

DRAFT MINUTES OF THE  
MARICOPA ASSOCIATION OF GOVERNMENTS  
TRANSPORTATION REVIEW COMMITTEE

August 28, 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: Mike James for 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: Lance Calvert	RPTA: Bob Antilla 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: Tami Ryall	Valley Metro Rail: John Farry
Glendale: Bob Darr for Terry Johnson	#Wickenburg: Gary Edwards
Goodyear: Cato Esquivel	Youngtown: Mark Hannah for 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	Eileen Yazzie, MAG
Jonathan Gelbart, MAG	Jenna Goad, City of Glendale
Bob Hazlett, MAG	Ray Dovalina, City of Phoenix
Sarath Joshua, MAG	Jim Mathien, Valley Metro Rail
Vladimir Livshits, MAG	Shirley Gunther, City of Avondale
Nathan Pryor, MAG	Brad Lundahl, City of Scottsdale
Steve Tate, MAG	Tom Remes, City of Phoenix
Tim Strow, MAG	Dianne Kresich, ADOT
Kevin Wallace, MAG	

1. Call to Order

Mr. Tom Callow from the City of Phoenix called the meeting to order at 10:07 a.m.

2. Approval of June 26, 2008 Draft Minutes

Mr. Callow asked if there were any changes or amendments to the meeting minutes. Mr. Dave Meinhart from the City of Scottsdale requested a modification to page five of the June 26, 2008 minutes. According to the draft minutes, one of the public speakers had lived in the Greenstone neighborhood. Mr. Meinhart requested a revision to the minutes clarifying that the individual lived in a neighborhood east of the 101. Mr. Cato Esquivel from the City of Goodyear moved to approve the minutes with the modifications requested by Mr. Meinhart. Mr. David Moody from the City of Peoria seconded, 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 announced the addition of a new staff member to the Transportation Division, Mr. Tim Strow. Mr. Anderson informed the Committee that Mr. Strow's position would focus on freight, aviation, and general planning activities. The Committee then welcomed Mr. Strow to MAG.

Next, Mr. Anderson addressed cost and revenues and provided two handouts to Committee members. He directed the Committee to his first handout, which depicted the change in sales tax revenue by month for fiscal years 2005 through 2008. Mr. Anderson reported that July 2008 revenues were down 11.2 percent. He stated that the revenue decline track paralleled the experiences of MAG's local government member agencies, such as Gilbert and Phoenix. Mr. Anderson added that the July 2008 sales tax revenues were less than \$30 million, which was the first time this had occurred since September 2006.

Mr. Anderson reported participating in the Arizona Department of Transportation (ADOT) Risk Assessment Process on construction costs and revenues. According to Mr. Anderson, concerns were expressed about the economy by representatives from Joint Legislative Budget Committee (JLBC) and the Governor's Office and economists at the Risk Assessment Process Panel discussion on Wednesday,. The Panel expressed specific concerns about the state of the economy and made the general consensus that the legislature likely would need to reconvene to address the Fiscal Year 2009 State budget. He explained that State shared revenues may be on the table for discussion at that time. Mr. Anderson encouraged Intergovernmental Liaisons to be cognizant of the situation and to assist member

agencies in securing existing funding.

Next, Mr. Anderson discussed construction costs. He directed the Committee's attention to the second handout provided, which was from the Association of General Contractors and displayed historical construction cost trends since 2003. He stated that although the price of cement was down at the moment that construction costs are expected to continue to increase faster than the general level of inflation for the foreseeable future.

Mr. Anderson reported that an asphalt vendor at the panel discussion indicated a 75 percent increase in the cost of asphalt was likely. Mr. Anderson also reported that refinery production was down and explained that these cost increases would occur regardless of the decline in the house market. He continued explaining that India and China planned to spend three percent of their gross domestic product on infrastructure over the next ten years, which would have a significant impact on commodity prices and construction costs. A brief discussion followed.

Mr. John Farry from Valley Metro requested that Mr. Anderson email the Committee the graph and related materials from the Association of General Contractors. Mr. Anderson stated that he would email the PowerPoint presentation with the graphs to the Committee.

In conclusion, Mr. Anderson announced that ADOT would published revised RARF Revenue projections towards the end of September or early October. He expressed concerns about the impact of the revised forecasts on the freeway and transit life cycle programs. In addition, Mr. Anderson explained that the revised projections would impact the bonding ability for the freeway component. He stated that MAG Staff was meeting with each of the Transportation Policy Committee members individually about the issue adding that a policy discussion would probably occur later in the Fall. He also stated that a lot of work was need to bring the freeway life cycle program back into fiscal balance, as required by state law, due to the changes in costs and revenues.

