

MINUTES OF THE
MAG MANAGEMENT COMMITTEE MEETING
August 8, 2007
MAG Office Building - Saguaro Room
Phoenix, Arizona

MEMBERS ATTENDING

Jan Dolan, Scottsdale, Chair	Mark Johnson, Guadalupe
Charlie McClendon, Avondale, Vice Chair	Darryl Crossman, Litchfield Park
# George Hoffman, Apache Junction	Christopher Brady, Mesa
Dave Wilcox, Buckeye	Tom Martinsen, Paradise Valley
* Jon Pearson, Carefree	Carl Swenson for Terry Ellis, Peoria
* Usama Abujbarah, Cave Creek	Frank Fairbanks, Phoenix
Mark Pentz, Chandler	John Kross, Queen Creek
Pat Dennis for B.J. Cornwall, El Mirage	* Bryan Meyers, Salt River Pima-Maricopa
Alfonso Rodriguez for Orlando Moreno, Fort McDowell Yavapai Nation	Indian Community
Tim Pickering, Fountain Hills	Jim Rumpeltes, Surprise
* Lynn Farmer, Gila Bend	Jeff Kulaga for Will Manley, Tempe
Derek White for Joseph Manuel, Gila River Indian Community	Chris Hagen for Reyes Medrano, Tolleson
George Pettit, Gilbert	* Steve McKay, Wickenburg
Brent Stoddard for Ed Beasley, Glendale	Lloyce Robinson, Youngtown
Jim Nichols for Brian Dalke, Goodyear	Dale Buskirk for Victor Mendez, ADOT
	David Smith, Maricopa County
	David Boggs, Valley Metro/RPTA

* Those members neither present nor represented by proxy.

Participated by telephone conference call.

+ Participated by videoconference call.

1. Call to Order

The meeting was called to order by Chair Jan Dolan at 12:12 p.m.

2. Pledge of Allegiance

The Pledge of Allegiance was recited.

Chair Dolan noted that George Hoffman, Apache Junction, was participating by telephone conference call. She stated that transit tickets were available from Valley Metro/RPTA for those using transit to come to the meeting. Parking validation was available from MAG staff for those who parked in the parking garage.

Chair Dolan stated that for agenda item #5, a project submission received from the City of Mesa was at each place.

3. Call to the Audience

Chair Dolan stated that Call to the Audience provides an opportunity to the public to address the Management 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. Chair Dolan noted that those wishing to comment on agenda items posted for action will be provided the opportunity at the time the item is heard. Public comments have a three minute time limit and there is a timer to help the public with their presentations.

Chair Dolan recognized public comment from Dianne Barker, who expressed her thanks for the transit tickets. She said that she was a 13th generation American, and was from Ohio. Ms. Barker stated that she chooses to use the bus and has done so for 15 years. She said that she thinks multimodalism will work in this region, but the people need to be motivated. Ms. Barker commented on concerns that RARF revenue was not coming in as expected. She stated that all air quality plans have failed. She stated that citizens want the oversight committee to communicate with them. Chair Dolan thanked Ms. Barker for her comments.

4. Approval of Consent Agenda

Chair Dolan stated that agenda items #4A, #4B, #4C, #4D, #4E, and #4F were on the consent agenda. She asked if any member of the committee had questions or a request to have a presentation on any consent agenda item. None were noted. Chair Dolan reviewed the public comment guidelines for the consent agenda and noted that no public comment cards had been turned in.

Mr. Pettit moved to recommend approval of consent agenda items #4A, #4B, #4C, #4D, #4E, and #4F. Mr. Crossman seconded, and the motion carried unanimously.

4A. Approval of July 11, 2007 Meeting Minutes

The Management Committee, by consent, approved the July 11, 2007 meeting minutes.

