

MINUTES OF THE
MARICOPA ASSOCIATION OF GOVERNMENTS
TRANSPORTATION REVIEW COMMITTEE

December 14, 2009

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

MEMBERS ATTENDING

Peoria: David Moody	Litchfield Park: Woody Scoutten
ADOT: Kwi-Sung Kang for Floyd Roehrich	Maricopa County: Clem Ligocki for John Hauskins
Avondale: Shirley Gunther for David Fitzhugh	Mesa: Brent Stoddard for Scott Butler
Buckeye: Jose Herdia Scott Lowe	Paradise Valley: Bill Mead
Chandler: RJ Zeder for Patrice Kraus	Phoenix: Ed Zuercher
El Mirage: Lance Calvert	Queen Creek: Wendy Kaserman
Fountain Hills: Randy Harrel	RPTA: Bob Antilla for Bryan Jungwirth
Gila Bend: Rick Buss	Scottsdale: Dave Meinhart
*Gila River: Doug Torres	Surprise: Bob Buckley for Vacant
Gilbert: Michelle Gramley for Tami Ryall	Tempe: Chris Salomone
Glendale: Terry Johnson	Valley Metro Rail: John Farry
Goodyear: Cato Esquivel	*Wickenburg: Rick Austin
#Guadalupe: Gino Turrubiarres	Youngtown: Grant Anderson for Lloyce Robinson

EX-OFFICIO MEMBERS ATTENDING

*Street Committee: Darryl Crossman, City of Litchfield Park	#Bicycle/Pedestrian Committee: Peggy Rubach, RPTA
ITS Committee: Debbie Albert, City of Glendale	*Transportation Safety Committee: Kerry Wilcoxon, City of Phoenix

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

OTHERS PRESENT

Eric Anderson, MAG	Ed Stillings, FHWA
Maureen DeCindis, MAG	Paul Ward, Olsson
Monique de los Rios-Urban, MAG	Joe Bowar, Phoenix
Dean Giles, MAG	Jorie Bresnahan, Phoenix
Roger Herzog, MAG	Ray Dovalina, Phoenix
Christina Hopes, MAG	Tom Remes, Phoenix
Nathan Pryor, MAG	Dawn Coomer, Tempe
Eileen Yazzie, MAG	Brad Lundahl, Scottsdale
John Dickson, ADOT	Troy White, Queen Creek
Bill Vachon, FHWA	Art Brooks, Strand Assoc.

1. Call to Order

Chairman David Moody from the City of Peoria called the meeting to order at 10:01 a.m.

2. Approval of Draft October 29, 2009 Minutes

Chairman Moody asked if there were any changes or amendments to the October 29, 2009 meeting minutes, and there were none. Mr. David Meinhart from the City of Scottsdale moved to approve the minutes. Mr. RJ Zeder from City of Chandler seconded the motion, and the minutes were subsequently approved by unanimous voice vote of the Committee.

3. Approval of Draft November 13, 2009 Minutes

Chairman Moody asked if there were any changes or amendments to the November 13, 2009 meeting minutes, and there were none. Mr. Lance Calvert from City of El Mirage moved to approve the minutes. Mr. Clem Ligocki from Maricopa County seconded the motion, and the minutes were subsequently approved by unanimous voice vote of the Committee.

4. 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.

5. Transportation Director's Report

Next, Chairman Moody invited Mr. Eric Anderson to provide the MAG Transportation Director's Report. Mr. Anderson announced that in early November MAG underwent the certification review process required every four years by the Federal Transit Authority (FTA) and Federal Highway Administration (FHWA).

Mr. Anderson stated that FHWA and FTA conducted a two and half day review of the MAG planning program. He informed the Committee that the certification process went well, but that FTA and FHWA had recommended MAG develop a financial plan for the Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) and Transportation Improvement Program (TIP). He added that he would discuss the certification review and subsequent recommendations in a later agenda item.

Mr. Anderson also announced the roll-out of the Western High Speed Rail Alliance. He stated that some members may have seen the roll-out in the newspapers in the previous weeks.

Next, Mr. Anderson reported that MAG was contending with additional fiscal issues, including the rescission of federal contract authority by the federal government. He stated that MAG Staff was working with Chief Financial Officer at Arizona Department of Transportation (ADOT), John Fink, to determine the impact of the rescission. He explained that per FHWA, the reduction in funding was applied to individual programs as opposed to allowing the state

Departments of Transportation to decide how to meet the rescission amount.

