

MINUTES OF THE  
MARICOPA ASSOCIATION OF GOVERNMENTS  
TRANSPORTATION REVIEW COMMITTEE

November 6, 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: Jack Tevlin, Vice-Chair	*Litchfield Park: Mike Cartsonis
ADOT: Chuck Eaton for Dan Lance	*Maricopa County: Thomas Buick
Avondale: Dave Fitzhugh	Mesa: Jeff Martin for Ron Krosting
Buckeye: Joe Blanton	Paradise Valley: Robert M. Cicarelli
Chandler: Patrice Kraus	Peoria: David Moody
Fountain Hills: Randy Harrell	RPTA: Ken Driggs
*Gila Bend: Shane Dille	Scottsdale: Michelle Korf
Gilbert: Tami Ryall	Surprise: Miryam Gutier
Glendale: Jim Book	Tempe: Mary O'Connor
Goodyear: Cato Esquivel for Grant Anderson	

EX-OFFICIO MEMBERS ATTENDING

*Regional Bicycle Task Force: 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	

\* Members neither present nor represented by proxy.

OTHERS PRESENT

Eric Anderson, MAG	Dennis Smith, MAG
Paul Ward, MAG	Pat McDermott, City of Chandler
Suzanne Quigley, MAG	Sarath Joshua, MAG
Dawn Coomer, MAG	Lindy Bauer, MAG
Kwi-Sung Kang, ADOT	Cathy Arthur, MAG
Maureen Decindis, MAG	Jim Creedon, Landry and Creedon
Terry Johnson, City of Glendale	Bryan Jungwirth, RPTA
Bob Antila, RPTA	Jack Tomasik, MAG
Claudia Walters, City of Mesa	Roger Herzog, MAG
Ash Sabnekar, Kirkham Michael	Roger Ball, MCDOT
Peggy Carpenter, City of Scottsdale	John Bradley, DMB, Inc.
Stuart Boggs, RPTA	Dave Nilsen, DMB, Inc.
Lynn Timmons, City of Phoenix	Jim Dickey, RPTA
Chris Voight, MAG	Andy Smith, ADOT
Stephen Tate, MAG	Ken Hall, MAG

1. Call to Order

Mr. Fred Carpenter, Chairman, called the meeting to order at 10:04 a.m.

2. Approval of Minutes of September 27, 2001 Minutes

Addressing the first order of business, Chairman Carpenter asked if there were any changes or amendments to the meeting minutes. Mr. Jim Book moved to approve the minutes as presented, with Mr. Jeff Martin 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 Manager's Report

Chairman Carpenter introduced MAG Transportation Manager, Mr. Eric Anderson, who gave the Transportation Manager's report. Mr. Anderson informed the Committee that the MAG review team has recommended a consultant to conduct the MAG High Capacity Transit Study. Mr. Anderson stated that the MAG review team had recommended the IBI Group, and that a formal recommendation would be provided to the MAG Regional Council at their meeting tomorrow night. Mr. Anderson then stated that there would be a Grand Avenue Stakeholders meeting tomorrow, for discussion of a number of items that will directly involve the future of Grand Avenue.

Mr. Anderson then provided an overview of the MAG Southwest, Northwest, and Southeast sub-area studies. He stated that next week there will be a meeting for each one of the studies, and that the Southeast Valley study also included the area of northern Pinal County. Mr. Anderson informed the Committee that representatives from Pinal County were planning a scheduled tour of the proposed Pinal County study area in the immediate future. He stated that Pinal County will be inviting individuals from MAG and the communities within Maricopa County that are also included within the Southeast Valley sub-area study. Mr. Anderson said that one of the intentions of next week's sub-area meetings was to identify individuals to serve as primary points of contact for their respective communities. Mr. Anderson said that the selected representatives would serve as a liaison between their municipality, MAG, and the selected consultant for their particular sub-area study.

