks more favorably on projects with regional support.

Ms. Kennedy stated that the handout provided to Committee members has the current list of projects agencies submitted to MAG. She noted that this is a very quick process, as it is every year.

Ms. Kennedy asked Committee members to keep in mind project eligibility and scheduling. She noted that every agenda item has something to say about keeping projects on schedule, and that if a project can't meet schedule that is one of the criteria for elimination. She noted that projects highlighted in orange are contingent on a finding of air quality conformity and projects highlighted in red are not currently in the TIP. She noted that the criteria for being included in the TIP are that the project has committed funding if it is in the first two years of the TIP or a reasonable expectation of available funding for the remainder of the TIP years.

Ms. Kennedy stated that she would begin with an overview of projects on the list and then ask for an open discussion.

Ms. Kennedy stated that the first project is on the Spine corridor which Mr. Bob Hazlett and ADOT have been working on for many months. The project combines active traffic management on Interstate 17 and two pedestrian bridges across Interstate 10. She stated that this is one multiple elements for the Spine project and that it may compete well. She noted that the initial schedule may be very tight but is achievable. She stated that the initial design is listed in the TIP and that construction will be added to the TIP at zero dollars as construction funding is not available within the TIP window. She noted that match funding is available if it does get awarded as a project to be submitted with regional support.

Responding to an inquiry by Mr. Dan Cook, Ms. Kennedy stated that she would like a yes or no from the Committee members regarding the projects meeting the initial criteria. Mr. Cook asked if Ms. Kennedy was looking for a motion. Ms. Kennedy responded that she would like either a head nod or a motion. Mr. Cook expressed his support for this project.

Ms. Kennedy stated that the next project is located on MC 85, and that it is a general roadway project and not in the TIP. She stated that all of the projects on the list are really good projects but that the TIGER grant process is looking for innovative and transformative projects. She noted that it should not be an issue to get these projects into the TIP if they are in Maricopa County DOT's CIP. She noted that it was not collected as one of the regionally significant projects as part of the recent regional data collection efforts.

Ms. Jennifer Toth stated that the project is currently going through the CIP process. She noted that it was approved by the transportation advisory board, and would be going to the Board of Supervisors in June.

Ms. Kennedy stated that the next project is also located on MC 85 from 91st Avenue to Jessie May Way and that it includes signage, local storm drain systems, and widening. She noted that she believes it is a similar scenario to the previous MC 85 project. Ms. Toth stated that it is.

Ms. Kennedy stated that the next project is located in Mesa on the Loop 202 Santan Freeway from Power Road to Guadalupe Road and is a shared-use path along the corridor. She added that it is along the lines of a bicycle/pedestrian project along the freeway corridor. She noted that it is currently not in the TIP but would not be contingent on a finding of conformity.

Ms. Kennedy stated that the next project is the SR 24 Williams Gateway Freeway expansion in Mesa for 4.6 miles. She noted that it is currently not in the TIP and currently not identified in the RTP for funding. She added that this project has a funding constraint unless there is a substantial amount of local match to get the project in the TIP.

Ms. Kennedy stated that the next project is a bicycle/pedestrian path in Phoenix on the Grand Canal. She noted that it is not contingent on a finding of conformity and that if a substantial local match could be shown, it could get into the TIP.

Ms. Kennedy stated that the next project is Grand Avenue in Surprise. She noted that it is not in the TIP and that it is important to get partner agencies involved. She added that El Mirage said they are currently working with Surprise and have not concurred to the project.

Ms. Kennedy stated that the next project is sponsored by Valley Metro and is direct bus access ramps from I-10 to I-17. She noted that it is currently in the TIP identified as a light rail ramp. She added that the project has been modified for conformity and would require a slight modification and rerun of the conformity model to include it as a bus access ramp.

Ms. Kennedy stated that the last project is a light rail station at 48th Street and Washington sponsored by Valley Metro Rail. She noted that it is not in the TIP and would be contingent on a finding of conformity.