Mr. Anderson informed the Committee that the U.S. Department of Transportation (USDOT) was operating under a continuing resolution that would expire on December 18, 2009. He explained the rescissions were part of the Federal Fiscal Year (FFY) 2009 funding were carried forward as part of that continuing resolution. Mr. Anderson stated that ADOT expressed concerns about the ability to spend apportioned funds. He added that he provide additional information as it became available.

Then, Mr. Anderson addressed Regional Area Road Fund (RARF) revenues. He reported that RARF revenues for November were 17.4 percent lower compared to November 2008. He stated the reduction was a surprise because RARF revenue collection had been trending at negative 13 percent for several months. He added that year-to-date RARF revenues were down 14.5 percent from the forecast for FY 2010.

Mr. Anderson announced that a table from the Air Quality Division was at their places. He stated the table removed one program at the request of the MAG Executive Committee. 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.

6. 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 consent agenda item on the development of FY 2011-2015 Transportation Improvement Program(TIP) and FY 2011 Arterial Life Cycle Program (ALCP). There were none. Mr. Zuercher motioned to approve the consent agenda. Mr. Grant Anderson from the Town of Youngtown seconded the motion, and the consent agenda was approved by a unanimous voice vote of the Committee.

7. Project Changes – Amendments and Administrative Modifications to the FY 2008-2012 MAG Transportation Improvement Program

Chairman Moody invited Ms. Eileen Yazzie, MAG Transportation Programming Manager, to present project changes to the FY 2008-2012 MAG Transportation Improvement Program (TIP). Ms. Yazzie announced that a summary transmittal and attached table were at their places for review. She stated the project changes listed in the attached table included cost adjustments to four ADOT projects, three new projects programmed with Congestion Mitigation and Air Quality (CMAQ) funds, and two new projects from Valley Metro Rail. Ms. Yazzie explained the projects needed to put in the TIP before the projects could move forward. She also noted that one local project was listed in the attached table.

Then, Ms. Yazzie announced that on Wednesday, December 9, 2009, the Regional Council and Executive Committee approved a recommendation to allow MAG Staff to transmit four types of administrative modifications to the TIP directly to ADOT and FHWA/FTA without going

through the traditional MAG committee process. She stated that federal law defined the differences between amendments and administrative modifications to the TIP in detail, and that according to FHWA, a variety of administrative modifications may be made by staff without approval through the MPO committee process. Ms. Yazzie reported that the four administrative modification approved by the Regional Council and Executive Committee to be executed by MAG Staff outside the traditional committee process included:

1. Revisions to project description (clarifying how project is described in the TIP not amending the scope);
2. Changes in the sources of funding for a project;
3. Combining/Splitting projects; and,
4. Cost decreases.

Ms. Yazzie informed the Committee that MAG Staff was coordinating the details on the process, such as frequency. She explained MAG Staff would submit an administrative memorandum with the requested modifications to ADOT, FHWA, FTA, as well as copy the TRC, and post the information to the MAG TIP website.

Ms. Peggy Rubach inquired if the enhancement grants from Valley Metro were listed on the project change sheet. Ms. Yazzie stated yes.

Mr. RJ Zeder motioned to approve the project changes, amendments and administrative modifications to the FY 2008-2012 MAG TIP as presented. Mr. Gino Turrubiarres from Town of Guadalupe seconded the motion, and the motion was approved by a unanimous voice vote of the Committee.

8. Programming of Projects for MAG Federal Congestion Mitigation and Air Quality (CMAQ) Funding in the Draft FY 2011-2015 MAG Transportation Improvement Program

Chairman Moody invited Ms. Yazzie to present the programming of MAG-CMAQ funds for projects in the Draft FY 2011-2015 Transportation Improvement Program (TIP). Ms. Yazzie announced MAG Staff was in the process of programming Congestion Mitigation and Air Quality (CMAQ) funds to bicycle/pedestrian, intelligent transportation systems (ITS), and paving of unpaved roads projects. She explained that in accordance with the Draft Federal Fund Programming Principles, a programming recommendation was needed by the Committee per mode. Ms. Yazzie listed the amount of CMAQ funds available by mode and fiscal year, as follows:

- \$4,513,000 for Paving unpaved roads in 2013;
- \$8,737,000 for Bicycle/Pedestrian Projects in FY 2014;
- \$6,887,000 for Arterial/ITS in FY 2014; and,
- \$7,503,000 for Air Quality Programs in 2014.

