

DRAFT MINUTES OF THE
MARICOPA ASSOCIATION OF GOVERNMENTS
TRANSPORTATION REVIEW COMMITTEE

November 23, 2004

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

MEMBERS ATTENDING

Scottsdale: Mary O'Connor for Jan Dolan, Chairperson	Litchfield Park: Mike Cartsonis
ADOT: Dan Lance	Maricopa County: Mike Sabatini, for Mike Ellegood
Avondale: David Fitzhugh	Mesa: Jim Huling for Jeff Martin
Chandler: Patrice Kraus	Paradise Valley: Robert M. Cicarelli
*Fountain Hills: Randy Harrel	Peoria: David Moody
+Gila Bend: Lynn Farmer	Phoenix: Tom Callow for Phoenix
Gilbert: Brian Townsend for Tami Ryall	RPTA: Bryan Jungwirth
Glendale: Jim Book	Surprise: Randy Overmyer
Goodyear: Grant Anderson	Tempe: Carlos De Leon
*Guadalupe, Antonio Figueroa - Iturralda	*Wickenburg: Shane Dille

EX-OFFICIO MEMBERS ATTENDING

Regional Bicycle Task Force: Randi Alcott, RPTA	Pedestrian Working Group: Eric Iwersen, City of Tempe
Street Committee: Don Herp, Phoenix	*Telecommunications Advisory Group:
ITS Committee: Jim Book	
* Members neither present nor represented by proxy.	+ Video Conference

OTHERS PRESENT

Eric Anderson, MAG	Clemenc Ligocki, MCDOT
Ken Hall, MAG	Robert Yabes, City of Tempe
Paul Ward, MAG	John Dugan, Pharos/BNSF
Steve Tate, MAG	Jonathan Lindsey, Fennemore Craig/BNSF
Ali Makarachi, City of Phoenix	Bill Hayden, ADOT
Peggy Carpenter, City of Scottsdale	Steve Jimenez, ADOT
Chris Voigt, MAG	Kwi-Sung Kang, ADOT
Terry Johnson, City of Glendale	Mark Young, Town of Queen Creek
Lynn Timmons, City of Phoenix	Kevin Wallace, City of Mesa
Stuart Boggs, RPTA	Mike Connors, HDR
Tom Remes, MAG	John McNamara, DMJM and Harris
Sarath Joshua, MAG	Steve Wilcox, DMJM and Harris

1. Call to Order

In the absence of Chairperson Jan Dolan, Mr. Tom Callow called the meeting to order at 1:05 p.m.

2. Approval of June 24, 2004 Minutes

Addressing the first order of business, Mr. Callow asked if there were any changes or amendments to the meeting minutes. Mr. Jim Huling moved to approve the minutes as presented. Mr. Dan Lance 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 to the next item on the Agenda.

4. Transportation Director's Report

Mr. Callow introduced Mr. Eric Anderson, MAG Transportation Director, to provide the Transportation Director's report. Mr. Anderson addressed the recent passage of Proposition 400 on November 2, 2004. He thanked the Committee members in attendance; MAG member agencies; the MAG Transportation Policy Committee; the MAG Management Committee; the MAG Regional Council; and all of those individuals, government committees and citizen groups for their assistance in the passing of Proposition 400. Mr. Anderson acknowledged the hard work associated with developing the plan, and the tremendous effort that went into the passage of Proposition 400 before the legislature. Mr. Anderson then provided a brief summary of the Regional Area Road Funds (RARF) and the Highway User Revenue Funds (HURF), and stated that the overall collections for the Regional Freeway Program were on target for FY 2005 and are in line with the projections for 2006 and 2007, and that the numbers looked very good.

Mr. Anderson stated that as a result of Proposition 400, there would be a significant amount of work to be done in order to establish a solid base for the successful implementation of the Regional Transportation Plan. He addressed recent efforts to program projects for Phase I of the plan for arterial streets, freeways and highways, transit, and other modes. He also informed the Committee that the MAG Transportation Division is in the process of assessing its current resources, and has decided to increase staff capacity in the Modeling Section of the Division, which is a key activity area for the agency. He informed the Committee that it was MAG's intent to add a Transportation Modeling Specialist in the near future, and that transportation staff management was also in the process of assessing other functions of the division to ensure efficient, and adequate staff resources as the agency moves into the full implementation of the Regional Transportation Plan.