Mr. Callow asked if there were any questions or comments on the Transportation Director's Report. There were none, and the Committee moved onto the next agenda item.

5. DRAFT MAG Federal Fund Programming Principles

Mr. Callow invited Ms. Eileen Yazzie from MAG to present on the MAG Federal Fund Programming Principles. Ms. Yazzie stated that the goal of the presentation was for the Committee to discuss possible guidelines and factors for recommending projects for federal funding. She reviewed Section 300.8 of the Draft MAG Federal Programming Principles, which previously had been emailed to the Committee. According to Section 300.8, "the TRC's role is to review the evaluation and analysis completed by the Technical Advisory Committees, and recommend projects to be selected and programmed with federal funds based on guidelines established for project selection." The section also states that the Committee would develop guidelines for project selection.

Ms. Yazzie informed the Committee that the upcoming schedule for competitive project selection distributed as an attachment to the agenda. She noted that the current schedule

differed from the previous year's schedule. Ms. Yazzie explained that the Committee would be presented with a list of project applications submitted for the paving of unpaved roads and Street Sweepers in September. She added that the Technical Advisory Committees (TACs) would work on the applications from October through December. Then, the paving of unpaved road project application rankings would be presented to the Committee in January.

Next, Ms. Yazzie briefly summarized the Transportation Review Committee's history of using guidelines and factor for making project funding decisions. She stated that historically the Committee has relied on recommendations from the TACs, Congestion Mitigation and Air Quality (CMAQ) Evaluations, Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) funding allocation and/or goals, and the RTP priority criteria. Ms. Yazzie directed the Committee's attention to the agenda packet, which included printouts from chapter two of the RTP that discussed goals, objectives and priorities as well as printouts of part of the CMAQ Guidance from the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA).

Ms. Yazzie asked the Committee to document the guidelines and factors to be considered when recommending projects to receive federal funds between the current Committee meeting and December 2008 or January 2009. With that, she turned to floor over to the Committee discussion on the agenda item.

Mr. Callow asked which year the Committee would be selecting projects to receive federal funds. Ms. Yazzie replied that for federal fiscal year (FFY) 2009, the project selection would be for the paving of unpaved roads projects programed for FFY2011 - FFY2012 and street sweeper applications for FFY2009. She added that bicycle/pedestrian, arterial streets, and intelligent transportation systems applications would not be considered at this time because the projects are programmed until FFY2013.

Then, Mr. Callow asked the Committee for questions and comments on the agenda item. Mr. David Moody from the City of Peoria asked if decisions made about the paving of unpaved road and street sweeper project selection process would be extended to the programming of other projects after FFY2013. Ms. Yazzie replied yes.

Mr. Meinhart from the City of Scottsdale asked if the Committee's decisions would affect the Federal Fiscal Year Closeout Process (Closeout). Ms. Yazzie explained that it could impact Closeout, but added that Closeout currently has defined criteria in place. Mr. Anderson added that the Draft Principles would apply to Closeout; however, there are additional, specific criteria in place stemming from a documented Closeout process.

Ms. Patrice Kraus from the City of Chandler stated that unit costs and traffic count methodologies vary from jurisdiction to jurisdiction and expressed concerns about comparing these factors given the variations in methodologies applied. Ms. Kraus asked Ms. Yazzie if unit costs and traffic counts were the type of criteria that MAG would like applied to the selection process by the Committee. Ms. Yazzie explained that starting this year, the TACs would analyze unit cost and traffic count methodologies when reviewing applications. She stated that at least three different Technical Advisory Committee meetings would review these methodologies. Discussion followed.

Mr. Callow asked if there were any additional questions or comments on this agenda item.

There were none, and the Committee moved on to the next item on the agenda.

6. MAG Regional Transit Framework Study

Next, Mr. Callow invited Mr. Kevin Wallace from MAG to present the MAG Regional Transit Framework Study. Mr. Wallace stated the dynamic for transit had changed recently due to oil prices and the sustainability movement.

Mr. Wallace informed the Committee that the long term objectives for the MAG Regional Transit Framework Study were to assess long-range transit needs, develop a vision for metropolitan growth up to and beyond 2050, and develop project descriptions up to 2030. Other objectives included obtaining guidance for future Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) updates and funding initiatives. In addition, the study would determine the future role of transit in the region.

