

MINUTES OF THE
MARICOPA ASSOCIATION OF GOVERNMENTS
TRANSPORTATION ENHANCEMENT FUNDS WORKING GROUP

Monday June 11, 2001
MAG Office Building, Suite 200 - Saguaro Room
302 North First Avenue, Phoenix

MEMBERS PRESENT

Councilman Phil Gordon, Co-Chair, City of
Phoenix
Lloyd Harrell, Co-Chair, Chandler, representing
the MAG Management Committee
Grant Anderson, Goodyear, representing the
MAG Street Committee
Angela Dye, representing the Arizona Society of
Landscape Architects Arizona Chapter
Marcie Ellis, representing the West Valley Fine
Arts Council

Reed Kempton, Maricopa County, representing
the MAG Pedestrian Working Group
*Andre Licardi, representing the Arizona
Commission of the Arts
Mary O'Connor, Tempe, representing the MAG
Regional Bicycle Task Force
Doug Kupel for Shereen Lerner, representing
Archaeological and Historic Preservation
(Arizona Preservation Foundation)

*Those members neither present nor represented by proxy.

OTHERS PRESENT

Jolene Linda, Area Agency on Aging
Michael Powell, Avondale
Tony Widowski, Avondale
Mickey Ohland, Chandler
Beth Mayburn, Goodyear
Christine McMurdy, Goodyear
Dawn M. Coomer, MAG

Bill Jacobson, Phoenix Historic Preservation
Office
Mario Paniagua, Phoenix
Bill H. Scheel, Phoenix
Lynn Timmons, Phoenix
Katherine Wischart, Phoenix
Elizabeth Thomas, Tempe

1. Call to Order

Co-Chair Phil Gordon called the meeting to order at 1:35 p.m.

2. Introduction of Working Group Members and Members of the Audience

Co-Chair Gordon stated there was a concern raised at the last meeting by some members of the audience that the input process should be more formalized. There needs to be additional discussion on how to develop a more formalized process for future meetings. Applicants had brought professionals forward at prior meetings, and we need to be sure that all persons that attend the meetings have a time period to provide their views.

Members of the Working Group introduced themselves and members of the audience introduced themselves.

3. Call to the Audience

No members of the audience wished to address the Working Group. Co-Chair Gordon noted that much of the funding for enhancements goes to rural areas of the state. At today's meeting, the Working Group will rank the applications from the MAG region and submit these results at the state meeting of the Transportation Enhancement Review Committee (TERC).

4. Staff Report

Dawn Coomer provided a report on items requested from the Working Group at the May 30, 2001 meeting. There were four items to discuss. The first item is the rankings of the ADOT TERC last year on MAG enhancement fund applications. This information is provided in Attachment A. One of the three projects submitted for state funds was funded by the TERC last year. This project ranked about half way down the list of funded projects.

Of the 18 projects submitted for local funds from the MAG region, four projects were funded. This included our highest ranked project in the city of Peoria on the West Valley Recreation Corridor. Also funded was the Bike Box program from Glendale. This project was successful since the TERC had not yet funded a project like it before, and because of its low cost. The City of Phoenix also had a project funded to create pedestrian amenities along 7th Avenue. Finally, there was a project funded in Gilbert along the Heritage Trail. This project was successful since it was the last link to be funded for an 18 mile trail system that connected several cities in the East Valley.

On the last page of attachment a, some information on how the funds were distributed among different parts of the state is presented. NACOG received the bulk of the local projects. They typically submit very good projects every year. In the state category, the funds were fairly evenly distributed based on the applications submitted. MAG doesn't typically do well in the state pot of funds since we don't have many projects to submit.

Second, attachment B provides some information on projects that have already received funding, and their status. Several projects were brought to the attention of the Working Group. The FQ Story Historic District project, which received funding two years ago, has not yet submitted a design concept report (DCR). The project development process cannot even begin until ADOT has received

a DCR. Gilbert, which received funding two years ago for the Heritage Trail, also needs to submit a DCR.

Finally, all of the projects submitted last year still need to set up an initial project scoping meeting with ADOT. This meeting needs to happen before the DCR is submitted.

