

MINUTES OF THE
MARICOPA ASSOCIATION OF GOVERNMENTS
TRANSPORTATION REVIEW COMMITTEE

June 26, 2001

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

MEMBERS ATTENDING

Wickenburg: Fred Carpenter, Chair	Guadalupe, Mark Johnson
Phoenix: Lynn Timmons for Jack Tevlin, Vice-Chair	*Litchfield Park: Mike Cartsonis
ADOT: Chuck Eaton for Dan Lance	Maricopa County: Tom Buick
*Avondale: Michael Powell	Mesa: Jeff Martin for Ron Krosting
*Buckeye: Joe Blanton	Paradise Valley: Robert M. Cicarelli
Chandler: Patrick McDermott for Bryan Patterson	Peoria: David Moody
Fountain Hills: Randy Harrell	RPTA: Bryan Jungwirth for Ken Driggs
*Gila Bend: Shane Dille	Scottsdale: Michelle Korf
Gilbert: Tami Ryall	*Surprise: Miryam Gutier
Glendale: Jim Book	Tempe: Glenn Kephart
Goodyear: Grant Anderson	

EX-OFFICIO MEMBERS ATTENDING

*Regional Bicycle Task Force: Maureen Mageau-Decindis, RPTA for Eric Iwersen, Tempe	Pedestrian Working Group: Reed Kempton, Maricopa County Dept of Transportation
*Street Committee: Don Herp, Phoenix	*Telecommunications Advisory Group: Jim Hull
ITS Committee: Jim Book, Mesa	

* Members neither present nor represented by proxy.

OTHERS PRESENT

Eric Anderson, MAG	Bob Antila, RTPA
Paul Ward, MAG	Stephen Tate, MAG
Chuck Williams, MCDOT	Ali Makarachi, City of Phoenix
Terry Johnson, Glendale	Andrew Smith, ADOT
Mike Sabatini, MDOT	Blue Crowley
Dawn Coomer, MAG	Sarath Joshua, MAG
Deborah Betzold, MCDOT	Chris Voigt, MAG
Chris Plumb, MCDOT	Ed Stillings, FHWA
Bill Vachon, FHWA	Ken Hall, MAG

1. Call to Order

Fred Carpenter, Chairman, called the meeting to order at 9:08 a.m.

2. Approval of May 22, 2001 Minutes

Addressing the first order of business, Chairman Carpenter asked if there were any changes or amendments to the meeting minutes. Mr. Jeff Martin moved to approve the minutes, with Mr. Bryan Jungwirth seconding. The minutes were subsequently approved by unanimous voice vote.

3. Call to the Audience

Chairman Carpenter noted that he had not received any request to speak cards from the audience, and moved to the next item on the Agenda.

4. Transportation Managers Report

Chairman Carpenter introduced MAG Transportation Manager, Mr. Eric Anderson, who gave the Transportation Manager's report. Mr. Anderson provided the Committee with an overview of the MAG Regional Transportation Planning process, and stated that a total of sixteen Focus Groups were conducted throughout various areas of the region. Mr. Anderson stated that MAG conducted a total of four meetings out of the sixteen, which included a West-South Phoenix Focus Group, a Southeast Valley (Gilbert) Focus Group, an Afro-American Focus Group and a Hispanic-American Focus Group. Mr. Anderson stated that the consultant was in the process of completing a Draft *State of the Region* Report, which was expected to be completed by the end of the week or during the first week of July. He informed members of the Committee that the consultant was also completed with the five Issue Papers that resulted from the Expert Panel Forums, and that he would provide them to members of the Committee, or interested entities or individuals upon request. He stated that the issue papers would be made available by mail, or that they could also be sent out electronically by E-mail.

When addressing contractual items of the RTP planning process, Mr. Anderson stated that the consultant had provided two video tapes of the forums, which consisted of the opening dinner and the land use forum. He stated that he did not have an opportunity to view them, but will assess their overall format and quality as soon as possible. Mr. Anderson went on to address Task #6 of the RTP Contract between MAG and the consultant, which specifically involves the development of alternative growth concepts and transportation options. Mr. Anderson stated that the consultant will be conducting a presentation before the Planners Work Group during the month of July, and that this will be an important meeting in the completion of developing scenarios for the region.