4B. Requested Material Change to Purchase the Mesa Transit Operations and Maintenance Facility and Amend the MAG Regional Transportation Plan and FY 2008 to 2012 Transportation Improvement Program

The Management Committee, by consent, recommended approval of the purchase of the Mesa Transit Operations and Maintenance Facility and to amend the MAG Regional Transportation Plan and FY 2008 to 2012 Transportation Improvement Program to include the project. According to A.R.S. 28-6353, MAG has the responsibility to approve material changes for projects funded from the Proposition 400 sales tax. The Regional Public Transportation Authority has requested approval of a material cost change for the purchase of the City of Mesa Transit Operations and Maintenance Facility. The RPTA Board of Directors approved the purchase of the facility for \$9,269,199, which represents Mesa's local investment in the facility. RPTA evaluated a number of options including continuing to lease the facility from the City of Mesa. According to the analysis, the best fiscal option is to purchase the facility using sales tax funds from the public transportation fund.

4C. Consultant Contract for AZ-SMART Support

The Management Committee, by consent, recommended approval of the selection of Planning Technologies for AZ-SMART support for an amount not to exceed \$40,000. The FY 2008 MAG Unified Planning Work Program and Annual Budget, approved by the Regional Council in May 2007, includes a \$40,000 project for AZ-SMART support. MAG is in the process of developing a statewide socioeconomic model, Arizona Socioeconomic Modeling, Analysis and Reporting Toolbox (AZ-SMART). The AZ-SMART socioeconomic modeling suite will primarily support socioeconomic activities at MAG. AZ-SMART will build upon a model that MAG currently uses, the Subarea Allocation Model (SAM). This model was developed by Planning Technologies. Since Planning Technologies is the developer of SAM, it is uniquely able to provide detailed technical guidance and support on the implementation and testing for AZ-SMART. MAG recommended that Planning Technologies be selected to provide AZ-SMART support for an amount not to exceed \$40,000.

4D. Regional Support for Low Demand Homeless Overflow Shelter

The Management Committee, by consent, recommended approval of the resolution of the MAG Continuum of Care Regional Committee on Homelessness supporting the Central Arizona Shelter Services' low demand overflow shelter for single homeless men. At the June MAG Management Committee meeting, there was discussion about regional support for the low demand homeless overflow shelter operated by Central Arizona Shelter Services (CASS). Since then, municipalities have come forward to offer support to CASS. Maricopa County has been and continues to be a significant funder of the shelter. The Management Committee requested the MAG Continuum of Care Regional Committee on Homelessness to address the low demand shelter issue. The Continuum of Care has recommended a resolution supporting the shelter. The resolution reads: The MAG Continuum of Care Regional Committee on Homelessness supports the low demand homeless overflow shelter operated by Central Arizona Shelter Services. The shelter is at capacity each night by serving up to 325 homeless single men who would otherwise be sleeping on the streets. Funding for the shelter will run out in November 2007. The low demand overflow shelter is an important regional issue that may become a crisis if additional funding is not secured. Overflow shelter is the term used to describe homeless shelters that are offered during times of increased need, such as the summer months. It is considered "low demand" not because it is not needed, but because the shelter does not make many demands of its homeless clients. For example, case management is a service that is available to the clients, but is not required as in the traditional shelter model. The low demand shelter model has been proven particularly successful in engaging hard-to-serve populations that typically resist treatment but access high dollar emergency services. Despite the proven results of the low demand overflow shelter, lack of funding may mean the shelter will close in November 2007. The Arizona Department of Housing has pledged to match any funds contributed by the municipalities. Anyone wanting to support the shelter may contact Mark Holleran, the Executive Director of CASS, at (602) 256-6945.

4E. Consultant Selection for Safety Evaluation of the Elderly Mobility Sign Project

The Management Committee, by consent, recommended the selection of Arizona State University for performing the Safety Evaluation of the Elderly Mobility Sign Project for an

amount not to exceed \$15,000. The MAG Transportation Safety Committee and the MAG Elderly Mobility Stakeholders Group recently launched a regional road safety project that will result in the installation of street name signs with larger letter sizes, using a font that is more legible to road users. The two committees also recommended a project to evaluate the overall safety effectiveness of these signs. MAG released a Request for Proposals on June 4, 2007, for this purpose. One proposal was received from Arizona State University. A proposal review panel evaluated the proposal and recommended to MAG the selection of Arizona State University.

