

March 11, 2009

TO: Members of the Transportation Policy Committee

FROM: Mayor Steve Berman, Gilbert, Chair

SUBJECT: NOTIFICATION OF MEETING AND TRANSMITTAL OF TENTATIVE AGENDA

Meeting - 4:00 p.m.  
Wednesday, March 18, 2009  
MAG Office, Suite 200 - Saguaro Room  
302 N. First Avenue, Phoenix

A meeting of the Transportation Policy Committee is scheduled for the time and place noted above. Members of the Committee may attend the meeting either in person, by videoconference, or by telephone conference call. As was discussed at the first meeting of the Committee, proxies would not be allowed. Members who are not able to attend the meeting are encouraged to submit their comments in writing, so that their view would always be a part of the process.

For those attending in person, please park in the garage under the building. Bring your ticket to the meeting, parking will be validated. For those using transit, the Regional Public Transportation Authority will provide transit tickets for your trip. For those using bicycles, please lock your bicycle in the bike rack in the garage.

Pursuant to Title II of the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA), MAG does not discriminate on the basis of disability in admission to or participation in its public meetings. Persons with a disability may request a reasonable accommodation, such as a sign language interpreter, by contacting Valerie Day at the MAG office. Requests should be made as early as possible to allow time to arrange the accommodation.

Refreshments and a light snack will be provided. If you have any questions, please contact Eric Anderson, MAG Transportation Director, or Dennis Smith, MAG Executive Director, at (602) 254-6300.

c: MAG Regional Council  
MAG Management Committee

**TRANSPORTATION POLICY COMMITTEE  
TENTATIVE AGENDA  
March 18, 2009**

COMMITTEE ACTION REQUESTED

<p>1. <u>Call to Order</u></p>		
<p>2. <u>Pledge of Allegiance</u></p>		
<p>3. <u>Call to the Audience</u></p> <p>An opportunity will be provided to members of the public to address the Transportation Policy Committee on items not scheduled on the agenda that fall under the jurisdiction of MAG, or on items on the agenda for discussion but not for action. Citizens will be requested not to exceed a three minute time period for their comments. A total of 15 minutes will be provided for the Call to the Audience agenda item, unless the Transportation Policy Committee requests an exception to this limit. Please note that those wishing to comment on agenda items posted for action will be provided the opportunity at the time the item is heard.</p>	<p>3. Information.</p>	
<p>4. <u>Approval of Consent Agenda</u></p> <p>Prior to action on the consent agenda, members of the audience will be provided an opportunity to comment on consent items that are being presented for action. Following the comment period, Committee members may request that an item be removed from the consent agenda. Consent items are marked with an asterisk (*).</p>	<p>4. Recommend approval of the Consent Agenda.</p>	

**ITEMS PROPOSED FOR CONSENT\***

<p>*4A. <u>Approval of the February 18, 2009, Meeting Minutes</u></p>		<p>4A. Review and approval of the February 18, 2009, meeting minutes.</p>
---	--	---

**ITEMS PROPOSED TO BE HEARD**

<p>5A. <u>ADOT Portion of the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act Funds</u></p> <p>On February 18, 2009, staff reported to the Transportation Policy Committee that MAG</p>		<p>5A. Information, discussion, and possible action.</p>
--	--	--

expected to receive approximately \$99 to \$188 million of the Arizona Department of Transportation (ADOT) portion of the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act (ARRA) funds. Staff noted that the State Transportation Board would be considering the MAG allocation at its meeting on February 20, 2009. The State Transportation Board allocated \$129.4 million to the MAG region. On February 25, 2009, the Regional Council approved a ranked list of projects cooperatively developed with ADOT for the ADOT portion of the ARRA funds totaling approximately \$194 million. The Regional Council also approved having the Chair of the Regional Council send a letter to the State Transportation Board forwarding the projects and also to send a letter to the Senate and House leadership requesting assistance in MAG receiving an equitable share of the ADOT portion of the ARRA funds. On March 3, 2009, the State Transportation Board heard testimony regarding the allocation of the ADOT portion of the ARRA funds. Following the testimony, the Board went into executive session and upon returning announced they had reaffirmed their decision made on February 20, 2009, to provide the MAG region 37 percent of the funds. It was noted that this was a unanimous decision. The Board then considered projects for the ADOT portion of the ARRA funds. This item was on the March 11, 2009, Management Committee agenda. No action was taken. Please refer to the enclosed material.

5B. MAG Sub-Allocation Portion of the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act Funds Project and Allocation Scenarios

The American Recovery and Reinvestment Act (ARRA) legislation sub-allocates 30 percent of the funding (\$156.57 million) to local jurisdictions. The amount being sub-allocated to MAG has not been officially transmitted yet by the Arizona Department of Transportation, however, MAG staff believes approximately \$104.6 million would be allocated directly to the MAG region. Metropolitan Planning Organizations have one year to obligate the funds. The Transportation

5B. Recommend approval of Scenario # 1, Option A, with a Minimum Agency Allocation of \$500,000 plus population dated March 10, 2009, for the distribution of the MAG Sub-Allocation Portion of the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act Funds in accordance with the following: 1. Establish a deadline of April 3, 2009, to have MAG member agencies define and submit projects to MAG for the sub-allocated funds due to the very limited time to obligate the projects. 2. Have MAG prepare the necessary administrative adjustments/amendments to the FY 2008-2012 MAG Transportation Improvement Program and or Regional Transportation Plan as appropriate. 3.

Policy Committee met on February 18, 2009, and requested a set of scenarios to fund projects for the MAG sub-allocated portion of the ARRA funds. These scenarios were presented and discussed at the MAG Transportation Review Committee meeting on February 26, 2009. The five scenarios are attached for your review. On March 11, 2009, the Management Committee recommended approval of Scenario #1, Option A, with a Minimum Agency Allocation of \$500,000 plus population dated March 10, 2009, for the distribution of the MAG Sub-Allocation Portion of the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act Funds in accordance with the following: 1. Establish a deadline of April 3, 2009, to have MAG member agencies define and submit projects to MAG for the sub-allocated funds due to the very limited time to obligate the projects. 2. Have MAG prepare the necessary administrative adjustments/amendments to the FY 2008-2012 MAG Transportation Improvement Program and or Regional Transportation Plan as appropriate. 3. Have MAG conduct the air quality consultation/conformity if necessary. 4. Establish a deadline of November 30, 2009, for projects to be obligated. Funds from projects that are not obligated will be reprogrammed to meet the federal obligation date of February 17, 2010, in order for Arizona to be eligible to receive funding from other states that are unable to obligate their funds. Please refer to the enclosed material.

Have MAG conduct the air quality consultation/conformity if necessary. 4. Establish a deadline of November 30, 2009 for projects to be obligated. Funds from projects that are not obligated will be reprogrammed to meet the federal obligation date of February 17, 2010 in order for Arizona to be eligible to receive funding from other states that are unable to obligate their funds.

5C. MAG Regional Portion of the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act -Transit

5C. Information and discussion.

