

October 16, 2008

TO: Members of the MAG Transportation Review Committee

FROM: Tom Callow, City of Phoenix Chair

SUBJECT: MEETING NOTIFICATION AND TRANSMITTAL OF TENTATIVE AGENDA

Thursday, October 23, 2008, 10:00 a.m.
MAG Office, Suite 200, Saguaro Room
302 North 1st Avenue, Phoenix

A meeting of the MAG Transportation Review Committee (TRC) will be held at the time and place noted above. **Please park in the garage under the building. Bring your ticket to the meeting as parking will be validated. Bicycles can be locked in the rack at the entrance to the parking garage.**

The next meeting of the MAG Transportation Review Committee will be held at the time and place noted above. Committee members or their proxies may attend **in person, via videoconference or by telephone conference call**. Those attending video conference must notify the MAG site three business days prior to the meeting. Those attending by telephone conference call please contact MAG offices for conference call instructions.

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 Christina Hopes at the MAG Office. Requests should be made as early as possible to allow time to arrange the accommodation.

Please be advised that under procedures adopted by the MAG Regional Council on June 26, 1996, all MAG committees need to have a quorum in order to conduct business. A quorum is a simple majority of the membership or twelve people for the MAG TRC. If you are unable to attend the meeting, please make arrangements for a proxy from your jurisdiction to represent you. If you have any questions or need additional information, please contact Eric Anderson or Christina Hopes at (602) 254-6300.

develop guidelines for recommending projects to be selected and programmed in the competitive project selection process for MAG Federal Funds. At the September 2008 TRC meeting, committee members suggested a working group to meet and discuss the guidelines in more detail. The TRC Working Group will meet, October 23rd from 9:00 - 9:55 a.m., prior to the TRC Committee meeting. An update will be provided at the Committee meeting.

7. Arterial Life Cycle Program Status Report

A Status Report on the Arterial Life Cycle Program (ALCP) will be provided for the period between October 2007 and March 2008 and will include an update on ALCP Project work, the remaining FY08 ALCP schedule, and ALCP revenues and finances. A copy of the ALCP Status Report is provided in Attachment One.

8. Member Agency Update

This section of the Agenda will provide Committee members with an opportunity to share information regarding a variety of transportation-related issues within their respective communities.

9. Next Meeting Date

The next regular TRC meeting will be scheduled Thursday, December 4, 2008 at 10:00 a.m. in the MAG Office, Saguaro Room.

7. Information and discussion.

8. For information.

9. For information.

DRAFT MINUTES OF THE
MARICOPA ASSOCIATION OF GOVERNMENTS
TRANSPORTATION REVIEW COMMITTEE

September 25, 2008

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

MEMBERS ATTENDING

Phoenix: Tom Callow	Maricopa County: John Hauskins
ADOT: Kwi-Sung Kang for Floyd Roehrich	Mesa: Scott Butler
Avondale: David Fitzhugh	Paradise Valley: Robert M. Cicarelli
Buckeye: Scott Lowe	Peoria: David Moody
Chandler: Patrice Kraus	*Queen Creek: Mark Young
El Mirage: Pat Dennis for Lance Calvert	RPTA: Bob Antila for Bryan Jungwirth
*Fountain Hills: Randy Harrel	Scottsdale: Dave Meinhart for Mary O'Connor
*Gila Bend: Vacant	Surprise: Randy Overmyer
*Gila River: David White	Tempe: Carlos de Leon
Gilbert: Stephanie Prybyl for Tami Ryall	Valley Metro Rail: John Farry
Glendale: Terry Johnson	*Wickenburg: Gary Edwards
Goodyear: Cato Esquivel	Youngtown: Lloyce Robinson
Guadalupe: Jim Ricker	
Litchfield Park: Mike Cartsonis	

EX-OFFICIO MEMBERS ATTENDING

*Regional Bicycle Task Force: Jim Hash, City of Mesa	Pedestrian Working Group: Brandon Forrey, City of Peoria
*Street Committee: Darryl Crossman, City of Litchfield Park	*Transportation Safety Committee: Kerry Wilcoxon, City of Phoenix
*ITS Committee: Mike Mah	

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

OTHERS PRESENT

Eric Anderson, MAG	Ray Dovalina, City of Phoenix
Monique de los Rios-Urban, MAG	Wulf Grote, Valley Metro
Dean Giles, MAG	Bill Hayden, ADOT
Bob Hazlett, MAG	David Johnson, Town of Buckeye
Roger Herzog, MAG	Brad Lundahl, City of Scottsdale
Nathan Pryor, MAG	Sue McDermott, City of Avondale
Steve Tate, MAG	Jenna Goad, City of Glendale
Tim Strow, MAG	Tom Remes, City of Phoenix
Eileen Yazzie, MAG	Julio Alvarado, ADOT
Steve Trussell, ARPA	Amanda McGennis, AGC
Patrick Weaver, Vulcan	

1. Call to Order

Mr. Tom Callow from the City of Phoenix called the meeting to order at 10:05 a.m.

2. Approval of September 28, 2008 Draft Minutes

Mr. Callow asked if there were any changes or amendments to the meeting minutes, and there were none. Mr. John Hauskins from Maricopa County moved to approve the minutes. Mr. Terry Johnson from the City of Glendale seconded the motion, and the minutes were subsequently approved by unanimous voice vote of the Committee.

3. Call to the Audience

Mr. Callow stated that he had not received any request to speak cards from the audience and moved on to the next item on the agenda.

4. Transportation Director's Report

Mr. Callow invited Mr. Eric Anderson to present the Transportation Director's Report. Mr. Anderson requested the members disregard the last two pages to Attachment Three, which was inadvertently attached to the agenda.

Mr. Anderson announced that July RARF revenues were down 11.2 percent from July 2007 and that FY2008 revenues were 3 percent lower than FY2007. He stated this was the first year to year loss in revenue since the inception of the tax in 1986. Mr. Anderson added that the August RARF revenues were down 9.1 percent compared to the previous year and that year-to-date RARF revenues were down 10.2 percent from the previous year.

Mr. Anderson stated the decline would probably continue throughout the fiscal year due to several factors including the collapse of the housing market. He informed the Committee that 40 percent of homes purchased within the last five years in the Phoenix metropolitan area have a net loss compared to the purchase price. He added that 50 percent of the homes sold in the second quarter of FY2008 were sold at a loss, and 38 percent of the housing transactions were foreclosures for that same period. Mr. Anderson noted a broad base loss of consumer confidence in the economy adding that MAG would continue to monitor the situation.

Mr. Anderson reported that MAG anticipated the publication of revised revenue projections by the Arizona Department of Transportation (ADOT) in October 2008. He warned the Committee that the projections would likely show a decrease in revenue. He reported the general consensus of the national media and local and regional experts suggested the economic downturn continuing would continue into 2010.

