



302 North 1st Avenue, Suite 300 ▲ Phoenix, Arizona 85003
Phone (602) 254-6300 ▲ FAX (602) 254-6490
E-mail: mag@mag.maricopa.gov ▲ Web site: www.mag.maricopa.gov

November 7, 2006

TO: Members of the Transportation Policy Committee

FROM: Mayor Keno Hawker, Mesa, Vice Chair

SUBJECT: MEETING NOTIFICATION AND TRANSMITTAL OF TENTATIVE AGENDA

Wednesday, November 15, 2006 - 4:00 p.m.
MAG Office, Suite 200 - Saguaro Room
302 N. First Avenue, Phoenix

A meeting of the Transportation Policy Committee is scheduled for the time and place noted above. Members of the Committee may attend the meeting either in person, by videoconference, or by telephone conference call. As was discussed at the first meeting of the Committee, proxies would not be allowed. Members who are not able to attend the meeting are encouraged to submit their comments in writing, so that their view would always be a part of the process.

Please park in the garage under the building. Bring your ticket to the meeting, parking will be validated. For those using transit, the Regional Public Transportation Authority will provide transit tickets for your trip. For those using bicycles, please lock your bicycle in the bike rack in the garage.

Pursuant to Title II of the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA), MAG does not discriminate on the basis of disability in admissions to or participation in its public meetings. Persons with a disability may request a reasonable accommodation, such as a sign language interpreter, by contacting Valerie Day at the MAG office. Requests should be made as early as possible to allow time to arrange the accommodation.

Refreshments and a light snack will be provided. If you have any questions, please contact me at (602) 262-7441, or Eric Anderson, MAG Transportation Director, or Dennis Smith, MAG Executive Director, at (602) 254-6300.

c: MAG Regional Council
MAG Management Committee

A Voluntary Association of Local Governments in Maricopa County

City of Apache Junction ▲ City of Avondale ▲ Town of Buckeye ▲ Town of Carefree ▲ Town of Cave Creek ▲ City of Chandler ▲ City of El Mirage ▲ Fort McDowell Yavapai Nation ▲ Town of Fountain Hills ▲ Town of Gila Bend
Gila River Indian Community ▲ Town of Gilbert ▲ City of Glendale ▲ City of Goodyear ▲ Town of Guadalupe ▲ City of Litchfield Park ▲ Maricopa County ▲ City of Mesa ▲ Town of Paradise Valley ▲ City of Peoria ▲ City of Phoenix
Town of Queen Creek ▲ Salt River Pima-Maricopa Indian Community ▲ City of Scottsdale ▲ City of Surprise ▲ City of Tempe ▲ City of Tolleson ▲ Town of Wickenburg ▲ Town of Youngtown ▲ Arizona Department of Transportation

**TRANSPORTATION POLICY COMMITTEE
TENTATIVE AGENDA
November 15, 2006**

	<u>COMMITTEE ACTION REQUESTED</u>
1. <u>Call to Order</u>	
2. <u>Pledge of Allegiance</u>	
3. <u>Call to the Audience</u> An opportunity will be provided to members of the public to address the Transportation Policy Committee on items not scheduled on the agenda that fall under the jurisdiction of MAG, or on items on the agenda for discussion but not for action. Citizens will be requested not to exceed a three minute time period for their comments. A total of 15 minutes will be provided for the Call to the Audience agenda item, unless the Transportation Policy Committee requests an exception to this limit. Please note that those wishing to comment on agenda items posted for action will be provided the opportunity at the time the item is heard.	3. Information.
4. <u>Approval of Consent Agenda</u> Prior to action on the consent agenda, members of the audience will be provided an opportunity to comment on consent items that are being presented for action. Following the comment period, Committee members may request that an item be removed from the consent agenda. Consent items are marked with an asterisk (*).	4. Recommend approval of the Consent Agenda.

ITEMS PROPOSED FOR CONSENT*

*4A. <u>Approval of September 20, 2006 Meeting Minutes</u>	4A. Review and approval of the September 20, 2006 meeting minutes.
*4B. <u>Changes to the Approved June 28, 2006 Arterial Life Cycle Program (ALCP) Policies and Procedures</u> Minor technical refinements (concerning invoices and administrative adjustments) need to be made to the approved June 28, 2006 Arterial Life Cycle Program (ALCP) Policies and Procedures. These	4B. Recommend approval of the proposed changes to the previously approved June 28, 2006 ALCP Policies and Procedures.

have been discussed with the ALCP Working Group, and on October 26, 2006, the MAG Transportation Review Committee recommended approval of the proposed changes to the ALCP Policies and Procedures. This item is on the November 8, 2006 Management Committee agenda. An update will be provided on action taken by the Committee. Please refer to the enclosed material.

*4C. Arterial Life Cycle Program (ALCP) – Status Report

Each quarter, MAG staff provides member agencies with an update on projects in the Arterial Life Cycle Program (ALCP). This is the third Status Report (covering the period from July to September 2006) for the ALCP. The Status Report includes an update on ALCP Project work, and ALCP revenue/financial section, information about ALCP amendments and administrative adjustments, and the remaining FY 2007 ALCP schedule. Please refer to the enclosed material.

*4D. Proposed Amendment and Administrative Adjustment to the FY 2007- June 28, 2006 Arterial Life Cycle Program (ALCP)

The FY 2007 Arterial Life Cycle Program (ALCP) was approved by MAG Regional Council on June 28, 2006. Since that time, one project has been identified that needs to be segmented, two projects have been identified that need to change project and reimbursement schedules, and two projects have been identified that need to lower and adjust the regional reimbursement amounts. An amendment is required to add the segment to the ALCP and change the project and reimbursement schedules, and an administrative adjustment is needed to adjust the project reimbursement amounts due to lower actual costs. On October 26, 2006, the MAG Transportation Review Committee recommended approval of the changes to the ALCP. This item is on the November 8, 2006 Management Committee agenda. An update will be provided on action taken by the Committee. Please refer to the enclosed material.

4C. Information and discussion.

4D. Recommend approval of an Amendment and an Administrative Adjustment to the FY 2007 – June 28, 2006 ALCP to add a new segment to a Chandler project, change two Maricopa County project and reimbursement schedules, and make an administrative adjustment to a Phoenix project and a Chandler project to reflect actual project costs.

ITEMS PROPOSED TO BE HEARD

5. Statewide Transportation Acceleration Needs (STAN) Account

House Bill 2865 created the Statewide Transportation Acceleration Needs (STAN) account that provides \$307 million to be used for the acceleration of the construction or reconstruction of freeways, state highways, bridges, and interchanges that are included in the Regional Transportation Plan. The Maricopa County region will receive 60 percent (\$184.2 million) of the fund, the Pima County area 16 percent, and the remainder of the state 24 percent. The legislation requires that the funds for this region be allocated to projects in the MAG Regional Transportation Plan. A report on the activities related to the STAN account will be provided. Please refer to the enclosed material.

6. Requested Changes to the ADOT Program

The Arizona Department of Transportation is requesting FY 2007 program changes to the MAG Regional Transportation Plan Freeway Program. These requests are the result of ADOT updating costs and schedules based on the latest study and design information. Action is being requested by MAG due to ADOT's need to advertise projects in mid-January 2007. MAG has reviewed the requested changes and has determined that they are reasonable and necessary to meet the RTP Freeway Program. MAG has also reviewed the ADOT cash flows with the requested changes incorporated into the analysis. Although the requested changes increase costs by more than \$122 million, the program schedule adjustments and revised revenue projections can accommodate these changes without other program changes being needed. This item is on the November 8, 2006 Management Committee agenda. An update will be provided on action taken by the Committee. Please refer to the enclosed material.

5. Information, discussion, and possible action to recommend to the MAG Regional Council a set of projects to be funded from the STAN account and to incorporate the required changes in the Draft 2007 Update of the Regional Transportation Plan and the Draft FY 2008-2012 Transportation Improvement Program.

6. Recommend approval of the requested program changes.

**MINUTES OF THE
MARICOPA ASSOCIATION OF GOVERNMENTS
TRANSPORTATION POLICY COMMITTEE MEETING**

September 20, 2006
MAG Office, Saguaro Room
Phoenix, Arizona

MEMBERS ATTENDING

Councilmember Peggy Bilsten, Phoenix, Chair	Mayor James Cavanaugh, Goodyear
Mayor Keno Hawker, Mesa, Vice Chair	Councilmember Pat Dennis, Peoria
Kent Andrews, Salt River Pima-Maricopa Indian Community	Mayor Boyd Dunn, Chandler
F. Rockne Arnett, Citizens Transportation Oversight Committee	Councilmember Cliff Elkins, Surprise
+ Councilmember Gail Barney, Queen Creek	# Mayor Hugh Hallman, Tempe
# Stephen Beard, SR Beard & Associates	* Eneas Kane, DMB Associates
Mayor Steven Berman, Gilbert	Joe Lane, State Transportation Board
Dave Berry, Swift Transportation	Mayor Marie Lopez-Rogers, Avondale
* Jed S. Billings, FNF Construction	Mayor Mary Manross, Scottsdale
Mayor Bobby Bryant, Buckeye	David Scholl, Westcor
	Mayor Elaine Scruggs, Glendale
	Supervisor Don Stapley, Maricopa County

* Not present

Participated by telephone conference call

+ Participated by videoconference call

1. Call to Order

The meeting of the Transportation Policy Committee (TPC) was called to order by Chair Peggy Bilsten at 4:05 p.m.

2. Pledge of Allegiance

The Pledge of Allegiance was recited.

Chair Bilsten announced that Steve Beard and Mayor Hugh Hallman were participating by telephone and Councilmember Gail Barney was participating by videoconference. She noted that copies of the presentations for agenda items #6 and #7 were at place.

Chair Bilsten requested that members of the public turn in their public comment cards to staff. Chair Bilsten stated that transit tickets for those who used transit to attend the meeting and parking garage ticket validation were available from MAG staff.

3. Call to the Audience

Chair Bilsten stated that an opportunity is provided to the public to address the Transportation Policy Committee on items that are not on the agenda that are within the jurisdiction of MAG, or non action agenda items that are on the agenda for discussion or information only. Citizens will be requested not to exceed a three minute time period for their comments. She noted that an opportunity is provided to comment on agenda items posted for action at the time the item is heard. No requests for public comment were received.

4. Approval of Consent Agenda

Public comment is provided for consent items. Each speaker is provided with a total of three minutes to comment on the Consent Agenda. No public comment cards were received.

Chair Bilsten requested that Dennis Smith brief the Committee on the Consent Agenda. He stated that agenda items #4A, #4B, #4C, and #4D were on the consent agenda. He added that agenda items #4B and #4D had been recommended by the Management Committee.

Chair Bilsten stated that any member of the committee can request that an item be removed from the consent agenda and considered individually. Chair Bilsten asked members if they had questions or comments on any of the consent agenda items. None were noted.

Vice Chair Hawker moved to recommend approval of consent agenda items #4A, #4B, #4C, and #4D. Mayor Bryant seconded, and the motion passed unanimously.

4A. Approval of July 19, 2006 Meeting Minutes

The Transportation Policy Committee, by consent, approved the July 19, 2006 meeting minutes.