Mr. Todd Taylor noted that the TIGER funding request is \$20 million and the balance funded with RARF and inquired why that local match level was chosen rather than a higher request for TIGER funding. Ms. Kennedy responded that the higher the percentage of local match, the higher likelihood the project has of getting funded. She added that the corridor has a substantial amount of funding available for improvements, and that the specific projects were pulled out for potential TIGER funding application and are quite scalable.

Mr. Grant Anderson inquired what was the average funding received per TIGER grant. Ms. Kennedy responded that she did not recall. Mr. Eric Anderson stated that it was possibly around \$8 million and that the strategy is to keep the total funding request down to an amount we think is reasonable for competitiveness.

Mr. Cato Esquivel inquired whether the region could submit the South Mountain Freeway project to offset some of the funding to reallocate to other regional projects. Mr. Eric Anderson responded that he would not recommend that, as it is a \$1.8 billion project and everything is in motion. He noted that even if the region received \$10-20 million in TIGER funding, the money is still firewalled into the freeway program. He noted that with the Active Traffic Management System project, in the event of a successful grant application, money could still be allocated elsewhere in the freeway program. He added that the project may not be seen favorably under the current administration.

Mr. Woody Scoutten inquired regarding examples of innovative or transformative projects. Ms. Kennedy responded that she cannot go into great detail. She noted that a webinar was occurring at the same time as the current Committee meeting. She stated that the active traffic management system could be a transformative project as it has the opportunity to change the way the Spine corridor works. She noted that the region does a lot of “bread and butter” projects such as roadway widening and improvements and safety improvements, but there are not that many transformative projects in the region. Mr. Eric Anderson noted the previous year’s grant for the environmental work on the South Central light rail corridor. He stated that it is introducing a new transportation mode into an economically disadvantaged area and providing a much better connection to the central business district for the people who live along South Central Avenue. He stated that a project like that is what is seen as transformative for development potential and bootstrapping that area.

Mr. Pryor gave a cursory look at lists of past funded projects. He noted that they included bus rapid transit, port access, airport redevelopment, and a fire suppression system on the Eisenhower Tunnel on Interstate 70 in Colorado.

Mr. Dan Cook stated that he has been involved a little bit in the Spine study and that the project addresses a lot of good ideas. He added that Mr. Hazlett and the design team have been very innovative with ideas to improve an older facility and make it function longer. He noted that the project meets many of the selection criteria, including state of good repair, safety improvements, economic competitiveness, and quality of life, especially noting the pedestrian bridges and the potential for decreased congestion. He added that the project is a partnership between a lot of agencies and would have a huge impact on the entire region. He stated that he feels this is a very competitive project, and while all of the projects are good projects, the region is competing on a national scale and not all of the projects hit the criteria needed to be competitive on a national level. He added that the project is in the TIP and would be a categorical exemption for environmental requirements. Mr. Grant Anderson expressed his agreement.

Chair Fitzhugh inquired regarding the intent of the Valley Metro project on Interstate 10. Mr. Eric Anderson stated that eastbound transit vehicles would use direct HOV ramps from I-17 to Van Buren Street. He noted that buses currently use the I-10 HOV exit at 5th Avenue, stop in downtown Phoenix, and then proceed to the Capitol. The new route would go directly to the Capitol and then to downtown, saving 6-7 minutes. He stated that the ramps would be built as bus only with provisions for future use by light rail.

Mr. John Farry stated that Valley Metro has worked closely with ADOT in development of this project and that ADOT is on board. He noted that one of the TIGER program's emphases is on "ladders of opportunity" for people who need to get to work and medical access and other services. Ms. Kennedy stated that TIGER applications take into account projects that have trouble with traditional funding pools, such as transit on freeways and bicycle/pedestrian access around freeways.

Mr. Jeff Martin moved to recommend the MAG Spine Corridor project incorporating the I-17 Active Traffic Management System and pedestrian bridges over I-10 as the regionally supported project for TIGER applications. Ms. Leah Hubbard seconded the motion.