Third, Attachment C has been updated to reflect applicant responses to comments from the Working Group. In general, all applicants have addressed the comments and concerns raised by the Working Group. Avondale has submitted a completed re-written application to address all concerns. The Chandler retention basin project, submitted for state funds, has been explained in more detail. Litchfield Park has substantially changed their application, resulting in a higher project cost and better quality application. The Scottsdale project has been clarified greatly by the answers given. Comments from Comments from FQ Story were expected via fax prior today's meeting but were not received. All other applicants submitted response.

Finally, a few comments about rankings from cities with multiple applications. Most cities have provided this information, which was e-mailed to the committee on Friday and is provided as a hand-out for today's meeting. For local applications from Gilbert, the priorities are (1) Powerline Multi-Modal Path, and (2) Santan Vista Multi-Modal Path. Glendale has submitted two projects, but is unsure of their priority. The bridge project meets a local goal while the Safety City project is more regional in scope. Glendale did indicate that their highest priority overall is the state submitted project for landscaping along the Loop 101. A priority for local projects has not yet been received by MAG staff from Glendale. In Phoenix, the priority overall is (1) 24th and Camelback, (2) 2nd Avenue, (3) Toverea, and (4) FQ Story. However, Phoenix would prefer the Tovrea is ranked as a state project. The Working Group will need to determine this later in the meeting.

Chandler has submitted four projects. Their priorities are (1) Retention Basin Landscaping, (2) Landform Graphics and Gateway: Santan Freeway and Arizona Avenue TI, (3) Landform Graphics: Price Freeway and the Santan Freeway TI, and (4) Landform Graphics and Gateway: Santan Freeway and Gilbert Rd.

5. Review, Discussion and Ranking of Round IX Enhancement Fund Applications

Co-Chair Gordon explained that there were time constraints at the May 30 Working Group meeting that prevented some applicants from presenting and providing information on their applications. Applicants affected by this timing issue may chose to provide additional information, up to five minutes, to the Working Group. Co-Chair Gordon reviewed the project list alphabetically to see if anyone wished to address the Working Group.

Michael Powell from Avondale said there were two major issues that were addressed when the application was re-written and re-submitted to MAG staff. First, the trails don't need to be ADA accessible. This is a joint use corridor. Access to the trail will be ADA accessible. Second, the cost estimate has been changed. The match cannot be increased at this time because there is not time to seek approval from City Council. However, the city will probably contribute more due than the

amount listed in the application due to cost increases and the length of time required to actually construct projects. Several questions were rewritten to address concerns, including crossing the barrier of I-10, connections of origins and destinations (two parks) and economic development opportunities.

Mary O'Connor asked about the ADA accessibility issue, stating that meeting ADA is necessary with federally funded projects. Mr. Powell said that paving the trail would violate a use agreement with the Flood Control District. Dawn Coomer added that she spoke with ADOT staff, and the response was that ADA access, with both this project and the Scottsdale Canal project, would not prohibit either project from being funded.

Angela Dye said that TEA-21 focuses on transportation, not recreation. The application should be clarified to explain the transportation benefit, not the recreation benefit. The discussion of recreation should be limited in the application. Mr. Powell explained the destinations in the area. Ms. Dye said that the application must show that the trail links transportation destinations rather than just two parks.

Reed Kempton added that ADA and AASHTO are different with respect to grades. The project should be able to follow AASHTO even if ADA cannot be met. Co-Chair Gordon suggested that Mr. Powell provide a copy of the application to his city attorney to see if the design would be adequate. Co-Chair Gordon stated that ADA access is very important, and limiting access to ADA persons can create legal problems. He added that Phoenix has a intergovernmental agreement with the Flood Control District, and that there was a lawsuit in Phoenix as to whether the facility was a maintenance road or trail.

Co-Chair Gordon continued to solicit additional comments from applicants. The revised application from Avondale was distributed to Working Group members for review. Mary O'Connor asked if the Glendale Safety City project will be viewed as a park project. Dawn Coomer responded that the Yuma MPO had a safety city project funded two years ago, and that Paula Moloff from Glendale had checked with YMPO and ADOT when creating the application.

