

MINUTES OF THE
MARICOPA ASSOCIATION OF GOVERNMENTS
TRANSPORTATION REVIEW COMMITTEE

August 27, 2009

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

MEMBERS ATTENDING

Peoria: David Moody
ADOT: Steve Hull for Floyd Roehrich
#Avondale: David Fitzhugh
Buckeye: Scott Lowe
Chandler: RJ Zeder for Patrice Kraus
El Mirage: Lance Calvert
Fountain Hills: Randy Harrel
*Gila Bend: Rick Buss
*Gila River: Sreedevi Samudrala for Doug
Torres
Gilbert: Michelle Gramley for Tami Ryall
Glendale: Terry Johnson
Goodyear: Cato Esquivel
#Guadalupe: Gino Turrubiarres

*Litchfield Park: Mike Cartsonis
Maricopa County: John Hauskins
#Mesa: Scott Butler
*Paradise Valley: Bill Mead
Phoenix: Ed Zuercher
*Queen Creek: Mark Young
RPTA: Bryan Jungwirth
Scottsdale: Dave Meinhart
Surprise: Randy Overmyer
Tempe: Chris Salomone
Valley Metro Rail: John Farry
Wickenburg: Rick Austin
Youngtown: Grant Anderson for Lloyce
Robinson

EX-OFFICIO MEMBERS ATTENDING

*Regional Bicycle Task Force: Jim Hash,
City of Mesa
Street Committee: Darryl Crossman, City
of Litchfield Park
*ITS Committee: Mike Mah
* Members neither present nor represented by proxy.

Pedestrian Working Group: Brandon Forrey,
City of Peoria
*Transportation Safety Committee: Kerry
Wilcoxon, City of Phoenix

+ - Attended by Videoconference
- Attended by Audioconference

OTHERS PRESENT

Eric Anderson, MAG
Alice Chen, MAG
Monique de los Rios-Urban, MAG
Bob Hazlett, MAG
Roger Herzog, MAG
Christina Hopes, MAG
Roger Roy, MAG
Tim Strow, MAG
Steve Tate, MAG
Kevin Wallace, MAG
Eileen Yazzie, MAG
Ed Stillings, FHWA

Jermaine Hannon, FHWA
Tami Ryall, Town of Gilbert
Mike Sabitini, MCDOT
Kwi-Sung Kang, ADOT
Wulf Grote, METRO
Ray Dovalina, City of Phoenix
Jim Schumann, CK Group
Jeanne Sapon, Sundt
Paul Ward, Olsson and Assoc.
John McNamara, AECOM
Jason Pagnard, Burgess and Niple

1. Call to Order

Chairman Moody from the City of Peoria called the meeting to order at 10:07 a.m. Chairman Moody informed the those present that three members would be attending the meeting via audio conference: Mr. Gino Turrubiartes from the Town of Guadalupe, Mr. David Fitzhugh from the City of Avondale, and Mr. Scott Butler from the City of Mesa.

Before moving to the next item on the agenda, Mr. Moody made a few announcements regarding the Transportation Review Committee's meeting schedule for the remainder of calendar year 2009. He announced that the Committee would not meet in September, but would meet on October 1st and October 29th. He also announced that a meeting would not be held in November due to scheduled holidays.

Chairman Moody also announced that the December 10th meeting of the Committee had been rescheduled to Monday, December 14th due to a scheduling conflict. He inquired if there were any questions or comments about the revised meeting schedule. There were none, and Chairman Moody moved on to the next agenda item.

2. Approval of the Draft June 25, 2009 Minutes

Chairman Moody asked if there were any changes or amendments to the June 25, 2009 meeting minutes, and there were none. Mr. David Meinhart from the City of Scottsdale moved to approve the minutes. Mr. John Hauskins from Maricopa County seconded the motion, and the minutes were subsequently approved by unanimous voice vote of the Committee.