Continuing on, Mr. Anderson discussed construction and commodity costs. He stated that although construction bid activity had been favorably over the last 6 to 12 months, experts were speculating about an increase in bids amounts due to commodity pricing. Mr. Anderson reported a continued increase in asphalt cost and announced that a presentation would be provided later in the meeting on escalation causes pertaining to asphalt.

Next, Mr. Anderson addressed the status of the Freeway Life Cycle Program (FLCP) and announced a \$4 billion deficit in the program. He stated the deficit would likely increase once the revised ADOT revenues projections were released. He explained if the revised projection were lower than currently forecasted that the bonding ability of the program would be negatively impacted. Mr. Anderson stated that the bonding ability was originally built into the program; however, a lower forecast would result in a reduced bonding capacity.

Mr. Callow asked if there were any questions or comments about this agenda item. There were none, and this concluded the Transportation Director's Report.

5. Approval of Consent Agenda

Addressing the next order of business, Mr. Callow directed the Committee's attention to the consent agenda. Three items were on the meeting's consent agenda: Agenda item #6 (ADOT Red Letter Process), Agenda item #7 (Project Changes - Amendments and Administrative Modifications to the FY2008-2012 Transportation Improvement Program), and Agenda item #8 (Submittal of Paving of Unpaved Road Projects and PM-10 Certified Street Sweepers for MAG Federal Funding). Mr. Callow asked whether any members in attendance had questions concerning these items, and there were none. Mr. Hauskins moved to recommend approval of the Consent Agenda. Mr. Bob Cicarelli seconded, and the motion was approved by a unanimous voice vote of the Committee.

9. TRC Guidelines for Recommending Projects for Federal Funding

Ms. Eileen Yazzie from MAG addressed the Committee about the Transportation Review Committee (TRC) Guidelines for Recommending Projects for Federal Funding. Ms. Yazzie directed the Committee's attention to the attachment for this agenda item.

Next, Ms. Yazzie recapped the Committee's August discussion on guidelines historically used by the TRC to review project applications and select recommendations. She stated the attachment documented the guidelines discussed at the August meeting and included reviewing and considering:

- the rank ordered project application list from the Technical Advisory Committees (TACs);
- the Congestion Mitigation and Air Quality (CMAQ) evaluation (cost effectiveness scoring) and it's part in the TAC review process;
- the funding allocation recommendations from the MAG Regional Transportation Plan (RTP);
- the MAG RTP Goals; and
- the MAG RTP Priority Criteria.

Ms. Yazzie reported that Member Agencies had expressed an interest in more narrow and focused guidelines. Next, she requested the Committee's guidance on how to proceed with developing the project selection guidelines. She stated that in January 2009 the TRC would begin the project review and selection process and suggested that finalized guidelines be in place at that time. Mr. David Moody from the City of Peoria asked if Ms. Yazzie to send the comments received to the Committee. Ms. Yazzie explained that the comments received to date were informal and non-specific.

Ms. Pat Dennis from the City of El Mirage asked if it was possible to establish a working group to resolve this issue. Mr. Anderson suggested that the Committee conduct workshops in lieu of forming a working group. He explained that workshops would allow for greater flexibility. Mr. Hauskins agreed stating that if a Committee Member could not attend the workshop a proxy could be sent in their place whereas with a working group this was not possible. A brief discussion followed, and the Committee and MAG Staff present informally decided to hold a workshop on the TRC Guidelines for Recommending Projects in November 2008.

Ms. Yazzie thanked the Committee for their guidance and announced that a MAG Staff would conduct a workshop in late October or early November. Mr. Callow asked if there were any additional comments in the agenda item. There were none, and this concluded the discussion on the TRC guidelines for recommending projects to receive federal funding.

10. 2008 Annual Report on Status of the Implementation of Proposition 400

Continuing on to the next agenda item, Mr. Callow invited Mr. Roger Herzog from MAG to provide the 2008 Annual Report on the Status of the Implementation of Proposition 400. Mr. Herzog informed the Committee that under Arizona Revised Statute Section 28-6354 MAG was required to issue an annual report on the status of projects funded through Proposition 400. In addition, the statute required MAG conduct a public hearing, which was scheduled for early November 2008. Mr. Herzog announced that the full version of the report was available on the MAG website.

Mr. Herzog reiterated the decreased RARF revenue collection discussed by Mr. Anderson in the Transportation Director's Report and announced a 2.6 percent decrease in federal revenues due to impact of increased gas prices on travel patterns. Revenue projections are being updated, which will likely result in lower long-range forecasts. He continued stating that the structure of future Federal transportation funding programs also represented a major uncertainty explaining that the funding legislation expired at the end of FFY 2009. Mr. Herzog anticipated a continuing resolution for funding due to the election year.

Mr. Herzog announced that the estimated future costs for the Transit Life Cycle Program (TLCP) were currently in balance with projected revenues. He reported that future revenues from FY2009 through FY2026 were forecasted at \$6.315 billion for TLCP while future costs for that period were estimated at \$6.312 billion. Mr. Herzog informed that Committee that costs were rising faster than anticipated and revenues are not expected to keep pace, at least in the short term.

Mr. Herzog stated that if revenues continued to decline, new bus service implementation may be impacted in the future. In addition, existing bus service may need to be reviewed to ensure that productivity goals are met. He reported that during FY 2009, RPTA would examine closely the assumptions used in estimating both revenues and expenditures for the Transit Life Cycle Program.

Next, Mr. Herzog addressed the Arterial Life Cycle Program (ALCP). Mr. Herzog explained that reimbursements were capped for projects in the ALCP therefore the program was not experiencing the same issues as the FLCP and the TLCP. Mr. Herzog announced that the total estimated future regional reimbursements for projects in the ALCP were in balance with projected revenues. He reported that future revenues from FY2009 through FY2026 were forecasted at \$1.864 billion for ALCP while future disbursements for that period were estimated at \$1.703 billion.

Mr. Herzog noted Lead Agencies' difficulties in providing the required matching funds, and other scheduling and resource issues, which resulted in the deferral of a number of arterial projects by implementing agencies. He reported that Lead Agencies deferred \$46 million in federal and regional funding from FY 2008 to later years. He added that MAG Staff anticipated project scope changes and rescheduling would continue to occur in the future, as local jurisdictions continue to face a variety of fiscal issues.

Continuing on, Mr. Herzog addressed the Freeway/Highway Life Cycle Program (FLCP) in greater detail. Mr. Herzog announced that the unadjusted future costs of the Freeway/Highway Life Cycle Program were currently in balance with projected revenues. He reported that future revenues from FY2009 through FY2026 were forecasted at \$10.273 billion while future unadjusted costs for that period were estimated at \$10.008 billion.