Mr. Anderson informed members of the Committee that MAG was in the process of issuing formal RFPs for the Southwest, Northwest and Southeast Valley sub-area studies. He stated that MAG Staff recently conducted a meeting in the City of Apache Junction with several southeast Valley communities and Pinal County representatives to address needs and concerns to consider for the Southeast Valley Sub-Area study. He said that this was a very productive meeting, and that he is anticipating a higher level of cooperation and coordination from those governments involved in the process.

Mr. Anderson then announced that on Tuesday there would be a final phase hearing for the five-year TIP and long-range plan. He informed the Committee that there was a finding of conformity out of the process and that the plan would be forwarded to the upcoming MAG Management Committee and Regional Council for approval. He mentioned that MAG was also in the process of conducting three public stakeholder's meetings in an effort to obtain early input for the upcoming 2003-2007 TIP planning process. An early input stakeholder's meeting will also be held for agencies. In addition, Mr. Anderson informed Committee Members that the Governor's Vision 21 Task Force would be conducting a meeting tomorrow at the State Capitol, which was designed to address the public meeting process for the upcoming year. There were no questions from the Committee, and this concluded Mr. Anderson's report.

5. Report on the MAG Freeway Program

Addressing the next order of business, Chairman Carpenter introduced Mr. Eric Anderson of MAG who briefed the Committee on the MAG Freeway Program. Mr. Anderson began his report by informing members of the Committee that on June 21, 2001, the MAG Regional Council approved a schedule change for delay of the South Mountain Freeway by two years in order to align the schedule to coincide with the completion of a required Environmental Impact Statement. Mr. Anderson also stated that next month the Regional Council would consider a request by the City of Mesa and the Town of Gilbert to swap segments of the San Tan and Red Mountain Freeways, which are both about the same cost. These two freeway segments include a segment of Power Road to University Drive along the Red Mountain Freeway, and a Williams Field to Power Road segment on the San Tan Freeway. Mr. Anderson stated that he did not foresee any issues or concerns with this request by the two communities, and anticipates that the request will go through without any problems.

Mr. Anderson then addressed the issue of reconvening the right-of-way stakeholders group to assess the issue of obtaining right-of-way within the San Tan Freeway Corridor. He informed the Committee that if purchases of right-of-way can be completed during the initial phases of the freeway development process, that the overall cost savings throughout the long run duration of the project would be substantial.

Mr. Anderson informed the Committee that recent HURF revenues were on target, and that overall RARF revenues were also on target for the month of May. There were no questions from the Committee, and this concluded Mr. Anderson's report.

6. Approval of Consent Agenda

Turning to the next item of business, Chairman Carpenter asked if there were any requests by members of the Committee to hear items that were separately listed in the consent agenda. There were no requests and Chairman Carpenter asked for a motion to approve the consent agenda. Mr. Brian Jungwirth made a motion to approve the consent agenda. Said motion was seconded by Mr. Reed Kempton. The motion was subsequently approved by a unanimous voice vote of the Committee.

9. Regional Transportation Authority (RTA) Presentation

Addressing the next order of business, Chairman Carpenter introduced Mr. Tom Buick of Maricopa County to provide the Committee with an update of the proposed Regional Transportation Authority (RTA) for Maricopa County. Mr. Buick introduced Mr. Mike Sabatini and Mr. Chuck Williams of the Maricopa Department of Transportation (MCDOT), and stressed to members of the Committee that he would like to have an informal, interactive presentation which would allow for questions and comments throughout the presentation.

Mr. Buick provided a brief overview of his past experience and credentials, and began his presentation by stating that the proposed RTA was not about jurisdictions or transportation per se, but was more about quality of life issues and maintaining economic vitality in the future. He emphasized the fact that the proposed RTA was about people receiving service and about developing a better method for the provision of services. Mr. Buick stressed that collectively; there must be better execution of delivering services. He emphasized the need to continue the traditional things that we do well, such as transportation provision and transit; developing a rapid transit system that elevates transit to a level above what we have today; and building and integrating an Intelligent Transportation System that is the "showcase" for the rest of the country. Mr. Buick again introduced Mr. Mike Sabatini, who addressed members of the Committee.