3. Call to the Audience

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

4. Transportation Director's Report

Chairman Moody invited Mr. Eric Anderson from MAG to present the Transportation Director's Report. Mr. Anderson informed the Committee that the Regional Council had adopted new policies and procedures for MAG Committees. He stated the MAG Staff would provide a presentation at the September meeting of the TRC to discuss the new policies and procedures in detail.

Mr. Anderson announced that under the policies, a meeting could not be conducted if a quorum was not met. He stated that after consulting with MAG legal counsel, it was determined that if the quorum was lost during the meeting that the meeting must be adjourned immediately, even if the remaining items on the agenda were for information and discussion only. He

encouraged the Committee members to attend meetings and remain until adjournment.

Then, Mr. Anderson addressed revenue receipts and forecasts. He reported that the July Regional Area Road Fund (RARF) revenues decreased by approximately 13.7 percent compared to July 2008. He announced that the Arizona Department of Transportation (ADOT) has produced a preliminary Fiscal Year (FY) 2010 RARF forecast that anticipated revenues for the year to be approximately \$315 million. He stated the revised forecast was lower than the actual RARF revenues collected in FY 2009 of \$328 million. Mr. Anderson also reported on the Highway User Revenue Fund (HURF) revenue receipts and forecast. He stated the HURF forecast for July was \$109 million; however, actual HURF revenues collected in July were \$97 million.

Chairman Moody 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, Chairman Moody directed the Committee's attention to the consent agenda. He inquired if there were any questions or comments about the ADOT Red Letter Process, which was on the consent agenda as Agenda Item #6. Mr. Grant Anderson from the Town of Youngtown stated he thought the Committee had intended to review the Committee's involvement in the ADOT Red Letter Process, as discussed at a previous Committee meeting.

Mr. Grant Anderson inquired what the approval of the agenda item meant. Mr. Eric Anderson replied that the agenda item was a recognition by MAG that information on the Red Letter Process had been received and disseminated to MAG Member Agencies. Mr. Eric Anderson stated that an agenda item may need to be included on a future Committee agenda to discuss what the process is, how the information is used by ADOT, and how the process may be refined.

Mr. Hauskins reported the Red Letter Process was initiated by ADOT to provide advance notification of development activities that may be planned in potential areas of future right-of-way acquisitions. He stated the process had benefitted Maricopa County for many years. He suggested the reason ADOT requested approval of the ADOT Red Letter Process, in part, as confirmation the process was a positive method of coordination between the State and local agencies. Mr. Hauskins asked Mr. Kwi-Sung Kang from ADOT to confirm his statement. Mr. Kang stated that Mr. Hauskins was correct. A brief discussion followed.

Mr. Hauskins motioned to approve the consent agenda. Mr. Ed Zuercher from the City of Phoenix seconded the motion, and the motion was approved by unanimous voice vote of the Committee.

7. Development of the FY 2011-2015 Transportation Improvement Program and the Regional Transportation Plan 2010 Update

Chairman Moody invited Ms. Eileen Yazzie, MAG Transportation Programming Manager, to present on the development of the FY 2011 - FY 2015 Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) and the Regional Transportation (RTP) Plan FY 2010 Update. Ms. Yazzie stated that in late July a memorandum and revised schedule had been disseminated to MAG Member Agencies in regards to the programming of the TIP as well as the RTP Update.

Ms. Yazzie announced that MAG Staff would not be producing a FY 2010 - 2014 TIP as originally planned. She explained that in July the MAG Regional Council voted to approve a three month moratorium of prioritization recommendations to the Freeway Life Cycle Program (FLCP). She stated the prioritization of the FLCP would be revisited in October 2009.

Ms. Yazzie explained that the delay in the prioritization and approval of the revised FLCP would push the approval schedule of the FY 2010-2014 TIP to June 2010. She stated that as a result, MAG Staff opted to forego the approval of the FY 2010-2014 TIP and proceed with the development of the FY 2011 to FY 2015 TIP and RTP Update, which was anticipated to be approved in July 2010.