Mr. Herzog cautioned that the cost estimates did not include the impacts of construction cost increases and project scope changes on the Freeway/Highway Life Cycle Program, which currently were being evaluated. He stated that the new preliminary estimated program costs increased to \$14.9 billion (2008\$). In 2003, the base planning estimate for the FLCP costs was \$8.5 billion. Mr. Herzog announced that price inflation for commodities, construction and labor added \$3.7 billion to estimated costs. In addition, scope changes added \$2.7 billion to the estimated costs.

Mr. Herzog reported that \$1.4 billion inflation allowance was included in the program at the time of development. However, the unprecedented cost increases have exceeded the inflation allowance by \$2.3 billion. In addition, a \$1.3 billion contingency allowance was included in the program at the time of development to account for scope changes. To date scope changes have exceeded the allowance by \$1.4 billion.

Mr. Anderson explained to the Committee that the preliminary cost estimate were provided by ADOT in June. At that time, ADOT reviewed the FLCP and updated unit costs to generate revised cost projections using completed scopes. Since then, revised project costs have been submitted. For instance, the South Mountain Freeway project cost estimate increased by \$600 million. Mr. Anderson cautioned the Committee that costs continue to be volatile. A brief discussion followed.

Mr. Herzog informed the Committee that the new program estimate exceeds estimated funding by approximately \$3.3 billion. He stated that the difference was subject to future increases, depending on the outlook for inflation, facility design contingencies, further cost estimate refinements, and updated revenue forecasts. He explained that given the potential deficit of approximately \$3.3 billion, a major effort to achieve a balance between future program costs and available revenues would be required. Mr. Herzog reported that potential approaches to balance the program balance could include enhanced financing methods, project phasing, extension of the programming period, and adjustment of project schedules.

Mr. Johnson from Glendale suggested that ADOT should revise cost and revenue figures annually. Mr. Anderson concurred and stated that MAG had requested that ADOT review the planning estimates. He stated that the cost estimates for the High Occupancy Vehicle (HOV) lanes were fairing better than the cost estimates for the new freeway alignments. Mr. Anderson explained that ADOT generally revises cost estimates by project as figures become available; however, a program wide update is not conducted annually. A brief discussion followed.

Mr. Callow asked if there were any additional questions or comments on the agenda item. There were none, and this concluded the Annual Report on the Status of the Implementation of Proposition 400.

11. Design Guidelines for the Arizona Parkway

Next, Mr. Callow invited Bob Hazlett from MAG to present of the design guidelines for the Arizona Parkway. Mr. Hazlett reported that the Arizona Parkway concept was derived from a recommendation from the Hassayampa Framework Study and was being carried forward to the Hidden Valley Framework Study.

According to Mr. Hazlett, the Arizona Parkway is a type of arterial concept which has been recommended for these areas. Mr. Hazlett explained that the Parkway concept has been in use for over forty years in seven states, particularly in Michigan. He reported a marginal cost increase over conventional arterials as well as near freeway level volumes and a context-sensitive design.

Mr. Hazlett summarized the primary differences between a typical arterial treatment and the parkway design. He stated that the parkways generally require a 60 foot medians and 200 feet of right-of-way and include up to eight thru lanes. A typical arterial includes a 12 foot median with 130 foot right-of-way and include six thru lanes. Mr. Hazlett explained that although direct left-turns are prohibited, indirect left turns are permitted. He reported that the State of Michigan noted a reduction of 60 to 75 percent in injury crashes as result of the indirect left turns on the parkways.

Mr. Hazlett stated that the parkway concept reduced signal phasing to two-phases, which made progression with other signals easier. He reported that the concept has received national recognition from United States Department of Transportation. He referenced a report by the Federal Highway Administration, which recognized the parkway's ability to accommodate large amounts of traffic under safer conditions.

Next, Mr. Hazlett provided an overview of the approach implemented in Michigan. He provided examples of Woodward Avenue, Telegraph Road, Northwestern Highway, and Michigan State Route 78. Mr. Hazlett stated that “fishhook signs” were used to instruct drivers how to accomplish indirect left turns on the parkways. He provided implementation examples in rural and urban settings as well as the appearance from an overhead and ground level perspective.

Mr. Hazlett acknowledged the efforts of Maricopa County on studying the concept. Results of the study conducted by the Maricopa County Department of Transportation (MCDOT) indicated that using the parkway approach reduced delay by 33 percent, stops by 21 percent and travel time by 10 percent compared to a conventional transportation network. Mr. Hazlett reported that using the parkway approach would reduce the number of conflict points at intersections from 32 conflict points to 16 conflict points.

Then, Mr. Hazlett provided an overview of the MCDOT design guidelines for the Arizona Parkway. The project, initiated in January 2008, included a site visit to Michigan to review the implementation of the technique, a state of the practice assessment, draft design guidelines, and a final report, which was published in July 2008. The final report addressed the following aspects of the parkway concept:

- cross-sectional elements;
- access management;
- median opening geometrics;
- multi-modal accommodations;
- traffic elements;
- phasing; and
- typical intersection configurations.

In closing, Mr. Hazlett directed the Committee’s attention to various resources which are available on the topic. The resources available included enhanced parkway reports and the MCDOT design guidelines. He also announced an Arizona Parkway website available on the Maricopa County website.

Mr. Callow asked if there were any questions or comments about the agenda item. Mr. Randy Overmyer from the City of Surprise informed the Committee that the concept has been included in the City’s Transportation Plan. He announced that a corridor improvement study had just been completed with MCDOT’s assistance on a 5-miles segment and stated that City anticipated a parkway being completed within the next five years. Discussion followed.

Ms. Pat Dennis from the City of El Mirage inquired if MAG intended to create different functional classifications. She questioned if the concept would be going to the MAG Streets Committee for review. Mr. Hazlett explained that presentation was for information and discussion only. He stated that the information was available for Member Agencies use, if they so choose. He added that the MAG modeling department would recognize roads designated as parkways for air quality modeling purposes to reflect the air quality benefits the parkway concept can provide.

Mr. Callow asked if there were any additional questions or comments on the agenda item. There were none, and this concluded Mr. Hazlett's presentation on the Arizona Parkway Design Guidelines.

12. Proposed ADOT Contract Provisions for Commodity Price and Availability

Moving on, Mr. Callow invited Mr. Patrick Weaver, the Regional Manager for Vulcan Materials Company, to present on contract provisions for commodity price and availability. Mr. Weaver stated his presentation would address the asphalt industry's risk and exposure due to extreme price changes in petroleum products and potential solutions.