4B. Proposed Amendment to the FY 2007-2011 Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) for Highway and Transit Projects

The Transportation Policy Committee, by consent, recommended approval of an Amendment and/or Administrative Adjustment to the FY 2007-2011 MAG Transportation Improvement Program to add one new Phoenix safety project, deferring and combining three Tempe multi-use path projects and adding several new transit projects, plus making several changes to existing transit projects and arterial life cycle program projects as shown in the attached tables. The FY 2007-2011 Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) was approved by the MAG Regional Council on July 26, 2006. Since that time, one project has been identified that needs to be added to the TIP, three projects need to be deferred, and several projects need to have the funds adjusted. An Amendment is required to add the new project and an Administrative Adjustment is needed to list the deferrals and the funding changes. The Transportation Review Committee and the Management Committee recommended approval of the proposed amendment.

4C. Proposed Adjustment to the FY 2007-2011 MAG Transportation Improvement Program

The Transportation Policy Committee, by consent, recommended approval of an Administrative Adjustment to the FY 2007-2011 MAG Transportation Improvement Program to remove the duplicate Pave Dirt Road project listed under MAG. On July 26, 2006, the Regional Council approved the FY 2007-2011 MAG Transportation Improvement Program (TIP). In the TIP, a Pave Dirt Road project was duplicated as one MAG project and as three jurisdictional projects for Cave Creek, Chandler and Fort McDowell Yavapai Nation. It is proposed to remove from the TIP the MAG Pave Dirt Road project listed under MAG. The MAG Management Committee recommended approval of the proposed adjustment.

4D. Arterial Life Cycle Program (ALCP) – Status Report

Each quarter, MAG staff will provide member agencies with an update on projects in the Arterial Life Cycle Program (ALCP). This is the second Status Report (covering the period from April to June of 2006) for the ALCP. The Status Report includes an update on ALCP Project work, the FY 2007 ALCP schedule, an ALCP revenue/financial section, and information on the Arterial Intelligent Transportation System (ITS) Program. This item was on the agenda for information and discussion.

5. 2006 Annual Report on the Status of the Implementation of Proposition 400

Roger Herzog, MAG Senior Project Manager, addressed the Committee on the 2006 Annual Report on Status of the Implementation of Proposition 400, which is the second report in this series. He noted that the annual report on the status of projects funded by the half-cent sales tax authorized by Proposition 400 is required by state law. Mr. Herzog stated that state law also requires that a public hearing be held on the annual report. Mr. Herzog stated that the Freeway/Highway, Arterial Street, and Transit Life Cycle Programs had been incorporated into the Regional Transportation Plan (RTP). He noted that several studies have been initiated for potential future adjustments to the RTP. These studies include the I-10/Hassayampa Valley Roadway Framework Study, the I-8/I-10 Hidden Valley Roadway Framework Study, and the Commuter Rail Strategic Plan.

Mr. Herzog reported on revenues from Proposition 400. He said that Fiscal Year 2006 receipts from the sales tax were 11.4 percent higher than the estimate in the 2005 Annual Report. Forecasts of future available regional revenues are largely unchanged from the 2005 Annual Report. Mr. Herzog stated that House Bill 2865 created the Statewide Transportation Acceleration Needs (STAN) Account. MAG's share of the available funding will be approximately \$184 million for projects on the State Highway System.

Mr. Herzog reported on the FY 2006 Freeway/Highway Life Cycle Program. He said that major progress has been made on finishing the Proposition 300 program with the completion in June of the Santan Freeway and the final Grand Avenue grade separation. Mr. Herzog noted that the Red Mountain Freeway should be completed by mid-2008. He advised that preliminary engineering and environmental analyses are proceeding on Proposition 400 corridors and widenings. Mr. Herzog noted that an I-10 widening project and the Dove Valley traffic interchange on I-17 were accelerated through HELP and GAN loans. He stated that approximately \$58 million was expended on projects in the Proposition 400 freeway/highway program.

Mr. Herzog stated that approximately \$540 million has been programmed for projects scheduled to go to bid for construction in FY 2007. He noted that cost increases for FY 2007-2026 projects, most of which are in the first five years of the plan, total \$252 million. Mr. Herzog stated that estimated future costs of the Freeway/Highway Life Cycle Program are in balance with projected revenues. He noted that revenues exceed costs by approximately \$50 million. Mr. Herzog advised that during the coming fiscal year, significant additional project cost increases may be encountered in the Freeway/Highway Life Cycle Program as detailed engineering studies are completed.

Mr. Herzog reported on the FY 2006 Arterial Streets Life Cycle Program. He said that the Arterial Street Life Cycle Program was refined and updated during FY 2006. Mr. Herzog noted that more than \$7 million in reimbursements were distributed to local governments and it is anticipated that approximately \$56 million will be distributed in FY 2007. He stated that work is proceeding on a broad range of arterial street projects over the next five years, and added that 52 Arterial Streets, including projects that have been accelerated, will be undergoing various stages of work. Mr. Herzog stated that total estimated future regional reimbursements for projects in the Arterial Street Life Cycle Program are in balance with projected revenues, with revenues exceeding costs by approximately six percent. He advised that given increasing construction costs, concerns are being raised regarding the ability of jurisdictions to provide full funding for all projects in the program. In addition, the mandatory Federal approval process can be lengthy and may pose schedule risks for projects receiving Federal funds.

Chair Bilsten asked Mr. Herzog to explain if scheduling risks were the result of FTA demands. Mr. Herzog replied that one issue was that the federal aid process is lengthy and can end up in scheduling delays. Mr. Herzog said that although ADOT works with individual agencies to move projects as quickly as possible, in the past, there have been occasions when the process bogged down. Chair Bilsten stated that when these delays are known, for any reason, she would like them brought before the TPC to see what they can do, because the longer it takes, the more expensive it is.

Mr. Herzog reported on the FY 2006 Transit Life Cycle Program. He said that the FY 2006-2026 transit program includes 31 Bus Rapid Transit/Express routes, 32 Supergrid routes, and 37.7 miles of extensions to the 20-mile Minimum Operating Segment of the light rail system. Mr. Herzog stated that during FY 2006, funding began for 14 existing Express and four existing RAPID bus routes, ADA paratransit service, and customer service and marketing programs. Also, 62 new coaches and 20 used coaches were purchased.

Mr. Berry asked if purchasing used coaches was standard practice. He added that he did not oppose purchasing used buses, he had just not heard of it before. Mr. Dave Boggs, RPTA Executive Director, replied that purchasing used coaches is not a normal practice. However, a number of used coaches came on the market from Golden Gate Transit, and it provided the opportunity to expand transit service quickly. Mr. Boggs stated that 80 coaches were purchased for \$20,000 each. He added that the buses were checked out mechanically before putting them into service, and would be phased out in two to three years. Mr. Boggs commented that although purchasing used buses is not usually a good idea, they have worked out quite well. He added that this is a stopgap measure and new buses would be purchased from now on. Mr. Boggs also spoke about a partnership between the City of Surprise and the City of Phoenix to start a route outside the plan. He noted that the first day of service, there were 24 people on the bus.

Mr. Herzog stated that approximately \$66 million was expended on the Transit Life Cycle Program during FY 2006. Mr. Herzog noted that a broad range of bus planning studies was started to define service concepts in detail and provide improved future cost estimates. During the next five fiscal years, 11 new BRT/Express routes and seven new Super Grid routes will be initiated. In July 2006, service began on the first regionally funded Super Grid route on Scottsdale/Rural Road. Service is also now being provided on rural connector routes. Mr. Herzog stated that construction is continuing on the LRT Minimum Operating Segment and service is scheduled to begin in December 2008. He indicated that estimated future costs for the full Transit Life Cycle Program are in balance with projected revenues, and added that recent trends of escalating wages and fuel prices will increase the pressure on balancing bus service operations costs with available revenues. Similarly, recent increases for right-of-way and construction materials are likely to drive up costs for transit capital facilities. Chair Bilsten thanked Mr. Herzog for his report and asked members if they had any questions.

Mr. Berry asked if we should be able to deliver the plan voted upon with the information available today. Mr. Herzog replied that we would be able to deliver the plan given the current Life Cycle and revenue information. Mr. Berry asked if the most immediate risks were construction costs and transit operations, such as labor and fuel. Mr. Herzog replied that was correct.

Vice Chair Hawker asked for clarification if the \$252 million construction cost increase was for that year or for the total program. Mr. Herzog replied it was for the total program identified in FY 2006 and was mostly concentrated on projects in the next five years.

Vice Chair Hawker said that he recalled recent cost increases that amounted to almost one-third of the cost of projects. He commented that this indicates that an eleven percent increase in revenue will not cover cost increases. Mr. Smith stated that long-range forecasts cannot be made with the information available today. If the program continues to have 27 percent cost increases there might be major adjustments in next year's report. Mr. Smith advised that this does not mean the plan will not get built; it means that the plan might be a 21- or 22-year plan instead of a 20-year plan. Mr. Smith added that some projects are funded by the gas tax, which continues beyond the 20th year.

Vice Chair Hawker asked if a 27 percent cost increase paired with an eleven percent increase in revenue equals a shortfall for the year. Mr. Smith referenced the \$100 million in February 2006 that had to be moved to cover cost increases. He said that next year's forecast would be more exact.

Vice Chair Hawker stated that goals, such as ridership, will be included in the 2010 plan audit. He stated that he would like to start identifying those goals as specifically as possible. Vice Chair Hawker stated that he would like to include that number in the report so the Legislature will know that the goal was met or not met. Mr. Anderson stated that staff are currently working on performance measures for all three modes, which will be incorporated into the Annual Report going forward.

Councilmember Dennis expressed concern for the \$252 million cost increase. She asked if the amount was broken down by mode. She commented that cities make up extra costs for the arterial streets mode, but does ADOT make up the extra cost for freeways/highways? Councilmember Dennis wondered if the STAN funds could be used for cost overrides. She asked if the \$252 million was included in the \$540 million? Mr. Herzog stated that the \$252 million increase is included in part in the \$540 million

construction amount going to bid in FY 2007. He said that the \$252 million reflects cost increases of the program as a whole, but projects impacted were generally in the next five years.

Councilmember Dennis stated that she felt this is a serious enough number that an examination is needed on how adjustments are made to the plan. Mr. Anderson stated that ADOT is working on design concepts, environmental work, scoping, etc. He said that after this work is completed, in approximately one year, ADOT will have new information in terms of costs. Mr. Anderson commented that ADOT is reluctant to adjust costs without more detailed engineering work; we are in a holding pattern now until that work is concluded. He added that there is some softening of oil prices, which will help the situation; however, some issues will need to be dealt with in the future to meet the promises made to the voters.

6. Update on Construction Costs

Jeff Romine, MAG Regional Economist, provided an update on construction costs. He stated that staff are tracking commodities such as cement, asphalt, steel, construction lumber, aggregate rock, and diesel fuel. Mr. Romine displayed a graph of commodity costs, using the approval of the Regional Transportation Plan in 2003 as the benchmark. He pointed out that the decrease in oil prices has somewhat eased diesel and asphalt prices. In addition, natural gas prices are expected to drop 20-25 percent during the winter season. Mr. Romine noted that since the MAG Construction Forum in January 2006, the price of asphalt has increased at least 80 percent. Mr. Romine displayed a table that showed the increased prices of individual commodities nationally. Mr. Anderson pointed out that cement has experienced more swings and changes in price. He added that the freeway program is also affected by right-of-way costs.