Ms. Yazzie referred the Committee to the revised programming schedule handout that addressed deadlines for the TIP and RTP Update. She noted that MAG Federal Fund applications were due on September 18, 2009 by 12:00 p.m. She emphasized that late applications would not be accepted by MAG Staff. Ms. Yazzie stated that in October the review and recommendation of the Draft Freeway Prioritization Program would be heard through the MAG Committee Process.

Continuing on, Ms. Yazzie explained that MAG Staff would coordinate with member agencies from November 2009 through the Spring of 2010 on updating project information for all projects programmed in the MAG TIP. She stated the project data on local sponsored projects was due to MAG Staff by January 8, 2010. Ms. Yazzie informed the Committee that drafts of the FY 2011- 2015 TIP and RTP Update would be available for review and comment in February or March 2010.

Then, Ms. Yazzie addressed the applications for federal funding through the MAG Committee Process. She reported that all documents, reports and forms were available for download from the MAG-TIP website at <http://www.mag.maricopa.gov/project.cms?item=413>. Ms. Yazzie informed the Committee that MAG had conducted an informational workshop on the MAG Federal Fund application process, which had been attended by more than sixty representatives from MAG Member Agencies.

Ms. Yazzie reported that MAG Staff would be programming funds for three years of the TIP depending on the mode. She stated that funds would be programmed for PM-10 Certified Sweepers in FY 2010, PM-10 Pave Unpaved Road Projects in FY 2013, Intelligent Transportation System (ITS) projects in FY 2014 as well as Bicycle and Pedestrian projects in FY 2014. Ms. Yazzie announced that Unpaved Road, ITS and bicycle/pedestrian project applications would be presented to the Committee for review and funding recommendation in December 2009.

Next, Ms. Yazzie addressed project funding eligibility. She stated that projects must be eligible per the Congestion Mitigation and Air Quality (CMAQ) Federal Guidelines. She explained that in order to be eligible for funding projects must be in the non-attainment area boundary as well as adhere to additional requirements depending on project type. She stated the street sweeper and paving projects must be located in the PM-10 Boundary whereas ITS, bicycle and pedestrian projects must be located within the 8-Hour Ozone Boundary. She referred the Committee to the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) CMAQ website at <http://www.fhwa.dot.gov/environment/cmaqpgs/cmaq08gd.pdf> for additional information.

Ms. Yazzie announced a new component of the MAG Federal Fund applications, which required agencies submitting applications to conduct site visits. She stated the new component required a site visit and the submission of at least one photo of the current site conditions. Ms. Yazzie also reported that applications must be signed by a jurisdiction's manager, administrator, or designated representative authorized to sign MAG funding request documents on behalf of that jurisdiction.

Chairman Moody asked if there were any questions or comments about this agenda item. There were none, and Chairman Moody moved on to the next agenda item.

8. Project Changes – Amendments and Administrative Modifications to the FY 2008-2012 MAG Transportation Improvement Program, FY 2010 Arterial Life Cycle Program, and Material Cost Changes to the ADOT Program

Chairman Moody invited Ms. Eileen Yazzie, the MAG Transportation Programming Manager, to present proposed project changes to the MAG FY 2008-2012 Transportation Improvement Program (TIP), FY 2010 Arterial Life Cycle Program (ALCP), and Arizona Department of Transportation (ADOT) Program. Ms. Yazzie directed the Committee's attention to a revised project change sheet at their places. She explained the difference between the agenda attachment and the revised handout pertained to two jurisdictions.

Ms. Yazzie stated that six projects had been added to the project change sheet at the request of ADOT. She reported that four projects funded by the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act (ARRA) of 2009 needed to be updated in the MAG TIP to reconcile cost data. She explained that the award or bid amount for the projects were lower than initially expected and the amounts reflected in the TIP needed to be consistent with those bids. She added that updating the cost data would also free up ARRA funding to be reprogrammed to other projects.