According to Mr. Weaver, liquid asphalt pricing has increased from approximately \$325 per ton to more than \$800 per ton in the last year. He stated the cause of the increase was due to the amount of demand exceeding supply. One reason he attributed to the reduced supply was that refineries have more options outside the paving industry to supply their bottom-end products, such as coker feed, heating oil, and bunker fuel.

Mr. Weaver reported that the Phoenix Metropolitan Service Area consumes between 5 to 6.5 million tons of asphalt per year. He stated that the average percent of oil in a ton of asphalt ranges between 5 and 5.5 percent. Given the price change of liquid asphalt of \$475, the cost of impact to a ton of mix ranges from \$23.75 to \$26.15. As a result, the cost impact to region based on current consumption has increased from \$118 million to \$170 million total cost.

To address the cost increase, Mr. Weaver suggested potential options for the Committee's consideration. First, he proposed allowing more creativity in the design mix used for roads. Toward that end, he encouraged Member Agencies to consider Reclaimed Asphalt Pavement (RAP). Mr. Anderson inquired why RAP was not permitted in Arizona. Mr. Weaver replied that RAP did not meet the State of Arizona's established specifications. A brief discussion followed. Mr. Weaver also proposed eliminating prescription asphalts. He recommended performance mixes which allow for optimization of oil contents without sacrificing quality, in his opinion.

Then, Mr. Weaver asked Mr. Julio Alvarado from the Arizona Department of Transportation to discuss the second half of the presentation. Mr. Alvarado's portion of the presentation focused on contract provision for commodity price adjustment for diesel fuel and bituminous material. He explained that ADOT, in partnership with industry and Federal Highway Administration (FHWA), developed specifications to minimize risks and impacts to contractors, subcontractors, and material suppliers of price fluctuations in diesel fuel and bituminous material. Mr. Alvarado reported that the provisions for bituminous material were instituted in January 1987 and the diesel provisions followed in September 2000.

Mr. Alvarado explained the benefit of including escalators provisions into construction contracts included minimizing risk, leveling "the playing field" at bid time, removing uncertainty, and enabling adjustments (increases and decreases). He added that the negative impact of the provisions included increased cost to projects. Mr. Alvarado explained that each contract includes a provision that trigger the price adjustment. At ADOT, the trigger is established at a 15 percent increase or decrease in cost.

Next, Mr. Alvarado provided an overview of the project eligibility requirements established by ADOT for contracts that include the escalator provision for diesel. According to Mr. Alvarado projects must have an estimated cost of \$1 million or more, with earthwork exceeds 20,000 cubic yards, have an aggregated quality exceed 1000 cubic units per yard, and asphaltic concrete quantities that exceed 5000 tons. Then, he provided the requirements for a bituminous material cost adjustment. The requirements included the cost of asphalt oils, emulsions, asphalt rubber material, and asphaltic concrete.

Continuing on, Mr. Alvarado provided a summation of ADOT's cost experience with the escalator clauses. He stated that ADOT had realized both cost increase and decreases as a result of the clauses.

Mr. Dave Moody acknowledged representatives from the asphalt community in the audience. He inquired about their satisfaction with the contract clauses. The audience members expressed satisfaction with the clauses and suggested resources for the Committee Members to use in regards to the issue. A brief discussion followed.

Mr. Callow asked if there were any additional questions or comments on the agenda item. There were none, and this concluded the agenda item.

13. Member Agency Update

Mr. Callow asked members of the Committee if they would like to provide updates; address any issues or concerns regarding transportation at the regional level; and asked if any members in attendance would like to address recent information that was relevant to transportation within their respective communities. There were none, and Mr. Callow moved to the next agenda item.

14. Next Meeting Date

Mr. Callow informed members in attendance that the next meeting of the Committee would be held on October 23, 2008. There being no further business, Mr. Callow adjourned the meeting at 11:47 a.m.

ATTACHMENT ONE



ARTERIAL LIFE CYCLE PROGRAM

Status Report

April 2008 – September 2008

CONTENTS

ALCP Revenue and Finance	1
RARF Collection and the Economy	2
ALCP Programming and Reimbursements.....	3
FY2008 RARF Closeout.....	3
ALCP FAQs.....	4
ALCP Project Status.....	4
Fiscal Year 2007-2008 ALCP Schedule.....	5
ALCP Project Status Tables for FY2008/FY2009	6

July 1st marked the end of fiscal year (FY) 2008 and the start of a FY2009. Beginning in December, MAG Staff and Member Agencies worked diligently to update information on projects programmed in the Arterial Life Cycle Program. The MAG Regional Council approved the FY2009 Arterial Life Cycle Program (ALCP) on June 25, 2008. MAG Staff distributed print versions of the ALCP to each Lead Agency and posted an electronic version to the program’s website at <http://www.mag.maricopa.gov/project.cms?item=5034>.

Minor changes were made to the FY2009 ALCP, which were not previously included in published versions. First, the Regional Remaining Budget for each project was published to the dollar. In the past, MAG Staff had rounded this number to the thousands of dollars.

Second, the layout of the ALCP Book was streamlined for projects with multiple Lead Agencies associated with one RTP identification number. This change occurred at the request of member agencies and had a minimal impact on many of the Lead Agencies programmed in the ALCP. Finally, the FY2009 clearly marked any completed projects or project segments. MAG Staff added “CO” for closed out/completed in the project status column of the ALCP.

MAG Staff would like to thank the efforts of everyone involved with updating the ALCP! We acknowledge the detailed nature of the task and appreciate each agency’s efforts to provided current and accurate information.

ALCP REVENUE AND FINANCE

The ALCP receives dedicated sales tax revenues (RARF) for transportation improvements to the arterial road network in Maricopa County. RARF revenues are deposited into the arterial account on a monthly basis.

In FY 2008, \$379 million was collected for all modes. Almost \$40 million was allocated to the Arterial Life Cycle Program in FY2008. Table 1 details the revenue collected by mode during FY 2008. The RARF Account balance was \$59.1 million as of September 30th. During the month, one PRR for \$13.6 million was submitted to ADOT for reimbursement, which would bring the account balance to \$45.5 million.

A spike in RARF revenues stemming from Super Bowl XLII held at the University of Phoenix Arena in Glendale, Arizona was anticipated in March 2008. However, the month’s revenues were 8.2% lower than forecasted. The March 2008 revenues also were down 1.6% compared to March 2007 revenues.