Mr. Berry asked about the share of the percentage of commodities to the total cost of the program. Mr. Anderson replied that he did not have that figure readily available and could probably pull it together. Mr. Berry asked if there was a rule of thumb figure. Mr. Romine stated there is no rule of thumb and he has reviewed study indexes produced in other states. He added that he is monitoring construction labor costs and will include them in future updates and reports.

Mr. Romine addressed factors affecting costs, which includes strong demand and limited supply for key materials, and limited production capacity in the MAG region and Arizona. Mr. Romine stated that there are no oil refineries nor steel manufacturing facilities in the state. In addition, half of the cement comes into the state comes by rail, and is therefore impacted by the cost of diesel and limited rail capacity. Mr. Romine also noted that the prices are high for raw materials, such as scrap metal and iron, which suggests that the price of steel is likely to rise in the coming year.

Mr. Romine reviewed a comparison of Arizona demand patterns in construction between 2001 and 2005. He noted that the shares of most construction activity tend to remain relatively stable, with single family and commercial construction substituting for each other's expansion. Mr. Romine displayed maps of rail service in Arizona by Burlington Northern Santa Fe and Union Pacific. He stated that the Phoenix metro area is the largest metro area served by spurs, which is mostly single tracked. Mr. Romine added that it was hoped a line would be built from the west to Phoenix. Mr. Smith stated that Union Pacific has indicated that it has no immediate plans to activate a main line to Yuma.

Mr. Romine stated that staff will continue to monitor and update prices and is creating a Construction Index for the MAG region and Arizona. He added that it is MAG's plan to prepare relevant reports on key commodities.

Mr. Arnett asked if there had been any evaluation that these commodities might have impacted a recent freeway bid in Tucson that exceeded the engineer's estimate. Mr. Romine stated that he understood that ADOT is preparing a report on why they thought the bid came in higher. Mr. Anderson replied that he understood that the bid opening came in at approximately \$200 million when the engineer's estimate was \$173 million. He added that this was the good news because it was speculated that the bid could come in as high as \$250 million. Mr. Anderson indicated that ADOT is still analyzing the bid, and MAG staff have not seen the commodity-by-commodity analysis yet.

Mr. Berry stated that we need to know how many dollars are exposed to commodity prices. He suggested hiring a consultant to analyze how those risks will be managed, for example, hedging fuel costs. Mr. Berry stated that there might be other innovative strategies, such as co-oping, purchasing, etc., to protect the plan from changing commodities.

7. Statewide Transportation Acceleration Needs (STAN) Account

Eric Anderson stated that House Bill 2865 created the Statewide Transportation Acceleration Needs (STAN) account that provides \$307 million statewide to be used for the acceleration of the construction or reconstruction of freeways, state highways, bridges, and interchanges that are included in regional transportation plans. He stated that the Maricopa County region will receive 60 percent (\$184 million) of the fund, the Pima County area 16 percent, and the remainder of the state 24 percent. Mr. Anderson noted that the \$184 million is less than six percent of the MAG Five Year Program. He advised that the legislation requires that the funds for this region be allocated to projects in the MAG Regional Transportation Plan and that STAN funds are intended to supplement, not supplant, committed funding.

Mr. Anderson then explained that after MAG recommends projects to the State Transportation Board, the Board is required to post this on its next agenda. He added that MAG is also required to report on activities related to the STAN account to the House and Senate by December 15, 2006. Mr. Anderson noted that some projects were specified in bills this past session; however, staff were adamant about leaving the project selection to the planning process and to not earmark funds.

Mr. Anderson addressed options that could be considered in the project selection process. The selection could follow adopted RTP priorities where projects are moved up in priority order. He said that one caveat is project readiness, because some projects may still require scoping and environmental work. Mr. Anderson noted that the selection could focus on gateway routes. He said he had included gateway routes as an option, not because they were in legislation, but because of discussions and bills that had been put forward.

Mr. Anderson noted that typical projects to utilize STAN funds could include construction that provides congestion relief, right-of-way protection, and advance engineering and environmental work. He stated that the four maps included in the packet at each place showed projects by phase in the RTP. He stated that there are three corridors that are undergoing environmental work and have uncertain timeframes: 1) The South Mountain EIS is due in Spring and a final record of decision is currently scheduled for

the end of 2007. 2) The I-10 Collector Distributor EIS is underway. 3) Loop 303 interim roadway that is part of Phase One. He noted that ADOT is currently completing the environmental work.

Mr. Anderson advised that ADOT and legislative staff have indicated that the I-10 widening recently accelerated by the West Valley would probably be ineligible for STAN funding because the legislation states the monies shall be used to supplement, not supplant, committed funding.

Mr. Anderson stated that those projects that cannot be accelerated because they are already in the final design phase include the widening of I-17 from 101 to the Carefree Highway; HOV lanes on SR-51, from Shea to Loop 101; and HOV lanes on the north/south portion of the Pima Freeway, and the Loop 303 interim roadway.

Mr. Anderson stated that what remains is an inventory of projects: I-10 south, San Tan to Riggs Road, general purpose lanes on I-10. He noted that there are many HOV lanes in Phase One timed to match with the implementation of Express Bus schedules.

Councilmember Dennis asked if traffic interchanges could be added to Phase One. Mr. Anderson replied he did not think traffic interchanges were precluded from funding.

Mr. Anderson stated that guidance from the TPC is needed on the types of projects that will be considered. Mr. Anderson noted that the ADOT Executive Director, Victor Mendez, was also present for questions.

Mr. Lane commented that the \$184 million is not a huge number and will do a few things well. He suggested that two to three high-impact, very visible projects be selected. If the TPC demonstrates responsible selection of projects, in the future, there will be a good argument for more money.

Mr. Scholl asked for clarification of bills that included I-17 and I-10. Mr. Anderson replied that there were a number of bills that fell into two categories to fund the I-10 widening to SR-85. He stated that there was also a lot of interest in widening I-17 to the County line, and some language to widen to Black Canyon City, which is beyond the MAG RTP. Mr. Anderson noted that the RTP includes widening from the Carefree Highway to New River Road. Mr. Scholl asked if these bills did not pass. Mr. Anderson replied that was correct, and he was not sure if they ever reached the floor.

Mayor Scruggs stated that if these gateway routes are accepted because they were originally considered in legislation that never passed, then the TPC is limiting where the money is going. Mayor Scruggs pointed out that this would be in direct conflict with the adopted RTP priorities. She remarked that Loop 303 is once again being passed over as it has since 1985, even though the TPC adopted guidelines that projects eliminated the past 20 years would be moved forward in order. Mayor Scruggs added that the South Mountain Freeway has issues that the 303 does not. She stated that she wanted to go on record as speaking for West Valley cities that to accept an intimation earlier this year that all money should go to I-10 and I-17 discriminates against projects eligible to move forward. Mayor Scruggs stated that they have done their own study on what works and what does not work. She said that she did not accept looking solely at I-10 and I-17. Mayor Scruggs stated that she agreed with keeping adopted priorities subject to project readiness. She added that she thought there were other significant corridors that will do a lot to relieve congestion, not only for Valley residents, but also for others outside the region who

are traveling through. Mayor Scruggs stated that she did not accept that the focus will be on gateway routes of I-10 and I-17.

Mayor Berman stated his agreement that some projects lost out in the 1985 funds. He remarked that the last project completed from Proposition 300 was the Loop 202 in his Town's vicinity. If there had been further cuts, this project would not have been completed. Mayor Berman expressed his support to the West Valley to complete Loop 303, which was promised earlier. He stated that completing unfinished projects such as this was a bone of contention in earlier negotiations, and MAG needs to make sure commitments are completed, particularly the older ones.

Vice Chair Hawker stated that he would like to acquire right-of-way early on. He said that for the first 20 years of the sales tax, right-of-way for the freeway frontage might have come in less expensive if it had been protected early in the program. Vice Chair Hawker commented that it would take a crystal ball to know if real estate prices will continue to increase; however, with residential encroachment, he was unsure if such facilities as the I-10 Reliever might be built if purchasing the right-of-way is delayed ten years. Vice Chair Hawker stated that because right-of-way was such a burden to complete freeways in Proposition 300, that might give logic to right-of-way protection.

Councilmember Dennis expressed concern that Loop 303 has been promised for years and it needs to be the focus. She added that another aspect is the traffic interchange issue in north Peoria or north Glendale where there is no access on east/west corridors. Councilmember Dennis stated that Beardsley is the only access on Loop 101 to provide relief. She stated that this is in Phase One and the City of Peoria is ready to proceed. Councilmember Dennis stated that the interchange and Loop 303 are essential to relieving traffic congestion.

Mayor Manross remarked that she concurred that the concentration should not be on I-10 and I-17. She noted that as Mr. Anderson mentioned, the STAN funds are less than six percent of the MAG Five Year Plan. Mayor Manross stated that MAG ought to try to support projects that will send a message to the Legislature that a significant impact is being made with the money. She commented that the focus should be on congestion relief. Mayor Manross stated that Loop 101 in the East Valley connects many cities and is one of the most heavily traveled and congested. She noted that the Salt River Pima-Maricopa Indian Community is growing by leaps and bounds on that freeway. Mayor Manross commented that in Scottsdale's vicinity, the HOV lane project is starting in Phase One, but the general purpose lane project is at the end of Phase Two. Mayor Manross suggested better coordination so the freeway will not have to be torn up more than once. Mayor Manross stated that she agreed with concentrating on selecting projects that will provide congestion relief. This will demonstrate to the State and the Legislature we are making a difference.

Councilmember Elkins expressed that he was gratified to hear support for Loop 303. He commented that congestion is one of the key words. Councilmember Elkins also noted that I-10 and I-17 are interstates, and are in a different category than the others, which are state routes.

Supervisor Stapley suggested sending a delegation to Washington, DC, to discuss additional funding with the new Transportation Secretary, Mary Peters. He said that acceleration is the key word for him, with congestion mitigation and connectivity as goals. Supervisor Stapley asked where is the most

critical point where MAG can make the best decision and impact? Supervisor Stapley suggested holding workshops in small groups.

Mr. Scholl stated that Loop 303 has right-of-way issues, but opening it immediately addresses congestion issues. Mr. Scholl noted that a number of new north/south routes have been brought in east of I-17, but only one west of I-17. He said that most demographers say that half of the three to four million people who move here will be west of I-17, and most of those will be in the Loop 303 corridor. Mr. Scholl commented that he would not like to look back and feel that Loop 303 was a missed opportunity and it should have been put in years before. Mr. Scholl stated that in the category of quick impact, the lack of north/south movement is critical in the West Valley.

Mayor Dunn stated that he was looking forward to the deliberations in this process. He commented that I-10 going south needs to be addressed, because of the impacts of Gila River's development and upcoming employment. He stated he agreed with Mayor Manross's comments on Loop 101 coordination. Mayor Dunn remarked that the TPC needs to keep in mind that the STAN amount is not a lot when it comes to freeways. He stated that if the Legislature is appeased, they might continue to do this. If they are not afforded gratification, we might not have the opportunity again. Mayor Dunn suggested looking at a balanced approach and projects that benefit north, south, east, and west, and pick a few that would give gratification to the Legislature and deal with congestion.