Ms. Yazzie stated that the two additional changes regarded the Williams Gateway Freeway/SR 802 project. She explained the projects have been approved by the Regional Council in May adding that an amendment to TIP and RTP needed to be formally adopted to reflect the approval. Ms. Yazzie informed the Committee that three Salt River Pima - Maricopa Indian Community (SRP-MIC) projects were previously omitted due to an administrative error and need to be included in the TIP and RTP as well.

Ms. Yazzie announced that a series of paving on unpaved road projects were included in the proposed administrative modification and amendments listed. She explained the projects inclusion in the project change sheet was due to the delay in approving the TIP. Ms. Yazzie

stated that many of the project changes pertained to the FY 2010 Arterial Life Cycle Program (ALCP). She reported that the FY 2010 ALCP had been approved by the Regional Council in June 2009. She stated that the FY 2008-2012 TIP needed to be amended to reflect changes in the approved FY 2010 ALCP. She explained the changes were needed to ensure that the information provided in the TIP and ALCP were consistent.

Mr. Grant Anderson inquired if the approval of the project change for the SR 802 was premature given the on-going discussions on prioritizing the Freeway Life Cycle Program. Ms. Yazzie replied that the project change pertained to \$45 million local funding financed by the City of Mesa for the project and did not impact the regional funding currently under discussion. Mr. Eric Anderson explained that the request to advance design and the acquisition of right-of-way for the project had been discussed and approved by the Regional Council in May; however, the TIP had not been amended to-date to reflect the approval. A brief discussion followed.

Mr. Hauskins motioned to approve the amendments and administrative modifications to the FY 2008-2012 MAG TIP, FY 2010 ALCP, and the material cost changes to the ADOT Program. Mr. Randy Overmyer from the City of Surprise seconded the motion, and the projects changes were approved by a unanimous voice vote of the Committee.

9. Central Mesa Light Rail Transit Locally Preferred Alternative

Continuing on, Chairman Moody invited Mr. Wulf Grote, the METRO Director of Project Development, to present on the Central Mesa Light Rail Transit Locally Preferred Alternative. Mr. Grote informed the Committee that the RTP currently contained plans for a 57 mile high capacity transit system, which were included in the Transit Life Cycle Program (TLCP).

Mr. Grote announced that with the recent update to the TLCP the completion dates for certain projects had been delayed due recent funding shortfalls. He stated the northeast expansion of the system incurred the biggest impact of the shortfall and having been deferred from FY 2025 to FY 2030. He explained that at the moment, the TLCP did not have sufficient funds to complete the program by FY 2025.

Mr. Grote informed the Committee that the Central Mesa Light Rail improvements were also impacted by the revenue shortfall. He stated the competitions date for the project had been deferred from FY 2015 to FY 2016. Mr. Grote reported that the Central Mesa Light Rail Project was a 2.7 mile extension of the current 20 mile light rail system. He stated the extension would add light rail from Sycamore at Main Street to Mesa Drive. He explained that the light rail station at Sycamore at Main Street was one of the highest boarding stations on the current light rail system.

Mr. Grote reported the Central Mesa Light Rail Project was included in the TLCP, which received a portion sales tax revenues from Proposition 400. He stated that the TLCP's funding stream assumed a funding split of 51 percent from Federal Transit Administration funds (New Starts-5309, CMAQ) and 49 percent Regional Public Transportation Fund (PTF). He stated the current project budget in the TLCP was estimated at \$194 million (2008\$).

Mr. Grote stated the corridor study area extended past the 2.7 mile alignment to Power Road

in the east and Gilbert Road to the south. He explained the areas outside the alignment were incorporated into the study due to the potential influence on the project.

Mr. Grote informed the Committee that in order to obtain federal funding for the project, METRO was required to adhere to specific steps in the federal fund process. He stated the first required step of the federal fund process was an alternatives analysis. He explained the purpose of the alternatives analysis was to (1) define the specific route selected for design and (2) determine other feasible options and technologies. He stated the Federal Transit Administration required projects to review the feasibility of Bus Rapid Transit (BRT) for corridors as well Light Rail Transit (LRT).