4F. Conformity Consultation

The Maricopa Association of Governments is conducting consultation on a conformity assessment for an amendment to the FY 2008-2012 MAG Transportation Improvement Program and Regional Transportation Plan - 2007 Update. The proposed amendment includes minor project revisions to Arizona Department of Transportation projects for right-of-way acquisition in the SR 801 (Interstate-10 Reliever) corridor, and implementation of a design-build project on Loop 202 Red Mountain Freeway. Minor project revisions do not require a conformity determination. Comments on the conformity assessment were requested by August 17, 2007. This item was on the agenda for consultation.

5. Statewide Transportation Acceleration Needs (STAN) II Account

Eric Anderson, MAG Transportation Director, reported that the legislature transferred \$62 million from the State Highway Fund to the State Transportation Acceleration Needs (STAN) account. Mr. Anderson noted that this is not new money, but funds that were programmed in the ADOT five year plan. The legislature also established in HB 2793, a subaccount for the reimbursement of interest expenses incurred by or on behalf of a local jurisdiction for the acceleration of transportation projects. Mr. Anderson stated that for this subaccount \$10 million was allocated from the \$62 million STAN appropriation. Mr. Anderson noted that HB 2793 also established a \$10 million roads of regional significance congestion mitigation subaccount for transportation projects in high growth areas.

Mr. Anderson advised that state law requires that the regional planning agency establish a process for the review and approval of reimbursement of interest costs from the STAN account. As part of the process MAG would recommend to the State Transportation Board projects to utilize the STAN funds. MAG would also need to provide a report to the House and Senate by December 15, 2007.

Mr. Anderson stated that to be eligible for the \$10 million roads of regional significance congestion mitigation subaccount, a jurisdiction's growth rate must exceed the average by 50 percent over the last five years; the project must be in the jurisdiction's transportation plan but unfunded; the project must be in the regional Transportation Improvement Plan; and the jurisdiction must enter into a repayment agreement with ADOT, which essentially is a non-interest loan. Mr. Anderson noted that Avondale, Buckeye, El Mirage, Gilbert, Goodyear, Queen Creek, and Youngtown may qualify for the roads of regional significance congestion mitigation subaccount. He added that ADOT is still considering how the growth rates are to be calculated.

Mr. Anderson explained that the \$10 million for the roads of regional significance congestion mitigation subaccount is deducted from the \$62 million STAN fund, leaving \$52 million. He noted that MAG's allocation of the STAN fund is 60 percent of the \$52 million, which is approximately \$31.2 million.

Mr. Anderson then addressed the interest reimbursement subaccount. He said that \$10 million was appropriated statewide. The law says that interest costs incurred for the acceleration of transportation projects, which must be on a state highway system, may be reimbursed. Mr. Anderson stated that interest costs must result from bonds, loans, or advances; the agreement to accelerate must include at least two local jurisdictions, ADOT, and the regional planning agency; the agreement must be entered into after January 1, 2007; and the project must be in a region's Regional Transportation Plan. Mr. Anderson stated that a process must be established and a recommendation made to the State Transportation Board. He noted that funds received from the subaccount would count toward a region's share of STAN; in MAG's case, \$31.2 million.

Mr. Anderson stated that the acceleration of the widening of I-10 from Loop 101 to just east of Sarival Road was approved by the Regional Council in 2006. He then reviewed the interest costs, of which approximately \$14.5 million is the program share and approximately \$9.7 million is the local share to be borne by Avondale, Goodyear, and Litchfield Park.

Mr. Anderson reviewed options and stated that MAG could approve full interest reimbursement, no interest reimbursement per MAG policy, or partial reimbursement. Mr. Anderson reviewed one scenario of sixty/forty partial reimbursement, which represents the program's and local's share of the interest respectively. He said that the program would pay \$8.5 million and the local jurisdictions would pay \$5.7 million. Mr. Anderson stated that under another scenario, MAG's sixty percent of the STAN fund could be applied to the \$10 million available, meaning \$6 million would be available to reimburse the local communities. This would leave a balance in the subaccount for other regions in the state to use.

Mr. Anderson reported on questions that have been raised. He said that some have asked why the rush? Mr. Anderson said that ADOT has designed the project and is waiting for resolution before advertising the project. He noted that there are major safety issues and congestion on I-10. With only two lanes and significant truck travel, the segment in the Goodyear vicinity experienced about 30 crashes and 15 injuries per month in 2005, which is likely higher today.

