

MINUTES OF THE
MARICOPA ASSOCIATION OF GOVERNMENTS
TRANSPORTATION REVIEW COMMITTEE

December 4, 1998

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

MEMBERS ATTENDING

Steve Hogan, Scottsdale, Acting Chairman
Chuck Eaton for Victor Mendez, ADOT
William Bates, Avondale
Dan Cook for Patrice Kraus, Chandler
*Randy Harrel, Fountain Hills
Tami Ryall, Gilbert
Ken Martin, Glendale
Doug Sanders, Goodyear
Mike Cartsonis, Litchfield Park

Chris Plumb for Tom Buick, Maricopa County
Jeff Martin, Mesa
David Moody, Peoria
Tom Callow for Jim Matteson, Phoenix,
Chairman
*Dick Schaner, Queen Creek
Bryan Jungwirth for Ken Driggs, RPTA
Ellis Perl for Bill Parrish, Surprise
*Harvey Friedson, Tempe

EX-OFFICIO MEMBERS ATTENDING

*Regional Bicycle Task Force: Patrick
McDermott, Chandler
*Street Committee: Ron Krosting, Mesa
*Pedestrian Working Group: Mike Branham,
Surprise

*Intermodal Management System Working
Group: Dave Berry, Swift Transportation
Company
*Telecommunication Working Group: Debbie
Kohn, Avondale

* Members neither present nor represented by proxy.

OTHERS PRESENT

Chris Thomas, Glendale
Eric Anderson, MAG
Dawn Coomer, MAG
John Farry, MAG
Terry Johnson, MAG

Paul Ward, MAG
Phillip Hubbard, Peoria
Don Herp, Phoenix
Lisa Takata, Phoenix
Neal Manske, Phoenix Transit

1. Call to Order

Acting Chairman Steve Hogan called the meeting to order at 11:40 a.m.

2. Policy Guidelines for Programming Regional Transportation Funds

Steve Hogan introduced the topic by noting that the TRC previously reviewed draft policy guidelines at their meeting on December 1, 1998. The purpose of today's meeting was to discuss details of the principles to create a unified perspective on the guidelines. He suggested that each principle would be examined and discussed.

Terry Johnson began the discussion with the concept of regionalism. He noted that changes requested at Tuesday's meeting had been incorporated into the document. In item number one under regionalism, "bus" had been changed to "transit." In addition, a new item had been added under regionalism: "Support projects that integrate land use and transportation planning to promote positive and beneficial impacts for the region."

Mike Cartsonis requested that an additional bullet be added under regionalism: "Provide transportation systems which interface with land use needs and interface with various transportation modes." He explained that land use alternatives should be used to remedy transportation deficiencies. Steve asked for discussion and comments. Bryan Jungwirth noted that transportation should lead land use whenever possible, rather than trying to fit transportation around existing community form. Steve suggested modifying the statement to incorporate these concerns. After discussion, the committee decided upon the following statement: "Support projects that integrate land use and transportation planning to provide a transportation system which interfaces with land use needs and provides appropriate accessibility by the various transportation modes."

Terry asked if one item should be discussed at a time, and if funding should be the next item of discussion. Steve suggested that less controversial topics should be discussed first. Mike noted that item four under regionalism placed too much emphasis on weighting. He suggested the following instead: "Facilitate street projects which promote regional traffic movement." John Farry noted that "system" should be changed to "significance."

Chuck Eaton asked about state corridors in the region which are not a component of the MAG regional freeway system. In addition, he opposed language that indicated MAG would program ADOT discretionary funds. Terry responded that MAG and ADOT would work cooperatively to determine priorities for ADOT discretionary funds. Steve suggested that the cooperative planning and programming process should be indicated in the principles, and Chuck agreed.

Doug Sanders added some comments on item two under regionalism. Jeff Martin noted that the regional freeway system as defined in 1985 was included in this item.

Steve noted that Chuck was asking about other major transportation corridors other than those defined in the MAG freeway system. Jeff noted that the principles don't need to address ADOT priorities since ADOT did not understand the importance of the MAG freeway system. The committee discussed these ideas, and Chuck noted that the remainder of the state system has regional importance. This concept needed to be addressed since this document would be used for all regional transportation funding. Chris Plumb suggested adding an additional bullet in the spirit of cooperation.

Jeff noted that he could support such a statement only if air quality and traffic congestion were added as criteria rather than gateway projects. Terry mentioned that gateway projects were not specifically addressed in the guidelines.

After more discussion, John suggested the following: "Recognize the importance of the state highway system within the region as it relates to improving air quality and reducing congestion." Tom Callow had no problems with the statement as presented due to its vagueness. Chris voiced support for the statement. Steve asked for a show of hands for those supporting the statement, and noted that the statement would remain.

Tom noted that regional projects may not have to cross boundaries to address regional travel needs. The introductory statement defining regionalism was changed to read: "Regional needs and projects serve regional travel needs."

Terry continued with a discussion of multimodalism. He reviewed all the statements as listed in the agenda attachment. Ken asked if telecommunciations should be replaced with teleconferencing. Bryan explained the difference between telework, telecommunications and teleconferencing. After discussion, item four was changed to "Support regionally significant telecommuting, teleconferencing, and teleworking projects."

Mike added that it was important to acknowledge new areas of growth, and the ability to facilitate non-automotive modes of travel in these developing areas. He suggested adding: "Encourage non-automobile travel by supporting community design which facilitates bicycle, pedestrian and other non-automotive travel." Tom asked if this should be a new item. Mike responded that it was important to design multi-use path connections while communities were being designed. Chris added that use of neighborhood electric vehicles was problematic in some developing areas of the County. Steve asked for a show of hands, and the above statement was added as an additional bullet.