Mr. Jeff Martin informed the Committee that just last week he had received a notice on the Southeast Valley/Northern Pinal County Area Study. Mr. Martin indicated that this

was not ample time to review the materials and that he needed more time to review the information pertaining to the study. Mr. Martin asked Mr. Anderson if it would be possible to move the first meeting date for the Southeast Valley Sub-Area Study back several weeks so that all parties involved could have enough time to review the proposed study materials. Mr. Anderson said that it was possible to reschedule the meeting, and that he would look into the possibility of another date and time. There were no additional questions from members of 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 provided an overview of HURF and the Maricopa County Regional Area Road Fund. He addressed the issue of sales tax collections, and stated that the collections for the month of August, prior to September 11, 2001, had indicated no growth in revenues. Mr. Anderson informed the Committee that this was the first time they have experienced a "no growth" situation in revenues. Initially, it was anticipated that the allocations would increase by five and a half percent during 2001. Mr. Anderson said that it is not clear what the final numbers would look like until next year, and that hopefully the tourism industry and the rest of the economy will stabilize in the near future. There were no questions from members of the Committee, and this concluded Mr. Anderson's report.

6. Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) Update

Addressing the next order of business, Chairman Carpenter introduced Mr. Roger Herzog, MAG Senior Project Manager, who provided an update of the MAG RTP. Mr. Herzog informed the Committee that the consultant and MAG are currently in the process of identifying values, goals and objectives, and also identifying several growth scenarios for the MAG region. Mr. Herzog stated that the entire process will include the identification of preliminary values and goals; developing multiple objectives for each goal; analyzing alternative growth scenarios and transportation concepts; developing performance measures; and reviewing and refining the identified values, goals and objectives over time in an effort to assure the relevancy of the planning process. Mr. Herzog said that as part of the planning process, a total of four growth scenario concepts were identified for the study. Mr. Herzog provided an overview of each scenario, which included a polycentric growth trend, an infill/revitalization concept, an activity center emphasis, and a suburban fringe growth concept.

Mr. Herzog then informed the Committee that there was a TRC/Planners Workshop conducted on October 24, 2001, at the MAG offices, and he provided a brief overview of the items which were presented by the consulting team. Mr. Herzog then explained that

MAG would continue to evaluate the identified growth scenarios and the supporting transportation system, and closely review the policies, strategies and performance measures for future transportation investments. Mr. Herzog highlighted a number of ongoing and proposed studies that would be incorporated into the RTP process over time, which included the following: an East/West Mobility Study; the Northwest Area Study; the Southwest Area Study; the Southeast Maricopa County/Northern Pinal County Study; the Northwest Grand Corridor Study; the Freeway Bottleneck/Capacity Study; the Commuter Rail/High Capacity Transit Study; and a Regional Transit System Study.

Mr. Martin asked whether the Regional Transit Study would comprehensively address various technologies in transit, in an effort to implement a “performance based” transit system. He then asked Mr. Herzog if staff could look at this issue of “identified needs and available technologies” in an effort to assure that future transit investments are efficiently maximized. Mr. Herzog stated that the study would address the feasibility and performance of alternate transit modes. Discussion followed, and Mr. Ken Driggs reiterated the fact that performance is critical. Mr. Driggs stated that in reality, the region will receive a limited amount of federal funds, and that it is important to compare potential regional transit system projects against certain types of available funding from the Federal Government. Mr. Driggs provided a brief overview of regional transit, and stated that bus rapid transit will continue to serve the majority of riders utilizing the system in the future. There were no additional questions or comments from the Committee, and this concluded Mr. Herzog’s presentation.

7. Requested Change to the MAG Regional Freeway Program

Addressing the next order of business, Chairman Carpenter introduced Mr. Eric Anderson of MAG who addressed the Committee on proposed changes to the MAG Regional Freeway Program. Mr. Anderson stated that MAG has the responsibility to review and recommend material changes to the regional freeway system according to the Arizona Revised Statutes. He emphasized the importance of the Committee in providing input on this particular Agenda Item, and stated that no formal action is required.

Mr. Anderson stated that ADOT was requesting \$16.868 million in FY 2002 project funding to be transferred from the South Mountain Freeway Corridor, over to the San Tan Freeway Corridor. The purpose of this request is to allow for the purchase of right-of-way in the San Tan Corridor. It is believed that a substantial amount of money would be saved by purchasing the needed right-of-way now, as opposed to several years in the future when the cost of real estate could possibly be much higher. Mr. Anderson stated that \$5.0 million would be transferred back to the South Mountain Freeway Corridor in FY 2003, and that the remaining \$11.868 million would be transferred back to the corridor project in FY 2004. Mr. Anderson also informed those in attendance that the Town of Gilbert was formally requesting a change to the vertical profile of the future San Tan Freeway, at the intersection of Ray Road and the Union Pacific Railroad (UPRR).