Ms. Yazzie directed the Committee's attention to a revised handout at their places. She explained there was an error with one of the bike/ped amount listed in the original handout, which had been corrected and highlighted in the revised handout.

Ms. Yazzie reported that 19 bicycle/pedestrian projects had been submitted requesting \$17,299,787 in funding. She stated the Bicycle/Pedestrian Committee recommended funding

eight projects for \$8,205,528, which left an unprogrammed balance of \$531,472. She added that the Bicycle/Pedestrian Committee recommended the remaining funds be applied to the City of Phoenix project on the Grand Canal Multi-Use Path Connection at Indian School Road and 16th Street. Ms. Yazzie stated the Bicycle/Pedestrian Committee also recommended the project be adjusted either by changing the amount of local funds or reducing the project scope.

Next, Ms. Yazzie discussed arterial/intelligent transportation system (ITS) projects submitted for funding consideration. She stated that 13 projects were submitted requesting \$7,464,642. She reported that the ITS Committee recommended all 13 proposed projects be programmed for FY 2014. Ms. Yazzie stated that the amount requested exceeded the available funding of \$6,887,000, which resulted in a shortfall of \$577,642.

Ms. Yazzie explained that the ITS Committee recommendation included adjusting the costs to fund the projects submitted. She proposed a few cost adjustment options available to the Committee, which included:

- adjusting the regional cost share to 62 percent for all projects;
- reducing the federal funds on the lowest ranked project;
- reducing the project scope on the lowest ranked project; or,
- reducing the project scope on other projects submitted for funding consideration.

Then, Ms. Yazzie addressed the paving of unpaved road project applications submitted. She reported that the Air Quality Technical Advisory Committee (AQTAC) met on Thursday, December 10, 2009, and ranked 13 proposed projects based on cost effectiveness. Ms. Yazzie referenced a memorandum that had been transmitted to the Committee electronically, which included the project listings and scores.

Ms. Yazzie stated that the AQTAC recommended funding eight of the 13 projects submitted. She added that a remaining balance of \$225,893 would need to be programmed if the first eight projects were recommended for funding. She explained the remaining balance could be applied to the next project on the list that required \$401,983 in funds, which resulted in a difference of \$176,090.

Moving on, Ms. Yazzie discussed programmed funds for air quality programs for FY 2014. She reported that at the October meeting the AQTAC recommended funding six projects/programs. She announced that since that meeting, the MAG Executive Committee met voted to eliminate the telework ozone/education program Ms. Yazzie explained that the funding for the program was reallocated to the paving dirt road and regional rideshare programs, and that the AQTAC recommended programming \$7,509,000 to the remaining five projects/programs for FY 2014.

Chairman Moody asked if there were any questions or comments about Ms. Yazzie's presentation. Mr. Zuercher proposed swapping two City of Phoenix bicycle/pedestrian projects for funding consideration. He stated the City would like to swap the funded Grand Canal Multi-Use Path Connection at Thomas Road and 22nd Street with the unfunded Grand Canal Multi-Use Path Connection at Indian School Road and 16th Street. Mr. Zuercher explained the Indian School Road to 16th Street project was a higher priority for the City. Ms. Peggy Rubach, the Bicycle/Pedestrian Committee representative for TRC, echoed Mr. Zuercher's suggestion. She stated that the Bicycle/Pedestrian Committee had an extensive

discussion on how to program the unprogrammed balance. She stated the Bicycle/Pedestrian Committee would probably endorse the proposed change presented.

Chairman Moody inquired if there were any questions or comments about the bicycle/pedestrian projects being considered for CMAQ funding. Mr. Lance Calvert inquired about the City of Chandler bridge crossing project listed with \$2.5 million in local costs and \$2 million in regional costs. He stated that the project had received regional funds during a previous programming cycle and inquired if those funds were reflected in the regional costs listed in the table provided. Ms. Yazzie affirmed that the City of Chandler had received funding in a previous year adding she did not believe the table included the previous funding allocation.