Mayor Hallman stated that Mayor Manross and Mayor Dunn said it was important to address congestion and have a real impact. He remarked that the West Valley has issues with Loop 303 not being built. The East Valley faces difficulties from the I-10 corridor, which is an example of a project that has been slated for awhile and delayed for a number of reasons. Mayor Hallman commented on issues related to connectivity of I-10 to US-60.

Chair Bilsten stated that she heard the TPC wanted to take a look at congestion relief, getting legislative support, and being performance-based. She commented that at the end of the day, if the decision we make does not make a difference, we have not achieved anything. Chair Bilsten stated that she liked the idea of sending a delegation to Washington. Chair Bilsten stated that in compliance with open meeting laws, small workshops or meetings could be conducted. She indicated that the October TPC meeting could be canceled in order to provide sufficient time to hold these workshops/meetings. Chair Bilsten stated that she would like to include the legislators who fought to get the bill.

Mayor Scruggs stated that she thought MAG staff heard gateway, but the majority of TPC does not choose to focus just on I-10 and I-17.

Mayor Dunn added that the focus would not be solely on I-10 or I-17, but they would not necessarily be excluded from discussion.

Mayor Scruggs stated that when the Legislature tried to come up with specific routes they wanted to see projects actually built. She mentioned Mayor Hawker's comments that right-of-way acquisition has been a problem for the past 20 years, and also heard the TPC wants to look at the entire map, not specifically I-10 and I-17.

Vice Chair Hawker commented that it might be helpful to show the Legislature what could be accomplished with \$184 million this year, and how much more could be accomplished with \$600 to \$800 million.

Mr. Smith commented that a ranked list might be helpful. He said that it was important to make an impact with the fund. Mr. Smith stated that we need to look at the design concept report on Loop 303 to see what the funds could accomplish. A commitment was made in Proposition 300 on the South Mountain and Loop 303. If a difference could be made, it would be logical that those projects move forward.

There being no further business, the meeting adjourned at 5:35 p.m.

Chair

Secretary

MARICOPA ASSOCIATION OF GOVERNMENTS

INFORMATION SUMMARY... for your review

DATE:

November 7, 2006

SUBJECT:

Changes to the Approved June 28, 2006 Arterial Life Cycle Program (ALCP) Policies and Procedures

SUMMARY:

Since the approval of the June 28, 2006 Arterial Life Cycle Program (ALCP) Policies and Procedures, three questions have been raised.

The first relates to what is needed for backup documentation to support right-of-way costs; the current policies and procedures address design and construction, not right-of-way. The second relates to how the documentation for the project costs should be organized to support the amounts on the Project Reimbursement Request Invoice. The third relates to the reallocation of project costs among project phases if the cost for a work phase is less than estimated.

MAG staff and the ALCP Working Group worked together to develop the suggested technical changes to the June 28, 2006 ALCP Policies and Procedures. These suggestions are explained in the attached document.

The Arterial Life Cycle Program is a key part of Proposition 400 and represents more than \$1.6 billion of regional investment over the next 20 years. The updated ALCP Policies and Procedures will continue to provide guidance to MAG and to MAG member agencies to ensure that the program is implemented in an efficient and effective manner.

The attached document provides the suggested changes to the ALCP Policies and Procedures that address these three questions. The approved June 28, 2006 ALCP Policies and Procedures are in the left column and the suggested changes are in the right column.

PUBLIC INPUT:

There was no public comment at the October 26, 2006 Transportation Review Committee meeting.

PROS & CONS:

PROS: Once the changes to the ALCP Policies and Procedures are approved, involved jurisdictions and MAG will continue to move forward with Project Requirements. If not approved, MAG staff and involved jurisdictions will not have complete policies and procedures regarding proper right-of-way documentation, project reimbursement request organization and clarification of the administrative adjustment process.

CONS: There are no cons to approving the proposed technical changes to the June 28, 2006 ALCP Policies and Procedures.

TECHNICAL & POLICY IMPLICATIONS:

TECHNICAL: MAG will be able to continue implementation of the ALCP regarding Project Requirements.

POLICY: A.R.S. 28-6352 (B) required that MAG performs life cycle management for the arterial street component of the RTP.

ACTION NEEDED:

Recommend approval of the proposed changes to the previously approved June 28, 2006 ALCP Policies and Procedures.

PRIOR COMMITTEE ACTIONS:

Management Committee: This item is on the November 8, 2006 Management Committee agenda. An update will be provided on action taken by the Committee.

The Transportation Review Committee voted to recommend approval of the proposed changes to the ALCP Policies and Procedures on October 26, 2006.

MEMBERS ATTENDING

Maricopa County: Mike Sabatini for Mike Ellegood, Chairperson	* Litchfield Park: Mike Cartsonis
ADOT: Dan Lance	Mesa: Jim Huling
Avondale: Shirley Gunther for David Fitzhugh	Paradise Valley: Robert M. Cicarelli
Buckeye: Timothy Edwards for Scott Lowe	Peoria: David Moody
Chandler: Patrice Kraus	Phoenix: Tom Callow
El Mirage: Mark Fooks for B.J. Cornwall	Queen Creek: Mark Young
Fountain Hills: Randy Harrel	RPTA: Bryan Jungwirth
* Gila Bend: Lynn Farmer	Scottsdale: Mary O'Connor
Gilbert: Tami Ryall	Surprise: Randy Overmyer
Glendale: Terry Johnson	Tempe: Carlos De Leon
Goodyear: Cato Esquivel	*Wickenburg: Shane Dille
Guadalupe: Jim Ricker	Valley Metro Rail: John Farry

EX-OFFICIO MEMBERS ATTENDING

*Regional Bicycle Task Force: Randi Alcott	*Pedestrian Working Group: Eric Iwersen
*Street Committee: Darryl Crossman	*ITS Committee: Alan Sanderson

* Members neither present nor represented by proxy. + - Attended by Videoconference
- Attended by Audioconference

CONTACT PERSON:

Eileen O. Yazzie, Transportation Planner II, 602.452.5058, eyazzie@mag.maricopa.gov

Suggested Changes to the June 28, 2006 ALCP Policies and Procedures

June 28, ALCP Policies and Procedures

Section 130: MAG Committee Process

- C. The MAG Committee Process will apply for:
1. Approval of amendments to the ALCP Policies and Procedures.
 2. Adoption of the Arterial Life Cycle Program.
 3. Approval of amendments to the ALCP, TIP, and RTP

Section 250: ALCP Administrative Adjustment

A. If MAG Staff has to adjust Project budgets after the ALCP has been adopted, it can do an Administrative Update to the ALCP and it is not necessary to do a Program Amendment.

B. There is a one-month lag time for the Maricopa County Excise taxes that are deposited in the RARF

C. The ALCP and project budgets will be adjusted at that time to reflect the remaining project funds.

D. MAG may initiate a separate ALCP Administrative Adjustment, if necessary, at the end of the federal fiscal year as well.

Section 330: Project Reimbursement Requests

A. The invoice will include:

1. Invoice #
2. Project name, description and RTP ID
3. Reimbursable items and related costs
4. Proper documentation of reimbursable items and reimbursable costs contained in invoice
 - a. A copy of the invoice from the contractor is sufficient documentation for contracted work,
 - b. An administrative breakdown chart including staff name, hours on Project, hourly rate, and total costs is sufficient documentation for administrative work.

Suggested Changes to the June 28, 2006 ALCP Policies and Procedures

Changes are noted in *bold*

Section 130: MAG Committee Process

- C. The MAG Committee Process will apply for:
1. Approval of amendments to the ALCP Policies and Procedures.
 2. Adoption of the Arterial Life Cycle Program.
 3. Approval of amendments to the ALCP, TIP, and RTP
 4. Approval of administrative adjustments to the ALCP

Section 250: ALCP Administrative Adjustment

A. An administrative adjustment will adjust the ALCP regional reimbursement Project budgets in the current and later fiscal years of the ALCP due to actual Project expenditures and regional reimbursements.

1. This does not require a Program or Project amendment because it is not a Project Update (Section 220) and does not cause a negative fiscal impact to the current fiscal year.

2. Regional reimbursement budgets can not be moved from a later fiscal year to an earlier fiscal year in an administrative adjustment. This would require an amendment.

B. An administrative adjustment is needed when:

1. Project expenditures for a Project work phase or a Project Segment are lower than the estimate, causing the 70% regional reimbursement to be less than what is programmed in the current ALCP.

2. The remaining regional reimbursement funds can be moved within the original Project, to another work phase or a Project Segment that is programmed in that fiscal year or a later fiscal year.

C. The ALCP and project budgets will be adjusted at that time to reflect the remaining project funds.

D. Administrative Adjustments can occur each quarter, the changes will be reported in the ALCP Status Report, and the ALCP will be reprinted.

Section 330: Project Reimbursement Requests

A. The invoice will include:

1. Invoice #
2. Project name, description and RTP ID
3. Reimbursable items and related costs
4. Proper documentation of reimbursable items and reimbursable costs contained in invoice is necessary. The list below provides options for sufficient backup documentation:
 - a. A copy of the invoice from the contractor is sufficient documentation for contracted work,
 - b. An administrative breakdown chart including staff name, hours on Project, hourly rate, and total costs is sufficient documentation for administrative work,
 - c. A copy of the Court Order,
 - d. A copy of the Settlement Statement,
 - e. A copy of the agency's payment documentation,
 - f. Or a completed Cost Attachment Form. If the Cost Attachment form is explaining dedicated right of way, easements, or Public Utility and Facilities Easements (PUFE), please include a signed letter from the appropriate department (Real Estate, Transportation, etc) to verify the items in the cost attachment form. Please use costs that are relevant to the time of dedication and if necessary, use the inflation chart to inflate the costs to the current value.
5. If an item for reimbursement (design, ROW, construction, etc.) has more than one backup invoice, please provide a chart, per time for reimbursement that:
 - a. Lists each invoice/backup documentation number or describe the document
 - b. The dollar amount of each invoice/backup documentation
 - c. And have the chart include the total dollar amount of all invoices, per each item. This total dollar amount should match what is on the Project Reimbursement Request invoice.
 - d. MAG will provide an example chart/form.



TRANSPORTATION DIVISION
Arterial Life Cycle Program (ALCP) – Status Report
July - September 2006

ALCP Project Status: July - September 2006

Fiscal year 2007 is the first full fiscal year of implementation for the Arterial Life Cycle Program (ALCP). During the year 39 projects will begin or continue work, which will vary from studies to construction completion. Twenty-three of the 39 are programmed to receive \$56 million for reimbursement in FY07. The other 16 are being advanced by local jurisdictions and will receive reimbursement later in the Program.

In August 2006, all involved jurisdictions provided the Maricopa Association of Governments (MAG) with a monthly FY07 schedule of when the project requirements (Project Overview, Project Agreement and Project Reimbursement Requests (PRR)) are expected to be submitted for the FY07 projects.