Mr. Anderson stated that one question asked the legislative intent. He reported that the intent was to allow interest costs related to accelerating a project to be paid from STAN funds.

Mr. Anderson stated that another question asked if reimbursement of interest conformed to the MAG Highway Acceleration Policy. Mr. Anderson noted that MAG's acceleration policy was adopted in 2000 before STAN was established and interest reimbursement subaccount was established. He said that the MAG policy provides that the local jurisdictions pay for a portion of the interest expense.

Mr. Anderson stated that another question asked the impact on the program. He noted that this has no impact on the program.

Mr. Anderson stated that another question asked what projects could be accelerated with the STAN funds. He explained that \$22.9 million of the \$31.2 million is already programmed for the MAG region by ADOT for FY 2008 and the Grant Anticipation Notes funding already used for the I-10 acceleration leaves limited capacity to advance any significant project.

Mr. Anderson reported that the next steps include a recommendation for interest reimbursement for the I-10 project, a recommendation on the use of the balance of the STAN allocation, and a report to the Legislature on STAN activities by December 15, 2007.

Chair Dolan thanked Mr. Anderson for his report and asked members if they had questions.

Mr. Pentz asked if projects other than the I-10 acceleration, such as the Mesa project that was submitted, would be considered for the interest reimbursement subaccount. Mr. Anderson replied that the Mesa project that was submitted has not gone through any technical evaluation or MAG committee process for the approval of acceleration. He stated that the I-10 project went through the process and was approved for acceleration in April 2006. The construction agreement has not yet been signed, and this satisfies the January 1, 2007 date in the legislation. Mr. Anderson added that two traffic interchange projects were recently accelerated by the City of Phoenix, but the agreements were signed prior to January 1, 2007. He said that in terms of active projects for acceleration, only the I-10 west project satisfies the language of the STAN statute passed this year. Mr. Anderson stated that there may be other jurisdictions that want to accelerate their project, such as the City of Mesa. Mr. Anderson noted that the Mesa project would require \$80 million of interest and almost \$300 million of new financing. Mr. Anderson advised that the MAG program does not have that capacity.

Mr. Pentz asked if the legislation earmarked the interest reimbursement for the I-10 widening project. Mr. Anderson replied that the legislation did not specifically say the \$10 million was to be used for the I-10 project, but based on discussion with legislators, that use was clearly the intent of those legislators.

Mr. Brady commented that something was different in this process. He stated that MAG requested projects on July 26, 2007. Mr. Brady remarked that he would not usually submit a project without the appropriate analysis, but he had only eight working days for a submission. He stated that by submitting a project, the City of Mesa was saying it has a project in a high growth area that it would like to be considered. Mr. Brady expressed concern about a call for projects with eight days notice. He said that it seemed like a predetermined disposition.

Mr. Brady asked for clarification of the statement in the CONS section of the summary transmittal that says the reimbursement of the local share of interest expense for the acceleration of transportation projects is not in accord with the adopted MAG Highway Acceleration Policy. Mr. Anderson replied that the MAG acceleration policy, which was adopted in March 2000, laid out an interest sharing arrangement between the program and the sponsoring jurisdiction. In the I-10 west project, the local share is 40 percent and the program share is 60 percent. Mr. Anderson stated that he had included that line to note that interest reimbursement was not in accordance with adopted policy. He added that now that STAN legislation is in effect, it might be appropriate to revisit the MAG acceleration policy.

Ms. Robinson asked if any jurisdiction would receive less money if this reimbursement went forward. Mr. Anderson replied that this would have no impact. He added that the money in the reimbursement subaccount comes out of the ADOT share for HURF after the distribution to cities.

Mr. Kross asked for clarification about ADOT not allowing the I-10 project to go forward until an agreement is signed. Mr. Anderson explained that ADOT had planned to advertise in late July or early August for construction bids. He said that before that happens, the Federal Highway Administration has to sign off by on the project agreement. Mr. Anderson added that Grant Anticipation Notes also need prior approval by FHWA, because it needs to know the net interest cost. Mr. Anderson stated that there may be concern if a project advances and this issue is not yet resolved, because one of the jurisdictions could pull out, leaving ADOT on the hook.