Mr. Calvert inquired if Chandler was building the project in phases over multiple years or if the City was requesting incremental funding for the project, which would improve the likelihood of receiving additional funds. Mr. Zeder from Chandler replied that the City intended to build the project in one phase.

Mr. Calvert asked for clarification on the total project cost. He stated the amount programmed seemed high for a project in one location that had already gone through a programming cycle. He referenced an City of El Mirage project for \$ 3 million that was denied funding because the project cost was too high. He suggested in the future, MAG Staff should place a limit on the amount to avoid the occurrence from happening again.

Mr. Meinhart expressed support for the City of Phoenix's proposal to swap projects. He stated that during the ranking process, committees often are unaware of local agencies' project priorities. Mr. Meinhart also stated that in terms of federal funds a balance was needed between obligating funds in a timely manner and avoiding short changing quality projects. He cautioned the Committee about funding projects that would not get built.

Mr. Zuercher motioned to approve funding of bicycle/pedestrian projects as presented with the amendment that the Grand Canal Multi-Use Path Connection at Thomas Road and 22nd Street with the be swapped with Grand Canal Multi-Use Path Connection at Indian School Road and 16th Street. Mr. Zeder seconded the motion, and the motion with subsequently approved by a unanimous voice vote of the Committee.

Then, the Committee discussed programming CMAQ funds for ITS projects in FY 2014. Ms. Yazzie reiterated the ITS Committee's recommendation to fund all 13 projects submitted with the necessary cost adjustments. She stated the Committee could alter the regional share, reduce the regional cost share for one or more projects, or change the project scope for one or more projects.

Chairman Moody asked if there were any questions or comments about the ITS projects recommended for funding. Mr. Meinhart inquired if the Town of Fountain Hills, which was ranked the lowest priority, could reduce the project cost in lieu of reducing the regional share for the other projects. Mr. Randy Harrel, from the Town of Fountain Hills, replied the current project was packaged at the minimum initial system.

Mr. Zeder inquired what the funding percentage was as proposed. Ms. Yazzie stated that per the Regional Transportation Plan, ITS projects were typically funded at a 70/30 split.

However, the Committee could reduce the regional share from 70 percent to 62 percent to fund all the projects presented. She added that if the Committee decided to reduce the regional share to 62 percent, then per the Draft Federal Fund Programming Principles, a letter would be required from city managers certifying local funds were available to fund those projects or the project scopes would be reduced accordingly.

Mr. Clem Ligoeki from Maricopa County asked Ms. Debbie Albert, Vice Chair of the ITS Committee, how the ITS Committee envisioned the adjustments be made to accommodate funding every project. Ms. Albert replied that the Committee discussed several options, but did not make any specific recommendations. She added that it was the goal of the Committee to see all the projects funded.

Chairman Moody summarized the ramifications of reducing the regional share for all projects versus reducing the regional funding for the Fountain Hills' projects. He stated that if the funding share was reduced to 62 percent for all projects, then each affected city would be required to submit a letter to MAG certifying committed local funds; whereas, if the Fountain Hills' project funding was reduced then only Fountain Hills would be required to submit a letter to MAG.

Ms. Albert requested clarification that if the Committee decided to reduce the regional share to 62 percent could the cities affected either reduce the project scope to maintain the 70/30 split or maintain the project scope and increase the local funding. Ms. Yazzie replied yes.

Chairman Moody inquired about the time frame for the requirements if the regional share was dropped to 62 percent. Ms. Yazzie stated that MAG Staff would request letters certifying local funding within two weeks. She added that revised project data would be presented to the TRC for funding approval at the January meeting and be incorporated into the Draft FY 2011-2015 MAG TIP in February.

Mr. Grant Anderson inquired if any jurisdiction felt that dropping the regional share to 62 percent would have a total detrimental effect to any project. He added that he felt dropping the regional share would be the fairest approach. Mr. Cato Esquivel from the Town of Goodyear stated that a reduction in the regional share would have a negative impact on the Town's project.

Mr. Meinhart inquired if Goodyear could resubmit the project for additional funding consideration in FY 2015. Ms. Yazzie replied that MAG Staff was not programming CMAQ funds for FY 2015 at this time. Mr. Meinhart replied that maybe it was possible for Fountain Hills to resubmit the project for consideration during the FY 2015 programming cycle. Ms. Yazzie stated that Fountain Hills could request funds for FY 2015; however, the Town would be required to go through the submittal process again.