Mr. Anderson then informed the Committee that MAG Staff was in the process of developing the Fiscal Year (FY) 2006 Unified Planning Work Program and Annual Budget, and that transportation staff was beginning to identify a list of potential consultant and in-house projects for the upcoming year. Mr. Anderson said that staff would be very interested in obtaining input from the TRC regarding the types of consultant projects that they would like to see in the FY 2006 work plan. He informed the Committee that the final draft version of the FY 2006 Unified Work Program and Annual Budget would be going to the MAG Management Committee in May of 2005, and to the MAG Regional Council for final approval in June of 2005. Mr. Anderson then informed the Committee of recent appointments of the Chairs of the Transportation Committees in the Arizona Senate and the Arizona House of Representatives. Mr. Anderson then addressed several questions from the Committee, and concluded his report.

5. Consent Agenda

Addressing the next order of business, Mr. Callow addressed Agenda item #6 (ADOT Red Letter Process), and asked members in attendance if they would like to entertain a motion to approve the item as presented, or to remove the item for discussion. Mr. David Moody moved to recommend approval of consent Agenda item #6. Ms. Mary O'Connor seconded, and the motion was unanimously approved by subsequent voice vote of the Committee.

7. Proposed Amendment and Administrative Adjustment to the FY 2004-2007 Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) for Highway Projects

Addressing the next order of business, Mr. Callow introduced Mr. Paul Ward, MAG Transportation Programming Manager, to provide an update on the proposed amendment and administrative adjustment to the FY 2004-2007 Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) for highway projects. Mr. Ward called the Committee's attention to a table located in Attachment Two of the Agenda packet. Mr. Ward informed the Committee that the City of Glendale is essentially requesting to change the description of a project at Loop 101 and Maryland Avenue in order to increase the amount of local funds being programmed, and to show the number of lanes as being increased. Mr. Ward informed the Committee that the Glendale project would only require an administrative adjustment to accomplish the change.

Mr. Ward stated that the Maricopa County request is to add five new, locally/privately funded, regionally significant projects, and two non-regionally significant projects to FY 2005 and that the City of Apache Junction is also requesting to add one new, locally funded, regionally significant project to FY 2005. He stated that these agencies' requests would require a full TIP amendment, including an air quality regional emissions analysis, which is expected to be completed by January, 2005.

Discussion followed, and Mr. Jim Book moved to approve the proposed amendment and administrative adjustment to the FY 2004-2007 MAG TIP, as presented. Mr. Grant Anderson seconded, and the motion was unanimously approved by subsequent voice vote of the Committee. This concluded Mr. Ward's presentation to the Committee.

8. Projects Submitted for Consideration for MAG Federal Funds in FYs 2008, 2009 and 2010 in the FY 2006-2010 Draft MAG Transportation Improvement Program

Addressing the next order of business, Mr. Tom Callow introduced Mr. Paul Ward, MAG Transportation Programming Manager, to provide an update on the ITS, Bicycle and Pedestrian and Air Quality/Transportation Demand Management projects that were submitted for consideration in the FY 2006-2010 Transportation Improvement Program (TIP). Mr. Ward called the Committee's attention to the screen at the front of the room, and informed those in attendance that the TIP development process was comprised of four main components, which included the MAG Federally funded program; the State Highway Program for projects in the MAG Region; Regional transit projects (including light rail); and city, town and agency projects that are locally developed, either with public or privately obtained funds from developers, or through joint public-private agreements.

Mr. Ward then provided a chronological overview of the current TIP schedule. He stated that the TIP Guidance Report was completed in July of 2004; all project applications were provided to MAG by September 10; the CMS and CMAQ Scores were finalized by the end of September; and that modal TAC rankings were completed by November. Approval of the MAG Federally funded program by the TRC, Management Committee, TPC, and Regional Council is expected to take place in December, 2004, and January, 2005. He stated that the Draft TIP for an Air Quality Conformity Analysis was scheduled for approval in March, and that the air quality conformity analysis was expected to be ran during the April/May time frame. Mr. Ward stated that the final approval(s) of the MAG TIP would take place in June and/or July, including a formal Public Hearing in mid-July. Following this process, the MAG TIP would be forwarded to the Governor (or her designee) for approval by August or September of 2005.