Although, \$379 million was collected in FY 2008, RARF revenues were \$30 million

Table 1. FY2008 RARF Collections (July 2007 - June 2008)				
	Freeways	Arterial Streets	Transit	Prop. 400 (total)
July	\$ 18,885,497	\$ 3,528,429	\$ 11,190,161	\$ 33,604,087
August	\$ 17,440,380	\$ 3,258,434	\$ 10,333,891	\$ 31,032,705
September	\$ 17,351,147	\$ 3,241,762	\$ 10,281,018	\$ 30,873,927
October	\$ 18,118,625	\$ 3,385,152	\$ 10,735,769	\$ 32,239,546
November	\$ 17,588,010	\$ 3,286,016	\$ 10,421,365	\$ 31,295,391
December	\$ 17,525,852	\$ 3,274,403	\$ 10,384,535	\$ 31,184,790
January	\$ 20,360,361	\$ 3,803,982	\$ 12,064,057	\$ 36,228,400
February	\$ 16,425,349	\$ 3,068,793	\$ 9,732,458	\$ 29,226,600
March	\$ 17,089,315	\$ 3,192,844	\$ 10,125,875	\$ 30,408,034
April	\$ 18,243,897	\$ 3,408,557	\$ 10,809,996	\$ 32,462,450
May	\$ 16,915,606	\$ 3,160,389	\$ 10,022,948	\$ 30,098,944
June	\$ 17,250,763	\$ 3,223,007	\$ 10,221,537	\$ 30,695,308
Total	\$ 213,194,803	\$ 39,831,769	\$ 126,323,611	\$ 379,350,183



lower than the \$408 million forecasted. During the first two months of FY2009, \$58 million in RARF revenues were collected for all modes, with \$6 million being allocated to Arterial improvements. The \$58 million collected was 5.8 percent lower than the \$61.6 estimated revenues for July and August 2008. Table 2 compares actual RARF revenues to estimated revenues for FY 2008.

The Arizona Department of Transportation (ADOT) publishes reports pertaining to the Regional Area Road Fund (RARF) on their website at http://www.azdot.gov/inside_adot/fms/rarflink.asp. Several reports are available for download, such as the:

- Monthly Revenue Trend Report;
- FY 2008 Actual Distribution Flow Chart;
- FY 2008 Year End Report; and,
- RARF Revenue Forecasts.

The current revenue forecast posted on the ADOT RARF website was published in September 2007.

ADOT is in the process of updating the forecasts, which should be published in the Fall of 2008.

Table 2. RARF Collections Estimate v. Actual FY2008 (July 2007 - June 2008)			
	Estimated Total RARF	Actual Total RARF	Percentage Difference
July	\$ 33,541,000	\$ 33,604,087	0.2%
August	\$ 31,331,000	\$ 31,032,705	-1.0%
September	\$ 32,518,000	\$ 30,873,927	-5.1%
October	\$ 33,108,000	\$ 32,239,546	-2.6%
November	\$ 32,786,000	\$ 31,295,391	-4.5%
December	\$ 32,853,000	\$ 31,184,790	-5.1%
January	\$ 40,623,000	\$ 36,228,400	-10.8%
February	\$ 32,990,000	\$ 29,226,600	-11.4%
March	\$ 33,118,000	\$ 30,408,034	-8.2%
April	\$ 36,740,000	\$ 32,462,450	-11.6%
May	\$ 34,271,000	\$ 30,098,944	-12.2%
June	\$ 34,821,000	\$ 30,695,308	-11.8%
Total	\$ 408,700,000	\$ 379,350,183	-7.2%

RARF COLLECTION AND THE ECONOMY

In November 2004, the voters of Maricopa County approved Proposition 400, which extended the ½ cent sales tax for transportation through 2025. The tax extension was divided among freeways (56.2%), transit (33.3%) and arterial streets (10.5%). The extension became effective on January 1, 2006. During FY 2008, the sales tax raised about \$379 million compared to \$390 million for FY 2007, a decline of about three percent. This is the first year-over-year decrease that the region has experienced since the tax was first imposed in 1986. The poor performance of the transportation sales tax is consistent with the other sales tax collections at the state level and among many of the MAG member agencies. The significant downturn in the economy was due to the substantial financial crisis in the housing industry that has resulted in significant financial distress among both homeowners and the financial industry.

New housing construction has fallen to levels similar to those experienced in 1991 in metropolitan Phoenix. Falling values combined with adjustable rate mortgages being reset to higher rates, has resulted in substantial loss of homeowner equity, and in many cases, houses with more debt than current values. The loss of home equity, the freezing of many home equity loans, and foreclosures has had a significant impact on sales tax collections.



In addition to the turmoil in the housing market, higher fuel costs have had a negative impact on sales tax collections. As fuel prices have continued to escalate, and as economic conditions and housing values have deteriorated, consumers have made significant changes in personal spending. The impact of higher fuel prices alone may have resulted in a shift of \$6.0 billion of expenditures to fuel purchases in Arizona. If this entire shift was from sales that are subject to sales taxes, the shift would represent a \$340 million loss in state sales tax collections and about a \$14.5 million loss in the Maricopa County transportation sales tax.

ALCP PROGRAMMING AND REIMBURSEMENTS

To date, almost \$954 million has been generated through the RARF tax collection as a result of Proposition 400. Of that, \$100 million in RARF revenues collected was dedicated to the Arterial Life Cycle Program for capacity and safety improvements. At the start of FY 2008, six Lead Agencies were programmed to receive \$74.8 million in reimbursements through the Arterial Life Cycle Program. Throughout the fiscal year, MAG reimbursed \$28.3 million to Lead Agencies for work conducted on ITS, arterial capacity and intersection improvements. RARF Closeout Projects received over \$14 million of the \$28.3 million reimbursed in FY08. ALCP Project receiving reimbursements in FY 2008 included:

- Chandler Blvd at Dobson Rd Intersection Improvements
- Ray Rd at Alma School Rd Intersection Improvements
- Greenfield Rd from Baseline Rd to Southern Ave
- McKellips Rd at Lindsay Rd Intersection Improvements
- Southern Ave at Stapley Dr Intersection Improvements
- SR101 Loop North Frontage Rd from Hayden Rd to Scottsdale Rd

During the annual update, several Lead Agencies deferred \$46.5 million in funding from FY 2008 to later fiscal years. More than \$26.5 million in RARF and \$19.5 million in STP-MAG were deferred in FY 2008. The total amount deferred represented 62% of the programmed reimbursements for Fiscal Year 2008.

FY2008 RARF CLOSEOUT

Fiscal Year 2008 represented the first RARF Closeout Process for the Arterial Life Cycle Program. On December 19, 2007, the MAG Regional Council approved the ALCP Policies and Procedures, which established the RARF Closeout Process (Section 260). According to the Policies, Lead Agencies with completed projects/segments that have submitted all ALCP Project Requirements to MAG Staff by June 1st are eligible for RARF Closeout. The allocation of eligible RARF Closeout funds will be made (in sequential order) to projects scheduled for reimbursement in the next fiscal year and then to all other projects in the chronological order of the programmed reimbursements. Table 3 lists the ALCP Projects eligible for RARF Closeout in 2008.