Mr. Zeder inquired if Fountain Hills could submit the project for federal fund closeout. Ms. Yazzie replied that Town could submit for closeout; however, that would have to occur in FY 2014. She added that if the amount of funding was reduced for the Fountain Hills' project, the Town would have to reduce the project scope to be included in the TIP at this time due to the fiscal constraint requirement. She stated that once the project had gone through the ADOT process that the project would be limited to the reduced scope during the federal fund closeout

process.

Chairman Moody stated he would entertain a motion at this time. Mr. Ligocki motioned to reduce the regional share to 62 percent for all projects to meet the amount of available funding. Mr. Grant Anderson seconded the motion. A brief discussion followed. Mr. Eric Anderson suggested that jurisdictions be allowed to reduce the project scope, if desired to maintain the 70/30 split, but keep the allocated funding the same. Mr. Ligocki and Mr. Grant Anderson agreed that the motion was intended to include that flexibility. Chairman Moody called a vote, and the motion was passed by a unanimous voice vote of the Committee.

Moving on, the Committee discussed the paving of unpaved road projects funding recommendations. Ms. Yazzie summarized the AQTAC recommendation to fully fund the first eight paving of unpaved projects with partial funding for the ninth project on the list.

Mr. Gino Turrubiarres from the Town of Guadalupe inquired why three projects from City of Peoria and two projects from the Town of Guadalupe were not recommended to receive funds. Ms. Yazzie explained projects were recommended for funding solely on the cost effectiveness scores. She stated the Peoria and Guadalupe projects ranked lower on cost effectiveness and that funding was exhausted before reaching those projects on the list.

Chairman Moody stated that from a Peoria standpoint, he would accept the partial payment because the city would be constructing the projects regardless. Mr. Grant Anderson asked if Chairman Moody was referring to the project below the line. Chairman Moody stated yes.

Mr. Lance Calvert motioned to fully fund the first eight paving of unpaved road projects with partial funding the Peoria project. Mr. Zuercher seconded the motion, and the motion passed by a unanimous voice vote of the Committee.

Next, the Committee addressed the programming of funds for air quality projects/programs. Ms. Yazzie summarized the earlier information, which included the elimination of the telework ozone/education program by the MAG Executive Committee and the revised handouts at their places.

Mr. Grant Anderson inquired if there were metrics or performance evaluations available for the projects/programs listed. Mr. Eric Anderson replied that when the Executive Committee reviewed the projects/programs, extensive materials were provided regarding how other metropolitan planning organization allocate funding to these programs. He added that MAG Staff could provide that information to the Committee after the meeting, if desired.

Mr. Grant Anderson replied that approaches from other regions may not meet the needs of the MAG region. He inquired how the Committee would know they were allocating the funds appropriately without metrics or evaluation criteria. Mr. Eric Anderson invited Mr. Dean Giles, the MAG Air Quality Planning Program Specialist, to address to the Committee. Mr. Giles stated the MAG Air Quality Division and AQTAC reviewed the projects/programs for any overlap occurring between the Regional Rideshare Program, the Valley Metro's Regional Clean Air Campaign, and Maricopa County's Clean Air - Make More Program. He clarified that the telework component eliminated by the MAG Executive Committee would be

incorporated into the Regional Rideshare Program.

Chairman Moody asked if there were any questions about the air quality projects/program recommended for funding. There were none. Mr. Bob Antilla from Valley Metro/RPTA motioned to approve the funding as presented. Mr. Brent Stoddard from the City of Mesa seconded the motion, and the motion was passed by a unanimous voice vote of the Committee.

9. Re-Allocation of Unused Local/MPO ARRA Funds – Technical Programming Issues

Chairman Moody invited Ms. Yazzie to present technical programming issues on the reallocation of unused Local/MPO ARRA funds. Ms. Yazzie referenced the memorandum disseminated in the agenda packet and summarized the ARRA discussions from the previous Committee meeting. She explained that three technical programming issues needed to be resolved regarding the programming of unused Local/MPO ARRA funds, which included establishing project savings programming threshold, assessing local project readiness, and developing a regional prioritized list.