Mr. Grote announced that the study began in the spring of 2007 stating the project took approximately two years to complete. He explained the length of the project was attributed to technical analysis as well as the community involvement process required. He reported the conclusion of the project occurred with the Mesa City Council's unanimous approval of the project recommendations in May 2009 and the subsequent METRO Board's approval in June 2009.

Continuing on, Mr. Grote outlined the project study process and findings. He explained the project reviewed a series of LRT alignments including Main Street and 1st Street in downtown Mesa from Country Club Drive to Mesa Drive. He added that the BRT alignment focused on Main Street in the same area. He stated the project included extending the LRT analysis out to Gilbert Road as well as reviewing the impact of the LINK BRT service on the various proposals.

Next, Mr. Grote addressed project costs. He reported that the two BRT options were less expensive than the LRT alternatives. He also reported that the LRT alignment on Main Street was within the project budget whereas the LRT alignment on 1st Street exceeded the project budget.

Mr. Grote announced the study recommendation to implement LRT on Main Street to Mesa Drive. He announced a second recommendation to ultimately end the LRT line at Gilbert Road instead of Mesa Drive. He explained the study recommendation did not include implementing the Gilbert Road as the end of the alignment at this time due to insufficient funding. Mr. Grote explained that terminating the LRT line at Mesa Drive was not optimal because the area was not suitable on a long-term basis for an end of line park and ride lot. He stated the study recommendations also addressed BRT improvements citing the need for compatibility between BRT and LRT service to maintain overall transit service frequencies.

Mr. Grote informed the Committee the item was on the agenda for information, discussion, and recommendation to approve light rail transit technology on the Main Street alignment to Mesa Drive (Phase I) with the additional recommendation to include the unfunded extension from Mesa Drive to Gilbert Road as an "illustrative project" as well as improvements to service frequency on the Main Street LINK BRT to correspond with the LRT (Phase II).

Mr. Grote stated that despite the higher costs of implementing the light rail alternative compared with two of the bus rapid transit alternative, that LRT was ultimately selected for the

corridor. He explained that although start up costs associated with LRT were higher than the long-term operating and capital costs of LRT were lower than BRT. He added that the LRT option also allowed more flexibility in adding capacity and had a greater reduction in overall travel times, in part because eliminating or reducing the need for transfers.

Then, Mr. Grote addressed the LRT alignment selection of Main Street over 1st Street. According to Mr. Grote, Main Street provided the best access to downtown Mesa activity centers, the greatest economic development opportunities, and best alignment to meet the FTA criteria for cost effectiveness. Other factors cited by Mr. Grote in the selection of the Main Street alignment included lower capital cost, highest projected ridership, lowest travel times, and the fewest property acquisitions. Mr. Grote apprised the Committee of the next steps in the process, which included the development of stakeholder group and the applying for FTA grants.

Mr. Chris Salomone from the City of Tempe inquired about the use of “illustrative” in the recommendation as well as the criteria that must be met for a project to be deemed illustrative and included in the RTP Update. Mr. Eric Anderson explained that term “illustrative project” was derived from federal planning regulations and referred to projects that are needed in a region, but that did not have funding associated with the project. A brief discussion followed.

Chairman Moody asked if there were any additional questions or comments, and there were none. Mr. Ed Zuercher from the City of Phoenix motioned to approve the recommendation as presented. Mr. Gino Turrubiarres from the Town of Guadalupe seconded, and the motion was approved by a unanimous voice vote of the Committee.