*Arizona Ave. & Chandler Blvd.
 Intersection Improvement*

During this quarter, three Project Overviews were submitted, and MAG signed five Project Agreements. Additionally in this time period, MAG processed three PRR's, and ADOT paid a total of three PRR's, one from the last quarter and two from this quarter. One PRR is still being processed by ADOT.

Table 1, located on pages two and three, provides the status of the current and advanced projects that are programmed this fiscal year. For each project, information on the progress and budget is presented.

The *Status* field provides a snapshot of what is programmed for this fiscal year and the *Other Project Information* column provides more detailed information. Projects that are underway will submit regular progress reports, either with the request for payment or by project milestone. The *Regional Funding Reimbursements* and *Total Expenditure* columns provide detailed financial information that is updated each quarter.

A new column, *FY07 Reimbursements to Date*, was added to this report, which shows the cumulative reimbursements for this fiscal year, while the *Total Reimbursement* column displays the cumulative reimbursements for the entire life cycle program.

This is the third Status Report for the Arterial Life Cycle Program (ALCP). Each quarter, MAG staff will provide member agencies with an update on the projects in the ALCP. As the program progresses, the information provided in this report will be updated. This report and all other ALCP information is available online at <http://www.mag.maricopa.gov/project.cms?item=5034>.

TABLE 1 – Arterial Life Cycle Program: July - September 2006, Status of Projects Underway (2006 and Year of Expenditure, Dollars in Millions, Consistent with the June 28, 2006 ALCP)

Lead Agency & Facility	Project Requirement Completed	Status S=Study, P=Pre-Design, D=Design, R=Right of Way, C=Const, C/O=Close and out	Regional Funding Reimbursements			Total Expenditures			FY for Final Constr.	FY(s) for Reimb.	Other Project Information
			Programmed FY07 Reimb. Dollars	Estimated Future Reimb.: FY 2008-2026 (2006 Dollars)	FY07 Reimb. To Date Dollars	Total Reimb.: FY 2006-2026 (2006 and YOY Dollars)	Expend. through FY 2007 (YOY Dollars)	Estimated Future Expend. FY 2007-2026 (2006 Dollars)			
CHANDLER											
Arizona Ave. at Chandler Blvd.	PO, PA	C		3,464			7,346	7,346	2007	2014	Project is nearing completion.
Arizona Ave. at Elliot Rd.	PO, PA	D, R, C		3,464			5,363	5,363	2007	2022	Currently under construction.
Arizona Ave. at Ray Rd.	PO, PA	D, R, C	3,464		0.714	0.714	1,068	5.0	2007	2007	Have received 2 Project Reimbursement Requests, one has been paid and one is at ADOT for processing. Design and ROW are complete, and construction is 7% complete.
Chandler Blvd. at Dobson Rd.	PO, PA	D	1.32	2,144	0.013	0.013	0.336	7,349	2008	2006-2008	The study is 100% complete and design is underway.
Gilbert Rd. Loop 202 to Queen Creek Rd. - SEGMENT A	PO, PA	D		6,317			11,874	9,709	2008	2022	This segment has been advanced. Design will begin in FY07.
Ray at Alma School Rd	PO, PA	D	0.363	3,101					2008	2006-2008	Design will begin in FY07.
Ray at McClintock (NE Corner Only)	PO	D		3,464				8,603	2007 & 2010	2012	The NE corner of the project is being advanced and will be constructed in 2007. The design is underway. The remaining intersection improvement will be done in 2010-2011 and dollar amounts reflect the entire project.
GILBERT											
Val Vista Rd. Warner Rd to Pecos Rd		D, R, C	3,464	6,705				20,353	2006	2007-2008, 2015	Project has been advanced and reimbursement funds have been exchanged with Elliot/Cooper & Guadalupe/Cooper projects. Reimb. will be in 2007-2008, 2015.
Warner Rd.: Cooper Rd.		D	1,316	2,148				5,619	2008	2006-2008	
MARICOPA COUNTY											
Dobson, Gilbert and McKellips Bridge Projects		S		42,797					2015	2015	Three ALCP Bridge Projects are being studied together.
EI Mirage Road Corridor: Northern to Bell		S		35,087					2018	2008-2018	Two EI Mirage Projects are being studied as a corridor.
Northern Ave.: Dysart Rd. to SR-303L - PHASE 1		P, D	19,016	36,855			3.5	104.4	2010	2007-2010	Project Design is underway and the reimbursement has been deferred from FY06 to FY07.
M.C./MESA											
Power Rd: East Maricopa Floodway (EMF) to Galveston - SEGMENT A		P, D	2,587	6,826				11,107	2008	2006-2008	
Power Rd: Baseline Rd to East Maricopa Floodway (EMF) - SEGMENT B		D, R	5,014	2,223				10	2007	2007-2008	
MESA											
Broadway Rd.: Dobson Rd. to Country Club Dr.		P	0.429	6,387				10,975	2009	2007-2009	



Lead Agency & Facility	Project Requirement Completed	Status S=Study, P=Pre-Design, D=Design , R=Right of Way, C=Const, C/O=Clos ed out	Regional Funding Disbursements				Total Expenditures			Years for Reimb.	Other Project Information			
			Programmed FY07 Reimb.	Estimated Future Reimb.: FY 2008-2026 (2006 Dollars)	FY07 Reimb. To Date	Total Reimb.: FY 2006-2026 and YOE Dollars	Expended through FY 2007 (YOE Dollars)	Estimated Future Expend. FY 2007-2026 (2006 Dollars)	Total Expend. FY 2006-2026 and YOE Dollars			Year for Final Constr.		
MESA														
Country Club Dr.: University Dr.		P		2.57						3.206		2009	2017	
Dobson Rd.: Guadalupe Rd.		P	0.14	2.43						2.796		2009	2007-	
Gilbert Rd.: University Dr.	PO	D, R		2.57						8.1		2007	2021	Design is underway.
Greenfield Rd: Baseline Rd to Southern - SEGMENT A		D, R	1.401	3.767						7.382		2008	2007-	
Greenfield Rd: Southern Rd. to University Rd. - SEGMENT B		P	0.345	4.432						12.6		2010	2009-	
McKellips Rd.: Gilbert Rd. to Power Rd		S		20.002						26.95		2013	2007-	
McKellips Rd.: Gilbert Rd. to Val Vista - SEGMENT A		D, R	1.46	3.138						6.555		2008	2007-	
McKellips Rd.: Val Vista Rd to Higley - SEGMENT B		P	0.34	7.777						11.109		2010	2007-	
Mesa Dr: Broadway Rd to US-60 Southern Ave. Country Club Dr to Stapley - SEGMENT A		P	0.18	8.424						11.94		2010	2007-	
Thomas Rd: Gilbert Rd to Val Vista Dr		S,D	0.86	7.12						11.3		2009	2007-	
PEORIA		D	0.346	4.794						7.269				
Beardsley Road Project		D		21.343						43.87		2009	2011-	Design is underway and reimbursement will be in Phase 2.
Happy Valley Rd: Lake Pleasant Pkwy to Terramar Blvd - SEGMENT A		D, R		8.649						14.952		2008	2022-	Design is underway.
Lake Pleasant Pkwy: Union Hills Dr to Dynamite Rd, 4 lane portion - SEGMENT B	PO, PA	D, R, C	7.263	7.778			7.027			48.049	19.124	2006	2006-	Construction is ongoing.
PHOENIX														
Happy Valley Rd: I-17 to 35th Avenue - SEGMENT A	PO	C/O		6.635						7.647		2005	2023	The Project is complete.
Happy Valley Rd: I-17 to 35th Avenue - SEGMENT B		D		1.917						2.738		2009	2023	
Happy Valley Rd: I-17 to 35th Avenue - SEGMENT C		D		2.178						3.111		2009	2024	
SCOTTSDALE														
SR-101L North Frontage Rd: Hayden to Scottsdale Rd - SEGMENT A		D,R,C	5.474									2007	2007	
SR-101L North Frontage Rd: Pima Rd/Princess Dr to Hayden		P,D,R	1.191	4.341								2007	2007-	
SR-101L South Frontage Rd: Hayden to Pima			0.123	12.616								2010	2007-	
Shea Blvd: SR-101L to SR-87		D,R,C		21.343								2008	2021-	



ALCP Revenue & Finance: July - September 2006

For the period July to September 2006, \$9,999,597 was collected from tax revenues for the ALCP Regional Area Road Fund (RARF) account, as

	July	August	September	Total
Freeways	\$ 18,807,785	\$ 16,827,963	\$ 17,885,906	\$ 53,521,655
Arterial Streets	\$ 3,513,910	\$ 3,144,014	\$ 3,341,673	\$ 9,999,597
Transit	\$ 11,144,115	\$ 9,971,017	\$ 10,597,877	\$ 31,713,009
Prop. 400 (total)	\$ 33,465,810	\$ 29,942,994	\$ 31,825,456	\$ 95,234,261

seen in Table 2. In this period, the Arterial RARF account paid \$7,541,856.37 in Project Reimbursement Requests. The remaining balance in the RARF account at the end of September is \$15,243,227. There has not been any expenditures made from MAG-Surface Transportation Program (STP) or the Congestion Mitigation Air Quality (CMAQ) arterial accounts to date.

Looking at the overall revenues, Table 3 shows the tax revenues collected in this quarter for the Maricopa Transportation Excise Tax, which are \$95,234,261. The tax collections for both July and September came higher than the estimated forecast for the month, while August came in lower than expected. August signaled the first non double digit increase from year over year.

	Estimate Total RARF	Actual Total RARF	% Difference
July	\$ 32,667,000	\$ 33,465,810	2.4%
August	\$ 31,026,000	\$ 29,942,994	-3.5%
September	\$ 31,484,000	\$ 31,825,456	1.1%
Total	\$ 95,177,000	\$ 95,234,261	0.1%

ALCP Amendment or Administrative Adjustment, Which One to Do?

The ALCP Policies and Procedures provide for two types of changes to the ALCP, an Amendment or an Administrative Adjustment. Both types of changes can be done, if necessary, on a quarterly basis. Background information on Amendments and Administrative Adjustments will be presented in this Status Report. An important question is which type of change, an amendment or an administrative adjustment, is appropriate to reflect a change for an ALCP project.

If an ALCP Project is undergoing a Project Update outside of the regular ALCP Update schedule, an amendment is required. There are seven types of Project Updates (Section 220 of the ALCP Policies and Procedures): advancing a project, deferring a project, segmenting a project, exchanging two projects, substituting a project, changing a project scope, or using Project Savings on another ALCP Project. If any of these updates are needed outside of the normal annual ALCP Update schedule, which is shown on the ALCP schedule on page 3 of this report, an amendment is needed.

What is an administrative adjustment then? An administrative adjustment is an adjustment to the ALCP regional reimbursement Project budget(s) in the current and later fiscal years of the ALCP, due to actual Project expenditures and regional reimbursements.

This is needed when Project expenditures for a Project work phase or Segment in the current and later fiscal years are lower than the estimate, causing the 70% regional reimbursement to be less than

what is programmed in the current ALCP. The remaining balance of regional funds for the project can be moved to another work phase or Segment of the original project that is programmed in the same or a later fiscal year. Regional reimbursement budgets can not be moved from a later fiscal year to an earlier fiscal year in an administrative adjustment since this will negatively impact the ALCP cash flow.