Mr. Anderson stated that the town is requesting that the freeway be depressed under the tracks at the intersection, and that the original design for the intersection calls for the construction of the freeway to go over the tracks. Mr. Anderson stated that the original design would have adverse neighborhood impacts, and that ADOT estimates this request would cost about \$4 to \$5 million to complete. He also stated that the Town of Gilbert has committed an amount of \$2 million in local money toward the completion of the project. Mr. Anderson said that he received correspondence from the Town of Gilbert regarding the project, and that copies of the letter could be found on the table located at the table by the door.

Mr. Martin addressed the Committee, and said that he was in support of the Town of Gilbert's project, especially considering the fact that it was contributing a total of \$2 million dollars in municipal funding to the overall project cost. Mr. Chuck Eaton informed the Committee that because the town's request is under \$5 million, the project may not constitute a major change from a dollar perspective, but is a material change because it involves a change in the section profile. Ms. Tami Ryall then provided an overview of the project, and stated that two cost estimates were obtained from consulting firms and that the two estimates were within reason. Mr. Eaton stated that the project is currently in the 30 percent design phase; therefore it is difficult to assess a real cost estimate at this time. Mr. Eaton stated that this is viewed by ADOT as a material scope and design change. Mr. Driggs stated that he wanted to go on record as being in support of these changes. Following this comment, Mr. Robert Cicarelli, from the Town of Paradise Valley, stated that he also wanted to go on record as being in favor of the project. Discussion followed and members of the Committee wanted to know if a formal recommendation was in order. Chairman Carpenter stated that although the Committee was unanimously in favor of this item, a formal motion was not required. Mr. Eaton said that he would like to see the item move forward as soon as possible, and that the project was ready to go before the November ADOT Board. Mr. Eric Anderson informed the Committee that this item would be on the December Agenda of both the MAG Management Committee and the MAG Regional Council. There were no additional questions or comments from the Committee, and this concluded Mr. Anderson's presentation.

Mr. Martin then addressed the Committee, and informed them of the fact that Councilmember Claudia Walters from the City of Mesa was in attendance. Mr. Martin formally requested that Councilmember Walters be allowed to address agenda item #10, which had to do with the Elderly Mobility Implementation Program. Chairman Carpenter addressed Mr. Paul Ward, MAG Transportation Program Manager, and requested clarification regarding the content of the item. Mr. Ward informed Chairman Carpenter and members of the Committee that agenda item #10 was the only identified project from the Human Services Modal Committee, and represented a project to be submitted for federal funds. Chairman Carpenter and members of the Committee agreed to go to agenda item #10, followed by agenda item #11.

10. Elderly Mobility Implementation Program

Addressing the next order of business, Chairman Carpenter introduced Councilmember Claudia Walters from the City of Mesa, who addressed the Committee and provided an overview of the Elderly Mobility Implementation Program. Councilmember Walters provided a statistical overview of Maricopa County's aging population, and stated how the region will experience a high percentage of older drivers on the roads by the year 2025. Councilmember Walters highlighted her personal experience in chairing the Elderly Mobility planning process within the region. She stated that this process culminated in the identification of 25 recommendations which make up the Regional Action Plan on Aging and Mobility. She informed the Committee that the plan was formally adopted by the MAG Regional Council at their meeting on October 3, 2001.

Councilmember Walters stated that the 25 recommendations of the Regional Action Plan on Aging and Mobility represented proactive strategies to specifically deal with mobility issues that will result from the increasing age of the region. She emphasized the importance of this plan in making our region's highways, streets, pedestrian facilities, and housing facilities safer and more accessible for seniors. Councilmember Walters said that the recommendations within the plan would call for the expansion and creation of new alternative transportation options for those seniors who no longer drive. She said that in an effort to implement these recommendations, the next step in the process would involve the formal request of \$800,000 to assist in the development of a program for cities and towns within the region; whereby communities could identify projects that would support key concepts or recommendations within the plan, and meeting the unique needs of each community.