Mr. Ward then addressed the Committee concerning the issue of available funding estimates for federal Surface Transportation Program (STP-MAG) and Congestion Mitigation and Air Quality (CMAQ) program funds. Mr. Ward stated that while the final estimates of available funds would not be known until federal transportation reauthorization legislation is passed, it is anticipated that STP-MAG Funds will increase by about 10 percent over the existing TEA-21 funding levels. Mr. Ward stated that this expected increase would provide an annual average of \$56.1 million in available STP-MAG funding over the next five years. A total of \$34.1 million in STP-MAG is annually committed to freeways, and the remainder in fiscal years 2008 through 2010 is fully committed to arterials.

Mr. Ward then informed the Committee that future CMAQ funding may decrease by as much as 10 percent from previous TEA-21 levels. Mr. Ward said that an annual average of \$45.2 million is expected to be available for CMAQ funding over the next five years of the TIP. Mr. Ward stated that, from FY 2008 to FY 2010, \$29.5 million will be committed to freeways, streets, and transit as stated within the MAG Regional Transportation Plan (RTP), and that the remaining amount of funding will be allocated to Intelligent Transportation Systems (ITS), Bicycle and Pedestrian projects, and Air Quality projects. Mr. Ward addressed future RTP allocations, and informed the Committee that STP-MAG funds would likely be fully committed to the Arterial Program; whereas CMAQ funds would be split between Air Quality, Arterial Program (and ITS), Bicycle, Freeway, Light Rail and

Pedestrian projects.

Mr. Ward then addressed CMAQ funding allocations for a number of transportation modes as identified within the RTP. He reported that the RTP allocates 19.1 percent of funding for freeways; 13.4 percent for arterials (including ITS projects); 35.9 percent for light rail; 17 percent for bicycle and pedestrian projects; and 14.6 percent for air quality projects (including Transportation Demand Management (TDM) projects and paving of dirt roads). These percentages translate into approximately \$6.7 million for Air Quality (and TDM) projects; \$7.8 million for Bicycle/Pedestrian projects; and \$2.5 million for ITS projects. All of the funds available are shown in current dollars, except for ITS projects which are presently listed in non-inflated dollars. Mr. Ward then provided an overview of expected RTP allocations by MAG Agency, based on the TAC ranked projects.

Mr. Ward handed out a table to the Committee, which was intended to replace the project tables originally included within Attachment Three of the TRC Agenda packet, which was mailed on November 16, 2004. The table provided projects grouped by mode and year and sorted by overall TAC rankings. Funding type, Air Quality scores and the amount of local and federal costs were also shown. Mr. Ward addressed the updated project list, and said that the projects identified in the tables represented those projects which were recommended for funding by their respective TAC. He then highlighted the funding categories containing air quality (including Transportation Demand Management projects), bicycle, ITS and pedestrian projects. Mr. Ward specifically addressed the ITS category, and stated that there were a total of 33 projects. He stated that the top ranked projects by the ITS Committee were programmed for FY 2008-2010; whereas the lower ranked projects were listed as "2020" which means that they are unprogrammed at this time.

Discussion followed, and several members in attendance inquired about the commitment of \$2.5 million per year to ITS projects, and asked whether the available amounts may or may not be adjusted for inflation. Mr. Ward stated that ITS projects are supposed to receive a total of \$50.0 million over the next 20 years, as stated in the MAG RTP. He reported that most of the funds are specifically listed as being in FY 2002 dollars and that it seemed appropriate that the funds for ITS projects should also be stated in the same way. If so, there would be approximately \$1.7 million more for ITS projects.