Mr. Pentz asked if it would be possible for MAG to apply the \$10 million as part of MAG's program match. He asked if the MAG program is obligated to provide \$14 million, could the \$10 million be applied, leaving only \$4 million as MAG's share. Mr. Anderson replied that it might be possible.

Mr. Kulaga asked if the options for the interest reimbursement subaccount had been fully vetted through the MAG committee process and how this fit in with Proposition 400. Mr. Anderson replied that this is the first committee that has discussed the interest reimbursement. He stated that the other committee could have been the Transportation Review Committee, but discussion of policy issues does not usually begin at the Transportation Review Committee and are left to the senior level committees. Mr. Anderson stated that the funding discussed today will not affect Proposition 400 projects.

Mr. McClendon made a statement regarding the I-10 widening acceleration. He said that this project is important to his city and to him personally. Mr. McClendon stated that in April 2006 the City Councils of the three partnering jurisdictions met jointly and passed a resolution to support this project. He noted that a number of legislators and the ADOT Director were present at the meeting. Mr. McClendon stated that all legislators spoke at the meeting and their message was if the three jurisdictions went forward with the acceleration, they would make sure they got help so they would not have to bear all the costs. Mr. McClendon stated that at the time, the I-10 widening project needed only \$10 million out of the \$190 million of STAN funds. He commented that the program would be in for \$130 million if the three jurisdictions had not decided to accelerate the project. Mr. McClendon stated that interest costs were deemed ineligible for the original STAN funding, and although Avondale disagreed with that interpretation, they were regional and voted to support the allocations. Mr. McClendon stated that they were told if there was an oversight in the language to go to the Legislature and ask them to fix it. He said that they did ask the Legislature to expand the language to clarify that interest costs would be an eligible expense. He stated that they believe the language in this legislation reflects the legislators' intent. Mr. McClendon stated that he believed that ADOT and the Legislature recognized the need to help because of the strategic importance of I-10, which allows the transport of goods through the county and the country. Mr. McClendon stated that the acceleration cost was an unprecedented amount because of the high cost of the project. He said that he did not want to minimize the impact to other cities that have accelerated projects, but millions of dollars for small cities is a huge expense. Mr. McClendon expressed that he felt

there was recognition of that in the Legislature. He said that he has heard great creativity on how not to provide reimbursement for this project and that this is an earmark. Mr. McClendon stated that the reason for legislation was not to earmark funds but to correct the unintended consequences of the original language. He stated that he thought the jurisdictions of Avondale, Goodyear, and Litchfield Park have a history of being regional players and he asked the Management Committee to support this. Mr. McClendon said that he believed the region will benefit from this project.

Mr. McClendon moved to recommend authorizing the MAG Executive Director to enter into an agreement with ADOT and the cities of Avondale, Goodyear, and Litchfield Park for reimbursement of interest costs for the I-10 widening project acceleration. Mr. Crossman seconded.

Chair Dolan asked Mr. Brady to speak to his project submission before the motion was discussed.

Mr. Brady said that the concern is that the rules of regionalism are not being followed. He said that the City of Mesa submitted its project to put something on the table. Mr. Brady stated that this process does not feel right when they were asked to submit a project and were then told it was unwanted. Mr. Brady stated that he did want to debate the merits of the I-10 project, which has regional benefit, just the process of arriving at this point, which is where the disconnect takes place.

Mr. Crossman stated that Litchfield Park does not have the majority of interest in the project, although the City is a part of the project. He stated that unless I-10 was widened to Indian School Road, Litchfield Park would not benefit more than anyone else at the table as far as commercial growth. Mr. Crossman stated that Litchfield Park was willing to participate because they felt strongly about the need for the project. He said that the legislative intent has been made very clear. Mr. Crossman reported that Litchfield Park Mayor Thomas Schoaf spoke to Representative John Nelson, who said this funding was for the I-10 widening project. He advised that he could say with confidence that the intent of legislators was to fund the I-10 acceleration. Mr. Crossman stated that the region will look ridiculous if it widens segments farther west before it widens this segment, because the improvements will result in bottlenecks. That is not good planning. Mr. Crossman noted that Litchfield Park's share is three percent, which is a higher percentage of a municipal budget than Goodyear's or Avondale's. He commented that this says a lot about how strongly the City feels about this project. If the \$10 million is not applied to this project as they had anticipated, Litchfield Park will have to take a second look, because their budget cannot handle more than what it allocated. He added that the City has not entered into any agreement other than for the design.