Councilmember Walters identified the development of Senior Friendly Neighborhood Zones and the replication of an Independent Transportation Network (ITN) as examples of promising projects that could be implemented with financial assistance. The Senior Friendly Neighborhood Zone process would identify areas with high concentrations of seniors and identify infrastructure and land use measures to make the roads, pedestrian facilities and housing developments of the zone safer and accessible. An ITN would utilize automobiles to provide on-demand, consumer oriented transit available for seniors 24 hours a day, 7 days a week, without proposed restrictions based on income or the purpose of the trip. Councilmember Walters stated that although these two projects were highlighted as examples of how funds would be implemented, that there are in fact many other projects aside from these that could be considered. She then thanked the Committee for her time, and asked that they would consider the Human Services Coordinating Committee's sole project request for funding. There were no questions from members of the Committee, and this concluded Councilmember Walter's presentation. Chairman Carpenter reminded the Committee that formal action was not required, and Mr. Anderson informed those in attendance that this particular item was in fact actually incorporated into Attachment 4A, located at the back of the Agenda Packet, as part of the funding requests for agenda item #11.

11. Recommendation of Projects for MAG Federal Funding in FY 2007 of the FY 2003-2007 MAG Transportation Improvement Program

Addressing the next order of business, the Chairman introduced Mr. Paul Ward, who provided an overview on the recommendation of projects for MAG federal funding in FY 2007 of the FY 2003 to 2007 MAG Transportation Improvement Program (TIP). Mr. Ward stated that MAG expects to have approximately \$38.6 million in Congestion Mitigation and Air Quality Improvement Program (CMAQ) funding, and approximately \$3.0 million in Surface Transportation Program (STP-MAG) funding available for non-freeway projects in FY 2007. Mr. Ward stated that these projections were conservative, and that changes are likely to take place when the Transportation Equity Act for the 21st Century (TEA-21) is reauthorized in FY 2004.

Mr. Ward referred to Attachments 4A and 4B located at the back of the agenda packet, and stated that all projects have been reviewed and prioritized by the individual Technical Advisory Committees (TACs). Mr. Ward specifically addressed Attachment 4A, and provided the Committee with an overview of the different modal committee rankings for FY 2007 funds. He also described the CMAQ and Congestion Management System (CMS) scoring processes involved for project requests, and reminding members that the lower the CMAQ emission reduction score, the more cost effective that the project is in improving air quality. Also, when considering the CMS score, he stated that the higher the score, the better the project.

Mr. Ward addressed Attachment 4B. Mr. Ward stated that the table compares past and staff recommended allocations for each particular modal category. Mr. Ward then addressed an error in line one of the Table (entitled AQ or TDM) and stated that the figure should be \$4.3 million, instead of \$3.057 million, and that the difference would need to be made up from other modes.

Mr. Ward provided an overview of the line entitled "Other," and informed the Committee that this included approximately \$800,000 in funding for the elderly mobility program, as highlighted by Councilmember Walters; approximately \$1.4 million for an aerial photography project; and a \$200,000 request for an Electronic Village project, which would be funded in part by the City of Phoenix. He indicated that there were two other options for aerial photography which requested \$300,000 and \$100,000. Jeff Martin agreed that the \$1.4 million option was rather high, and suggested including the \$300,000 option. In response to a question, Mr. Jim Hull, the Chairman of the MAG Telecommunications Advisory Group, provided an overview of the Electronic Village project.

Mr. Ken Driggs stated that he could not support the current allocation with regard to transit, due to the current policy that targeted a large proportion of MAG federal funds for freeways. Discussion followed, and Ms. Patrice Kraus asked if the Committee could go through the modes individually. There was an involved discussion regarding the

differences between the regional rideshare program, and the trip reduction program and additional Air Quality projects. Following further comments from Ms. Kraus, Mr. Driggs and Mr. Martin, there was general agreement that the Committee may want to take a closer look at these programs and address how they work together.

Mr. Mike Sabatini addressed the Committee, and asked Mr. Ward how MAG staff arrived at the allocations as proposed within attachment 4B. Mr. Ward described how MAG staff attempted to address current regional priorities for air quality projects and federal guidelines, and stated that a variety of modal needs and the percentile categories from the FY 2002-2006 TIP appeared to work. Questions arose from several members of the Committee as to the Street Committee priorities. Mr. Ward provided an overview of the Street Committee selection process, and stated that the final ranking of projects was derived by utilizing a Delphi ranking system. There were several questions regarding the rationale behind the CMAQ and CMS scoring systems, and Eric Anderson stated that the Committee is required to consider these two scoring systems in the project selection process.

Several members of the TRC suggested that each modal Committee should in fact go back and more closely consider the CMAQ and CMS scores. Mr. Jim Book, representing the ITS Committee, stated that his Committee specifically considers both scoring systems. Mr. Dave Fitzhugh questioned the Street Committee's ranking of the projects, and stated that he did not understand the logic involved in identifying and scoring projects. Mr. Martin and Mr. Fitzhugh addressed several projects on Attachment 4A, and discussion regarding the ranking process followed.