Chair Fitzhugh noted that the Spine Corridor project and Valley Metro's I-10 ramps project are both really good projects and it is difficult to make a decision. He requested more discussion on the motion.

Mr. John Farry asked if the "sweet spot" of grant funding request level had been looked into. He also asked if there could be a discussion about combining projects, such as the Spine corridor project and the I-10 ramp project. He noted that a combination of the projects would be improving both transit and traffic flow.

Mr. Eric Anderson stated that that option has been considered and is still on the table. He noted that while it increases the funding request, it provides an additional element to the project. He stated that the NOFA says that projects should not be combined if they are not alike, but that the ramps in combination with the active traffic management system and pedestrian bridges are all part of the Spine study, it should work. He noted that the strategy will be determining if the projects should be separate or combined. Mr. Paul Jepson noted that the recommended funding request for urban areas is \$10-25 million.

Mr. Naimark stated that Mr. Farry's idea is intriguing as adding another mode may make the project that the motion recommends more interesting. He added that he would favor the idea of combining them. He noted that Phoenix was looking at combining the canal project and the 48th Street light rail station. He inquired whether there were two separate funding pots for planning and implementation as there had been in 2014. Ms. Kennedy responded that this year they are not entertaining planning projects for funding. She stated that the need for some planning would not preclude a project from funding but there is no separate funding pot for planning.

Ms. Kennedy stated that USDOT is looking for construction projects and that the timeline is really critical. She noted that the pre-application is due May 4th and that the benefit/cost analysis and final applications are due by June 5th, which does not leave a lot of time. She stated that MAG wants to narrow the field down so that we are concentrating on the best projects. She stated that, with the Spine project, if we get additional funding it would benefit the whole region. She added that many of these projects are regionally oriented and that there are freight concerns on MC 85. She stated that it is up to the Committee to make a recommendation and that MAG staff will go in any direction to repackage the project that the Committee recommends.

Mr. Farry asked if it would be possible to revise the motion on the table to recommend investigating the combination of the Spine project and the I-10 bus ramps. Mr. Martin responded that he would revise his motion.

Mr. Cook stated that the combination of the two projects would push the total grant request over the \$25 million threshold. He added that if there is a desire to, moving the local match would get the grant request back to the \$20 million level. Mr. Scoutten noted that with that project, there is no issue with air quality conformity. Ms. Kennedy responded that the model would need to be rerun, but it should not affect conformity. She noted that the ramps are in the model for 2023, but the difference between bus and light rail should not be much and the project would not cross a conformity boundary.

Ms. Hubbard asked if the region has the opportunity to submit two requests or only one. Mr. Eric Anderson responded that MAG could submit up to three as the lead agency. He added that whether or not the ramp project is combined is a strategy issue. He stated that after hearing the discussion he agrees that it is a stronger application in the package with the added transit aspect, the bicycle/pedestrian projects which would benefit the town of Guadalupe as a ladder of opportunity, and the active traffic management system which is potentially innovative and transformative. Regarding Mr. Cook's statement, Mr. Anderson stated that if MAG submits a combined package, there needs to be some flexibility on the level of local match and grant request. He noted that if the region is successful in getting any project funded, it is a benefit to everyone.

Mr. Jeff Martin revised his motion to recommend combining the Spine project and the Valley Metro ramp project and repackaging them as a regionally supported project and revising the local match. Ms. Leah Hubbard seconded the motion. The motion carried unanimously.

Ms. Kennedy stated that there were two projects submitted from rural areas. The first is the SR 347 bridge in Maricopa, which has been ongoing for 12 years. She noted that ADOT Multimodal Planning Division intends to submit this project for a TIGER grant. She stated that ADOT, the City of Maricopa, and Pinal County have been working together, and that the project is in the TIP, has received a FONSI, and meets air quality conformity. She stated that the question is if we would like to recommend this project with regional support. She noted that the other project is in Florence and is currently in the TIP but has not started environmental work.