Mr. Pentz expressed his agreement with Mr. Brady's comments. He stated that the issue is regionalism and process. Mr. Pentz stated that an acknowledgment was made that this fund was earmarked. He stated that this could be turned into a legislative free-for-all or MAG could act responsibly as a regional body with adopted policies. Mr. Pentz noted that legislation says a policy must be adopted, but this has not happened. He commented that if MAG wants to set back regionalism, it can do that today.

Mr. Wilcox stated that he did not think a decision to support this project would damage regionalism. He said that the region has the opportunity to make a good transportation decision, rather than a decision based on a process. Mr. Wilcox stated that the I-10 widening acceleration is the only project that qualifies for the interest reimbursement subaccount, because it has been in the planning and design stages for a long time. He commented that ADOT is ready to go to bid and there is no impact on the overall program. Mr. Wilcox stated that the three West Valley cities are among the highest growing cities, not just in the county, but in the nation. He stated that this project responds to highway congestion and to dangerous conditions, and places MAG in a good position to make a good transportation decision.

Mr. Crossman stated that some may want to call it an earmark, but it could be viewed as an attempt to fix a wrong and make it right. This is a major regional transportation decision and trying to dilute the effort at this point is not serving the region properly.

Ms. Dennis stated that she served on the TPC during discussion of STAN I. She said that the TPC extensively discussed whether the acceleration of the I-10 widening qualified for STAN funding. Ms. Dennis stated that the legislation said it did not qualify. She reported how Avondale Mayor Marie Lopez Rogers expressed the need for improvements to I-10 and the TPC told her to go and fix the language. Ms. Dennis said that the cities acted on this direction from the TPC and got the language fixed. Ms. Dennis asked members how many of them do not use I-10 to go to and from California. She said it is part of everyone's job to try to prevent the occurrences of accidents and deaths. Ms. Dennis stated that this project has been on the books, been through numerous committees, and should be supported.

With no further discussion of the motion, the vote passed by a vote of nineteen yes, six no, and one abstention, with Jan Dolan, Charlie McClendon, George Hoffman, Dave Wilcox, Pat Dennis, Alfonso Rodriguez, Tim Pickering, Derek White, Jim Nichols, Mark Johnson, Darryl Crossman, Tom Martinsen, Carl Swenson, Frank Fairbanks, Jim Rumpeltes, Chris Hagen, Lloyce Robinson, David Smith, and David Boggs voting yes, Mark Pentz, George Pettit, Brent Stoddard, Christopher Brady, John Kross, and Jeff Kulaga voting no, and Dale Buskirk abstaining.

6. Requested Changes to the ADOT Program

Mr. Anderson reported that the Arizona Department of Transportation (ADOT) has requested MAG concurrence with two proposed changes to FY 2008 of the ADOT Program. He said that ADOT has an opportunity to purchase right-of-way protection along the SR 801 (I-10 Reliever). He said that this acquisition will include a total take of 75 acres from a parcel located at the southeast corner of 67th Avenue and Broadway Road in Phoenix. Mr. Anderson noted that the homebuilder, DR Horton, is ready to start home construction there, and advanced acquisition within the corridor at this time will result in significant savings versus purchasing buildout of the subdivision at a later date.

Mr. Anderson stated that the second request is to implement a seven-mile, \$184 million design-build project in 2008, on SR202L, Red Mountain Freeway from SR51 to the SR101L/SR202L traffic interchange. He advised that the estimated 24 month design-build construction project will reduce both construction durations and public inconveniences. Mr. Anderson noted that

there are no net cost changes affected by these requests. Chair Dolan thanked Mr. Anderson for his report. She asked members if they had questions.