The Goodyear project was the next project discussed. Marcie Ellis said that this was a one time opportunity, and that the railroad station should be saved. Ms. Ellis asked about the status of another project funded in Litchfield Park. Dawn Coomer replied that the project was moving along to the best of her knowledge. There were now two project numbers for the Litchfield Park project: one for the art component and one for the path component. Ms. Ellis asked for additional details, and Ms. Coomer said she was unsure. She explained that project development is typically managed by applicants and ADOT, and that MAG is often unaware of how specific aspects of the projects are proceeding.

Ms. O'Connor asked about the Litchfield Park application for this round. Eight feet in width is insufficient for a two-way path. Also, the response to the project bidding question is disturbing. Someone must be able to stamp the drawings. They will need to hire a consultant. Ms. O'Connor stated that these questions, left unanswered, affect this application's ability to be ranked.

Reed Kempton added that two-way bicycle traffic on a multi-use path is dangerous. He asserted that this project is really a sidewalk, and he could not recommend funding for the project as it was described in the application and in the responses to staff concerns raised at the last meeting.

Grant Anderson asked if he could make a motion, and moved to move the Tovrea project to the state pot of funding. Mary O'Connor seconded the motion, and the motion passed unanimously. Co-Chair Gordon added that staff should write a letter indicating that this project is a one-time opportunity.

Angela Dye said that she had worked on the 24th and Camelback project report funded from MAG, and asked if there was a conflict. Co-Chair Gordon said there would be a conflict if Ms. Dye would lose or gain from the decision. Ms. Dye said she would abstain from voting on this project, and the 2nd Avenue project as well, since she was also involved in that project.

Marie Ellis said that the Timber Bridge project is a good project, and that the landscaping along the Agua Fria is desperately needed. The multi-use park project in Glendale will also be an excellent community resource.

Lloyd Harrell stated that he did not sense that Scottsdale was enthusiastic about the Canal Bank Enhancement project. Ms. Dye added that the project was probably not erosion control as indicated in the application. She added that the beautification project along the freeway in Glendale was not typically endorsed by the Working Group for state funds. Dawn Coomer said that these types of projects had been funded through set-aside funding in ADOT. Ms. Dye said that projects funded through enhancements need to have a transportation function, and not be pure landscaping projects. Mr. Anderson asked what types of projects had been funded with state funds. Co-Chair Gordon said that Tovrea received state funding, and some underpasses were enhanced in Phoenix. However, these projects included bicycle/pedestrian amenities in addition to just public art. Ms. O'Connor added that most projects funded have been bicycle/pedestrian projects. Median landscaping projects submitted in earlier rounds of funding have not been received favorably by the Working Group.

Mr. Anderson stated that this landscaping was removed when the cable barriers were put in. Ms. Ellis asked who funded the bridges over the Squaw Peak in Phoenix, and Co-Chair Gordon said that these projects were funded with general funds. Mr. Kupel asked if members of the Working Group needed to follow local priorities. Co-Chair Gordon said that each member should vote as they wish. City priorities are simply a factor to consider in the ranking. Mr. Kupel asked if the median landscaping project shouldn't be funded. Ms. Dye said that denying funding to the application by rejecting it by this Committee was not advisable, but the multi-modal transportation should be considered the main use of transportation enhancement funding. Co-Chair Gordon added that these comments are meant to assist applicants in preparing the best application possible. Having a project which qualifies for multiple categories is better.

Reed Kempton said that he had spoken with Fred Carpenter in Wickenburg about his project as well, and that two-way bike traffic on one side of the street is dangerous. There are too many destinations in this area. He said that Mr. Carpenter would be changing his application, and asked Ms. Coomer if the revised application had been received. Ms. Coomer replied that Mr. Carpenter had called her

and shared about his conversation with Mr. Kempton, and indicated that his application would be revised.

The meeting was recessed at 2:40 p.m. for members to complete their ranking form. The meeting was reconvened at 3:15 p.m.