At the start of the process, nine projects programmed for \$28.7 million in reimbursements throughout the life of the ALCP for consideration. After a detailed financial analysis, MAG



Staff determined that \$14.98 million should be used during the Closeout Process. Three of the five Lead Agencies that submitted projects received advanced funding through the RARF Closeout Process.

Table 3. FY08 RARF Closeout Eligible Projects

Eligible projects are in consecutive order based on the fiscal year the project is programmed for reimbursement					
Fiscal Year for Reimb.	RTP ID	Lead Agency	Project Name	Fiscal Year for Work	Amount 2007\$ (millions)
2012	ACI-LKP-10-03-B	Peoria	Lake Pleasant Pkwy: Union Hills to Dynamite Rd	2006	4.022
2013	ACI-LKP-10-03-B	Peoria	Lake Pleasant Pkwy: Union Hills to Dynamite Rd	2006	4.022
2014	All-ARZ-30-03	Chandler	Arizona Ave/Chandler Blvd: Intersection Improvements	2006	3.582
2014	ACI-VAL-20-03	Gilbert	Val Vista Dr: Warner Rd to Pecos Rd	2006	3.352
2021	All-ARZ-10-03	Chandler	Arizona Ave/Elliot Rd Intersection Improvements	2006	3.582
2021	ACI-SHA-20-03-C	Scottsdale	Shea Blvd at Via Linda (Phase1)	2006	0.945
2021	ACI-SHA-20-03-F	Scottsdale	Shea Blvd at Mayo/134th St	2006	0.280
2021	ACI-SHA-20-03-A	Scottsdale	Shea Blvd at 90th/92nd/96th Streets	2007	3.500
2022	ACI-HPV-20-03-A	Phoenix	Happy Valley: I-17 to 35th Ave	2005	5.439
Total					28.724

All of the projects slated to receive RARF Closeout Funds were reimbursed. Without the RARF Closeout Process reimbursements, 56% of programmed reimbursements (\$41.8 million) would have been deferred from FY2008 to later fiscal years.

ALCP FAQs

Will my project be deleted from the ALCP if the decrease in revenues negatively impacts the program? What if I defer a project?

ALCP Project Reimbursements may be delayed if there is a deficit of Program funds. Reimbursements will be delayed in priority order of the ALCP (Policies Section 270B). Projects may also be advanced if a surplus of funds occurs (Policies Section 270A). This means, that project reimbursements may be delayed in one fiscal year and then advanced the following year contingent on the program’s revenue stream.

When should I submit a Project Overview?

Technically, a Project Overview must be accepted by MAG before a project may be reimbursed and/or a Project Agreement may be initiated by MAG. In addition, a Project Overview must be submitted prior to the purchase of right-of-way for advanced projects (Policies Section 400).

ALCP PROJECT STATUS

The fourth quarter of fiscal year 2008 and the first quarter of 2009 were extremely productive for member agencies with projects programmed in the ALCP. Over the last 6



months, MAG Staff received 9 Project Overviews from 5 Lead Agencies and initiated 9 Project Agreements with 6 Lead Agencies. In addition, MAG Staff received 7 Project Reimbursement Requests in the amount of \$16.3 million. Tables 4 and 5 provide detailed information on the status of projects programmed for work and/or reimbursement in FY08 and FY09, respectively.

Arterial Life Cycle Program - Fiscal Year 2009

2008	
September	25th: Transportation Review Committee (TRC) Project changes to amend/administratively modify the current Transportation Improvement Program (TIP), Regional Transportation Plan (RTP), and Arterial Life Cycle Program (ALCP)*
October	Managers, Transportation Policy Committee (TPC), and Regional Council (RC) review/recommend/approve project changes to amend/administratively modify the current TIP, RTP, and ALCP*
November	17th: TIP/ALCP Data Entry System available to member agencies for 2009-2014 project updates
December	4th: TRC review/recommend/approve project changes to amend/administratively modify the current TIP, RTP, and ALCP*
2009	
January	Managers, TPC, and RC review/recommend/approve project changes to amend/administratively modify the current TIP, RTP, and ALCP* 9th: Due Date, Member Agencies submit 2009-2014 ALCP project updates for inclusion in the 2010-2014 TIP via the TIP/ALCP Data Entry System
February	6th: Due Date, Member agencies submit 2015-2026 ALCP project updates for the Draft FY10 ALCP via the TIP/ALCP Data Entry System 20th: MAG Staff will provide Member Agencies with the first draft of the FY2010 ALCP for review and comment
March	20th: Due Date, Member agencies submit comments for Draft FY2010 ALCP 26th: TRC review/recommend/approve project changes to amend/administratively modify the current TIP, RTP, and ALCP*
April	Managers, TPC and RC review/recommend/approve project changes to amend/administratively modify the current TIP, RTP, and ALCP* 15th: MAG Staff will determine the availability of RARF Closeout Funds and Eligible Projects 23rd: TRC review/recommend ALCP projects for RARF Closeout Funds
May	Managers, TPC and RC review/recommend/approve ALCP projects for RARF Closeout Funds 28th: TRC review/recommend/approve Draft FY2010 ALCP
June	1st: Due Date, Member Agencies submit final Project Reimbursement Requests for FY2009 1st: Due Date, Member Agencies recommended to receive RARF Closeout Funds submit final versions of all ALCP project requirements Managers, TPC and RC review/recommend/approve Draft FY2010 ALCP

**If necessary*

This is the ninth Status Report for the Arterial Life Cycle Program (ALCP). Semi-annually, MAG staff will provide member agencies with an update on the projects in the ALCP. This report and all other ALCP information are available online at <http://www.mag.maricopa.gov/project.cms?item=5034>.