Ms. Yazzie stated the current agenda item focused on establishing a project savings threshold and local project readiness. She explained that the information presented in the memorandum were ideas generated by MAG Staff, which included setting a minimum dollar or percentage that would trigger the reallocation of project savings back to the region for reprogramming. Ms. Yazzie stated that establishing a threshold was important given the administrative costs associated with implementing ARRA and/or STP funded projects. She presented a few scenarios that demonstrated the need for the threshold.

Mr. Zeder stated that at the previous meeting, the Committee discussed moving project savings from one project to another to reduce the local share on the second project. He asked how that option would work under the threshold scenario. Mr. Eric Anderson replied that the option to apply project savings to other ARRA projects was still available. He stated that if projects were in-process and ready to obligate, then allocating the project savings to the second project would be a choice. Mr. Anderson cautioned that the issue with that approach was if the project savings occurred on the second project after the first has gone to bid.

Mr. Ligocki inquired if ARRA project savings could be reallocated to non-ARRA projects. Mr. Eric Anderson replied FHWA was not accepting new ARRA projects and, as a result, ARRA savings could not be reallocated to a non-ARRA funded project. He stated that if an agency wanted to swap ARRA savings with ADOT-STP funds, then those funds could be applied to another federally eligible project; however, the federal local match requirement of 5.4 percent would still apply.

Mr. Ligocki inquired if the proposed threshold would apply to swapped ADOT-STP funds. Mr. Eric Anderson replied that MAG Staff would coordinate with each member agency by project to determine the best way to proceed. He added that for the current agenda item, MAG Staff was requesting guidance in situations where jurisdictions have a minimal amount of savings.

Mr. Stoddard asked if the Committee discussed the minimum threshold when the funds were originally allocated. A brief discussion followed.

Mr. Grant Anderson motioned to establish that the local agency with the ARRA project savings would have local discretion to move the project savings to another existing ARRA project in that jurisdiction and/or swap the ARRA funds with ADOT-STP funds and move the project savings to an eligible project, that is above \$500,000, including new projects, and can obligate before September 30, 2010. He added that any jurisdiction that could not meet the \$500,000 threshold and obligation deadline of September 30, 2010 will return the project savings to the regional pool for reallocation.

Mr. Ligocki inquired if \$500,000 in project savings could be transferred to transit capital projects. Ms. Yazzie replied that she did not have information available at the moment on ready-to-go capital transit projects. Mr. Terry Johnson from the City of Glendale stated that if an agency's saving exceeded \$500,000, then the agency could apply more than \$500,000 towards transit capital. Ms. Yazzie clarified that the \$500,000 in question would be the minimum threshold for project savings to remain with a jurisdiction or trigger reallocation to a regional pot. She stated that the local discretion approved at the previous Committee would still apply.

Mr. Calvert stated El Mirage would not support a threshold of \$500,000 given the original allocation of Local/MPO ARRA funds to the smaller jurisdictions in the region. He stated that a threshold of \$250,000 or \$200,000 would be more appropriate.

Mr. Johnson inquired if the minimum threshold pertained to total project cost or to the total project savings. Mr. Grant Anderson replied that the motion was to return the amount of project savings under \$500,000 to the regional pool for reallocation. Mr. Johnson replied that if the amount applied to project savings, then Glendale would oppose a threshold of \$500,000.

Mr. Bob Antilla inquired if MAG Staff could address the pros and cons of a \$500,000 versus a \$200,000 threshold in an effort to help guide the Committee in making a decision. Mr. Eric Anderson replied that there were limited options available to reprogram the ARRA savings regardless of the amount. He stated the options available would be minimal for all jurisdictions in the region citing the inability to fund new projects because of the obligation time frame. Mr. Anderson added that MAG Staff did not want to establish too high of a threshold because that would trigger all funds to be returned to the region.

Mr. Zeder stated that the goal was to keep local discretion and that the \$500,000 was too high. He questioned the need to establish any threshold for the reallocation of project savings. Mr. Calvert stated he would agree with the exception of the administrative costs associated with federally funded projects. Then, Mr. Calvert suggested amending the current motion to include a threshold of \$200,000 instead of the \$500,000 proposed.

Mr. Zeder requested to amend the previous motion to include a minimum project savings threshold of \$200,000, and Mr. Grant Anderson seconded. Mr. Grant Anderson inquired what options were available to local jurisdictions if project savings occurred. Ms. Yazzie replied

that agencies could apply the project savings to local match reduction or moving the funds to another ARRA project/eligible STP project.