10. Acceptance of the Interstates 8 and 10-Hidden Valley Transportation Framework Study

Chairman Moody invited Mr. Bob Hazlett, MAG Senior Engineer to discuss the Interstates 8 and 10-Hidden Valley Transportation Framework Study. Mr. Hazlett outlined the study area, which encompassed approximately 3,000 square miles of land in Maricopa and Pinal counties and was bounded by Gila River to the north, the I-8 corridor to the south, Overfield Road to the east, and 459th Avenue to the west. Mr. Hazlett referred to the full presentation on the Framework Study presented at the Committee meeting in June 2009. He stated that in addition the presentation provided to the Committee that MAG Staff also had provided an update on the Framework Study to the MAG Management Committee, the Transportation Policy Committee, and MAG Regional Council in July 2009.

Mr. Hazlett announced that the Interstates 8 and 10-Hidden Valley Transportation Framework Study was on the agenda for information, discussion, and recommendation of acceptance of the study finding. He outlined the recommendations, which included to:

- (1) accept the findings of the Interstates 8 and 10-Hidden Valley Transportation Framework Study as the surface and public transportation framework for the Hidden Valley area of the MAG region that is bounded by the Gila River on the north, SR-87 and the Pinal County on the east, the Tohono O’Odham Indian Community and the Barry Goldwater Range on the south, and 459th Avenue on the West;
- (2) adopt a two-mile traffic interchange spacing policy for new freeway facilities within the

Hidden Valley area with appropriate planning for non-access crossings of the freeway facilities to facilitate local transportation movements;

(3) accept the findings and implementation strategies as described in the study for inclusion as long-range unfunded illustrative corridors in the Regional Transportation Plan;

(4) recommend the affected jurisdictions within the Hidden Valley study area incorporate this study's recommendations into future updates of their general plans; and

(5) coordinate this acceptance with the tribal councils of the Gila River and AK Chin Indian Communities.

Mr. Hazlett explained that a Study Review Team (SRT) comprised of numerous local, regional, and national entities were participating in the Study. He reported that the SRT conducted a variety of key stakeholder meeting and extensive public involvement efforts for the Study. He stated that some of the key stakeholders involved included economic development organizations, public/private utilities, individual land owners, affected citizens, neighborhood groups, and development firms. Then, Mr. Hazlett offered to address any questions or concerns about the project, and there were none.

Chairman Moody asked if there were any additional questions or comments, and there were none. Mr. Scott Lowe from the Town of Buckeye motioned to approve the recommendation as presented. Mr. Cato Esquivel from the City of Goodyear seconded, and the motion was approved by a unanimous voice vote of the Committee.

11. Update on the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act of 2009: Re-allocation of Unused Funds – Policy Options

Chairman Moody then invited Ms. Yazzie to provide an update on the reallocation of unused ARRA funds. Ms. Yazzie referred the Committee to a three-page memorandum as well as status report from July included in the agenda packet. She also directed the Committee's attention to a two-page chart at their places. Ms. Yazzie noted an error in the handout explaining that the first listed under the backup list of projects (the 99th Avenue project) should be listed in the previous section under projects recommended to receive funding.

Ms. Yazzie provided an overview of the "Use or Lose It" provisions in the ARRA legislation as well as the deadlines imposed by the Regional Council on the obligation of ARRA funds sub-allocated to local agencies. She stated the first deadline, which was established by the MAG Regional Council, required the obligation of MAG sub-allocated funds by November 30, 2009. She stated the second deadline, which was established in the ARRA legislation, was March 2, 2010. She explained the ARRA deadline required all projects funded under the Act must be obligated by that date.

Next, Ms. Yazzie provided an overview of the ARRA funds allocated to the MAG Region. She reported that MAG received \$129.4 million in funds for State Highway projects. She stated that the MAG Regional Council approved a rank order list of 13 projects. She explained that the seven projects in the rank order listed had been funded with ARRA (priority order 1, 2, 4-8). Ms. Yazzie announced that bids and awards for the projects were coming in lower than anticipated, and as a result, \$14.69 million was available for programming in the highway section.