Mr. Paul Jepson stated that it will be their seventh application for a TIGER grant. He noted that the project has moved from not recommended to highly recommended. He stated that he heard from USDOT that they do not like projects which do not have completed environmental work. He noted that Maricopa is in a Democratic Congressional district and that the project will transform Maricopa as they need the overpass.

Ms. Hubbard stated that she would like to applaud the City of Maricopa for their tenacity. Mr. Grant Anderson stated the need to connect the region to Maricopa and noted that the project also provides a good connection to the casino. Mr. Jepson added that it is also a good connection to San Diego.

Mr. Dan Cook moved to recommend the SR 347 overpass project as a regionally supported project. Mr. Paul Jepson seconded the motion. The motion carried unanimously.

Ms. Kennedy stated that she would be happy to work with individual agencies who would like to submit projects on their own to get those projects into the TIP.

Mr. Farry stated that the NOFA catches us off guard every year and that we are always scrambling to meet deadlines. He suggested creating a list of projects that are ready to go as TIGER is announced each year.

Chair Fitzhugh noted that certain MAG staff had scheduling conflicts and moved ahead to items 11 and 12 on the agenda, noting that item 10 would now be presented after item 12.

11. Bicycle Counter Rental Program

Chair Fitzhugh invited Mr. Alex Oreschak to present this item.

Mr. Oreschak stated that through the Unified Planning Work Program MAG purchased 13 pneumatic tube bicycle counters. He noted that two weeks of 24-hour counts are conducted at 44 locations within the MAG region in both October-November and April-May and presented a map showing the location of MAG's bicycle counts. He stated that MAG would like to allow member agencies to use the counters when MAG is not using them.

Mr. Oreschak stated that possible uses of the counters could be to look at before and after counts after implementation of a new project, to collect baseline count data at locations not counted by MAG, to collect counts of bicycling to transit stops, project applications, master plans, bicycle studies, and other uses.

Mr. Oreschak stated that the program is proposed to begin in June of this year. A 2-3 page guidebook with an overview of bicycle count collection methodology and how to use the bicycle counters will be provided, along with a short request form and agreements between the agency and MAG specifying the dates of the rental and the number of counters. If those dates are available, MAG will approve the request. If not, MAG would discuss alternate date options with the agency. The agency would pick up the counters from the MAG office and return them at the end of the loan period. The agency would also be responsible for installation of the counter and field checks. MAG will provide a detailed installation guide including pictures and MAG staff would be available by phone or email if agencies have issues. After data collection MAG would receive the data over a wireless cellular network and would review for issues and provide estimate counts for any missed days. MAG would provide the agency with an Excel spreadsheet with the raw count data and estimated data.

Mr. Oreschak then showed possible data visualizations in a presentation slide. He stated that it is possible to look at hour of day counts. He added that there are other options in addition to tube counters, such as peak hour manual counts which have been conducted by other agencies around the country. He noted that a local advocacy group worked with the City of Tempe to conduct peak hour manual counts. He stated that another option is to install permanent counters on bike lanes or paths, which the City of Mesa has done on their Consolidated Canal multi-use path. The installation can be done as part of another project,

which is cheaper. MAG has information available on the purchasing process. Another option is to conduct video or camera counts.

Mr. Oreschak stated that the next step is to finalize the guidebook and form in the next month and begin the loan program in June. He stated that MAG staff would like to hold a webinar which is tentatively schedule for May 26 after the Bicycle and Pedestrian Committee meeting. He noted that additional information will be provided to the Transportation Review Committee.

Mr. Eric Anderson thanked Mr. Oreschak and Ms. Eileen Yazzie for working on this program. He noted that Ms. Yazzie will be going to the City of Phoenix Street Transportation Department, which is a big loss for MAG and a big gain for the City of Phoenix. He encouraged the Committee members to look at the MAG interactive bike map and noted that it has video and photos available for more difficult areas for bicyclists to navigate.

Chair Fitzhugh thanked Mr. Oreschak for his presentation.