Dawn Coomer read the state project rankings to the Working Group, and Ms. Dye wrote the results on the white board in the room. The results of the state projects were:

APPLICANT	PROJECT	RANK
Phoenix	Preserving Historic Vistas/State Route 202/Tovrea Castle	1
Chandler	Retention Basin Landscaping	2
Tempe	US 60 @ County Club Way Bicycle/Pedestrian Bridge& Multi-Use Path	3
Wickenburg/ ADOT	US 60 Multi-Use Path	4
Glendale	Agua Fria Freeway Loop 101 Median and Bridge Enhancements	5
Surprise	Grand Avenue SR 60	6
Chandler	Landform Graphics & Gateway: Santan Freeway and Arizona Avenue TI	7
Chandler	Landform Graphics: Price Freeway & Santan Freeway TI	8
Chandler	Landform Graphics & Gateway: Santan Freeway and Gilbert Rd.	9

Co-Chair Gordon asked if state applications should be discussed separately, and the Working Group agreed. Doug Kupel stated that the Chandler Retention Basin project is ranked too high. Tempe had lots of public involvement, and should be ranked higher. Mary O'Connor stated that Tempe did not want to make additional presentation earlier in the meeting. US 60 had a lot of public support and is Tempe's highest priority project.

Co-Chair Harrell stated that #2 and #3 could be switched. He added that the Retention Basin project is a highly visible and important project in Chandler. He asked Mickey Ohland for additional information. Mr. Ohland state that the project is a 10 acre tract of land and includes 10 foot wide paths to adjacent neighborhoods. Marcie Ellis made a motion to move Tempe up in the ranking (switching with Chandler), and Angela Dye seconded the motion.

Reed Kempton asked if the Tovrea Castle project qualified for a state project. Co-Chair Gordon stated that he had met with the former coordinator of the program and the chair of the TERC, and both were supportive. The project may qualify for funding if the TERC agrees. Ms. O'Connor asked if the Chandler project had a pedestrian element, and said that this should be clarified in the application. Ms. Coomer said that Chandler's response to the Working Group's comments did clarify this point. Co-Chair Gordon asked what the point difference was in the ranking of the projects, and Ms. Coomer said there was only one point difference in the ranking. Co-Chair Gordon asked the maker of the motion to amend the motion to have the Chandler and the Tempe project ranked equally. Both agreed. The motion passed unanimously. Mr. Anderson moved to approve the ranked list of state projects and have MAG staff forward the ranked list of applications to the Arizona Department of Transportation. The new ranking follows:

APPLICANT	PROJECT	RANK
Phoenix	Preserving Historic Vistas/State Route 202/Tovrea Castle	1
Chandler	Retention Basin Landscaping	2 (tie)
Tempe	US 60 @ County Club Way Bicycle/Pedestrian Bridge & Multi-Use Path	2 (tie)
Wickenburg/ ADOT	US 60 Multi-Use Path	4
Glendale	Agua Fria Freeway Loop 101 Median and Bridge Enhancements	5
Surprise	Grand Avenue SR 60	6
Chandler	Landform Graphics & Gateway: Santan Freeway and Arizona Avenue TI	7
Chandler	Landform Graphics: Price Freeway & Santan Freeway TI	8
Chandler	Landform Graphics & Gateway: Santan Freeway and Gilbert Rd.	9

The meeting continued with Ms. Coomer reading the local project rankings:

APPLICANT	PROJECT	RANK
Phoenix	Camelback Core Pedestrian Enhancement Demonstration Project	1
Tempe	13 th Street Pedestrian & Bikeway Improvements, Landscape & Artist-Designed Elements	2

APPLICANT	PROJECT	RANK
Gilbert	Powerline Trail Multi-Modal Path	3
Phoenix	2 nd Avenue Bicycle, Pedestrian and Landscaping Enhancement	4
Avondale	Coldwater Park to Community Park 2 Agua Fria Connector Route	5
Goodyear	Historic Railroad Station at the New Goodyear City Center	6
Chandler	Western Canal Bike Path, Alma School to Hamilton	7
RPTA	Bicycle/Pedestrian Safety Program	8
Tempe	West Dam Bicycle/Pedestrian Bridge	9
Glendale	Grand Canal Timber Bridge and Multi-Use Connector Path at 79 th Avenue and Missouri	10 (tie)
MAG et al.	Southeast Valley Multimodal Facilities Master Plan	10 (tie)
Phoenix/FQ Story Historic District	Intersection and Walkway Improvements, Phase II	12 (tie)
Scottsdale	Indian School Road Canal Bank Enhancement	12 (tie)
Glendale	Children's Pedestrian/Bicycle Safety City	14
Gilbert	Santan Vista Trail, Multi-Modal Path, Eastern Canal	15
Litchfield Park	Litchfield Road Regional Connection Pathway	16