Ms. Yazzie summarized the project development status of the highway projects listed in the prioritized table. She stated that project 9 was recommended to be combined with a non-prioritized project because both projects were auxiliary lane projects on the same freeway. She stated that both projects were ready to obligate, but that conformity would need to be assessed first. Then, Ms. Yazzie addressed projects 10, 11, and 13, which were still under development and may not obligate by the March 2nd deadline. She stated that project 12 was ready to obligate and announced that three additional projects were recommended to be included in the table. She explained the project recommended to be added to the list included: adding a second auxiliary lane to Loop 101, the SR87 project, and the 99th Avenue project.

Ms. Yazzie informed the Committee that if funds were not obligated by the November 30th deadline, then the process of funding projects on the backup list would be initiated. She stated the funding of projects on the backup list should occur in order of project readiness to ensure the obligation of the ARRA funds by the March 2nd deadline.

Then, Ms. Yazzie referenced the Regional Council action that established the November 30, 2009 for the MPO sub-allocated that required unobligated funds to be reprogrammed to meet the federal obligation date of March 2, 2010. Ms. Yazzie requested the Committee's input on potential policy options to implement in anticipation of unobligated MPO/Local ARRA Funds. She explained that MAG anticipated an unobligated balance of ARRA funds due to project bids and awards coming in 20 percent to 50 percent below the original cost estimates as well as projects failing to meet the November 30, 2009 obligation deadline.

Next, Ms. Yazzie addressed three potential policy options identified by MAG Staff in conjunction with ADOT. Ms. Yazzie stated the first option would be to work with ADOT on an exchange of funds. She explained that MAG may be able to exchange ARRA funds with STP funds, which would local agencies until September 2010 to obligate. Ms. Yazzie stated that another option may be a one-way transfer of funds to transit or highway projects in the region. She stated the third option included allocating funds to any local project that could obligate by the March 2nd deadline.

Mr. Eric Anderson reported that MAG had discussed the potential of swapping funds with ADOT. He stated that ADOT expressed concerns about the lack of federally eligible projects that would be able to use the funds by the established deadlines. He added that the region was also running low on potential projects to use the funds within the established parameters. Mr. Anderson stated that many projects that used ARRA funds were initially programmed with STP funds and as a result, ADOT has a surplus of STP funds, which have not been obligated due to a lack of project ready to obligate. A brief discussion followed.

Ms. Yazzie informed the Committee that transit projects were also coming in below the original estimates. She stated it was anticipated that there would be unobligated transit ARRA funds available too. She reported that RPTA would be addressing the issue through their committee process in August and September. She stated that recommendations from RPTA on how to address the issue would be presented to MAG in September and October.

Mr. Hauskins informed the Committee that Maricopa County had submitted a series a projects as a contingency list in the event that ARRA funds became available. He encouraged other

member agencies to review any projects in their jurisdictions for eligibility under the ARRA guidelines. Chairman Moody encouraged Mr. Hauskins and MAG Staff to provide a copy of Maricopa County's contingency list. Mr. Hauskins agreed. A brief discussion followed.

Mr. Lowe inquired what would happen to projects that missed the November 30th deadline. Ms. Yazzie replied that the November 30th deadline was projects to obligate not for projects to be awarded or go to bid. Mr. Eric Anderson clarified that MAG Staff would review project readiness on a project by project basis. He explained that MAG would take into consideration projects that were about to obligate, but that did not meet the deadline by a few days or due to a minor administrative issue. A brief discussion followed.

Mr. Meinhart inquired if a feasible option would be to reduce the local match requirement for federal funded projects established in the RTP or to allocate ARRA funds to existing federally funded projects that were not currently funded by ARRA. Ms. Yazzie replied yes adding the MAG Staff was reviewing a series of options to determine what was feasible and permitted under the Act.

Chairman Moody asked if there were any additional questions or comments, and there were none.

12. Member Agency Update

Chairman Moody 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 Chairman Moody moved to the next agenda item.

13. Next Meeting Date

Chairman Moody informed members in attendance that the next meeting of the Committee would be held on October 1, 2009. There be no further business, Chairman Moody adjourned the meeting at 11:11 a.m.