12. Update on Performance Measures and Targets Advisory Group

Chair Fitzhugh invited Ms. Monique de los Rios-Urban to present this item.

Ms. de los Rios-Urban stated that the last update to the performance measures and targets occurred in 2013 as a result of the 2010 performance audit, and that the advisory group is preparing for the 2015 performance audit. She stated that the MAG performance program was initiated in 2009 when MAG hired a consultant to help define a framework of performance for all modes. She stated that MAG has been successful in applying the framework. She noted that in 2012 some tools connected to the MAG website were created, including the Performance Dashboard and RTP project viewer which gives information regarding projects included in Prop 400. She stated that since 2013 MAG has been preparing for MAP-21 rulemaking and all of the requirements that come with the new rules.

Ms. de los Rios-Urban stated that the performance measures are used to support studies and programming at MAG. She noted that performance measures have been incorporated into the programming process for funds. She then presented the performance dashboard and the project cards available on the MAG website and demonstrated some of the data available.

Ms. de los Rios-Urban stated that MAP-21 has established national goals which are the basis for the performance measures being suggested in the Notices of Proposed Rulemaking (NPRMs) being issued by the federal government. She noted that with these measures, we are required to provide targets for the region and for the state. She stated that the idea of MAP-21 is to be transparent and accountable for all programming and planning activities in the entire country. MAP-21 requires states, MPOs, and transit agencies to closely coordinate performance measurements, targets, and reporting.

Ms. de los Rios-Urban stated that MAG's approach has been to establish an advisory group, which had its first meeting a few days prior. The meeting focused on looking at the links between the RTP goals and objectives and the performance measures and targets and their effectiveness in making evaluative decisions. She stated that the next steps are to monitor the rulemaking process and submit comments in a coordinated process to the published NPRMs, implement the 2015 RTP regional performance audit and determining the time horizon to implement these targets and the methodologies and scope to apply them to planning and programming.

Ms. de los Rios-Urban presented the three NPRMs which have been published: safety performance measures, Highway Safety Improvement Program (HSIP), and metropolitan planning. These are closed for comment. Two NPRMs related to infrastructure conditions and the highway asset management plan are open for comment. She stated that the advisory group is coordinating comments to submit to the docket. She noted that a NPRM regarding system performance measures including reliability, congestion, and time of travel has not been published yet but is expected later this year.

Chair Fitzhugh thanked Ms. de los Rios-Urban for her presentation.

10. Project Initiation Pool (PIP)

Chair Fitzhugh invited Ms. Teri Kennedy to present this item.

Ms. Kennedy noted that this project was the result of a request from City of Avondale staff who were trying to get a project through the ADOT process. The Project Initiation Pool concept began as a process improvement. It has taken about 9-10 months as a coordinated effort between ADOT, FHWA, and MAG. The Street Committee reviewed and recommended the implementation of the Project Initiation Pool.

Ms. Kennedy stated that the project would establish a small three-year pilot program with no more than \$250,000 each year to encourage agencies to bring projects forward earlier. She stated that the purpose is to encourage early submission of projects to ADOT on a voluntary basis. She noted that ADOT has moved up the project submission deadline each year which has not worked very well. She stated that projects should come in earlier so they can be reviewed and any issues be addressed sooner and allow staff time to assist in the development of the IGA through ADOT. She added that this helps the region ensure all federal funds are obligated each year and encourage an efficient closeout process.

Ms. Kennedy stated that eligible projects will be bicycle/pedestrian, paving, ITS projects funded with CMAQ, Transportation Alternatives projects, and Highway Safety Improvement Program projects with MAG suballocated funding. She noted that eligibility is limited to projects which have not started. The funding available will be \$2,829 in Federal funding with a \$171 local match and will be distributed on a first-come, first-serve basis. The funding will be available from October 1st through December 31st each year and is intended to allow

ADOT staff to begin project review, assign project numbers, get a project manager on board, hold a kickoff meeting, and assist with the IGA and JPA development. Unused funds could be used for other review work activities for ADOT staff. For Certification Acceptance agencies this could be used for doing environmental clearance review.