Mr. Sabatini provided an overview of the Maricopa County Board of Supervisor's Resolution calling for the provision of coordinated regional leadership for transportation within the County. Mr. Sabatini addressed the concept of having "Regional Roads of Significance" and provided an overview of problems associated with the coordination of transportation issues within Maricopa County. Mr. Sabatini then highlighted several current issues, which related to unacceptable levels of congestion on the freeway and arterial systems; an over-dependency upon single occupancy vehicles and freeways; the problems associated with municipal parochialism; and inadequate funding and

disconnected allocations (money not allocated to the appropriate jurisdictions and modes). He stressed that the regional transportation problem centered upon a void in the deployment, operations, and maintenance of a regional multi-modal transportation system. Mr. Sabatini presented an existing accountability matrix, displaying the active functions of transportation responsibilities and activities by agency. He informed the Committee that there is a tremendous need for a regional authority and cited three examples, in the county's opinion, that justify the existence of a RTA in order to overcome existing problems. The County's examples included the need for an improved Bell Road, Loop 303, and achieving consistency in the regional bike system.

Mr. Sabatini provided an overview of Bell Road and the need for a regional process. Mr. Sabatini stated that due to parochialism and the need for a true regional process, these much-needed improvements on Bell Road never took place as originally intended. Mr. Sabatini addressed the need to complete Loop 303 as a regional facility, and indicated that there are so many problems associated with the roadway due to the fact that there are a total of six jurisdictions in charge of it. He indicated that because of parochialism, he is uncertain of the project's future. As a final point in stressing the need for a RTA, he addressed the problem of inconsistencies in the connectivity of regional bike trails and systems. Mr. Sabatini stated that there was a lack of connectivity in the MAG bikeway system and mentioned several problems concerning connectivity issues in the City of Tempe. Mr. Sabatini stated that a regional authority would be able to advocate for, and provide for funding to complete current gaps in the regional bike system.

At this point in the presentation, the Committee initiated discussion regarding concerns, comments and observations pertaining to the development of a proposed RTA. Mr. Pat McDermott stated his concerns, and told the Committee and Mr. Sabatini that the points which were presented as reasons for developing a RTA could be solved if there was more money to distribute for these types of projects. Mr. McDermott stated that bike issues in particular were primarily an issue of not having enough funding, and that the cities have done a tremendous job with the regional bike system at the local levels. He told Mr. Sabatini and members of MCDOT that the disconnects which were referenced in the system would eventually get completed, and that it is only an issue of individual municipalities not having adequate resources to complete the entire system at this time.

Mr. Jeff Martin concurred with these particular points that were addressed by Mr. McDermott. Mr. Martin addressed funding issues within the City of Mesa and how the community is struggling to keep up "fiscally" in regard to obtaining project monies needed to accommodate the connection of the Red Mountain Freeway. He noted that the City of Mesa is in the process of issuing bonds to improve a number of streets. Mr. Martin addressed members of MCDOT and informed them of the Gilbert Road project. He stated that on several occasions they attempted to work in conjunction with Maricopa County to extend improvements to areas outside of the current municipal boundary of Mesa, because they considered it a road of regional significance. Mr. Martin pointed out that they were not able to receive assistance from the County to further extend improvements along Gilbert Road, primarily due to the fact that the Maricopa Board of Supervisors made it a standing policy decision not to issue debt. He stated that the

County was not willing to issue bonds in an effort to keep up with growth, and pointed to Gilbert and Val Vista Roads as examples. Mr. Martin stated that it was not a Maricopa Staff issue at all, but rather that the County at this time does not have enough money to keep up with the transportation needs throughout the region.