The Working Group then discussed the ranking of the local projects. Marcie Ellis suggested that the Avondale and Goodyear projects be moved up a ranking, and that 2nd Avenue be moved down. Angela Dye suggested that the 13th Street project be moved up a ranking as well. Ms. Ellis added that the multi-modal link over I-10 is very important, and that the Goodyear project is a one-time opportunity. Co-Chair Gordon asked Co-Chair Harrell to lead the discussion since a Phoenix project was involved. Mr. Kupel suggested that the Gilbert Powerline project should be lower since it wasn't a regional type of project. Ms. Dye suggested making Goodyear #3. Grant Anderson said that the Goodyear project is a one-time opportunity of some urgency. In addition, making this project a higher priority may appeal to the rural representatives on the TERC.

Co-Chair Harrell asked for a motion. Ms. Ellis moved that the first, second and third priorities remain the same, and that the fourth priority be Avondale, that the fifth priority be Goodyear, and that the 2nd Avenue project moved to number six. Mr. Anderson seconded the motion. Ms. O'Connor

suggested that Chandler be substituted for the Gilbert project since the Chandler project is more regional. The Chandler project also has a higher match. Co-Chair Gordon said that these projects were ranked based on consensus and that the ranking shouldn't be changed unless there is a consensus of the Working Group members. He said he would vote against the motion since there didn't appear to be consensus. He added that the 2nd Avenue project is in a lower socioeconomic area, which should be an important consideration. Ms. Ellis added that the Avondale project is also in a low-income area. Mr. Kupel asked why the Gilbert project was ranked so high. The projects should be ranked based on their quality rather than their location. He suggested that the top ranked six projects should be revoted. Co-Chair Harrell asked for a vote. The motion did not pass, with Mr. Kupel, Co-Chair Harrell, Ms. O'Connor, Ms. Dye and Co-Chair Gordon voting against the motion.

Ms. Ellis moved to revoke the top six ranked projects. Mr. Kupel seconded the motion, noting disagreement with the logic of the motion. Co-Chair Gordon stated that the Working Group has advocated many projects in the West Valley, including the West Valley Recreation Corridor study done by MAG. Co-Chair Gordon voiced support for historic preservation as well, and noted that the TERC likes historic preservation projects. He added that the Working Group's reasons for ranking the projects can be voiced to the TERC.

Ms. O'Connor noted that 2nd Avenue, Chandler and 13th Street have large local matches. Goodyear is a one-time opportunity. Gilbert, while a good project, does not have these factors. These factors can be considered by the Working Group as "leveling factors" when ranking projects is difficult.

Co-Chair Harrell asked for a vote of the motion. The motion failed, with Mr. Kempton, Co-Chair Harrell, Ms. Dye, Co-Chair Gordon and Ms. O'Connor voting against the motion. Mr. Anderson moved to substitute the Goodyear project for the Gilbert project in the ranking. Ms. Ellis seconded the motion. The motion passed, with Co-Chair Harrell, Mr. Kempton and Co-Chair Gordon voting against the motion.

Mr. Kupel moved to recommend that MAG staff forward the ranked list of local applications to the Arizona Department of Transportation. Co-Chair Harrell seconded the motion. Ms. O'Connor stated that the Chandler project should move up in the rankings. Co-Chair Harrell explained that the project is the highest priority project in Chandler, of all local and state projects submitted, but that the project is not a one-time opportunity. The motion passed unanimously.

6. Other Items Relevant to the Round IX and Future Enhancement Fund Applications

The Working Group decided to meet again to discuss these items. There needs to be input from the intergovernmental liaisons on how to improve the process of reviewing and ranking enhancement fund applications. There could be a workshop with ADOT staff, and an adopted process on how to address rankings. Mr. Anderson suggested that MAG staff be given time to create some options for consideration by the Working Group. Co-Chair Gordon suggested that someone else other than MAG could host a workshop. Lynn Timmons suggested the Tovrea Castle, and the Working Group agreed that this should be considered.

7. Future Meeting Dates

Future meeting dates were not set at this time.

The meeting adjourned at 4:00 p.m.