Since the ALCP was approved on June 28, 2006, the City of Chandler has made a request to amend one project due to an advanced segment of a project and Maricopa County has requested that two projects are amended to reflect current project and reimbursement schedules. Additionally, an administrative adjustment is needed for two projects, one in the City of Chandler and one in the City of Phoenix, due to lower project costs. These requests will go through the MAG Committee starting in October 2006. As with both the ALCP Amendments and Administrative Adjustments, appropriate amendments will also be made to the TIP and the RTP.

Remaining FY07 Arterial Life Cycle Program Schedule

TABLE 4: Fiscal Year 2006-2007 Arterial Life Cycle Program Schedule	
November	<p>8th, 15th: Management Committee (MC), Transportation Policy Committee (TPC) – ALCP Status Report and any necessary amendments or administrative adjustments</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Release ALCP information for 2008-2012 TIP Update
December	<p>13th: Regional Council (RC) – ALCP Status Report and any necessary amendments or administrative adjustments</p>
January	<p>5th: Information due for ALCP Projects in 2007-2012 for the TIP Report</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Transportation Review Committee (TRC) – ALCP Status Report and any necessary amendments or administrative adjustments
February	<p>9th: Information due for ALCP Projects in 2013-2026 for the RTP Update and Air Quality Conformity Analysis (AQCA)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - MC, TPC, RC – ALCP Status Report and any necessary amendments or administrative adjustments - TRC –TIP Report and RTP Update for AQCA are presented
March	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - MC, TPC, RC –TIP Report and RTP Update for AQCA are presented
April	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - ALCP Working Group – Final review of updated information for the FY08 ALCP - TRC – ALCP Status Report and any necessary amendments or administrative adjustments
April/May	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - TIP Report and RTP Update undergoes AQCA
May	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - TRC - Present Draft FY 08 ALCP - MC, TPC, RC - ALCP Status Report and any necessary amendments or administrative adjustments
June	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - MC, TPC and RC - Present Draft FY 08 ALCP and FY08 ALCP Schedule

MARICOPA ASSOCIATION OF GOVERNMENTS

INFORMATION SUMMARY... for your review

DATE:

November 7, 2006

SUBJECT:

Proposed Amendment and Administrative Adjustment to the FY 2007 - June 28, 2006 Arterial Life Cycle Program (ALCP)

SUMMARY:

The FY07 ALCP was approved by MAG Regional Council on June 28, 2006. Since that time, one City of Chandler project has been identified that needs to be segmented, two Maricopa County projects have been identified that need to change project and reimbursement schedules, one City of Chandler project has been identified that needs to lower and adjust the regional reimbursement amounts, and one City of Phoenix project has been identified that needs to lower and adjust the regional reimbursement amounts. An amendment is required to add the segment to the ALCP and change the project and reimbursement schedules, and an administrative adjustment is needed to adjust the project reimbursement amounts due to lower actual costs.

The Arterial Life Cycle Program is a key part of Proposition 400 and represents more than \$1.6 billion of regional investment over the next 20 years. The updated ALCP Policies and Procedures will continue to provide guidance to MAG and to MAG member agencies to ensure that the program is implemented in an efficient and effective manner.

The attached document provides both the approved FY07-June 28, 2006 ALCP and the proposed amendments and administrative adjustments.

PUBLIC INPUT:

There was no public comment at the October 26, 2006 Transportation Review Committee.

PROS & CONS:

PROS: Once the changes to the FY07 ALCP are approved, involved jurisdictions and MAG will continue to move forward with Project Requirements this FY07.

CONS: None.

TECHNICAL & POLICY IMPLICATIONS:

TECHNICAL: MAG will be able to continue implementation of the ALCP this fiscal year.

POLICY: A.R.S. 28-6352 (B) required that MAG performs life cycle management for the arterial street component of the RTP.

ACTION NEEDED:

Recommend approval of an Amendment and an Administrative Adjustment to the FY 2007 – June 28, 2006 ALCP to add a new segment to a Chandler project, change two Maricopa County project and reimbursement schedules, and make an administrative adjustment to a Phoenix project and a Chandler project to reflect actual project costs.

PRIOR COMMITTEE ACTIONS:

Management Committee: This item is on the November 8, 2006 Management Committee agenda. An update will be provided on action taken by the Committee.

The Transportation Review Committee recommended approval of the amendments and administrative adjustments to the FY07 - June 28, 2006 ALCP on October 26, 2006.

MEMBERS ATTENDING

- Maricopa County: Mike Sabatini for Mike Ellegood, Chairperson
- ADOT: Dan Lance
- Avondale: Shirley Gunther for David Fitzhugh
- Buckeye: Timothy Edwards for Scott Lowe
- Chandler: Patrice Kraus
- El Mirage: Mark Fooks for B.J. Cornwall
- Fountain Hills: Randy Harrel
- * Gila Bend: Lynn Farmer
- Gilbert: Tami Ryall
- Glendale: Terry Johnson
- Goodyear: Cato Esquivel
- Guadalupe: Jim Ricker
- * Litchfield Park: Mike Cartsonis
- Mesa: Jim Huling
- Paradise Valley: Robert M. Cicarelli
- Peoria: David Moody
- Phoenix: Tom Callow
- Queen Creek: Mark Young
- RPTA: Bryan Jungwirth
- Scottsdale: Mary O'Connor
- Surprise: Randy Overmyer
- Tempe: Carlos De Leon
- *Wickenburg: Shane Dille
- Valley Metro Rail: John Farry

EX-OFFICIO MEMBERS ATTENDING

- *Regional Bicycle Task Force: Randi Alcott
- *Street Committee: Darryl Crossman
- *Pedestrian Working Group: Eric Iwersen
- *ITS Committee: Alan Sanderson

* Members neither present nor represented by proxy. + - Attended by Videoconference
- Attended by Audioconference

CONTACT PERSON:

Eileen O. Yazzie, Transportation Planner II, 602.452.5058, eyazzie@mag.maricopa.gov

AMENDMENTS & ADMINISTRATIVE ADJUSTMENTS

To the FY07 – June 28, 2006 Arterial Life Cycle Program (ALCP)

All dollar amounts are shown in millions and in 2006\$

AMENDMENT - City of Chandler – Ray/McClintock Intersection Improvement – This project is currently programmed as one project. The City of Chandler revised this project and moved the northeast (NE) corner of the project forward to FY07 to coincide with work being done by SRP on that corner. An amendment to the 2007-2011 TIP to reflect the advancement will also be needed.

Fiscal Impact - There is no negative financial impact to the ALCP.

FY07 – June 28, 2006 ALCP:

Ray/McClintock: Intersection Improvements			FY11
	DES	2009	\$ 0.414
	ROW	2010	\$ 0.391
	CONST	2011	\$ 2.659

Proposed:

Ray/McClintock: Intersection Improvements			FY11
Ray/McClintock - NE Corner	DES	2007	
Ray/McClintock - NE Corner	ROW	2007	
Ray/McClintock - NE Corner	CONST	2007	
Ray/McClintock - SE, SW, and NW Corner	DES	2009	\$ 0.414
Ray/McClintock - SE, SW, and NW Corner	ROW	2010	\$ 0.391
Ray/McClintock - SE, SW, and NW Corner	CONST	2011	\$ 2.659

AMENDMENT - Maricopa County – El Mirage Rd: Thunderbird Rd to Northern Ave - MCDOT and El Mirage are planning to enter into an MOU this fiscal year regarding the funding and phasing of this project. An amendment is requested to reprogram the regional reimbursements to fit the project schedule.

Fiscal Impact - The ALCP cash flow can accommodate the requested amendment.

FY07 – June 28, 2006 ALCP:

El Mirage Rd: Thunderbird Rd to Northern Ave			FY16	FY17	FY18
	STUDY	2006			
	DES	2016	\$ 1.542		
	ROW	2017		\$ 4.615	
	CONST	2018			\$ 9.263

Proposed:

El Mirage Rd: Thunderbird Rd to Northern Ave			FY16	FY17	FY18
	STUDY	2006			
	DES	2016	\$ 2.898		
	ROW	2017	\$ 2.800		
	CONST	2018		\$ 7.005	\$ 2.717

AMENDMENT - Maricopa County – El Mirage Rd: Paradise Ln over Grand Ave to Thunderbird Rd- MCDOT and El Mirage are planning to enter into an MOU this fiscal year regarding the funding and phasing of this project. An amendment is requested to reprogram the regional reimbursements to fit the project schedule and to correctly define the project's boundaries. This project has a total of \$19.667 of regional reimbursements; \$5.14 is available in Phase I and \$14.527 is available in Phase II

Fiscal Impact - The ALCP cash flow can accommodate the requested amendment.

FY07 – June 28, 2006 ALCP:

El Mirage Rd: Paradise Ln over Grand Ave to Thunderbird Rd			FY15
	STUDY	2006	
	DES	2016	\$ 1.788
	ROW	2017	\$ 3.352
	CONST	2018	\$14.527

Proposed:

El Mirage Rd: Bell Rd. to Thunderbird Rd		FY08	FY09	FY10	FY11	FY12	FY13	FY14	FY15
	DES	\$0.896	\$0.378						
	ROW	\$2.562	\$1.126	\$0.178					
	CONST						\$8.403	\$4.822	\$1.302

ADMINISTRATIVE ADJUSTMENT - City of Chandler - Arizona Avenue/Chandler Boulevard Intersection Improvement The costs incurred for the right of way acquisition for the Arizona Ave/Chandler project are less than the estimate listed in the FY07 ALCP. \$650,000 has been moved from the right of way work to the construction to reflect actual project costs. The

Fiscal Impact – There is no negative financial impact on the ALCP.

FY07 – June 28, 2006 ALCP:

			FY14
Arizona Ave/Chandler Blvd: Intersection Improvement	DES	2004	\$ 0.18
	ROW	2005	\$ 1.61
	CONST	2006	\$ 1.67

Proposed:

			FY14
Arizona Ave/Chandler Blvd: Intersection Improvement	DES	2004	\$ 0.18
	ROW	2005	\$ 0.98
	CONST	2006	\$ 2.30

ADMINISTRATIVE ADJUSTMENT - City of Phoenix – Happy Valley Rd: I-17 to 67th Avenue - Segment A: I-17 to 35th Ave., of the Happy Valley: I-17 to 67th Avenue Project has been completed and the project expenditures came in lower than expected. An Administrative Adjustment is needed to allocate the available funds from Segment A to the other segments of this project. The project has been advanced by the City of Phoenix and the regional reimbursements remain in the same fiscal years.

Fiscal Impact - There is no negative financial impact on the ALCP.