The American Recovery and Reinvestment Act (ARRA) regional portion for transit is in the range of \$65 million to \$75 million. The legislation requires that 50 percent of the transit funds be obligated within 180 days. The Regional Public Transportation Authority (RPTA) board met on February 19, 2009, and recommended project selection criteria. RPTA, MAG, and member agencies are working collaboratively in this analysis. A memorandum from RPTA explaining a draft ARRA transit scenario recommendation is attached. The Board is expected to meet on March 19, 2009, for further review and possible

action. This item was on the March 11, 2009, Management Committee agenda for information and discussion. Please refer to the enclosed material.

6. Project Changes – Administrative Modification to the FY 2008-2012 MAG Transportation Improvement Program for Funding from the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act of 2009

On February 17, 2009, President Obama signed the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act (ARRA). The components of the bill and policy implications are discussed in a separate agenda item. In response to the expedited time frames for transportation projects in the Act, and administratively modifying the FY 2008-2012 Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) and, as appropriate, the Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) 2007 Update, may be necessary to move projects forward. The FY 2008-2012 TIP and RTP 2007 Update were originally approved by the MAG Regional Council on July 25, 2007. On February 25, 2009, the MAG Regional Council voted to approve a cooperatively developed list of MAG Region Highway - ADOT/State projects in priority order for the ADOT portion of the ARRA funds of 2009 and that the projects be forwarded to ADOT contingent upon projects finally selected receiving the necessary administrative adjustments and amendments to the MAG TIP and air quality conformity and consultation. The Arizona State Transportation Board met on March 3, 2009, to discuss highway projects for the use of funds allocated to the ARRA. The Board approved the MAG listing of projects for the ARRA funds. It was noted that discrepancies between the priorities submitted by MAG would be clarified before the next State Transportation Board meeting. The necessary administrative modifications to the FY 2008-2012 MAG Transportation Improvement Program for approximately \$129.4 million allocated by the Board is presented for consideration by the Transportation Policy Committee. On March 11, 2009, the Management Committee recommended approval of administrative

6. Recommend approval of administrative modifications to the FY 2008-2012 Transportation Improvement Program, as appropriate, to the Regional Transportation Plan 2007 Update, and material cost changes to the ADOT Program, for funding from the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act of 2009 as shown in the attached table.

modifications to the FY 2008-2012 MAG Transportation Improvement Program, and as appropriate, to the Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) 2007 Update for funding from the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act of 2009. Please refer to the enclosed material.

7. Legislative Update

An update will be provided on legislative issues of interest.

7. Information, discussion and possible action.

MINUTES OF THE  
MARICOPA ASSOCIATION OF GOVERNMENTS  
TRANSPORTATION POLICY COMMITTEE MEETING

February 18, 2009  
MAG Office, Saguaro Room  
Phoenix, Arizona

MEMBERS ATTENDING

- |  |  |
|--|--|
| Mayor Steven Berman, Gilbert, Chair                          | * Eneas Kane, DMB Associates                             |
| Mayor Marie Lopez Rogers, Avondale,<br>Vice Chair            | * Mark Killian, The Killian Company/Sunny<br>Mesa, Inc.  |
| Councilmember Ron Aames, Peoria                              | Mayor Jackie Meck, Buckeye                               |
| * Kent Andrews, Salt River Pima-Maricopa<br>Indian Community | David Scholl   |
| Councilmember Maria Baier, Phoenix                           | Mayor Elaine Scruggs, Glendale                           |
| + Vice Mayor Gail Barney, Queen Creek                        | Mayor Scott Smith, Mesa                                  |
| # Stephen Beard, SR Beard & Associates                       | Mayor Jim Lane, Scottsdale,                              |
| Dave Berry, Swift Transportation                             | Mayor Lyn Truitt, Surprise                               |
| Jed Billings, FNF Construction                               | Supervisor Max W. Wilson, Maricopa County                |
| Mayor James Cavanaugh, Goodyear                              | * Felipe Zubia, State Transportation Board               |
| # Mayor Boyd Dunn, Chandler                                  | * Vacant, Citizens Transportation Oversight<br>Committee |
| # Mayor Hugh Hallman, Tempe                                  |  |

\* Not present

# Participated by telephone conference call

+ Participated by videoconference call

1. Call to Order

The meeting of the Transportation Policy Committee (TPC) was called to order by Chair Steven Berman at 4:08 p.m.

2. Pledge of Allegiance

The Pledge of Allegiance was recited.

Chair Berman noted that Mayor Hugh Hallman, Mayor Boyd Dunn, and Steve Beard were participating by teleconference and Vice Mayor Gail Barney was participating by videoconference.

Chair Berman announced that Jed Billings and Mark Killian were reappointed to the TPC by Senate President Robert Burns.

Chair Berman noted that transit tickets for those who used transit to attend the meeting and parking garage ticket validation were available from MAG staff.

3. Call to the Audience

Chair Berman stated that an opportunity is provided to the public to address the Transportation Policy Committee on items that are not on the agenda that are within the jurisdiction of MAG, or non action agenda items that are on the agenda for discussion or information only. Citizens will be requested not to exceed a three minute time period for their comments. An opportunity is provided to comment on agenda items posted for action at the time the item is heard.

4. Approval of Consent Agenda

Chair Berman stated that agenda item #4A was on the consent agenda. He stated that public comment is provided for consent items. He noted that no public comment cards had been received. Councilmember Aames moved to approve consent agenda item #4A. Mayor Cavanaugh seconded, and the motion carried unanimously.

4A. Approval of the January 23, 2009, Meeting Minutes

The Transportation Policy Committee, by consent, approved the January 23, 2009, meeting minutes.

5. Transportation Planning Update

Bob Hazlett, MAG Senior Engineer provided an update on activities related to balancing the freeway program component of Proposition 400. He said that two activities have been underway—the first is the Inner Loop Peer Review and the second is MAG working with the ADOT management consultants in workshops to look at ways to save costs on those corridors.

Mr. Hazlett stated that the Inner Loop Peer Review expert panel has been studying the area from Northern Avenue to the South Mountain, from Loop 101 on the west to Loop 101 on the east. He noted that a final report is anticipated for the end of March 2009.

Mr. Hazlett stated that the Inner Loop Peer Review expert panel convened in November 2008, and is a joint effort by ADOT and MAG to examine the Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) and Design Concept Report (DCR) recommendations for freeways leading to the Inner Loop in order to accomplish future travel demand and look at the network's constraints. Mr. Hazlett stated that three nationally recognized experts are on the panel: John Conrad, CH2M Hill, and former Washington Department of Transportation State Engineer; Mike Falini, Wilson & Company, and extensive expertise with the Florida DOT, Colorado DOT, and Utah DOT; and Jack Lettiere,

former commissioner with the New Jersey Department of Transportation and Executive Director for the New Jersey Transit.

Mr. Hazlett stated that the panel expressed their amazement at MAG's extensive information, and indicated that although \$5 billion short of need, the Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) is well funded, compared to other areas of the country. Mr. Hazlett stated that the panel also felt that the region's transportation system is in good condition.