**Transportation
Division**



Arterial Life Cycle Program Status Report

TABLE 5

ARTERIAL STREET LIFE CYCLE PROGRAM

April 2008 - September 2008, Project Status of Projects Underway

(2008 and Year of Expenditure, Dollars in Millions, Consistent with the FY09 - June 25, 2008 ALCP)

(2007 and Year of Expenditure, Dollars in Millions, Consistent with the FY08 - May 28, 2008 ALCP)

Lead Agency & Facility	Project Requirement Completed PO = Project Overview PA = Project Agreement	Status S=Study P=Pre-Design D=Design R=ROW C=CONST C/O=Closed out	Regional Funding Reimbursements			Total Expenditures (Exp.)		FY(s) for Reimb.	FY for Final Constr.	Other Project Information
			Programmed Reimb. FY09	Estimated Future Reimb. FY 2010 - 2026 (2008\$)	Reimb. To Date	Exp. through FY 2009 (YOE\$)	Estimated Future Exp. FY 2010 - 2026 (2008\$)			
CHANDLER										
Chandler Blvd at Alma School Rd	PO, PA	D, R	1.304	2.411			9.633	2009-2011	2011	
Chandler Blvd at Dobson Rd	PO, PA	D, R, C	3.627		0.084	0.774	7.686	2007-2009	2009	Study 100% complete; Design is 92% complete
Gilbert Rd: Chandler Heights Rd to Hunt Hwy		D		5.895				2024	2011	
Gilbert Rd: Queen Creek Rd to Chandler Heights Rd		D		7.940				2023	2011	
Gilbert Rd: SR202L/Germann Rd to Queen Creek Rd	PO, PA	D, R, C		6.773			11.874	2021	2009	
Queen Creek Rd: Arizona Ave to McQueen	PO, PA	D, R, C		4.318			9.597	2012	2009	
Queen Creek Rd: McQueen Rd to Lindsay		D		11.967				2011-2012	2011	
Ray Rd at Alma School Rd	PO, PA	D, R	2.080	1.492	0.137	0.196	9.709	2008-2010	2010	Design 30% Complete
Ray Rd at McClintock Dr	PO	D		3.714			8.102	2011	2011	
FOUNTAIN HILLS										
Shea Blvd: Palisades Blvd. to Fountain Hills Blvd.	PO	D	0.288				0.411	2009	---	Project programmed for Design only
Shea Blvd: Technology Dr to Cereus Wash	PO	D, R	1.089	4.614			8.147	2009-2010	2010	
GILBERT										
Guadalupe Rd/Cooper Rd: Intersection Improvements		D, R, C	3.714					2009	2009	
Guadalupe/Power: Intersection Improvements		D		3.582				2010	2010	Exchanged with Guadalupe/Cooper during annual update. Moved the Phase IV
Power Rd at Pecos: Intersection Improvement	PO	D, R, C	5.327	4.666			8.700	2009-2010	2009	
Power Rd: Santan Fwy to Pecos Rd		D, R, C	4.060	6.316				2009-2010	2010	
Val Vista Rd: Warner Rd. to Pecos Rd.	PO, PA	C/O	6.934	0	10.398	15.271		2007-2008, 2014	2006	Project Complete; RARF Closeout Project
Warner Rd. at Cooper Rd.	PO, PA	R, C	3.714					2007-2008	2008	

Arterial Life Cycle Program Status Report

TABLE 5

ARTERIAL STREET LIFE CYCLE PROGRAM

April 2008 - September 2008, Project Status of Projects Underway

(2008 and Year of Expenditure, Dollars in Millions, Consistent with the FY09 - June 25, 2008 ALCP)

(2007 and Year of Expenditure, Dollars in Millions, Consistent with the FY08 - May 28, 2008 ALCP)

Lead Agency & Facility	Project Requirement Completed PO = Project Overview PA = Project Agreement	Status S=Study P=Pre-Design D=Design R=ROW C=CONST C/O=Closed out	Regional Funding Reimbursements			Total Expenditures (Exp.)		FY(s) for Reimb.	FY for Final Constr.	Other Project Information
			Programmed Reimb. FY09	Estimated Future Reimb. FY 2010 - 2026 (2008\$)	Reimb. To Date	Exp. through FY 2009 (YOE\$)	Estimated Future Exp. FY 2010 - 2026 (2008\$)			
MARICOPA COUNTY										
Dobson Rd, Gilbert Rd, McKellips Rd: Bridge over Salt River		S		44.261				2010-2011, 2015	2012	Three ALCP Bridge Projects are being studied together. Projects Deferred to Phase II
El Mirage Rd: Bell Rd to South of Beardsley		D, R		9.568				2016-2018	2010	
El Mirage Rd: Deer Valley Drive to L303		D, C		9.722				2016-2018	2009	Project resegmented in annual update
El Mirage Rd: Thunderbird Rd to Bell Rd	PO	P, R	0.680	19.978			71.539	2006, 2008-2015	2015	
El Mirage Rd: Thunderbird to Northern Ave.	PO	P		16.535			24.020	2016-2018	2018	
McKellips Rd: Loop 101 (Pima Fwy) to SRP-MIC/Alma School Rd		P		38.820				2009, 2013-2015	2015	
Northern Parkway: Corridorwide ROW Protection		R	1.810	3.338				2009-2011		
Northern Parkway: Sarival to Dysart		P, D, R	19.699	35.060				2009-2011	2011	
Power Rd: Baseline Rd to East Maricopa Floodway	PO, PA	D, R, C	4.882		2.820	8.948	6.264	2008-2009	2009	
MESA										
Broadway Rd: Dobson Rd to Country Club Dr	PO, PA	P, D, R	1.920	5.305	0.080	0.115	14.962	2008-2010	2010	Studies 100% Complete; DES/ROW/CONST to be deferred in the FY2010 ALCP annual update
Country Club at University	PO, PA	D, R		2.756			6.995	2017	2010	
Dobson Rd at Guadalupe Rd	PO, PA	P, D, R	0.514	2.092	0.106	0.152	5.760	2008-2010	2010	Design 60% Complete
Dobson Rd at University Dr		D		2.756				2020	2011	
Gilbert Rd at University Dr	PO, PA	D, R, C		2.756			8.100	2022	2009	
Greenfield Rd: Baseline Rd to Southern Ave	PO, PA	D, R	0.751	4.086	0.455	0.650	7.165	2008-2010	2010	Design 90% Complete; ROW 30% Complete
Hawes Rd: Santan Fwy to Ray Rd		D		2.329				2021	2010	

Arterial Life Cycle Program Status Report

TABLE 5

ARTERIAL STREET LIFE CYCLE PROGRAM

April 2008 - September 2008, Project Status of Projects Underway

(2008 and Year of Expenditure, Dollars in Millions, Consistent with the FY09 - June 25, 2008 ALCP)

(2007 and Year of Expenditure, Dollars in Millions, Consistent with the FY08 - May 28, 2008 ALCP)