Mr. Grant Anderson addressed the issue of Bell Road, and stated that Scottsdale opted out of the regional process many years ago. Mr. Anderson said that the flexibility with the County was not there at the time when Bell Road was an issue many years ago, and that many of the individual cities had to “go it alone” because the appropriate leadership from the County did not exist. He went on to state that Bell Road is now completed as originally planned, and he is uncertain if a regional overriding committee or organization is needed to ensure that it is funded. Discussion followed, and Mr. Grant Anderson said that we must respect the intent of leadership from individual communities to get things done financially. Ms. Michelle Korf followed these points with a comment that she was unclear as to how the proposed RTA would actually work, and how under such scenarios it would be any different from the MAG process and work that is currently being completed by individual municipalities. Discussion followed, and Mr. Eric Anderson addressed design standards along Bell Road, and problems with curb cuts and access issues. Members of the Committee concurred that the problems presently encountered along Bell Road were created when the road was under the jurisdiction of Maricopa County many years ago. Mr. Anderson then asked if the County knew how much the cities have spent on Bell Road improvements. Mr. Sabatini responded by saying they did not.

Mr. David Moody then informed members of the Committee that if Maricopa County did in fact set up a RTA, they would have to maintain close adherence to recently adopted general plans, local political sensitivities, and the needs of local jurisdictions in regard to regional roads of significance. Mr. Tom Buick concurred with this point, and acknowledged the fact that individual needs among the communities may be different and may require various solutions. Mr. Jim Book then addressed regional roads of significance, various transportation modes, regional transit issues and existing land use issues. Mr. Book said that it was important not to have a situation where there are a number of regional entities overseeing such issues. Following on these points, Mr. Jeff Martin addressed the concept of established development along regional roads of significance and locally adopted general plans. Mr. Martin said that maintaining a true, functional system for regional roads of significance as suggested by Maricopa County was not an issue of municipal parochialism, but rather was a complex series of issues regarding existing land use issues and established development policies as adopted by local municipalities.

Mr. Glenn Kephart addressed Mr. Sabatini’s presentation in regard to regional bike systems, and Mr. Sabatini’s previous example of the City of Tempe’s connectivity issues on regional bike trails. Mr. Kephart stated that several of the city’s system disconnects were an issue of not having adequate funding. He stressed to members of the Committee that these trails would eventually be completed over time, and that upon completion they would be appropriately integrated into the proposed regional bike system as planned.

Mr. Kephart concluded his comments by stating that he did not believe that the County's example of connectivity issues in the regional bike system were a good example of needing a regional authority. Discussion followed, and Mr. Sabatini introduced Mr. Chuck Williams from MCDOT, who proceeded with the County's presentation on the need for a RTA.

Mr. Williams addressed members of the Committee and informed them that the "solution" to the proposed "problems" would be the responsibility of the County as a jurisdiction, and would depend upon the County's ability and approach to make things better from a transportation perspective by forming significant alliances. Mr. Williams stated that Staff conducted a high level of analysis into regional issues, and that Maricopa County also conducted in-depth research of existing transportation districts and authorities throughout the country. As a result of this research, the County has concluded that in their opinion, a regional transportation district or authority would be the solution to overcoming the problems as stated earlier in the presentation.

Mr. Williams stated that the purpose of a RTA was to plan, integrate, implement, operate and maintain a comprehensive, regional multi-modal transportation system. He addressed the proposed organizational structure, and emphasized that a RTA would be a "regionally focused" organization that is flexible and collaborative in taking an integrated, comprehensive view of transportation. Mr. Williams stated that regional integration was an important component of the proposed organization, and that the "regional roads of significance approach" was an important part of the solution. He again cited the examples of Bell Road, Loop 303, regional bike system connectivity, and other examples, and reiterated how complete and advanced that these regional facilities could be today if in fact the RTA was in place many years ago.