Mr. Hazlett stated that the panel discussed some areas of improvement. He said that one area to address is traffic congestion, and the panel discussed the impacts of doing nothing, expanding to meet the need, or stabilizing to meet traffic demand. Mr. Hazlett stated that another area is addressing the HOV lane policy, and a part of that is maintaining the relationship with park and ride lots and HOV freeway-to-freeway connections to maintain the speed of travel in these lanes. Mr. Hazlett stated that the panel expressed that the current park and ride lot system may not meet the demand. He said that another area for improvement was in travel demand management. Mr. Hazlett commented that the MAG region is the only place in the United States paying for freeway operations with sales tax funds.

Mr. Hazlett stated that the panel discussed MAG's planning process, and to improve efficiency, they thought the process should be expanded to a systemic analysis, rather than analysis by individual corridors themselves. He stated that this was apparent with studies on I-10 and I-17 that recommended bringing more traffic onto the Stack, but not necessarily improving the Stack itself. He remarked that essentially, it is moving people faster to a larger parking lot. Mr. Hazlett stated that transit is also a solution, and a balance between transit and roadways is needed.

Mr. Hazlett reviewed some options suggested by the panel. For the I-10/Maricopa Freeway, integrate alternative modes and consider other corridors to meet the travel demand. For the I-10/Papago Freeway, improve the integration with light rail plans and do not make any improvements without adding additional capacity in the Stack. For the I-17 truck route, do not make any improvements without adding additional capacity in the Stack and utilize to meet travel demand from one end of downtown to the other. For the I-17 Black Canyon Freeway, operate the upper deck as a toll facility to recoup costs. Mr. Hazlett stated a formal report on the panel's recommendations will be provided to the TPC.

Mr. Hazlett then addressed the second activity — the corridor review workshops being held with MAG, ADOT, and ADOT's management consultants to find some options for cost savings in the freeway system. He noted that two six-hour workshops have been held, with one more planned.

Mr. Hazlett said that options identified in the workshops for the Loop 202/South Mountain Freeway could include construction as a six-lane freeway and obtaining right of way for an ultimate ten-lane facility; construction of a six-lane freeway with a provision for HOV lanes in the median; build within a narrower footprint, such as SR-51; construction as an Arizona Parkway in freeway right of way; construction as an Arizona Parkway in parkway right of way; or no build. He noted that these same options could also be considered for the SR-801.

Eric Anderson, MAG Transportation Director, stated that these options are being modeled and cost information developed for these corridors, and he expected more detail would be available by the March TPC meeting. He added that staff is trying to put together the pros and cons for each option.

Mr. Hazlett addressed some options for Loop 303, south of SR-801, SR-801 to I-10, I-10 to US-60, and US-60 to I-17. He stated that options for Interstate 17/Black Canyon Freeway could include evaluating options for the segment from the Arizona Canal to Loop 101, and added that most of the improvements north of Loop 101 are already under construction. Mr. Hazlett reported that improvements are under construction for the Interstate 10/Papago Freeway from Loop 303 to Dysart Road and from Dysart Road to Loop 101. Mr. Hazlett noted that one option might be to mitigate deficiencies at system traffic interchanges. He stated that options for Interstate 10/Maricopa Freeway still need to be evaluated.

Mr. Hazlett stated that next steps include getting a better handle on the revenue, establishing costs, completing impact assessments, and coordinating EIS and DCR schedules and design and construction.

Mr. Anderson stated that the revenue projections received from ADOT in Fall 2008 showed flat revenue, but the actual projections are running 11.2 percent below that projection. He noted that on a base of \$380 million, the amount of the sales tax decrease will total about \$40 million. Mr. Anderson stated that ADOT is going to the bond market this Spring and it looks like the RARF will be down almost \$1.9 billion. He added that the \$6 billion deficit could become a \$7 million deficit.

Mr. Anderson reported that ADOT is also revising the HURF forecast, and he noted that HURF revenues are down significantly this year. He remarked that he thought that HURF for this fiscal year would be \$120 million to \$150 million below forecast, which is a 10 percent decline. Mr. Anderson advised that because much of the HURF revenue is composed of fuel and vehicle taxes, decreases in the fund cannot be recovered. He said that a vehicle that is not going to drive twice the distance because the recession ended. Mr. Anderson stated that the economic downturn has not yet ended, and so it is difficult to develop a plan when the revenue picture continues to decline. He said that he had indicated to the ADOT financial staff that he thought the financial forecast might be conservative. Mr. Anderson remarked that due diligence is required when going to the bond market and issuing debt.

Chair Berman asked about the original forecast of sales tax collection. Mr. Anderson replied that the original forecast in 2003 was about \$15 billion, and that amount is now down to \$12 billion with the revised forecast. Mr. Anderson added that the HURF, which is usually more stable than sales tax is also down, due to the significant decline in the fuel tax and vehicle license tax.

Mr. Hazlett stated that staff wants to get the information from the four areas for improvement and the individual corridor options and have an in-depth discussion at the TPC meeting in March. He added that he hoped there was a better understanding of the revenue side by that time.

Mr. Anderson suggested that workshops for the TPC members could be held, perhaps in 30 to 60 days.

Mayor Scruggs stated that cost saving ideas may save money, but changing a facility to become something less than planned is not fulfilling the intended use. She asked if that happened does the alternative continue to be considered. Mr. Hazlett replied yes, and added that one of the remarks by the expert panel was to design to need and not to money. That is the direction we are heading. Mr. Hazlett stated that an impact assessment needs to be studied about the impacts of changes on the traffic, the program, and accomplishing Proposition 400.

Mayor Scruggs asked for clarification that Mr. Hazlett was saying that fulfillment of the need would not be sacrificed to achieve a big cost reduction. Mr. Hazlett replied that conclusion could be made, and added that it is a delicate situation because costs have escalated dramatically. He noted that they are having a workshop to present the details and look at the impacts if changes are made.

Mayor Scruggs stated that there was considerable vetting when these projects were included in the RTP in 2003 and were determined to be the needs. She expressed concern with people saying a project is not needed because the system has revenue problems. Mayor Scruggs stated that if a project was needed in 2003 and was in the plan and voted on by the people, she thought it would be difficult to diminish a facility because of money. She said that she hoped the TPC would keep this in mind during discussion of the stimulus agenda item.

6. Federal Economic Recovery/Stimulus Update

Nathan Pryor, MAG Senior Policy Planner, stated that the Reinvestment and Recovery Act was signed by the President on February 17, 2009. He said that the highway/bridge component of the legislation is \$27.5 billion, plus a \$1.5 billion competitive grants provision. Mr. Pryor stated that the legislation includes \$8.4 billion for transit.

Mr. Pryor stated that the State of Arizona is expected to receive \$521.9 million for highway infrastructure and \$99 million for transit. He reported that three percent off the top is allocated for transportation enhancement projects, but the actual distribution formula is yet unknown.

Mr. Pryor stated that the State Transportation Board will discuss regional funding, including the STAN funding issue, at its meeting on February 20, 2009, and he added that the region is looking at receiving an amount in the range of \$253 million to \$352 million.

Mr. Anderson clarified that the highway suballocation includes other uses besides highway projects. He said that they are called highway funds because they are Federal Highway Administration funds.