Mr. Grant Anderson stated he thought local discretion was the first priority and inquired what happened if a jurisdiction had \$750,000 in project savings with no options available. Ms. Yazzie replied that if the project savings did not meet the threshold or the other requirements, then the project savings would be reallocated to the region for reprogramming. A brief discussion followed.

Chairman Moody called for a vote to amend the motion. The Committee voted 12 to nine to amend the motion. Then, Chairman Moody called for a vote on the amended motion. The motion passed with a vote of 13 to eight to approve the amended motion.

10. Development of MAG Transportation Financial Plan

Chairman Moody invited Mr. Eric Anderson to present on the development of the MAG Transportation Financial Plan. Mr. Anderson stated that during the certification review, FHWA and FTA recommended MAG develop a Transportation Financial Plan that addressed the underlying financial assumptions used for the Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) and Transportation Improvement Program (TIP). He stated the financial plan would need to include regional, state, and federal funds included in RTP and TIP.

Mr. Anderson announced that MAG would be required to include local funding in the financial plan. He explained the documented local funding would need to include dedicated funding sources as well as general fund revenues allocated towards transportation. Mr. Anderson stated the requirements were new and that historically, MAG had included a subjective analysis on the revenue sources.

Mr. Anderson explained the financial crisis and declining revenues had raised concerns about the fiscal constraint of the TIP and RTP. He stated for projects to be programmed in the first two years of the MAG TIP, funds must be committed to the projects. He added that for the out years of the RTP assumptions could be made that funds would be reasonably available.

Mr. Anderson informed the Committee that FHWA and FTA had concerns about transit operations and fiscal constraint. He stated the regional FTA representative questioned why the region continued to fund new capital expansion projects when operations for the current system was being reduced or eliminated.

Mr. Anderson presented a slide that addressed sales tax revenues. He stated that current sales tax revenues had decreased to 2005 levels. Then, he presented another slide that demonstrated the decline of sales tax revenues for eight continuous quarters. Mr. Anderson emphasized that while some may believe the economy would rebound soon to the previous projection levels, he did not believe this would happen. He opined that the region was on a lower trajectory for future revenues.

Mr. Anderson expressed concerns that during the development of the Transportation Financial Plan, member agencies may be projecting more growth than what MAG may be projecting. He emphasized that while a member agency may be able to provide documentation for the projections used that did not mean the projections were accurate or consistent with the regional projections.

Mr. Anderson informed the Committee that the MAG Transportation Financial Plan would be documenting the assumptions used by MAG as well as the MAG Member Agencies. He forewarned the Committee that MAG Staff might require jurisdictions to verify how submitted figures were determined. Mr. Anderson stated the development of the financial plan would likely begin in early 2010 and announced that MAG Staff would send out requests for additional information at that time.

Chairman Moody inquired if there were any questions or comments about the presentation. Mr. Zuercher inquired if the slides presented could be sent to the Committee. Mr. Anderson replied yes. Chairman Moody asked if there were any additional questions or comment, and there were none.

11. American Recovery and Reinvestment Act (ARRA) Monthly Status Report

Next, Chairman Moody invited Ms. Yazzie to provide a status report on the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act (ARRA) funding and project status. Ms. Yazzie explained the highlights of the report were that all highway projects were coming in below bid. She also reported that FHWA anticipated obligating all ARRA projects by the deadline of February 1, 2010.

12. Report on the Performance Measurement Framework and Congestion Management Update (PM/CMP) Study

Then, Chairman Moody invited Ms. Monique de los Rios-Urban from MAG to provide an update on the Performance Measurement Framework and Congestion Management Update (PM/CMP) Study. Ms. de los Rios-Urban announced the completion of Phase I and II of the PM/CMP Study adding that Phase III would begin in late December.

Ms. de los Rios-Urban informed the Committee that the deliverables for Phase I were a review of best practices, the development of a Technical Advisory Committee (TAC), and recommendations from the TAC on performance measures to be included in Phase II of the study. She stated the deliverables for Phase II of the study included a data assessment report,

a gap analysis, a performance measurement framework, a template report, a website interface, and recommendations on future performance measures. She explained that Phase III would include an congestion management process update, which was mandated under federal law.