Mr. McClendon referenced the right-of-way at 67th Avenue and Broadway. He said that he understood all alignment options were together and buying this parcel would not affect the alignment farther west. Mr. Anderson replied that was correct.

Chair Dolan noted that no public comment cards had been submitted. With no further discussion, Chair Dolan called for a motion. Mr. Crossman moved to recommend concurrence with the proposed changes to the ADOT Program to advance right-of-way acquisition in the SR 801 (I-10 Reliever) corridor, and implement a design-build project on the 202L (Red Mountain Freeway), and to amend the FY 2008-2012 Transportation Improvement Program and the MAG Regional Transportation Plan - 2007 Update, as appropriate, contingent on an air quality conformity analysis. Mr. McClendon seconded, and the motion carried unanimously.

7. The Interstate 10-Hassayampa Valley Transportation Framework Study

Bob Hazlett, MAG Senior Engineer, updated members on the Interstate 10-Hassayampa Valley Transportation Framework Study. He said that the study had its inception due to concerns about I-10. Mr. Hazlett stated that the study encompasses 1,400 square miles in the east, west and central valleys. He added that more than 100 master planned communities are planned for this area. Mr. Hazlett reviewed the Hassayampa Valley estimates that showed a projected 2030 population of 948,000 and projected 2030 employment of 379,000.

Mr. Hazlett stated that the study considered spacing between traffic interchanges on freeways. He said that every time a two-mile segment of a high volume freeway is split by a traffic interchange means crashes occur 2.5 times more frequently. Mr. Hazlett stated that the study recommends a spacing of 20 traffic interchanges along I-10 from SR 303 to 459th Avenue. He noted that some of the interchanges have been approved, but work continues with the jurisdictions of Avondale, Goodyear, and Buckeye.

Mr. Hazlett described the “Arizona Parkway” model, which has been in practice for 40 years and is used in seven states. He noted that Dr. Maki from the City of Surprise first suggested this concept to MAG. Mr. Hazlett stated that a Arizona Parkway carries greater traffic volumes, is less costly than freeways, is more environmentally friendly, and has fewer crashes because left turns are removed. He noted that a MAG workshop on the Arizona Parkway concept was scheduled for the next day.

Mr. Hazlett spoke about the transportation framework in the study area. He stated that most future major arterials have been planned, but connectivity is lacking. Mr. Hazlett stated that with 1.7 million trips projected west of the White Tanks transit options were examined and could include bus rapid transit, high capacity shuttles, commuter rail, passenger rail, and light rail. He noted that the Burlington Northern Santa Fe spur has been approved for reactivation. Mr. Hazlett listed some potential revenue sources, such as local or regional taxes, impact fees, property taxes or usage fees.

Mr. Hazlett stated that the study was developed through the input from 130 stakeholder meetings and is subject to planning, engineering, and environmental studies, and added that none of the actions is funded. He stated that the recommendations will be brought back to the Management Committee for action. Chair Dolan thanked Mr. Hazlett for his report. She asked members if they had questions.

Mr. Fairbanks said how much he liked this study, especially the freeway, which could be called Loop 13013. He asked how the City of Phoenix could go about having a study such as this, and wondered if he could assemble a group of developers to make the request. Mr. Smith replied that MAG is open to requests from member agencies. He noted that the cities participating in this study all participated financially.

Mr. Rumpeltes complimented Mr. Hazlett and MAG staff for their efforts on getting ahead of the growth, which is just beginning in the far West Valley. He said he especially appreciated the public transportation piece. He expressed that he looked forward to moving this plan ahead.

Mr. Smith stated that this plan has its beginnings when the Federal Highway Administration said it would not approve interchange spacing until there was a better plan in the area. He added that they realized it was more than freeways that needed to be considered, it included parkways and arterials, and that is why it was a joint project.

8. Comments from the Committee

An opportunity will be provided for Management Committee members to present a brief summary of current events. The Management Committee is not allowed to propose, discuss, deliberate or take action at the meeting on any matter in the summary, unless the specific matter is properly noticed for legal action.

No comments from the Committee were noted.

There being no further business, the meeting adjourned at 1:20 p.m.

Secretary

Chairman