FY07 – June 28, 2006 ALCP

Happy Valley: I-17 to 67th Avenue			FY23	FY24
Happy Valley: I-17 to 35th Avenue – A	DES	2003	\$ 0.46	
Happy Valley: I-17 to 35th Avenue – A	ROW	2004	\$ 0.34	
Happy Valley: I-17 to 35th Avenue – A	CONST	2005	\$ 5.84	
Happy Valley: 35th Avenue to 43rd Avenue -B	DES	2007	\$ 0.14	
Happy Valley: 35th Avenue to 43rd Avenue-B	ROW	2008	\$ 0.54	
Happy Valley: 35th Avenue to 43rd Avenue-B	CONST	2009	\$ 1.23	
Happy Valley: 43rd to 55th Avenue-C	DES	2007		\$ 0.23
Happy Valley: 43rd to 55th Avenue-C	ROW	2008		\$ 0.14
Happy Valley: 43rd to 55th Avenue-C	CONST	2009		\$ 1.81
Happy Valley: 55th to 67th Avenue-D	DES	2008		\$ 0.23
Happy Valley: 55th to 67th Avenue-D	CONST	2009		\$ 2.17
	Savings	2024		\$ 2.07

Proposed:

Happy Valley: I-17 to 67th Avenue			FY23	FY24
Happy Valley: I-17 to 35th Avenue-A	DES	2003	\$ 0.55	
Happy Valley: I-17 to 35th Avenue-A	ROW	2004	\$ 0.01	
Happy Valley: I-17 to 35th Avenue-A	CONST	2005	\$ 4.70	
Happy Valley: 35th Avenue to 43rd Avenue-B	DES	2007	\$ 0.31	
Happy Valley: 35th Avenue to 43rd Avenue-B	ROW	2008	\$ 0.54	
Happy Valley: 35th Avenue to 43rd Avenue-B	CONST	2009	\$ 2.08	
Happy Valley: 43rd to 55th Avenue-C	DES	2007		\$ 0.23
Happy Valley: 43rd to 55th Avenue-C	ROW	2008		\$ 0.14
Happy Valley: 43rd to 55th Avenue-C	CONST	2009		\$ 2.17
Happy Valley: 55th to 67th Avenue-D	DES	2008		\$ 0.23
Happy Valley: 55th to 67th Avenue-D	CONST	2009		\$ 2.17
	Savings	2024		\$ 2.07



302 North 1st Avenue, Suite 300 ▲ Phoenix, Arizona 85003
 Phone (602) 254-6300 ▲ FAX (602) 254-6490
 E-mail: mag@mag.maricopa.gov ▲ Web site: www.mag.maricopa.gov

October 25, 2006

TO: Members of the Transportation Policy Committee

FROM: Eric J. Anderson, Transportation Director

SUBJECT: TRANSMITTAL OF PROJECT INFORMATION FOR THE STATE
 TRANSPORTATION ACCELERATION NEEDS (STAN) ACCOUNT
 DISCUSSION

Chair Bilsten has requested that the project information on the attachment be distributed to the members of the Transportation Policy Committee (TPC). It is anticipated that a recommendation may be made at the November 15, 2006 TPC meeting for the use of the \$184.2 million of STAN funds that have been allocated to the MAG region. The TPC recommendation would go forward to the MAG Regional Council for consideration at the December 13, 2006 meeting. The action by the Regional Council would then be forwarded to the State Transportation Board for consideration at the next regularly scheduled meeting and would be included in the report to the Arizona House and Senate, which is required to be submitted by December 15, 2006.

Determination of Project Readiness

The project information includes the listing of projects that have been determined to be "project ready" and, therefore, candidates for consideration by the TPC for STAN funding. The determination of project readiness is based on a thorough review of all of the highway projects in the Regional Transportation Plan by the Arizona Department of Transportation and MAG. This review identified projects that have been through sufficient scoping and environmental review so that funding could be obligated within approximately the next 24 months. For construction projects, this means that the final design process is either underway or could be started immediately. There are a number of projects that are already in final design and are scheduled for construction over the next 12 to 18 months. For right-of-way projects, "project ready" means that corridors have to be identified in sufficient certainty to allow acquisition of right of way in this same time frame.

TPC Guidance

At the September 2006 meeting, the TPC discussed the need to fund projects that provided the best benefit for the region. In particular, the impact of a proposed project on congestion and safety were mentioned as important factors. The benefit of acquiring right-of-way sooner was also discussed as a way to avoid future cost increases as rising land values and development continue to increase costs. Another discussion point was the possibility of advancing the scoping studies and environmental assessments on projects so that there are more projects that are "project ready" in the future.

Description of Project Information

The attached table presents the information on each potential project that has been determined to be project ready. A description of the information is provided in the table on the second page of the attachment. The information includes a description of each project, the current estimated cost, including any cost for the final design, the Regional Transportation Plan phase of the project and the target fiscal year for when the construction of the project could begin.

Performance information is also provided for possible construction projects and includes historical traffic volume information and how the project would impact 2008 traffic volumes and the expected level of service improvement. Information on the number of crashes in 2003, 2004 and 2005 for each segment is also presented. Statistics on the total number of crashes and the number involving serious injuries or fatalities are also included for these years. A 2005 crash rate has been determined based on the total number of crashes, the length of the roadway segment and the traffic volumes, with the ranking of the projects also included. A second crash rate and ranking is also included based on the number of crashes with serious injury or fatalities.

Please contact me or Dennis Smith at the MAG offices if you have any questions or comments on the information being provided or would like information on why other projects may have not be included on this list.

Summary of Potential Projects for STAN Funding ¹

Table 1: Project Status Information

(as of November 1, 2006)

Route	Segment	Type	Length	Estimated Design Cost (millions)	Estimated Right of Way Cost (millions)	Estimated Construction Cost (millions)	Estimated Total Cost (millions)	RTP Phase	Year of Construction in Current ADOT Program	Scoping / DCR	Environmental	Design Status
Loop 101 - Price												
L101 (PR)	Baseline Road to L202 (Santan)	Add HOV lane	5.4	3.0	None	35.5	38.5	1	2010	Complete	EA Completed	Design not started
Loop 202 - Red Mountain												
L202 (RM)	L101 TI to Gilbert Road	Add HOV lanes	6.5	3.3	None	38.6	41.9	1	2009	Apr-07	Due April 2007	Design not started
Loop 303 - Estrella Freeway												
L303	Bell to Grand	Build full freeway and Grand TI	3	22.0	20.0	256.0	298.0	2	2011-2015	Completion Dec 06	Due Spring 07	30% due Dec 06
L303	Peoria to Bell	Build full freeway	4	14.0	19.0	164.0	197.0	2	2011-2015	Completion Mar 07	Due Spring 07	30% due Mar 07
L303	Bell/L303 TI	Construct partial interchange	N/A	1.0	-	12.0	12.0	2	2011-2015	Completion Dec 06	Due Spring 07	30% due Dec 06
L303	Cactus & Waddell Roads	Construct bridge structures	N/A	1.0	-	9.0	10.0	2	2011-2015	Completion Dec 06	Due Spring 07	30% due Mar 07
L303	I-10 to Grand	Cooridor ROW Protection	N/A					2	2011-2015	Completion Dec 06	Due Spring 07	30% due Mar 07
Loop 101 - Pima												
L101 (PI)	Tatum to Princess Dr	Add HOV lane	5.2	2.6	None	30.0	32.6	2	2011	Complete	Due Jan 07	Design not started
Williams Gateway Freeway												
Williams Gateway	L202 (Santan) to Meridian Road	ROW Protection	5		100 (total) 20 - 25 (interim)		100 (total) 20 - 25 (interim)	3	2016,2020	Start Nov 06	Start Nov 06	Design not started
I-10 Reliever												
I-10 Reliever	L202 (South Mtn) to L303	ROW Protection	25		300 (total)		300 (total)	4	2023-2025	Due Jan 08	Due Oct 07	Design not started
Interstate 10												
I-10	SR 85 to Sarival Road	Add GP lane	12.75	7.2	None	85.2	92.4	4	2023	Complete	EA Completed	30% plan completed
OR												
I-10	Watson Road to Sarival	Add GP lane	8.75	5.2	None	61.2	66.4	4	2023	Complete	EA Completed	30% plan completed
OR												
I-10	Verrado Way to Sarival	Add GP lane	5.75	3.7	None	43.2	46.9	4	2023	Complete	EA Completed	30% plan completed
Interstate 17												
I-17	New River Road to Carefree Highway	Add GP lane	8	5.2	None	60.5	65.7	4	2023	Complete	EA Completed	Design not started
OR												
I-17	Anthem to Carefree Highway	Add GP lane	5.1	2.6	None	30.5	33.1	4	2024	Complete	EA Completed	Design not started
Various	Advance Environmental and scoping											

1) Potential projects based on ADOT assessment of project status.

Summary of Potential Projects for STAN Funding¹
Table 2: Project Performance Information
(as of November 1, 2006)

Route	Segment	Type	Traffic Volumes 2003	Traffic Volumes 2004	Traffic Volumes 2005	2008 Traffic Volumes Before	LOS: Level of Service Before (2)	2008 Traffic Volumes After	LOS: Level of Service After (2)	Crashes 2003 (Total/Injuries/Fatal)	Crashes 2004 (Total/Injuries/Fatal)	Crashes 2005 (Total/Injuries/Fatal)	2005 Crash Rate (3)	Crash Rate Rank	2005 Injury & Fatal Crash Rate(4)	Injury & Fatality Crash Rate Rank
Loop 101 - Price																
L101 (PR)	Baseline Road to L202	Add HOV lane	87,100	157,000	160,000	160,400	F	162,900	E	269 / 74 / 2	394 / 105 / 2	420 / 120 / 1	133.18	1	38.37	2
Loop 202 - Red Mountain																
L202 (RM)	L101 TI to Gilbert Road	Add HOV lanes	96,000	99,100	128,000	137,000	E	140,700	D	135 / 31 / 0	151 / 36 / 2	150 / 36 / 0	49.39	7	11.85	9
Loop 303 - Estrella Freeway																
L303	Bell to Grand	Build full freeway and	3,600	3,700	10,000	17,500	N/A	24,100	N/A	0 / 0 / 0	2 / 1 / 0	2 / 1 / 0	18.26	10	9.13	10
L303	Peoria to Bell	Build full freeway	8,200	16,400	16,000	18,500	N/A	30,600	N/A	5 / 2 / 0	30 / 13 / 0	29 / 13 / 0	124.14	2	55.65	1
L303	Bell/L303 TI	Construct partial	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
L303	Cactus & Waddell	Construct bridge	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
L303	I-10 to Grand	Cooridor ROW Protection	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Loop 101 - Pima																
L101 (PI)	Tatum to Princess Dr	Add HOV lane	74,700	102,000	132,000	132,000	E	139,500	D	146 / 45 / 0	147 / 40 / 0	176 / 46 / 0	70.25	5	18.36	5
Williams Gateway Freeway																
Williams Gateway	L202 (Santan) to Meridian Road	ROW Protection	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
I-10 Reliever																
I-10 Reliever	L202 (South Mtn) to L303	ROW Protection	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Interstate 10																
I-10	SR 85 to Sarival Road	Add GP lane	34,100	28,100	43,800	46,800	B	56,400	B	32 / 13 / 0	32 / 9 / 2	28 / 8 / 1	43.79	8	14.07	8
OR																
I-10	Watson Road to Sarival	Add GP lane	41,000	43,100	47,400	52,000	C	57,900	B	28 / 16 / 1	31 / 8 / 1	28 / 7 / 2	53.95	6	17.34	6
OR																
I-10	Verrado Way to Sarival	Add GP lane	50,300	55,000	66,000	54,300	C	64,000	B	73 / 26 / 1	92 / 29 / 3	115 / 44 / 4	83.02	3	34.65	3
Interstate 17																
I-17	New River Road to	Add GP lane	34,700	35,700	44,000	45,100	C	46,500	B	37 / 10 / 1	23 / 5 / 1	19 / 6 / 2	40.80	9	17.18	7
OR																
I-17	Anthem to Carefree	Add GP lane	38,000	41,800	60,000	64,000	D	72,300	C	107 / 35 / 5	97 / 29 / 4	88 / 29 / 4	78.79	4	29.55	4
Various	Advance Environmental and scoping															

2) LOS = Level of Service (A = Excellent, B = Very Good, ..., F = Highly Congested)

3) Crash Rate per 100 million Vehicle Miles of Travel = (Number of Crashes X 100,000,000)/(Volume X Segment Length X 365)

4) Injury & Fatal Crash Rate per 100 million Vehicle Miles of Travel = (Number of Crashes with Injury or Fatality X 100,000,000)/(Volume X Segment Length X 365)

Description of STAN Project Information

Table 1: Project Status Information

Route:	Route number
Segment:	Beginning and ending points of the project
Type:	Description of the type of improvement / investment
Length:	Length of the segment in miles

Estimated Design Cost: Estimated cost to complete the final design of the project.