Mr. Wallace stated the study was technical in nature and would use tools and analysis to understand regional travel patterns. The study would define mobility needs by mode and trip purpose and/or length. He stated the study would also assess connections between activity centers and between land use and transportation in an effort to strengthen those connections through transit.

Mr. Wallace explained that the Regional Transit Framework Study was following a customer based approach. Toward that end, the project team was obtaining input from transportation system users as well as potential users. He added that the project team was working to incorporate the efforts of others such as RPTA, METRO, ADOT, and other local jurisdictions. Mr. Wallace stated the study was working to address local conditions and to provide policy makers with the technical tools to guide future policy decisions.

Then, Mr. Wallace explained that three scenarios would be developed for the study. Scenario One would review incremental low cost expansion and the potential acceleration of the RTP. Scenario Two would include a moderate increase in financial resources and the coordination of land use plans to reinforce transit patronage. Finally, Scenario Three would raise public transit to a level that makes it competitive with automobiles in congested corridors. Mr. Wallace explained that costs associated with the scenarios would increase as they progressed (ie. Scenario 1 - lowest cost; Scenario 3 - highest cost).

Mr. Wallace announced the development of regional service concepts for three geographic levels: community, subarea, and regional. The community geographic level included corridors up to eight miles in length. The Subarea level included corridors between five and 15 miles in length. Mr. Wallace noted the overlap between the community and subarea levels. He explained that subarea levels provides connections in longer corridors between major regional activity centers/population centers and other regional services and may include moderate-to-high density residential and commercial land use patterns. Finally, the regional level included corridors in excess of 15 miles in length. Regional level corridors provide long distance connections between regional activity centers/population centers and includes high density activity center within corridor.

According to Mr. Wallace, as part of the study seven focus groups were conducted to date to obtain community feedback. The focus groups included two sessions with transit riders, two sessions with non-transit riders, and three sessions with representative from the disability community. Mr. Wallace summarized key finding from the focus group meetings, which included:

- residents in central locations are generally more satisfied with existing transit services;
- key words to describe the public transit system in the Valley were “slow,” “old,” and “prehistoric;”
- key words used to describe transit systems in other areas were “seamless” and “painless;”and,
- most transit riders and non-riders alike are excited and optimistic about light rail service in the Valley.

As part of the study, peer regions were determined. The peer regions were selected included Atlanta, Georgia; Dallas, Texas; Denver, Colorado; Salt Lake City, Utah; San Diego, California; and, Seattle, Washington. The study would review the transit in the peer regions in an attempt to learn from their success stories. Mr. Wallace continued providing a brief comparison of the number of modes provided, ridership, and expenditures for each peer and compared to the region.

Next, Mr. Wallace outlined the study’s project schedule. He reported that the research phase was completed in July 2008, and the current phase would evaluate the data to determine regional travel patterns and identify opportunities to increase transit market share. He announced that between August and October the project team would develop concepts and evaluate the methodology for service scenarios; he stated this phase should be complete by September 2008. Mr. Wallace reported that recommendations based on the study would be presented in the Fall of 2008. Finally, he informed the Committee that Peer Review Panel Workshop would be held in November and that a final draft of the study should be available in December 2008 or January 2009.

Mr. David Fitzhugh from the City of Avondale questioned how the study would address the lack of transit infrastructure in the West Valley per the approved the Regional Transportation Plan. Mr. Anderson stated that geographic equity was a part of the RTP and explained that different areas of the Valley requested specific types of infrastructure improvements (ie. freeways versus transit improvements) at the time of the development of the RTP, which lead to inequities by mode. However, Mr. Anderson assured the Committee that the RTP was geographically equitable. Mr. Fitzhugh acknowledged Mr. Anderson’s comments and expressed concerns that the RTP may not get built due to the current economic situation. A brief discussion followed.

Mr. Moody asked if the removal of the firewall established by Proposition 400 would be a possibility due to increased fuel costs. Mr. Anderson explained the firewalls were established in the Arizona Revised Statutes and stated a ballot initiative approved by the voters would be required to remove the firewall. Mr. Anderson emphasized that the removal of the firewalls would be a challenge and would require the Regional Transportation Plan to be significantly revised. The discussion continued.

Mr. Callow asked if there were any additional questions or comments on this agenda item.

There were none, and this concluded this agenda item.

## 7. MAG Access Management Scan

Continuing on to the next agenda item, Mr. Callow invited Ms. Christina Hopes from MAG to discuss the MAG Access Management Scan. Ms. Hopes thanked the Committee for their time and briefly explained her background in access management. She stated that prior to joining MAG Staff that she had worked as research faculty and the Center for Urban Transportation Research (CUTR) at the University of South Florida. While at CUTR, she was mentored by Kristine Williams, co-author of the Transportation Research Board's Access Management Manual and current Chair of the TRB Committee on Access Management.