Mr. Pryor stated that the funds are expected to be made available no later than 21 days after the date of enactment (March 10, 2009), after which the "use it or lost it" clock starts ticking. He

explained that the State has 120 days to obligate 50 percent of the funds and transit has 180 days to obligate 50 percent of the funds. He added that there is no short term provision for the MPOs, and said that 100 percent of all three of the funds must be obligated in one year (February 17, 2010). Mr. Pryor stated that the unobligated funds will be put into a pot which creates an opportunity for other states to apply for the unused funds.

Mr. Pryor stated that FHWA is still working on the criteria and application process for the competitive grants provision, and once that is completed applications will be due 180 days after criteria publication, and project selection is to occur by February 17, 2010.

Mr. Pryor reviewed the reporting requirements, which would occur at 90 days, 180 days, one year, two years, and three years, and noted that reporting is to be posted on [www.recovery.gov](http://www.recovery.gov) for the public's view. He then reviewed some of the information to be reported, such as the amount of funds appropriated, the numbers of projects, projects put out to bid and awarded, direct and indirect jobs created, etc.

Eileen Yazzie, MAG Transportation Program Manager, continued the presentation on programming projects for the economic recovery funds, and noted that she would cover the federal requirements, the status of highway and transit projects, the coding of projects submitted by member agencies, other factors to consider besides the federal requirements, proposed funding scenarios, and policy direction.

Ms. Yazzie stated that economic recovery funds can be used on projects that meet current Surface Transportation Program (STP) and Transportation Enhancement federal programs. She said that questions were asked at the Management Committee and TRC meetings about paving projects, and explained that paving dirt roads and alleys do not qualify under these programs. Ms. Yazzie noted that the funds, though, could be flexed to projects such as transit projects, bike and pedestrian projects, and ADA projects.

Ms. Yazzie stated that the focus needed to be on the federal requirements and the TIP status. She explained that one year to obligate the funds seems like sufficient time, but because it usually takes two years to get a project through the federal process, one year is a quick turnaround. Ms. Yazzie stated that right now, the TIP is conforming and if new projects are added that affect the conformity determination, the public input process of 30 to 45 days would have to be followed.

Ms. Yazzie stated that there is a range of possible funds that could come to MAG, such as the funds coming to ADOT and some of the \$16 million in Enhancement Funds that will be available statewide. She said that the State Transportation Board will be discussing this on February 20, 2009.

Mr. Anderson stated that how ADOT will be allocating the funds in Arizona was discussed at a previous Board study session. He said that the issue is MAG believes it is fair to make MAG whole from the sweep of MAG's portion of STAN funds by the Legislature to balance the state's 2009 budget. Mr. Anderson noted that these funds included \$94 million that were for I-10, I-17,

and Williams Gateway Freeway projects, and \$10 million in cost savings on the I-10 widening project outside of the MAG region. He stated that this accounts for the difference in the range of totals, and he believes, based on discussion, that the amount for ADOT projects in the MAG region would be in \$170 million to \$180 million range. Mr. Anderson stated that the Board needs to have that discussion, give guidance to ADOT management, and then MAG will have a clear idea how much money will be available for the project selection process.

Mr. Smith stated that federal law requires that MAG produce a financial plan and have a cooperatively developed revenue estimate. He said that the projects on the ADOT list also need to be developed cooperatively. Mr. Smith stated that the state has to meet a 120-day deadline to obligate the economic recovery funds, and if there could be agreement on projects, the list could be provided to the Regional Council on February 25, 2009, to get the ADOT projects out the door.

Ms. Yazzie noted that at each committee member's place was the MAG list of projects for the State Transportation Board's discussion.

Ms. Yazzie stated that MAG is working cooperatively with RPTA, which has been hosting meetings on the transit side. She reported there are 80 projects on the list totaling about \$1.8 billion with funds available in the range of \$64 million to \$75 million. Ms. Yazzie reported that RPTA will host a meeting February 19, 2009, following the RPTA Board meeting, to discuss prioritization and a possible project list.

Mr. Smith noted that transit projects need to get out quickly as they have a 180-day deadline. He said if there was agreement on projects, the list could also be provided to the Regional Council on February 25th.

Ms. Yazzie then proceeded to preparations for programming the MAG suballocation, which is approximately \$88 million. She indicated this number could change slightly, and added that they are waiting on finalization of the number from FHWA. She expressed appreciation to member agency staff for their diligent work on assembling the project lists.

Ms. Yazzie explained the coding of lists, and said that due to the timing requirements, they looked at whether a project was in the TIP, would the project affect the TIP conformity determination, and the project's status in federal clearances. She advised that the federal clearance is a huge factor because the process can take two years and the economic recovery funds have to obligate in one year. Ms. Yazzie stated that more than 100 projects, totaling more than \$1.5 billion, were coded "C," which means that they would affect the conformity determination or would be facing a lengthy NEPA process, and are probably not good candidates for these funds.

Ms. Yazzie stated that projects coded "A" and "B" seem to be better candidates for the economic recovery funds. She stated that the TRC Working Group has met twice to discuss the projects. Ms. Yazzie noted that member agency staffs were asked to contact MAG staff if they had a project coded "C" and felt it should be coded differently. Ms. Yazzie stated that "B" projects are categorical exclusions and could be obligated quickly. She displayed a list of categorical

exclusions, such pavement preservation that includes mill and overlay and bridge rehab and maintenance.

Ms. Yazzie said that the economic recovery funds can be used to fund 100 percent of a project's cost. Ms. Yazzie stated that the projects must be prepared to obligate in one year. She explained that each year, MAG does a fiscal analysis of those projects that did not obligate their federal funds and noted that MAG still needs to obligate the current fiscal year federal funds. Ms. Yazzie stated that MAG has a large carry forward from fiscal year 2008 and anticipates that the amount for fiscal year 2009 could be in the range of \$50 million. She noted that a lot of projects on the list could take advantage of these closeout funds.

Ms. Yazzie stated that if economic recovery funds are used to supplant currently programmed local funds, that agency would have to report on how it used the funds on transportation in the same time period.

Ms. Yazzie reviewed possible project selection criteria that include feedback from the Management Committee and the TRC Working Group. She noted that the criteria were not listed in any particular order. Ms. Yazzie stated that criteria include projects that can be obligated and/or constructed in the short term, which goes back to the coding of projects as "A" or "B" projects. She said that balancing funding for "A and "B" projects was discussed, with distribution based on population and funding groups of projects that can fit a categorical exclusion or met in the short term.

Ms. Yazzie then provided a review of possible scenarios, and noted that the \$88.7 million number has not been finalized. She stated that Scenario A includes funding AA projects first, and then do a member agency allocation for BB (categorical exclusion) projects of \$57.8 million, which leaves \$30.5 million to be distributed to member agencies. Ms. Yazzie noted that it has been suggested that this could be distributed on a minimum funding amount and then do a population-based distribution on top of that.

Ms. Yazzie stated that Scenario B includes funding projects that are AA or AB and possibly do a member agency allocation to categorical exclusion projects. She noted that this is more project based and would not leave a lot of money for member agencies.