Mr. Jack Tevlin then addressed the Committee, and expressed his concern over the ranking and selection process. Mr. Tevlin compared the process with the "Casa Grande Resolves," which forms the basic understanding that MAG and ADOT use to set allocations for the distribution of funds throughout the State. Mr. Tevlin estimated that Phoenix is only likely to receive 18 percent of the available funding, but has 42 percent of the region's population. He said that the estimated allocation was not fair and would not be acceptable. He suggested that the projects be directed back to the individual modal committees and that they readdress them from an "equity" perspective.

Mr. Anderson acknowledged Mr. Tevlin's comments, and stated that this is exactly why this item is on today's agenda. Mr. Tevlin agreed that it is not easy to allocate funding. Mr. Ward acknowledged Mr. Tevlin's concerns and stated that, although federal guidance expressly discourages division of funding by jurisdiction or mode, further review by the modal committees would occur and the Committee had the ability to provide further guidance.

Mr. Dennis Smith, MAG Assistant Director, stated that he is aware of the equity issue, especially when he recently reviewed the Street Committee rankings. He understood Mr. Tevlin's concerns and said that the modal Committees would again review these lists and

suggested that these concerns could be best addressed by them. He reiterated that the process was not complete and that the TRC was not expected to recommend any projects at this time. Mr. Tevlin stated that all he is asking for is some form of equity.

Chairman Carpenter requested action on this item. Mr. Martin moved that the Committee should refer all projects back to the modal committees to review the rankings again and reconsider the CMAQ and CMS scores. Mr. David Moody seconded. Mr. Pat McDermott, representing the Regional Bicycle Task Force, briefed the Committee on the selection process the Task Force used, and questioned whether the motion as passed, adequately addressed the concerns of Phoenix. Mr. Tevlin did not expect that the City of Phoenix should receive 42 percent of the funding available, but requested that the Committee should consider equity and fairness in selecting projects. Mr. Tevlin declined the offer to amend the stated motion. The Chairman re-stated the motion, and it was approved by unanimous voice vote.

Mr. Driggs then addressed the Committee and expressed his concerns over the time. Mr. Driggs asked the Chairman and members whether it was possible to place agenda items #8A, #8B, #9 and #12 on consent, and to approve them as consent agenda items. The Chairman discussed the remaining items on the agenda with Mr. Anderson and members of the Committee. Mr. Anderson stated that he would address agenda item #12. It was agreed upon that agenda item #13 concerning RPTA 5307 Transit Program funds for FY 2007 did not require action at this time, and could be heard at a future meeting. The Committee agreed that agenda item #14 could also be heard at a future meeting.

12. Draft Cooperatively Developed ADOT Project List of 2007

Addressing the next order of business, Chairman Carpenter introduced Mr. Eric Anderson, who provided a brief overview of the Cooperatively Developed ADOT Project List of 2007. Mr. Anderson stated that ADOT, MAG, and the RPTA developed a cooperative list in an effort to fund projects for the new fifth year of the ADOT Five-Year Highway Construction Program. Mr. Anderson informed the Committee that copies were not available at the time the packet was mailed, but could be found on the table located by the door. Mr. Anderson addressed the contents of the table and called the Committee's attention to the Transportation Interchanges that were located on pages 5 and 6. Mr. Anderson said that it is ADOT's policy that such interchange projects would not be funded. He stated that communities really need to consider this policy, and said that a collective strategy had to be adopted on how to deal with this issue. Realizing the time constraints involved with the meeting, Mr. Anderson informed members of the Committee to call or e-mail him at any time if in fact they had questions or comments regarding the project list. There were no questions from members of the Committee, and this concluded Mr. Anderson's presentation.

14a. Approval of Consent Agenda

Chairman Carpenter stated that as previously agreed upon, agenda items #8A, #8B, and #9 were placed on the consent agenda. Chairman Carpenter asked for a motion to approve the consent agenda items. Mr. Ken Driggs moved to approve the consent agenda items, with Mr. Jim Book seconding. The consent agenda items were subsequently approved by unanimous voice vote.

15. Next Meeting Date

Chairman Carpenter informed members in attendance that the next meeting of the Committee would be conducted on December 11, 2001. There being no further business, the Chairman adjourned the meeting at 12:08 p.m.