Ms. Hopes informed the Committee that access management was the systematic control of the location, spacing, design, and operation driveways, median openings, interchanges, and street connections to a roadway. She add that access management also involved roadway design applications, such as median treatments auxiliary lanes and signal spacing. Ms. Hopes explained that by managing roadway access, member agencies could preserve the functional integrity of the roadway, increase public safety, reduce traffic congestion, and improve the appearance and quality of the built environment.

Ms. Hopes reported that numerous studies conducted over the past several years have shown that effective access management program can reduce congestion by 50 percent, increase roadway capacity up to 45 percent, and reduce travel time and delay up to 60 percent. She cautioned that without proper access management, the function and character of major roadway corridors could deteriorate rapidly. She added that failing to manage access was associated with the adverse social, economic, and environmental impacts, including:

- An increase in vehicular crashes;
- Accelerated reduction in roadway efficiency;
- Unsightly commercial strip development;
- More cut-through traffic in residential areas due to overburdened arterials; a continuous cycle of widening roads; and
- Increased commute times, fuel consumption, and vehicular emissions

Next, Ms. Hopes explained that MAG had the unique opportunity to aid local governments in the identification and implementation of effective access management strategies. She added that toward that end, MAG Staff was conducting a state of the practice scan to determine the current and best access management policies and practices in the region. Ms. Hopes stated that the short term objectives of the scan were to facilitate the sharing of current and best practices in the region and to educate member agencies and staff on the principles and benefits of access management. She also stated that the long term objectives of the scan were to help MAG determine how to assist member agencies in managing access and to encourage continuity on multi-agency projects in the region.

Continuing on, Ms. Hopes informed the Committee that there were numerous techniques and tools to manage access including corner clearance standards, joint and cross access requirements, and retrofitting requirements. She explained that a common misconception

about access management is that the goal is to take away driveways, which is not true. Ms. Hopes explained that the MAG Access Management Scan would focus on numerous techniques in addition to limits on driveways that would assist member agencies in managing access in their communities.

Then, Ms. Hopes summarized the Access Management Scan process. The first step included an access management survey, which was distributed to all MAG member agencies on July 30<sup>th</sup>. She informed the Committee that the deadline to submit surveys to MAG Staff was September 5<sup>th</sup>. Ms. Hopes explained the next step in the scan was to review key documents, such as general plans, design guidelines, and land development regulations, from each jurisdiction. She stated that the data collected would guide MAG Staff in their educational efforts. Specifically, the feedback received would be reflected in the topics covered at the MAG sponsored access management workshop in October/November 2008 that would address the principles and benefits of access management. Ms. Hopes also informed the Committee that a final report synthesizing current and best practices would be published during the summer of 2009.

Mr. Callow asked the Committee if there were any questions or comments about the agenda item. Mr. John Hauskins from Maricopa County encouraged Ms. Hopes to present access management to local developers. He stated that the Committee supported her presentation; however, dealing with the development community would be a significant barrier to implementation of access management. Ms. Hopes informed that Committee that at the workshop she would be distributing CDs from the Federal Highway Administration that addressed how access management was beneficial to businesses. In addition, she agreed with Mr. Hauskins that having the support of the development community was instrumental in effective access management. However, she cautioned that without the proper policy framework in place at the jurisdiction level that member agencies would not be able to require developers to adhere to access management standards.

Mr. Meinhart stated that the difficulty with access management occurs when trying to balance economic vitality with stability. Mr. Moody added that compromises between high commercial development and access management can be made to facilitate both. Discussion followed.

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

#### 8. 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.

Mr. Farry reported that the overhead wires on the light rail were almost complete. He added that by mid to late September the light rail would be able to travel the entire 20 mile alignment powered by the overhead wires. Mr. Farry stated that the signals were also being

installed. He announced the grand opening of light rail over the weekend of December 27<sup>th</sup> and 28<sup>th</sup>. He stated that approximately 300,000 people may be on hand for the opening ceremonies.

Mr. Callow announced that within the next week all of the paving on Central due to light rail would be complete. Mr. Callow asked if there were any additional comments, and there were none. This concluded the Member Agency Update.

9. Next Meeting Date

Mr. Callow informed members in attendance that the next meeting of the Committee would be held on September 25, 2008. There being no further business, Mr. Callow adjourned the meeting at 11:25 a.m.