Mr. Jim Book, who also serves as the ITS Chairman, said that the ITS Committee is one of the few committees that can specifically commit CMAQ funds and spend them in a timely manner. Mr. Book addressed the concept of required federal matching ratios, and stated that the current breakdown allows for each eligible project to receive a maximum of 94.3 percent in federal CMAQ funds, and to contribute a minimum local match of 5.7 percent. Mr. Book stated that in the past, member agencies took it upon themselves to commit more than the required 5.7 percent match, even though they were not required to do so. He stated that requiring amounts that exceed this minimum of 5.7 percent would become a hardship for local governments. Mr. Book stated that the 30 percent local match was too high, and asked the Committee to treat the ITS mode at a local match of 5.7 percent, and to consider the concept of inflation for the remaining modes. There was discussion by the Committee concerning the RTP requirement for a larger 30 percent match for Street projects that is also applied to ITS projects.

Ms. Mary O'Connor stated that she had several concerns over the allocations for bicycle and pedestrian projects, and asked whether there were available options to expend more money on these modes from available funding sources. Mr. Anderson stated that none of the sales tax monies could be used on bicycle or pedestrian projects. Mr. Anderson said that although this concern could allow for the region to revisit STP-MAG and CMAQ allocations in the future, the reality of the situation has more to do with the fact that federal transportation reauthorization is not in place and there aren't any set formulas for funding. Thus it would be inappropriate to make any funding changes at this time.

Mr. Brian Jungwirth then stated that he had concerns regarding the amount of CMAQ funding that would be available, and inquired about any additional funding or other options to acquire money. Mr. Anderson stated that the way in which CMAQ funding is allocated is unlikely to be substantially changed. He said the current allocations were for specific projects, and that the funding was already identified in the RTP. However, Mr. Anderson stated that if CMAQ funding levels are lower as the result of reauthorization, then it may be necessary to revisit the numbers in the future. Mr. Dan Lance informed those in attendance about the availability of State Transportation Enhancement funds through ADOT. He stated that although the funding is somewhat limited, and that there is competition by various entities throughout the state, enhancement funds represent another option that is available to MAG member agencies.

Mr. Grant Anderson stated that although the ITS Committee projects should remain with the rest of the modal projects in terms of their match requirements at 30 percent, the funds available for ITS projects should move with inflation. Mr. Tom Callow asked whether the Committee would like to act on this item. Mr. Grant Anderson suggested that it be placed as an Agenda item at the upcoming TRC meeting for action at that time. Discussion followed, and Mr. Eric Anderson stated the item can be moved, and that MAG Staff would address policy issues, along with recommended changes at the next TRC meeting scheduled for December 16, 2004. Mr. Carlos De Leon moved to table the discussion of the ITS match request, in addition to any clarifications regarding what effect the request would have on other modes, to the upcoming meeting of the TRC, which is scheduled for December 16, 2004. Mr. Jim Book seconded, and the motion was subsequently passed by unanimous voice vote of the Committee. There were no additional questions pertaining to this item, and this concluded Mr. Ward's presentation.

9. Discussion of the Draft FY 2006-2010 Regional Freeway Program

Addressing the next order of business, Mr. Tom Callow introduced Mr. Bill Hayden of ADOT, to provide an overview of the Draft FY 2006-2010 Regional Freeway Program. Mr. Hayden called the Committee's attention to the screen at the front of the room, and displayed a map of the MAG Region. Mr. Hayden addressed the first phase Implementation Strategy, and highlighted the process for developing and implementing a management consultant program. Mr. Hayden stated that it was the intent of ADOT to utilize a total of three consultants to oversee the entire MAG Region, which would report directly to ADOT. He informed the Committee that design work on a number of segments in the regional freeway program were not completed, and that ADOT would rely upon extensive use of consultant

engineering capabilities to accelerate design plans. Mr. Hayden said that it was the intent of ADOT to construct the facilities as soon as possible, and that ADOT would use bonding to accelerate construction and initiate a financial management plan for the refinement of the life cycle program.

Mr. Hayden addressed Phase I of the Regional Transportation Plan from FY 2006 to 2010. He informed those in attendance of funding for new freeway corridors, existing corridor widenings and improvements, High Occupancy Vehicle (HOV) lanes, general purpose lanes, and right-of-way projects. He also stated that there were a total of four Transportation Interchange projects that would occur during Phase I of the Regional Freeway Program, and that there were a total of 50 miles of the system under study, which included environmental assessment and alignment studies. Mr. Hayden addressed corridor widenings and improvements along US 60, the Loop 202, State Route 85 and I-10, and informed those in attendance that Phase I represented a very ambitious program.