Mr. Williams then addressed the topic of accountability. He enforced the concept that Maricopa County would assist in creating a RTA that is accountable without creating another level of government within the metropolitan region of Phoenix. He informed the Committee that Maricopa County would have the ability to propose a very flexible authority, and addressed that they would have the ability to accelerate the project development and funding process. He said that the Maricopa County Board of Supervisors would function as the Board of Directors for the proposed RTA. Mr. Williams concluded his portion of the presentation by stating that the RTA would be "effective and efficient." By this statement, Mr. Williams said that the RTA would enhance and deliver the regionally integrated, multi-modal transportation system envisioned as part of MAG's planning responsibilities by consolidating development, implementation, operations and maintenance. He said that Maricopa County would work with MAG in the future to bring the concept of a regional RTA to fruition. This concluded Mr. William's section of the MCDOT RTA presentation, and discussion followed.

Ms. Tami Ryall asked Mr. Buick for clarification on the proposed funding for the RTA, and he called her attention to pages five and six of the RTA handout, which was distributed to members of the Committee. After further discussion, Mr. Eric Anderson

addressed members of MCDOT and the Committee and stated that in the past MAG has been accused of being parochial by its very nature. He went on to describe how this served as a regional forum for discussion and allowed for an expression of local interests by providing an open forum for all cities and towns throughout the region, in an effort to ensure that all concerns and decisions are considered. Mr. Anderson asked Mr. Buick and members of the MCDOT presentation team how the Maricopa County Board of Supervisors would be able to maintain this level of integration of concerns and issues, since each of the five Board members would represent over 600,000 people, and also asked what mechanisms were in place in order to ensure that local and neighborhood concerns are not lost if in fact the RTA were to be established. Addressing this question regarding the proposed structure, Mr. Buick stated that this process would remain intact by use of a citizen's advisory committee.

Mr. Martin addressed the Committee, and said he did not agree that the proposed RTA was an improvement over the current way of doing things in terms of addressing transportation. He said that parochialism existed on the Maricopa County Board of Supervisors as well, and in reference to the accountability issue raised by Mr. Williams, he does not see how the proposed RTA would allow for a higher degree of accountability. He stated that MAG is doing the very same thing and has been very successful and does not understand how a RTA or overall regional authority processes in general can force locally elected officials to stop being parochial. Mr. Buick then addressed Mr. Martin's concerns. Mr. Buick stated that at the present time, the County Board of Supervisors is not responsible or accountable with respect to issues and projects region wide, but that this would change once a RTA was established.

Mr. Grant Anderson stated that Maricopa County should not duplicate MAG, and should instead be focusing on "getting their own house in order." Mr. Anderson said that the County should be assisting individual cities to take the appropriate measures to enhance regional solutions to transportation issues and problems. Mr. Jim Book stated that the public schools are presently exempt from the municipal site plan review process, and that when it comes to the idea of establishing regional roads of significance, the issue ultimately lies with the individual communities and should not be the focus of a regional authority. Mr. Glenn Kephart followed this comment by indicating that he does not see how this proposed process is an improvement over what we have now. Mr. Buick answered these concerns by stating that there is presently a void in maintaining a coordinated and efficient regional system, and that individual governments throughout the region are not taking accountability for the void, nor adequately addressing problems and regional issues. Mr. Buick re-emphasized the fact that more accountability for regional transportation facilities does not exist, and is seriously needed.

Mr. Chuck Eaton then addressed the regional freeway system as being a significant success story in transportation planning. He informed the Committee that ADOT and MAG have a very successful relationship in working together throughout this process, which has resulted in a higher level of cooperation and coordination. Mr. Eaton said that it is important for Maricopa County to also be a part of this process. Mr. Bryan Jungwirth followed these comments by stating that people should consider the Regional

Public Transportation Authority (RTPA) as a viable authority due to its regional nature and approach to transit issues throughout the metropolitan area.

Mr. Pat McDermott then addressed the proposed RTA and its direct relationship to MAG. Mr. McDermott stated that the primary issue has to do with the fact that the County has not really done a better job than the cities on many transportation issues, and wanted to know how this proposed structure could possibly be any better than the present MAG structure. Discussion followed, and Mr. Eric Anderson stated that collectively, there has to be more discussion in the future on how some of these regional issues, concerns and problems should be addressed, and also stated that there is a need to identify what some of the possible solutions may be. Mr. Anderson suggested that these issues could be further addressed at an upcoming TRC meeting, and that representatives of MAG and the TRC should again meet with Mr. Buick and members of Maricopa County in an effort to discuss the RTP concept and to address further issues and concerns.