Ms. Yazzie stated that Scenario C would distribute all of the \$88.7 million to member agencies with a minimum funding amount and adding a population-based distribution onto that.

Ms. Yazzie stated that the next two scenarios involve possible early closeout. Scenario D would fund AA projects first, then allocate \$68.5 million to member agencies. Scenario E would distribute \$82.7 million to first priority projects and \$56 million to member agencies.

Chair Berman asked members if they had questions.

Supervisor Wilson asked if there was a higher priority placed on projects that perhaps complete a highway or are based on traffic. Ms. Yazzie replied that the majority of projects on the project list are not road widening improvements and many are intersection, bicycle, pedestrian, ITS projects. She explained that a lot of roadway projects that add capacity are mostly categorized as C projects because they cannot meet the quick obligation timeline of one year. Ms. Yazzie stated that there are not a lot of these types of roadway projects in the pipeline that meet the federal standards.

Councilmember Aames asked for clarification of the allocations in Scenario A. Ms. Yazzie replied that \$57.8 million would be allocated to AA projects and \$30.5 million would be allocated to member agencies based on population. Councilmember Aames asked if AA projects were anticipated to meet the obligation timeline. Ms. Yazzie replied that was correct, and explained that the first A indicates a project is in the TIP and the second A indicates that the project has met the federal clearances and is ready to obligate. Councilmember Aames asked for clarification of BB projects meeting the timeline. Ms. Yazzie replied that BB projects, which are categorical exclusions, are good candidates to meet the one year obligation timeline. She noted that if C status projects were included, there was the possibility of not meeting the one-year deadline of obligating the economic recovery funds and the region could lose the funds.

Mr. Billings asked for clarification that the AA projects represented a total of about \$79 million in costs. Ms. Yazzie replied that was correct, and about \$22 million of the total is currently programmed with federal funds. She said that it is recommended that the federal funds remain and added that the \$57 million would supplant the local funds, which would remove the member agency dollar contributions.

Mayor Scruggs asked for clarification how this new money could reconcile the \$6 billion shortfall delivered in the previous agenda item, which presented options for shaving down projects that were agreed to initially because there is no money. She said that she would have a hard time saying it is a good idea to use the economic recovery funds for striping 100 miles of arterial streets versus doing work on the Northern Avenue Parkway or Loop 303. Ms. Yazzie referenced the first sheet of projects that includes the ADOT identified ready project list that can obligate within one year. She said that she did not know if the \$88.7 million would fill the gap in the freeway program, but she recognized the question. Ms. Yazzie stated that the \$88.7 million suballocated to MAG could be determined as a priority to turn to the freeway or transit program because the funds are flexible between modes.

Mayor Scruggs asked for clarification of replacement of the STAN funds that were swept. Mr. Anderson stated that MAG is looking to ADOT for stimulus funding to replace the \$94 million in STAN funds that were swept. He said that the \$94 million would come out of the \$170 million or \$180 million from ADOT and MAG would still have another \$88 million on top of that.

Mayor Scruggs referenced the eight TIP projects on the chart and asked if they are ready to go and are a part of the RTP. Mr. Anderson replied that was correct, the projects are the A category of projects.

Mayor Scruggs commented that the other categories were new projects that would not help reach the goal of completing Proposition 400, but would relieve the financial pressure on cities. She expressed that she felt strongly that her responsibility is to the public to complete Proposition 400. Mayor Scruggs stated that it seems a grim prospect right now that will be achieved. She stated that taking the \$88 million and spreading it to projects that are not a part of the RTP do not help overcome the deficit, bring us no closer to meeting the needs identified in 2002 and 2003, and would be irresponsible. Mayor Scruggs stated that it would be nice to have extra money coming to her city, but she is at MAG in a regional capacity, not in a parochial capacity. She said she needed help to guide her decision as to why she should support this over moving toward a way to say to ADOT, the Legislature, the Governor, and the citizens that MAG is working toward the fulfillment of the commitment made to them. Mayor Scruggs stated if there are some funds that cannot be allocated that way, she needed to know that, but she heard that all funds could be allocated to the RTP.

Chair Berman stated that the allocations did not seem to approach equity at all. He said that he could not support that his city would get \$4 million to \$5 million and other cities not much larger would receive \$40 million to \$50 million. Chair Berman stated that the goal of this body is to provide a regional transportation system. He said he would also like money to come to Gilbert to do roadwork, but more important, is his regional obligation. Chair Berman stated that his first priority is to allocate as much money as possible to completing the projects all agreed to in Proposition 400, but if that is not possible, his second choice would be to allocate the money to each city proportionately based on population to do with as they see fit. Chair Berman stated that the interstate highway system was initiated by President Eisenhower as part of national defense, and if an evacuation is ever needed, a proper transportation system would be critical.

Councilmember Aames asked if one of the scenarios would accomplish what Chair Berman suggested. Ms. Yazzie replied that a scenario that funds ready projects in Proposition 400 with a member agency distribution based on population has not been run, but staff could do that. She added that the Proposition 400 shortfall affects more than the freeway system, it also impacts the transit life cycle and the arterial life cycle programs.

Mayor Truitt expressed his agreement with Mayor Scruggs, and said that to do less than Proposition 400 projects first would be irresponsible and not in line with the voters' wishes. He said that he did not think there was a second option but to do that first, and then split the money that is left over.

Councilmember Aames noted that the caveat is that projects need to conform to the timeframe.

Vice Chair Lopez Rogers said that her understanding of the stimulus funding is to create jobs first, it does not say to complete Proposition 400. She stated that if jobs can be created in that timeframe, Proposition 400 can then be looked at, but we have to meet that timeframe with creating jobs first. Vice Chair Lopez Rogers stated that she also was looking at an equitable distribution.

Mayor Scruggs stated that she saw Proposition 400 as construction projects, which represent jobs. She said when she does not consider sign replacement projects on the project list as creating the types of jobs she thought this was about. Mayor Scruggs stated that this nation is going into debt for decades, and she felt a tremendous responsibility to accomplish what the economic recovery act intended. She stated that Proposition 400 includes construction jobs, and that is why we want the STAN funds replaced. Mayor Scruggs expressed that this is the fair thing to do because they were the next projects that were going to be constructed. Mayor Scruggs stated that the regional equity battle was fought in 2003 and 2004. She said that keeping the program moving with construction jobs will create real jobs and people will have money to spend which then generates sales tax that can be used for more projects. Mayor Scruggs stated that equity will be maintained because that was hammered out already; it is just advancing the plan further. She stated that those projects at the end of the plan will have a greater chance to finish, and we will also not have to fight each other again. Mayor Scruggs stated that she thought putting money into the Proposition 400 program will meet the intent of the economic stimulus – it will create jobs, relieve congestion, better our air quality, provide opportunities for economic development along those roadways, and achieve what was hoped Proposition 400 would accomplish.