Mr. Hayden then addressed the rubberized asphalt plan for the Regional Freeway Program, and stated that to date, a total of 75 miles of regional freeways have been paved with rubberized asphalt. He stated that \$30 million of the originally allocated \$39 million for rubberized asphalt has been expended, and that an additional 38 miles of highway are scheduled to receive rubberized asphalt as part of the FY 2006 to FY 2010 Regional Freeway Program. Mr. Hayden also addressed landscaping, and the accelerated maintenance program.

Mr. Hayden then answered several questions from the Committee concerning design plans and various construction aspects associated with the Program. Discussion followed, and Mr. Grant Anderson addressed the west section of I-10 from Dysart Road to the area west of Loop 303. Mr. Anderson stated that the referenced section of I-10 needed serious improvement, and had significant ramifications on the economic development efforts associated with several west valley communities. He informed the Committee that the condition of I-10 also had implications for the City of Phoenix, because this area represented the gateway into the metropolitan area for traffic coming from the west. Mr. Anderson informed the Committee that the enhancement of the corridor is in serious need of improvement, and that the City of Goodyear was willing to commit itself to work with ADOT to do whatever it could to ensure that the corridor was taken care of early on in the RTP process. Mr. Anderson said that improvements for the I-10 corridor were currently listed in Phase II of the MAG RTP, and that it was imperative that the improvements were moved up to Phase I.

Discussion followed about possible acceleration of the project from Phase II to Phase I. Mr. David Fitzhugh said that he had serious concerns about communities attempting to accelerate projects in the MAG RTP process. Mr. Eric Anderson stated that some of the dollar amounts in Phase I may be changed, and then addressed the concept of acceleration. Mr. Eric Anderson stated that under the MAG Freeway Acceleration Policy, there were several possibilities for acceleration. He said that a jurisdiction could provide the funding for a project up front and apply for a repayment, but that the project would have to go through the MAG TIP and RTP amendment processes. He informed the Committee that there could also be a systemwide acceleration. Especially as the tax is collected over the course of the 20-

year period, and the region is in a position where it collects more money than is necessary and has the ability to move projects forward. He also addressed situations where there may be a time delay due to environmental assessments, where money cannot be spent until the studies are complete.

Further discussion followed concerning system HOV and General purpose lanes, and rubberized asphalt. Mr. Carlos De Leon then addressed the Committee, and stated that he would like to see a rubberized asphalt surface completed for the section of Loop 202 in the City of Tempe as soon as possible. Mr. Dan Lance called the Committee's attention to page 6 of Attachment Four located in the Agenda Packet, and informed those in attendance that there was a total of \$30 million programmed for rubberized asphalt in Fiscal Years 2006, 2007 and 2008. Mr. Lance stated that this \$30.0 million represents the first such expenditures toward the \$75.0 million regional set aside for noise mitigation in the MAG RTP. Mr. Lance stated that ADOT is currently working on Phase I segment recommendations to address rubberized asphalt gaps in the system, and that the recommendations would be forthcoming over the next several months. Further discussion followed concerning the Loop 303, the future South Mountain Freeway Alignment, and the acceleration of the I-10. There were also several questions and further discussion pertaining to lane widenings along the US 60 Superstition Freeway, concerning the communities of Tempe and Mesa.

Following further discussion, Mr. Tom Callow asked for a motion on this item. Mr. Eric Anderson informed the Committee that several items associated with the FY 2006-2010 Regional Freeway Program needed clarification, and that the item could be brought back to the December 16, 2004, meeting of the TRC. Mr. Eric Iwersen moved to delay this a decision on the FY 2006-2010 Regional Freeway Program until the next meeting of the TRC on December 16, 2004, and to allow for internal staff clarification on program issues. Mr. Jim Huling seconded, and the motion was subsequently passed by unanimous voice vote of the Committee. There were no further questions, and Mr. Callow thanked Mr. Bill Hayden of ADOT for his presentation, and for taking the time to address the Committee.