Estimated Right of Way Cost: Estimated cost to acquire the necessary right of way for the project. Note some projects that do not have a figure in the column may require a minimal amount of right of way.

Estimated Construction Cost: Estimated cost to construct the project.

Estimated Cost: Latest estimated cost to complete the project including design, right of way, and construction.

RTP Phase: The Regional Transportation Plan phase in which the project is currently scheduled.

Year of Construction in Current ADOT Program: Year that project construction is scheduled in the current ADOT Life Cycle Program.

Scoping / DCR: Status of the project scoping and/or design concept report (DCR) for the project.

Environmental: Status of the environmental studies for the project.

Design Status: Status of the final design of the project.

Table 2: Project Performance Information

Route:	Route number
Segment:	Beginning and ending points of the project
Type:	Description of the type of improvement / investment

Traffic Volumes: Traffic volumes from the ADOT traffic count program for calendar years 2003, 2004 and 2005 are shown. Volumes are average annual daily traffic.

2008 Traffic Volumes Before: Estimated traffic volumes from the MAG Travel Demand Model for 2008 without the improvement.

LOS: Level of Service Before: Indicator of the level of service of the segment based on the traffic volumes and number of lanes. LOS for the L303 sections are not included since this is currently an interim road facility and is not a freeway.

2008 Traffic Volumes After: Estimated traffic volumes from the MAG Travel Demand Model for 2008 with the improvement.

LOS: Level of Service After: Indicator of the level of service of the segment based on the traffic volumes and number of lanes with the proposed improvement in place. LOS for the two L303 sections are not included due to the end of freeway conditions.

Crashes (Total / Injury/ Fatal): Data are provided for calendar years 2003, 2004, and 2005 and includes the total number of crashes, the number of crashes with injuries, and the number of crashes with fatalities.

2005 Crash Rate: The number of crashes per 100 million miles of vehicle traffic. The crash rate provides a measure of the crashes taking account of the length of the segment and the traffic volume that uses each segment.

Crash Rate Rank: The ranking of the 10 projects that have crash rates according to the 2005 Crash Rate.

2005 Injury and Fatal Crash Rate: The number of crashes that involve serious injuries or fatalities. This provides an indication of the severity of crashes for each segment.

Injury & Fatality Crash Rate Rank: The ranking of the 10 projects that have crash rates according to the 2005 Injury & Fatality Crash Rate.

MARICOPA ASSOCIATION OF GOVERNMENTS

INFORMATION SUMMARY... for your review

DATE:

November 7, 2006

SUBJECT:

Requested Changes to the ADOT Program

SUMMARY:

The Arizona Department of Transportation (ADOT) has requested a number of program changes for FY 2007 to incorporate revised cost estimates and to adjust the schedule of certain projects. These changes include a number of projects related to the I-17 widening from L101 to Carefree Highway, including increases in the right-of-way budgets to reflect higher costs and to include the land needed for the I-17/L303 Traffic Interchange. In addition the I-17 widening project has been divided into two projects, one from L101 to Jomax Road and the second from Jomax Road to Carefree Highway.

The requested changes by corridor include:

- I-10: Right-of-way and design projects moved from 2007 to 2008 since EIS still underway.
- I-17: Right-of-way and construction costs updated. Widening from L101 to Carefree Highway divided into multiple projects to reduce size of bid package.
- Grand: Revised construction costs.
- Superstition: Updated landscape construction costs.
- SR 74: Eliminate right-of-way funds since no acquisitions pending.
- SR 85: Revised cost estimates and one construction project moved from 2007 to 2009.
- SR 87: Revised construction costs.
- SR 88: Moved from 2007 to 2008 due to design progress.
- Pima: Freeway Management System (FMS) project added with funds from the FMS program and revised cost estimate.
- Red Mountain: Updated landscape construction costs.
- L303: Revised right-of-way costs and updated construction costs.
- Williams Gateway: Move right-of-way funding from 2007 to 2008 since no acquisitions pending.
- Systemwide: Moving rubberized asphalt funds from 2008 to 2007 and reduce advance acquisition of right-of-way funding.

MAG has reviewed the requested changes and has determined that they are reasonable and necessary to meet the RTP Freeway Program. MAG has also reviewed the ADOT cash flows with the requested changes incorporated into the analysis. Although the requested changes increase costs by more than \$122 million, the program schedule adjustments and revised revenue projections can accommodate these changes without other program changes being needed.

PUBLIC INPUT:

No public input has been received concerning the specific requested change.

PROS & CONS:

PROS: The proposed changes reflect the best cost and schedule information available and, if approved, will result in the FY 2007 planned ADOT projects staying on schedule.

CONS: Higher costs reduce the available cash flow for the freeway program.

TECHNICAL & POLICY IMPLICATIONS:

TECHNICAL: None

POLICY: MAG is required to approve material changes to the ADOT Life Cycle Program.

ACTION NEEDED:

Recommend approval of the requested program changes.

PRIOR COMMITTEE ACTIONS:

Management Committee: This item is on the November 8, 2006 Management Committee agenda. An update will be provided on action taken by the Committee.

CONTACT PERSON:

Eric J. Anderson, (602) 452-5008.

**ARIZONA DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION
PROPOSED CHANGES TO THE FY 2007 REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION PLAN FREEWAY PROGRAM**

Route	Phase	Project	Fiscal Year		Budget (000)		Change	Other Misc. Changes (Comments)
			From	To	From	To		
I-10								
10	RW	40th St - Baseline Rd, CD Road	07	08	\$5,000	\$5,000	\$0	Based on latest study progress
10	RD	40th St - Baseline Rd, CD Road	07	08	\$5,775	\$5,775	\$0	Based on latest study progress
I-17								
17	RW	101L - SR74, Carefree Highway	07	None	\$7,800	\$0	(\$7,800)	Delete this project and create three new RW projects
17	RW	101L - Happy Valley Rd	None	07	\$0	\$23,000	\$23,000	Create this project from the deleted project and use latest cost estimates.
17	RC	Jomax / Dixileta TI	07	07	\$40,000	\$47,300	\$7,300	Based on latest cost estimates
17	RW	Happy Valley Rd - Dixileta Dr	None	07	\$0	\$18,800	\$18,800	Create this project from the deleted project and use latest cost estimates.
17	RW	Dixileta Dr - SR74, Carefree Highway	None	07	\$0	\$24,500	\$24,500	Create this project from the deleted project and use latest cost estimates.
17	RC	101L - SR74, Carefree Highway	07	None	\$182,000	\$0	(\$182,000)	Delete this project and create two new projects (one project in FY07 and one project in FY08)
17	RC	101L - Jomax Rd	None	07	\$0	\$99,000	\$99,000	Create this project from the deleted project and use latest cost estimates.
17	RC	SR74 TI, Carefree Highway	07	07	\$17,000	\$24,000	\$7,000	Based on latest cost estimates
GRAND AVENUE								
60	RC	99th Ave - 83rd Ave (Including New River Bridge)	07	07	\$6,500	\$10,000	\$3,500	Based on latest cost estimates
SUPERSTITION								
60	LC	Val Vista - Power, Landscape Construction	07	07	\$5,100	\$5,810	\$710	Updated landscape construction costs
SR74								
74	RW	US60, Grand - 303L, Estrella	07	None	\$1,000	\$0	(\$1,000)	No acquisitions pending
SR85								
85	RC	MP 139.01 - MP 141.71	07	07	17,300	26,100	\$8,800	Based on latest cost estimates
85	RC	MC 85 - Southern Ave	07	07	8,500	13,800	\$5,300	Based on latest cost estimates
85	RC	Southern Ave - I-10	07	09	11,200	29,600	\$18,400	Based on latest cost estimates. Based on current design progress

ARIZONA DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION
 PROPOSED CHANGES TO THE FY 2007 REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION PLAN FREEWAY PROGRAM

Route	Phase	Project	Fiscal Year		Budget (000)		Change	Other Misc. Changes (Comments)	
			From	To	From	To			
SR87									
87	RC	Forest Boundary - New Four Peaks	07	07	18,000	21,500	\$3,500	Based on latest cost estimates	
SR88									
88	RC	Fish Creek Hill	07	08	\$1,500	\$1,500	\$0	Based on latest design progress	
101L, Pima									
101	RC	Princess Dr - 202L, Red Mountain	07	07	65,000	69,500	\$4,500	Add FMS scope and funding to this project	
101	FMS	Princess Dr - 202L, Red Mountain	07	07	8,400	3,900	(\$4,500)	Transferred FMS funding to HOV construction project.	
101	RC	64th St	07	07	23,000	26,000	\$3,000	Based on latest cost estimates	
202L, Red Mountain									
202	LC	US60/SR202L TI, Landscape construction	07	07	7,600	8,126	\$526	Updated landscape construction costs	
303L, Estrella									
303	RW	Happy Valley Rd - I-17, Interim	07	None	26,000	0	(\$26,000)	Delete this project and create two new projects (one project in FY07 and one project in FY08)	
303	RW	Happy Valley Rd - Lake Pleasant Rd, Interim	None	07	0	36,300	\$36,300	Create this project from the deleted project and use latest cost estimates.	
303	RC	Happy Valley Rd - I-17 (TI) Construction @ I-17	07	08	30,000	34,000	\$4,000	Based on latest cost estimates	
SR802, Williams Gateway									
802	RW	202L, Santan - Meridian Rd	07	08	2,000	0	(\$2,000)	No acquisitions pending, funding moved to FY 08	
System Wide (SW)									
SW	Noise	Asphalt Rubber Noise Mitigation	None	07	0	6,500	\$6,500	Advanced \$6.5 million from FY08 Asphalt Rubber Noise Mitigation project.	
SW	R/W	R/W Advance Acquisition	07	07	5,000	1,000	(\$4,000)	Based on projected need to FY 07	
							TOTAL:	\$47,336	