Mayor Cavanaugh asked if any AA or AB projects from Proposition 400 would not be funded due to the criteria listed. Mr. Smith noted that if the TPC wants to work the process for Proposition 400, he wanted to mention that ADOT is constrained to obligate projects in 120 days. He said they need to go through the list, figure out what is related to Proposition 400, and hopefully have a list for the February 25th Regional Council meeting. Mr. Smith noted that the projects that would be funded by the \$88 million suballocation would not require action by the Regional Council on February 25th.

Councilmember Baier stated that in looking at all of the options presented, she tended to agree with Vice Chair Lopez Rogers that these projects could fall into the intent of the economic stimulus to get people back to work. She expressed she was not sure a couple of highway construction projects are necessarily the end-all of getting people back to work; in fact, the numbers indicate that is not the case. Councilmember Baier indicated that she thought the TPC ought to look at what is possible to be done and what is equitable. She stated that of all the options presented, she supported Option C, which offers each municipality and the region the opportunity to do the most for the region in the timeframe established, including BB projects that can forego some of the regulatory timeframes that could make obligating some of these projects functionally impossible.

Chair Berman asked for clarification if Scenario C was the one that came closest to equitable distribution to each city. Ms. Yazzie replied that was correct; the distribution was based on a minimum funding requirement and additional distribution based on population.

Supervisor Wilson stated that a bridge in Maricopa County that goes over US-80 is on the list and costs \$7.4 million. He said that probably ten to fifteen vehicles use this bridge daily, and one day, he sat for four hours and saw two trucks go over it. Supervisor Wilson commented that there are so many places with traffic problems, there must be a way to utilize the funds to solve them and

accelerate projects we need than to spend money as fast as possible. He added that he understood the money needed to be spent or we would lose it.

Mayor Smith stated that the TPC has been talking about priorities, but there are dueling expectations. He commented that the TPC has been diligent to be true to the voters' expectations on Proposition 400. Mayor Smith stated that with the economic stimulus, there is a separate set of expectations from those of the voters that has nothing to do with transportation priorities – it has to do with economic stimulus priorities. He remarked that whether we like it or not, every penny available to us has to be spent, and if any of it is left on the table the voters will take exception. Mayor Smith commented that whether or not MAG can fit it into a transportation priority or not, the first priority is to spend the money because it is coming from a completely different source and scenario than Proposition 400. Mayor Smith expressed concern that we will fail our first priority to take the money and put it to work in our communities. He said that he felt the expectation of the voters is to use the money, and he was not sure if it is their priority to put it toward Proposition 400. Mayor Smith stated that the reason AA and AB projects are on the list does not have to do with transportation priorities, but with timing – if a project is ready, it is on the list. Mayor Smith stated that he did not want to say to the voters we did not use some of the funds because we did not feel a project was worthwhile from a transportation standpoint. He remarked that he was not sure there is time to get hung up if it works with the details, but MAG needs to ensure nothing goes back to the pot that can be used by another state or region. Mayor Smith stated that he was not sure which scenario that fit. He suggested applying as much as possible to the Proposition 400 program and the ADOT program, but this might be a different expectation of the voters.

Mayor Lane stated that he felt the taxpayers' expectation is to use the funding responsibly, not just use it up. He said if \$88.7 million needs to be obligated within one year, his question was are there Proposition 400 projects not on the list that would fit into that year. If that is the case, the money would be used responsibly. Mayor Lane expressed he would support going back to the Proposition 400 allocations provided the projects could be done within the stipulated timeframe.

Mayor Truitt asked for clarification that Mayor Lane was suggesting filling out Proposition 400 projects and then create jobs on a regional basis, and if so, he would support that. Mayor Lane replied yes.

Ms. Yazzie noted that it would be a new scenario, Scenario F. She asked for clarification if by Proposition 400 funds they meant street, freeway, and transit projects that are ready to go.

Mayor Lane replied that was what he meant.

Mayor Scruggs stated that she thought transit had its own funding. Ms. Yazzie explained that ADOT Highway Discretionary funds go directly to ADOT, but are distributed to the MAG region and dedicated to the MAG freeway program. She noted that they are called highway funds, but this is an umbrella term that includes bicycle, pedestrian, ITS, and street projects. Ms. Yazzie stated that transit is a separate pot of money. She noted that MAG does give some of its allocation to transit, the majority of which goes to local projects.

Chair Berman stated that Gilbert has a \$3 million project on the A list, and Fountain Hills, a town one-tenth the size of Gilbert, has an A list project of \$3.5 million. He asked who categorized the projects. Ms. Yazzie replied that MAG staff and member agency staff categorized the projects over the last two to three weeks. Ms. Yazzie stated that the coding was a straightforward process: If a project is in the TIP, it is an A project; if it is not in the TIP, it is a B or C project. She added that they are still open if a project is not categorized correctly.

Mayor Scruggs asked for clarification of her understanding that a vote by the Regional Council next week is the goal, but there are some funds that can wait one year and not be at risk of being lost to other states. Mr. Smith confirmed that the \$88.7 million amount does not need to be obligated for one year and a decision is not needed on February 25th. He added that the tighter timeframe is for the ADOT funds, which are expected to be in the \$170 million to \$180 million range. Mr. Smith stated that what he was hearing is to get a list from ADOT that would accommodate the one-year time that MAG has to obligate the suballocated funds, ensure the list benefits Proposition 400 projects, and bring it to the Regional Council on February 25th. Mr. Smith noted that we already have the motion from the TPC and Regional Council on I-17 and I-10 west regarding the STAN funding, so we know where \$73 million of the funds will go.

Mayor Scruggs asked about the Williams Gateway Freeway. Mr. Anderson replied that it was on the list for \$12 million for design components.

Mayor Scruggs asked the total amount of STAN funds on these projects that were swept. Mr. Anderson replied the amount is \$73 million or \$94 million, depending if the Williams Gateway Freeway design money was included. Mayor Scruggs asked if the amount of ADOT Discretionary Funds ranged from \$99 million to \$188 million. Mr. Anderson replied that was correct. Mr. Anderson stated that he was not sure what the State Transportation Board would decide, but if the amount is in the \$170 million range and the Regional Council funds the three STAN projects at \$85 million, they would still have another \$85 million to allocate on other projects.

Mayor Scruggs stated that she was hearing it is entirely doable for staff to present to the TPC a list of ADOT projects that meet the criteria and are also in Proposition 400. Mr. Anderson replied that was correct.

Mayor Scruggs stated that she was also hearing no action was needed by the Regional Council next week on the \$88 million. Mr. Anderson replied that was correct. Mayor Scruggs stated that it all gets down to policy decisions on how the money will be used, and she was not certain if there was agreement yet on the policy aspects. She indicated that she would be more comfortable with the Regional Council considering the \$99 million to \$188 million amount with a list of projects that ADOT says are ready to go that meet all of the criteria and are in Proposition 400, and leaving the \$88 million for a future time when there is more opportunity to think this through.

Mayor Smith asked if the Proposition 400 ADOT projects would be able to utilize the \$85 million left. Mr. Anderson replied that he thought so. He indicated that this list was assembled at the time staff thought the window was only 75 to 90 days and that is why pavement preservation projects

and sign replacement projects, which can be obligated quickly, are included on the list. Mr. Anderson indicated that since the Conference Committee passed, the window of obligation is now known, but staff has not had the opportunity in one day to go back to ADOT.