10. Arterial Life Cycle Program Update

Addressing the next order of business, Mr. Callow introduced Mr. Eric Anderson, MAG Transportation Director, to provide an update on the Arterial Life Cycle Program. Mr. Anderson called the Committee's attention to a map projected on the screen at the front of the room, which displayed the results of Proposition 400 by voting precinct. Mr. Anderson said that the successful approval of Proposition 400 to continue the half-cent sales tax for transportation was the result of a lot of hard work, and that it was well received by the general public. Mr. Anderson also informed the Committee that House Bill 2456 specifically stated that MAG was required to adopt a budget process, which ensures that the estimated cost of the arterial street mode does not exceed the total amount of estimated revenue that is to be available for the arterial street mode. Mr. Anderson then handed out a table to the Committee, which listed each arterial project by jurisdiction for Phase I of the MAG RTP.

Mr. Anderson informed the Committee that the MAG RTP Arterial Life Cycle Program

involved an allocation of over \$1.4 billion over a 20-year period. He said that the program included 62 street projects in the amount of approximately \$1.3 billion, 34 intersection projects in the amount of \$113 million, and a \$50 million set aside for arterial ITS projects. Mr. Anderson said that program would generate approximately \$863 million in revenues from the half-cent sales tax. In addition to the sales tax, he said that the program would also incorporate \$105 million from Congestion Mitigation and Air Quality (CMAQ) program funds, and \$497 million in federal Surface Transportation Program (STP-MAG) funds over the 20-year period.

Mr. Anderson then addressed a number of factors associated with the MAG RTP Arterial Life Cycle Program. He stated that the program must include all arterial projects as identified in the RTP, and that there must be sufficient resources to construct all projects in the program over the duration of the planning horizon. Mr. Anderson informed those in attendance that many of the projects have not yet been fully scoped or designed, and that funding from third parties, such as private developers, would be encouraged. Mr. Anderson also stated that an important element of the cycle was to ensure that adequate funds are available prior to construction. Mr. Anderson went on to state that jurisdictions should be able to advance construct projects and be reimbursed according to the adopted schedule.

Discussion followed, and then Mr. Anderson addressed a number of important policy points that were previously discussed with the MAG Transportation Policy Committee. He said that when considering future arterial projects, that it was necessary for a lead agency to be designated. Mr. Anderson said that this concept was especially important in situations where a project was located in multiple jurisdictions. Mr. Anderson also addressed project agreements, project changes, fixed regional budgets, the reallocation of unused project funds, and project reimbursements. Mr. Anderson addressed several questions pertaining to reimbursements, and said that the process would involve a city or community directly submitting an invoice to MAG, which in turn, would submit the invoice to ADOT for the disbursement of funds once the request and project completion status (in accordance with a project milestone) was approved by MAG. Mr. Anderson also addressed reporting requirements and audit considerations.

Mr. Anderson then addressed various reporting activities associated with the MAG RTP Arterial Life Cycle Program. He stated that MAG would be required to complete an Annual Report, which provides an overview of project status by mode, and also provides for a detailed analysis of financial revenues and expenditures for each mode throughout the 20-year planning horizon of the RTP. Mr. Anderson also informed the Committee that MAG Staff was currently in the process of developing an annual report for the Regional Transportation Plan. Mr. Anderson said that there would also be a required annual financial audit, and a Five-year performance audit that would be completed at intervals over the 20-year planning horizon.

Mr. Anderson informed the Committee that the draft projects associated with the Arterial Life Cycle Program would be included within the FY 2006-2010 Draft TIP, which is scheduled for completion and MAG Regional Council approval in January of 2005. Mr. Anderson addressed the Phase I arterial projects in the table that was handed out to the Committee, and informed those in attendance that a refined version of the projects would be

included for the Committee's review and approval at the upcoming meeting in December. Mr. Anderson answered questions pertaining to the Arterial Life Cycle Program from a number of Committee members, and concluded his presentation. There were no further questions.

11. TRC Meeting Schedule for 2005

Mr. Eric Anderson called the Committee's attention to Attachment Six of the agenda packet, and addressed the meeting schedule for 2005. There were no questions from the Committee.

12. Next Meeting Date

Mr. Tom Callow informed members in attendance that the next meeting of the Committee would be held on December 16, 2004. There being no further business, Mr. Callow adjourned the meeting at 2:38 p.m.