Ms. Kennedy stated that agencies would need to sign a letter contract with ADOT as authorization to start this process. She noted that the letter contract is included in the agenda packet and requested that Committee members provide comments to MAG staff within the next two weeks for ADOT to review.

Ms. Kennedy stated that this is an initial program which is not being done anywhere else in the state, and that if the pilot project is successful, ADOT would entertain a similar program statewide. She noted that the program is proposed for three years and that the Committee would be provided with a report each year to show what is being achieved and whether it is a success or not. She stated that the biggest goal is to see a shift from projects authorizing in the last quarter of the Federal fiscal year to the first or second quarters. She noted that right now approximately 72% of projects authorize in the last quarter and that it is difficult for ADOT to get staff time to get that many projects through the process. She stated that for non-Certification Acceptance agencies, the barrier to project startup is the time it takes to develop the IGA and get it reviewed with the legal team, and that this program should help get that moving forward.

Mr. Dan Cook moved to recommend approval of implementing the Project Initiation Pool. Mr. Mike Gent seconded the motion.

Ms. Jenna Goad stated that Glendale agrees that the PIP is a good idea and that the IGA process is difficult. She inquired regarding the payment of the local match, as an IGA is required for any work to begin. Ms. Kennedy responded that the intent of the letter contract is to provide a way to get this process started. She noted that the letter contract began as one page and grew to three pages after ADOT legal review. She stated that the \$3000 funding level was chosen because this meets both the federal and ADOT threshold for work that can be done that is not considered federal interest and does not need an IGA signed. She noted that a funding level of \$3000 means that the three-page letter contract is sufficient to start the process. She stated that the intent of the program is to smooth out the process and help local agencies with their ADOT project review fees. She noted that the PIP will be listed as a basket of funding in the TIP similar to the CMAQ street sweeper funding. She stated that the MAG website will show which projects are eligible for funding through the PIP and the boilerplate letter contract will be available.

There being no further discussion of the motion, Chair Fitzhugh called for a vote. The motion carried unanimously.

Mr. Eric Anderson stated that he thinks it is kind of silly to have another process to provide money so ADOT can negotiate an IGA. He stated that he has heard that ADOT staff have

said they cannot meet with agencies to discuss the IGA without an IGA in place. He noted that under the FHWA stewardship agreement, ADOT has responsibility for administering local projects. He stated that he thinks that until ADOT recognizes their fundamental responsibilities and comes up with an easier process that we will have to take these approaches to deal with the process. He stated that there is a lot of paperwork involved and that he thinks it will cost more than \$3,000 in staff labor to execute the letter contract. He stated that it disturbs him that we need to go through these kinds of hoops to move a project forward.

13. Request for Future Agenda Items

Mr. Dan Cook stated that Chandler has noticed maintenance issues along the freeways. He stated that Proposition 400 had some allocation to ADOT for freeway maintenance. He stated that Chandler did some maintenance contract rebidding with a 25% increase in cost due to higher healthcare costs. He noted that the city of Mesa had 50-60% increases. He stated his concern that ADOT may have a similar increase with no adjustment in maintenance funding, which would lead to cutting back on maintenance. He stated that it puts ADOT in a tough situation. He noted that everyone has been responding to the economic downturn and has found innovative ways to deal with it, but these increased costs may come back to ADOT. He stated he would like to see a review of the maintenance program and what the funding is and what projected needs will be for the life of this program. He stated that he thinks we all agree that maintenance is a high priority and that it is worth some discussion. He stated that cities' expectations of what the freeways look like may have to change if the costs are changing.

14. Member Agency Update

There were no updates from member agencies.

15. Next Meeting Date

The next regular Transportation Review Committee meeting will be scheduled for Thursday, May 28, 2015 at 10:00 a.m. in the MAG Office, Saguaro Room.
The meeting was adjourned at 11:43 a.m.