Ms. de los Rios-Urban listed key reasons for developing performance measures in the region. The reasons listed included:

- Evaluating performance and regional strategies at the system/corridor level for all transportation modes;
- Compliance with legislative requirements, such as the Proposition 400 Performance Audit (state requirement) and the Congestion Management Process updates (federal requirement);
- Updating Regional Congestion Management Strategies to facilitate system programming and evaluation using Performance Measurements as a reference.

She stated that performance measurement was important to the MAG region because it would deliver results and establish accountability; provide feedback relative to goals; measure results for tracking progress, and improve transportation service to the public.

Ms. de los Rios-Urban summarized approaches to reporting performance in the region. She stated that historically MAG has used simulated results and compared those results with base year and no build scenarios. She explained the simulated approach was used in the development of the RTP and the Annual Report on the Implementation of Proposition 400.

Ms. de los Rios-Urban stated the PM/CMP Study team focused on creating a performance measurement framework consistent with achieving the goals and objectives of the RTP, which included (1) system preservation and safety; (2) access and mobility; (3) sustaining the environment; and (4) accountability and planning. Ms. de los Rios-Urban announced that the performance measurement framework was multi-modal by the goals of the RTP. Due to time constraints, she provided an overview of the measures established, such as:

Mode - Freeway GP lanes and HOV Lane Performance

Goal: Access and Mobility Measures

- Throughput – Vehicle (AADT) and (AAWDT)
- Throughput – Freight (Estimated Truck Volume)
- Per Capita Vehicle-Miles of Travel (VMT)
- Lost Productivity (Percent of Productivity Lost)

Goal: Travel Time, Travel Time Variability, and Delay Measures

- Speed (Average Corridor and Point-based Speeds)
- Point-to-Point Travel Times (Average Commute Time)
- Travel Time Variability (Average Travel Time, Travel Time and Buffer Indices)
- Extent of Congestion (Percent of Time Congested)

Goal: Safety Measures

- Crash/Injury/Fatality Rates on Freeways (Crashes per Million VMT)
- Crash/Injury/Fatality Totals for Large Truck-Involved Crashes on Freeways (Total Number of Truck-Involved Crashes)

Mode - Arterial Performance

Goal: Access and Mobility Measures

- Throughput – Vehicle (Weighted Corridor Throughput)
- Travel Time, Travel Time Variability, and Delay Measures
- Spatial Extent of Congestion (Percent of Time Congested)

Goal: Safety Measures

- Intersection Crash Ranking
- Crash/Injury/Fatality Totals for Large Truck-Involved Crashes on the Arterial System (Total Number of Truck-Involved Crashes)

Mode - Transit Performance

Goal: Access and Mobility Measures

- Transit Boardings (Total Number of Annual Transit Boardings)
- Boardings per Revenue Mile (Total Number of Annual Transit Boardings / Total Number of Transit Agency Revenue Miles)
- Travel Time, Travel Variability, Delay Measures
- Transit On-Time Performance (Percentage of “On-Time” Trips)

Goal: System Accessibility and Modal Options Measures

- Percent of Park and Ride Capacity Used
- Vehicle Revenue Miles of Transit Service per Agency
- Subsidy Per Boarding
- Transit Share of Travel

Mode - Pedestrian Performance

Goal: Safety Measures

- Bicycle and Pedestrian Crash Totals for the MAG Region
- System Accessibility and Modal Options Measures
- Bicycle and Pedestrian Share of Travel (Estimate of the Percentage of Total Commuter Trips Made by People on Bicycles or Pedestrians)

After providing an overview of the framework developed, Chairman Moody inquired if the Committee had any questions or comment about Ms. de los Rios-Urban’s presentation. Mr. Zuercher inquired if the transit measures included light rail transit (LRT) and if LRT would be combined with or separate from bus transit. Ms. de los Rios-Urban stated she was unsure how transit would be handled at this point.

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

13. Request for Future Agenda Items

Chairman Moody inquired if the members had any topics or issues of interest they would like to have considered for discussion at a future Committee meeting. There were none, and Chairman Moody moved onto the next agenda item.

14. 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.

15. Next Meeting Date

Chairman Moody informed members in attendance that the next regularly scheduled meeting of the Committee would be held on January 28, 2010. There be no further business, Chairman Moody adjourned the meeting at 12:04 p.m.