Mr. Buick thanked those in attendance for listening to the MCDOT presentation, and he informed the Committee that the input they received would be very valuable in the County's efforts to assess concerns and to proceed accordingly. Chairman Carpenter thanked members of the County for their presentation and time, and indicated that the topic would certainly warrant further discussion and consideration. There were no additional questions, and this concluded the RTA presentation by the Staff of MCDOT.

10. Draft FY 2003-2007 MAG TIP Guidance Report (ex Management Systems Report)

Addressing the next order of business, Chairman Carpenter introduced Mr. Paul Ward of MAG, who provided the Committee with an update the Draft FY 2003-2007 MAG TIP Guidance Report (TGR). Mr. Ward informed the Committee that the TGR was the former Management Systems Report. Mr. Ward addressed several of the similarities and differences between the past and current reports, and stressed that although Management Systems were still a priority, MAG would not be penalized by the federal government if they were not implemented.

Mr. Ward stated that the Draft Copy of the Executive Summary included in the packets does not represent the full copy of the TGR. Mr. Ward informed the Committee that a full copy of the report would be available by the end of the week. He also informed the Committee that he is working with the TRC Ad Hoc Working Group to finalize the application forms, and that this process should be completed by the upcoming TRC meeting during the month of July. Mr. Ward also stated that MAG Air Quality Staff are reviewing the forms with regard to the CMAQ rating system. He informed the Committee that a final version of the appendix will be attached to the TGR when it is completed, and will be made available to the MAG Management Committee for review and approval by the middle of next month. There were no questions by the Committee, and this concluded Mr. Ward's report.

11. Final Close Out of the MAG Federally Funded Program for FY 2001

Addressing the next order of business, Chairman Carpenter called on Mr. Paul Ward of MAG, who briefed the Committee on the final close out of the FY 2001 MAG federal funded program. Mr. Ward informed the Committee that MAG, to date, has committed all of their existing federal funds. However, Mr. Ward stated that the amount of funds that MAG will receive in the form of redistributed OA is unknown at this time. When analyzing past cycles, he stated that MAG on average has received approximately \$500,000 in redistributed OA funding. Mr. Ward indicated that his “best guess” estimate in the amount of redistributed OA to be received this year should be anywhere from \$500,000 to \$1,000,000 in total funds, but that this amount will not be known until August of this year. Mr. Ward informed the Committee that before a project can be eligible to receive funding, the project will have to be included within the MAG TIP and must be in a position to be initiated immediately. Following this overview, Mr. Ward indicated that MAG is in the process of attempting to identify contingency projects in an effort to identify how to expend the remaining amount of money if in fact redistributed OA funding becomes available. He further stated that MAG may need to complete a TIP Amendment for the identified projects in advance, even though the amount of funding available is unknown at this particular time.

Discussion followed, and Mr. Glenn Kephart addressed the City of Tempe’s Traffic Signal Emergency Vehicle Preemption project and how \$144,000 in left over funding could be applied to this particular project. Mr. Kephart stated that this project was ready to be initiated, and that at final closeout, the Tempe project would be ideal in assisting Mr. Ward with “balancing the checkbook” in regards to expending the remaining amount of redistributed OA funds. Mr. Kephart said that the city’s project would be ideal for the remaining funds, and that he did not see a “down side” with the Tempe project.