Mayor Smith asked for clarification that he was understanding it might be an easier task to select projects because Proposition 400 projects through ADOT may be eligible in the \$99 million to \$188 million amount and, then following this decision, we would get into the detail for the \$88 million. Mr. Anderson replied that was a fair summary statement.

Mr. Smith asked for clarification from the TPC that there was consensus on the ADOT projects for a list to go to the Regional Council. He said that if the TPC could give guidance on some options for the \$88 million, then staff could work on that for the next TPC meeting.

Chair Berman expressed that he liked the option of dividing the funds equally among the cities. Mr. Smith noted that having a base, perhaps \$250,000, plus the population distribution provides a meaningful amount to accomplish something.

Vice Chair Lopez Rogers asked for clarification of CMAQ and the supplanting issue. Ms. Yazzie replied that all projects in the AA and AB lists are in the TIP, and with the exception of a couple of AB projects, have some sort of federal funding and local funds. She said that if the economic recovery funds are used to take the place of the local funding, that project's agency would be required to report back on the use of those recovery funds for transportation projects in the same time period.

Supervisor Wilson asked if there was any reward for spending the money quickly, other than being able to submit requests for the funds not used by other agencies. Ms. Yazzie replied that if there is any bonus, it is not having the funds taken away. She also advised that whatever is obligated for the recovery funds needs to be completed in three years (February 17, 2012), and added that obligating means that ADOT and FHWA agree that a project met its federal requirements and can proceed to the bidding process.

Councilmember Baier stated that she liked the idea of having a base allocation plus the population distribution. She said that she thought it might be premature to discuss the highway funding because that conversation has not yet taken place. Councilmember Baier expressed that she thought it was a good idea to get more information on the relationship between TIP projects and Proposition 400 projects and what is feasible. She said that she would not favor a scenario where \$277 million goes to build a couple of lanes of a highway because she thought that was not the intent of the stimulus program.

Mayor Cavanaugh stated that the effect of the addition to this list of Proposition 400 ready-to-go projects is unknown. He said that assuming up to \$277 million might be available, it is important to decide on Option A, Option B, or Option C, although not necessarily tonight. Mayor Cavanaugh indicated that the decision may be each city getting its proportion, but what we need to see is exactly what is going to be funded by each option. He suggested showing how the money would

be distributed in each option as a separate element, because the impact of Proposition 400 ready projects on this list is really not known.

Councilmember Aames asked for clarification that he was hearing that Proposition 400 projects would be covered under the ADOT ready-to-go projects that are not on this list. Mr. Smith stated that ADOT money will take care of ADOT projects; this is a constrained list. He added that ADOT projects also can use STP funding and MAG has one year to obligate its funds. Councilmember Aames asked what are the Proposition 400 related projects if ADOT was given more time for the \$88 million.

Ms. Yazzie stated that there are street and transit projects in Proposition 400 and asked for clarification if the TPC wanted staff to look at the project readiness of those projects to be included in the analysis of the \$88 million. She offered a recap of the scenarios by saying that Scenario C would use a base number and population distribution for the \$88 million, with no decision tonight. After the ADOT list has been determined, see if there is a gap in the highway section and whether the \$88 million could infill any of that. Look at current street, highway, and transit Proposition 400 projects and see if any could be funded.

Chair Berman stated that with the Scenario C option, if funds were allocated to cities, he would like a second column added to show funds saved if another methodology was used. He remarked that he did not mind giving up a little bit to have a functional network, but he had a problem with giving \$650,000 to put up video detection cameras in another city.

Councilmember Aames asked for clarification that the \$88 million had to be obligated in one year. Ms. Yazzie replied that was correct.

Mayor Scruggs expressed her concern for including transit, because at RPTA they are grappling with the shortfall of funds, and to do that, they are reexamining policies, such as the cost of operations being considered when buses are being purchased. She said that she thought it would be difficult if MAG tries to allocate funds to transit.

Mayor Hallman expressed his disagreement with Mayor Scruggs. He commented that if MAG is going to follow the concept of allocation to existing Proposition 400 projects, all items need to be included. Mayor Hallman noted that was a part of the compromise of the Proposition 400 process. Mayor Hallman expressed for examining those projects that would help address the shortfall at a regional level, and the discussion should include all projects that are Proposition 400 eligible.

Mayor Scruggs asked for clarification if Mayor Hallman meant to include the Proposition 400 RPTA projects but include operating costs. Mayor Hallman replied that in connection with capital projects, operating and maintenance costs would be included if funding is available. Mayor Scruggs replied that she was comfortable with that.

Mr. Billings asked if MAG receives a similar amount of federal funds this year and next year if the five-year highway bill is passed, and if passed what projects and how do they factor into this list.

Mr. Smith stated that for several years, MAG had a carry forward of about \$20 million from projects that could not complete the processes, and last year the carry forward was about \$45 million, part of which is the Northern Avenue Parkway. He stated that we do not yet have a solid number and have resource issues at ADOT that need to be corrected to get that number. We will have projects that need to be obligated this year or else we will try to carry forward the money with ADOT. Mr. Smith stated that the economic recovery bill outlines getting as many construction projects out as possible. He added that the ADOT consultants are ready to help MAG obligate projects. Mr. Smith stated that he thought MAG needs to look at using the money responsibly and getting the economy moving because it is about jobs.

Ms. Yazzie stated that on a normal basis, the federal funds to the MAG region do not include the State Discretionary funds and MAG would get about \$90 million to \$100 million in STP and CMAQ funds.

Mayor Cavanaugh stated that it is important to know the impact of Options A, B, and C and he would like to have that for the Regional Council meeting next week.

Councilmember Baier stated that it would be helpful to add the closeout money as a component of each scenario. Mr. Smith advised that it would be a conservative guess because we might not have the number yet from ADOT. Councilmember Baier expressed she supported that.

Mayor Lane asked for clarification of who would decide how the \$88 million would be allocated. Ms. Yazzie replied that the TPC and Regional Council would recommend a list of projects to be amended or administratively modified into the TIP.

Mayor Lane asked if the TPC and Regional Council would decide the projects and the amount of funding of each project if the \$88 million were applied to the projects on the list that meet the criteria. Mr. Smith replied that ideally, this would go through the MAG Transportation Review Committee, the MAG Management Committee, the TPC, and the Regional Council process, but tonight, staff needs guidance to get to the March meetings.

Mayor Smith asked if it was an accurate statement that if the funds are applied to Proposition 400 projects it would be an acceleration mechanism, although not in the technical sense, to do things that could not be done otherwise. Mr. Smith replied that was an accurate statement. Mayor Smith suggested that if the funds were not used to accelerate Proposition 400 projects, then the \$88 million could be prioritized and used as a completely different pool of funds to do completely different projects. He said that the funds might be put into Proposition 400 projects, to accelerate everything, supplant the existing funds and projects move up the list, or put toward different projects with another list, and options seems to be what percentages are allocated to which projects.

Councilmember Aames commented that he understood if local funds are not spent there is a reporting requirement.