Lead Agency & Facility	Project Requirement Completed PO = Project Overview PA = Project Agreement	Status S=Study P=Pre-Design D=Design R=ROW C=CONST C/O=Closed out	Regional Funding Reimbursements			Total Expenditures (Exp.)		FY(s) for Reimb.	FY for Final Constr.	Other Project Information
			Programmed Reimb. FY09	Estimated Future Reimb. FY 2010 - 2026 (2008\$)	Reimb. To Date	Exp. through FY 2009 (YOES)	Estimated Future Exp. FY 2010 - 2026 (2008\$)			
MESA										
McKellips/Greenfield, McKellips/Higley, and McKellips/Val Vista Intersection Improvements	PO, PA	P	0.119	8.215	0.119	0.170	11.347	2008, 2011-2013	2013	Studies 100% Complete; Design 10% Complete; Projects Deferred to Phase II
McKellips Rd at Lindsay Rd	PO, PA	D, R	1.956	4.278	0.043	0.060	8.385	2008-2010	2010	Design 15% Complete; ROW to be deferred in the FY2010 ALCP annual update
Mesa Dr at Broadway Rd	PO	P	0.150	0.701			18.700	2009-2012	2012	
Mesa Dr: US-60 (Superstition Fwy) to Southern	PO, PA	P, D, R	2.324	4.879	0.044	0.063	21.650	2008-2010	2010	Studies 75% Complete; ROW to be deferred in the FY2010 ALCP annual update
Power Rd: East Maricopa Floodway to Santan Fwy/Loop 202		D, R, C	10.092					2009	2009	
Ray Rd: Sossaman Rd to Ellsworth Rd		D, R		3.759				2022	2010	
Southern Ave at Country Club Dr	PO	D	0.307	4.504			6.400	2009-2011	2011	
Southern Ave at Lindsay Rd	PO	D	0.315	4.415			6.303	2009-2011	2011	DES to be deferred in the FY2010 ALCP annual update
Southern Ave at Stapley Dr	PO, PA	P, D	1.221	11.259			16.800	2008-2011	2011	
Thomas Rd: Gilbert Rd to Val Vista Dr		D, R	1.746	3.766				2009-2010	2010	DES and ROW to be deferred in the FY2010 ALCP annual update
PEORIA										
Beardsley Rd Connection: Loop 101 to Beardsley Rd at 83rd Av/Lake Pleasant Pkwy	PO, PA	D, R, C		22.885			30.700	2011-2012	2009	
Happy Valley Rd: Lake Pleasant Pkwy to 67th Ave		D, R, C		20.369				2021-2023	2009	
Lake Pleasant Pkwy: Dynamite Blvd to L303	PO	D		26.407				2011-2014	2011	
PHOENIX										
Happy Valley Rd: I-17 to 35th Avenue	PO, PA	C/O		5.439		7.648		2022	2005	Project Complete
Happy Valley Rd: 35th Avenue to 43rd		D		4.045			2.738	2022	2011	
Happy Valley Rd: 43rd Ave to 55th Ave		D		4.138				2024	2012	

Arterial Life Cycle Program Status Report

TABLE 5										
ARTERIAL STREET LIFE CYCLE PROGRAM										
April 2008 - September 2008, Project Status of Projects Underway										
(2008 and Year of Expenditure, Dollars in Millions, Consistent with the FY09 - June 25, 2008 ALCP)										
(2007 and Year of Expenditure, Dollars in Millions, Consistent with the FY08 - May 28, 2008 ALCP)										
Lead Agency & Facility	Project Requirement Completed PO = Project Overview PA = Project Agreement	Status S=Study P=Pre-Design D=Design R=ROW C=CONST C/O=Closed out	Regional Funding Reimbursements			Total Expenditures (Exp.)		FY(s) for Reimb.	FY for Final Constr.	Other Project Information
			Programmed Reimb. FY09	Estimated Future Reimb. FY 2010 - 2026 (2008\$)	Reimb. To Date	Exp. through FY 2009 (YOE\$)	Estimated Future Exp. FY 2010 - 2026 (2008\$)			
PHOENIX										
Sonoran Blvd: Central Ave to 32nd St	PO	D		32.111			44.244	2011-2014	2013	
SCOTTSDALE										
Pima Rd at Happy Valley Rd		C/O						2009	2008	
Pima Rd: McKellips Rd to Via Linda		P, D, R	5.592	24.602				2008-2011	2011	
Pima Rd: SR101L to Thompson Peak Parkway	PO, PA	C/O	13.659		13.639	19.485		2009	2008	
Pima Rd: Thompson Peak Pkwy to Pinnacle Peak Rd	PO, PA	D, R, C	7.994	5.442			19.194	2009-2010	2010	
Scottsdale Rd: Thompson Peak Pkwy to Pinnacle Peak Rd		P, D		11.409				2011	2011	
Shea at 120/124th Streets		D, R, C		0.377				2022	2009	
Shea Auxiliary Lane from 90th St to Loop 101		D		3.411				2023-2024	2010	
Shea Blvd - 96th St to 144th St ITS Improvements		D, R		2.322				2024	2010	
Shea Blvd - SR-101L to 96th St, ITS Improvements		D, C		0.377				2022	2009	
Shea at 90th/92nd/96th Intersection Improvements	PO, PA	C/O		3.500			3.347	2021	2006	Project Complete; Project consolidated to include 3 previous intersection improvement projects
Shea Blvd at 114th Street		D, R		0.261				2022-2023	2010	
Shea Blvd at 115th Street		D		0.109				2024	2010	
Shea Blvd at 136th Street		D		0.174				2024	2011	
Shea Blvd at Frank Lloyd Wright Blvd		D, R		0.653				2022	2010	
Shea at Mayo Blvd/134th St	PO	C/O		0.280			0.312	2021	2007	Project Complete
Shea at Via Linda (Phase I)	PO	C/O		0.945			0.912	2021-2022	2006	Project Complete

Arterial Life Cycle Program Status Report

TABLE 5										
ARTERIAL STREET LIFE CYCLE PROGRAM										
April 2008 - September 2008, Project Status of Projects Underway										
(2008 and Year of Expenditure, Dollars in Millions, Consistent with the FY09 - June 25, 2008 ALCP)										
(2007 and Year of Expenditure, Dollars in Millions, Consistent with the FY08 - May 28, 2008 ALCP)										
Lead Agency & Facility	Project Requirement Completed PO = Project Overview PA = Project Agreement	Status S=Study P=Pre-Design D=Design R=ROW C=CONST C/O=Closed out	Regional Funding Reimbursements			Total Expenditures (Exp.)		FY(s) for Reimb.	FY for Final Constr.	Other Project Information
			Programmed Reimb. FY09	Estimated Future Reimb. FY 2010 - 2026 (2008\$)	Reimb. To Date	Exp. through FY 2009 (YOE\$)	Estimated Future Exp. FY 2010 - 2026 (2008\$)			
SCOTTSDALE										
SR-101L North Frontage Rd: Hayden to Scottsdale Rd	PO, PA	C	3.805		3.037	4.338	4.391	2009	2008	Design 100% Complete; Construction 99% Complete
SR-101L North Frontage Rd: Pima Rd/Princess Dr to Hayden		P, D, R	1.233	14.135				2008-2009	2009	
SR-101L South Frontage Rd: Hayden to Pima		P, D	0.705	12.470				2008-2010	2010	Project Deleted in the annual update