Steve began with the air quality principle. Doug noted that some communities are experiencing difficulty with implementing alternative fuel conversion programs, and that the air quality benefit from these programs was minimal. Ken agreed with Doug, adding that reducing pollution should be the focus of programs. Item one was changed to: "Support programs which reduce pollution caused by vehicular travel."

Mike added that using alternative modes for short-length trips needed to be addressed. Bryan noted that Mike's issue was addressed in the multimodal category, and the committee agreed. Tom asked why item seven did not mention CMAQ funds, and Terry responded that CMAQ funds can not be used for studies. Doug noted that item six does not consider additional lanes or flyovers to address air quality concerns. Terry responded that CMAQ funds have been used for turning lanes, and that the goal of the statement was to clarify ways to use CMAQ funds to reduce carbon monoxide.

Steve continued the discussion by discussing the congestion guideline. Chris noted that item three did not belong under this guideline. Terry responded there was no other category, and that the Regional Council needed a way to act upon this concern voiced by the public. Tom asked for a safety

category, and Chris agreed that safety should be a high priority. Steve suggested that safety have the example of road rage with the potential to add more examples in the future. Jeff suggested putting the road rage example under the human services category. Steve asked for a show of hands, and the item was placed under the human services category.

Under human services, Dave noted the typographical error in item one. This error was corrected.

The committee continued by discussing funding issues. Terry began by reviewing item one. Chuck noted that ADOT feels that funding should be used based on need, and that the contribution issue had not yet been resolved. He objected to the statement and second sentence since the funding level had not yet been agreed upon. Ken added that the entire category should be omitted from the guidelines since there were too many issues and unanswered questions. He suggested that the guidelines be used to prioritize projects, and questioned why the funding was even mentioned.

Eric Anderson noted that this item is important, and that a Regional Council policy was needed to have credibility with ADOT. He noted that the needs based allocation should be based on a wide range of criteria. Dave mentioned that items four and five run contrary to a needs based approach. Jeff voiced support for item one, and that a strong position on fair share was needed. Ken added that the purpose of this document was to provide a programming policy. Funding is a separate issue which could be addressed in other ways.

Eric explained that a strong regional position was needed. Several high priority projects had been omitted from the ADOT program, and that funding is integral to the policy. Tom suggested putting the item in the introduction portion of the document. He agreed with Eric, noting, however, that placing this specific item as a guideline was not appropriate. Dan Cook asked how this criteria would be used to select projects.

Steve asked if there was agreement in using Tom's suggestion since funding was really an overarching policy concern. David Moody suggested using portions of items one, two and three in the introduction, and deleting items four, five and six. Dan agreed with David. Tom suggested that item two could be used as a project criteria. David agreed that freeways should be funded at their current level.

Steve explained that item one was different from items two and three. Item one was to seek the support of another agency, while items two and three were self-imposed by action of the Regional Council. Terry noted that item two may be difficult to implement when selecting projects. Steve asked for a show of hands on the proposal to add item one to the introduction. Eric was supportive, noting that his concerns would be addressed and the statement would be given more emphasis. The committee agreed.

Jeff Martin suggested keeping item two, but asked for a clarification of how it changed current policy. Terry explained that less than 70 percent was included for freeways in the new program. Jeff suggested delaying this decision until a regional funding estimate is determined. The committee discussed whether to omit item two, and Eric noted that the item provides guidelines for

programming and planning, not only project selection. He explained that the statement leaves the absolute amount of funding the same, and may actually make more funding available for other types of projects. Jeff noted that this statement did not clearly show a policy change. Ken asked for clarification of the TEA-21 distribution and why a policy change may be needed. Jeff Martin suggested that the first sentence read: "At least the current amount of programmed MAG funds committed to new freeway construction needs to be maintained." Chuck suggested additional changes to the last sentence, which should read: "Maintaining a 70 percent commitment to freeways has become difficult as TEA-21 has substantially increased the share of MAG funds in the Congestion Mitigation and Air Quality (CMAQ) category; CMAQ funds can not be used for new freeway construction unless it includes qualified uses, such as the construction of an HOV lane."

Terry noted that item three did not include a specific amount due to funding uncertainty. Jeff voiced support for an overall policy, and noted that the issue of a modal allocation for transit needed to be addressed. Ken asked how this statement differed from item one, and Steve noted that the issue of modal allocation should be further discussed by the TRC.

David suggested omitting item five. Jeff agreed, noting that the idea is to have reform in how funds are allocated. The intent is to give jurisdictions a higher stake in the process, not to place undue burden on smaller communities. The committee discussed this, and Ken noted that this issue should be removed for now and discussed more later. Chris noted that item six needed to be addressed as well, especially how to define cost effectiveness. Bryan added that over-reliance on one cost effectiveness criteria may not permit holistic analysis. Steve summarized that a more comprehensive statement was needed, and Terry noted that item six could be brought back to the TRC for further discussion. David agreed that the item should be addressed later.

David asked if a checklist would be developed from the guidelines. He noted that the checklist would act as a ranking system, and he would oppose the development of a checklist. Terry noted that this idea could be discussed later as well. Tom questioned why some criteria was listed as examples of a category and other criteria was not. The committee agreed that the criteria should be listed consistently throughout the guideline categories.

David moved to recommend to the Management Committee that the principles be adopted as amended. Jeff seconded the motion, and the motion passed with ADOT abstaining.

The meeting adjourned at 1:15 p.m.