Mr. Jeff Martin then addressed the Committee and said that he would like to see a regional approach to the expenditure of redistributed funds. Mr. Martin suggested that the Committee follow the recommendation as identified within the TRC Agenda item, and entertained a motion to utilize all redistributed OA funds to advance the purchase of transit vehicles in future years. Mr. Bryan Jungwirth seconded this motion. However, before a final vote of the Committee, Mr. Kephart proposed an amendment to the motion which stated that any additional leftover funding should be applied to the \$144,000 requested for the City of Tempe’s Traffic Signal Emergency Vehicle Preemption project. Mr. Kephart entertained a motion to approve the amendment as stated. The motion was seconded by Mr. Grant Anderson. However, before a formal vote was obtained, Mr. Bryan Jungwirth asked Mr. Ward for clarification on the amount of money that could be expended for buses. Mr. Ward indicated that the current obligation of transit vehicles would likely be in multiples of \$300,000. Mr. Kephart said that if anything is left over, and an additional bus cannot be purchased, then the remaining amount should go toward the Tempe project. Ms. Lynn Timmons questioned why the money should go to Tempe, and asked for clarification as to why Tempe is getting these funds and not another community. Mr. Kephart replied by stating that the City of Tempe received a letter from MAG about leftover OA funds and that Tempe submitted a request for such funds,

should they become available. Mr. Grant Anderson then spoke in favor of the Tempe project.

Chairman Carpenter asked for a final clarification of the amended motion, which included a request to utilize all redistributed OA funds to advance the purchase of transit vehicles in future years, with any additional leftover funding to be applied to the \$144,000 requested for the City of Tempe's Traffic Signal Emergency Vehicle Preemption project. The motion was approved by a unanimous voice vote of the Committee, with the exception of dissenting votes from Mr. Jeff Martin and Ms. Lynn Timmons. After the motion was approved, a member of the public addressed the Committee on several agenda items. There were no further questions.

12. Presentation on the Routing of US 60 and US 93

Addressing the next order of business, Chairman Carpenter introduced Mr. Andy Smith of ADOT to provide the Committee with an update of the proposed Draft alternatives for rerouting and renumbering US 60 and US 93 in the metropolitan Phoenix area. Mr. Smith addressed the Committee, and directed their attention to Attachment Number 4 in the TRC packet. Mr. Smith informed members of the Committee that the nature of his presentation was to obtain input and suggestions, and that he would like an interactive discussion with open questions and answers throughout the presentation.

Mr. Smith addressed Alternative A, which calls for the relocation of US 60 from Grand Avenue to Loop 101 and I-10; leaving the end of US 93 in Wickenburg for possible extension along a future CANAMEX corridor to I-10; and redesignating Grand Avenue from Loop 101 to I-17 as Business 60. Discussion followed, and Mr. Smith then addressed Alternative B, which suggests eliminating US 60 between Brenda, Arizona (I-10 and MP 31) and I-10 in Tempe, and beginning US 60 eastward at the Superstition interchange – redesignating this segment as SR 60, or as an extension of SR 74; extending US 93 down Grand Avenue and Loop 101 to I-10; and redesignating Grand Avenue from Loop 101 to I-17 and Business 93. Following this, Mr. Smith described Alternative C, which would relocate US 60 from Grand Avenue to the existing SR 74 and I-17 interchange, and eliminate SR 74 as a state route number; leave the end of US 93 in Wickenburg for possible extension along a future CANAMEX corridor to I-10; and redesignate Grand Avenue from Morristown to I-17 as Business 60, or as a new state route number.

Throughout Mr. Smith's presentation, the Committee discussed the possible strengths associated with each of the alternatives. Chairman Carpenter stated that from the Town of Wickenburg's point of view, leaving the CANAMEX Corridor as it is from US93 to the I-10 interchange is the favored alternative. Mr. Bryan Jungwirth was in favor of Alternative B, and Mr. Jim Book was in favor of maintaining US 93 diagonally along Grand Avenue. Mr. Eric Anderson asked Mr. Smith what the next proposed steps in the overall rerouting and renumbering process would include after his presentation to the Committee. It was stated that ADOT wants additional input, and that they would have to

go through a formal approval process at the federal level prior to any of the favored alternatives being selected.

Chairman Carpenter thanked Mr. Smith for his presentation, and stated that it would be necessary to have additional input from the MAG Management Committee and Regional Council. There were no additional questions, and this concluded Mr. Smith's presentation.

13. Next Meeting Date

Chairman Carpenter told members in attendance that the next meeting of the Committee would be conducted on July 24, 2001. There being no further business, the Chairman adjourned the meeting at 11:40 a.m.