Mr. Anderson remarked that one of the difficulties is the uncertain revenue forecast and rather than accelerating projects it is keeping projects from being delayed.

Chair Berman stated that his initial thought was to complete Proposition 400 projects with the stimulus funds, but it is a separate program which the federal government set up to distribute to all, presumably in a semi-equal way. Chair Berman commented that it was not necessarily fair to attach Proposition 400 criteria. He expressed that he thought the funds should be distributed equally, based on population which is as fair as anything and which is how the money was collected.

Mayor Scruggs stated that the State of Arizona is in an indescribable situation. She said that we like to spend our time making sure the Legislature and Governor do not look on our money to help them solve their problems, and she would like to put that on the table for thought. Mayor Scruggs stated that if the decision is made to take this money, and instead of running our cities, apply it to ADOT projects, it would be seen as doing more than our share and helping a greater cause. She remarked that we are all citizens of the State of Arizona and are impacted by what is going on there. Mayor Scruggs expressed that she thought there will be a day we have to answer to the Legislature as to why we should not help with the problem. Mayor Scruggs said that she felt strongly that this should not be seen as a windfall to help our immediate problems, but goes to a commitment that has been made. She commented on supplanting by saying that when we experience shortfalls, this money seems attractive, but we have to pay it back; it is not free money.

Chair Berman stated that he did not know how he would tell his citizens that this federal money came into the State to be divided among the cities and Gilbert got \$3 million, Fountain Hills got \$5 million, and Mesa got \$40 million. He stated that this is not money we collected from a proposition, this is federal money to be divided fairly among all of us. Chair Berman stated that he would not support any allocation that represents such a disproportionate distribution.

Mayor Cavanaugh remarked that he thought the TPC indicated a consensus to consider the Proposition 400 projects. He said that by the Regional Council meeting we may have an idea how the Proposition 400 projects impact the list; they may have no impact whatsoever, but let us find out before denying or accepting Proposition 400 projects.

Chair Berman replied that he would agree to that, but he did not see his position changing dramatically and his city walking out with nothing from the economic stimulus. He stated that when we see the numbers, we will see some cities that are big winners and other cities that are big losers. Chair Berman stated that the goal of the stimulus plan is not disproportionate distribution, no matter what criteria are used.

Mayor Cavanaugh stated that the TPC just needs to give staff clear guidance on what to bring to the Regional Council.

Mayor Lane stated that he thought the guidance was to come back with Options A, B, and C for the \$88 million. He said that he understood that the list of ADOT-ready projects could be at the

Regional Council meeting. Mayor Lane said that the funds being distributed based on population is a measure, but if the distribution is arbitrary and is based on the list, it could be more difficult to bring back to the voters. Mayor Lane stated that he would like to see what will happen with the Proposition 400 projects, because there has already been a determination of those projects, although he also would consider a distribution based on population.

Councilmember Aames asked for clarification if the TPC would discuss the allocation of the \$88 million at the March meeting. Mr. Smith replied that MAG has one year to obligate the \$88 million, but some projects need time to get ready. He said that hopefully, we will have clarification next month for the TPC to make a recommendation to the Regional Council.

Mayor Scruggs extended her compliments to Ms. Yazzie for her professionalism and calm demeanor in responding to the TPC's questions.

There being no further business, the meeting adjourned at 6:16 p.m.

---

Chair

---

Secretary

# **MARICOPA ASSOCIATION OF GOVERNMENTS**

## **INFORMATION SUMMARY... for your review**

**DATE:**

March 11, 2009

**SUBJECT:**

ADOT Portion of the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act Funds

**SUMMARY:**

On February 18, 2009, staff reported to the Transportation Policy Committee that MAG expected to receive approximately \$99 to \$180 million of the Arizona Department of Transportation (ADOT) portion of the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act (ARRA) funds. Staff noted that the State Transportation Board would be considering the MAG allocation at its meeting on February 20, 2009. The State Transportation Board allocated \$129.4 million to the MAG region. On February 25, 2009, the Regional Council approved a ranked list of projects cooperatively developed with ADOT for the portion of the ARRA funds totaling approximately \$194 million. Please see the attached table that shows the project list, which also includes other ADOT projects that are non-prioritized on page two.

The Regional Council also approved having the Chair of the Regional Council send a letter to the State Transportation Board forwarding the projects and also to send a letter to the Senate and House leadership requesting assistance in MAG receiving an equitable share of the ADOT portion of the ARRA funds. On March 3, 2009, the State Transportation Board met to consider projects for the ADOT portion of the ARRA funds. The attached memorandum provides further information.

**PUBLIC INPUT:**

None.

**PROS & CONS:**

**PROS:** The transportation infrastructure portion of the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act (ARRA) of 2009 is time sensitive. This information and discussion are timely since 50 percent of the ADOT/State portion of the ARRA funds are required to be obligated within 120 days after the Federal Highway Administration releases their official funding tables.

**CONS:** None.

**TECHNICAL & POLICY IMPLICATIONS:**

**TECHNICAL:** Projects that wish to utilize transportation federal funds, including the ARRA funds, need to be shown and programmed in the TIP in the year that they expect to commence and may need to undergo an air quality conformity analysis or consultation. This programming process is discussed through the MAG Committee process.

**POLICY:** This amendment request is in accord with MAG guidelines. The federal planning requirements for the ARRA funds remain. Federal law requires that the financial plan be developed by the Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO) in cooperation with the state and transit operator. The state and transit operator must provide the MPO with estimates of available federal and state funds. Also, projects for federal discretionary funds need to be cooperatively developed between MAG and ADOT.

**ACTION NEEDED:**

Information, discussion, and possible action.

**PRIOR COMMITTEE ACTIONS:**

Management Committee: This item was on March 11, 2009, Management Committee agenda. No action was taken by the Committee.

MEMBERS ATTENDING

Rogene Hill for Charlie McClendon, Avondale	Christopher Brady, Mesa
Mark Pentz, Chandler	Jim Bacon, Paradise Valley
# Matt Busby for George Hoffman, Apache Junction	Carl Swenson, Peoria
David Johnson for Jeanine Guy, Buckeye	Frank Fairbanks, Phoenix
Jon Pearson, Carefree	John Kross, Queen Creek
Wayne Anderson for Usama Abujbarah, Cave Creek	* Bryan Meyers, Salt River Pima-Maricopa Indian Community
Pat Dennis for B.J. Cornwall, El Mirage	John Little, Scottsdale
Alfonso Rodriguez for Phil Dorchester, Fort McDowell Yavapai Nation	# Michael Celaya for Randy Oliver, Surprise
* Rick Davis, Fountain Hills	Charlie Meyer, Tempe
* Rick Buss, Gila Bend	Reyes Medrano, Tolleson
David White, Gila River Indian Community	Gary Edwards, Wickenburg
George Pettit, Gilbert	Lloyce Robinson, Youngtown
Jessica Blazina for Ed Beasley, Glendale	John Halikowski, ADOT
John Fischbach, Goodyear	Kenny Harris for David Smith, Maricopa County
RoseMary Arellano, Guadalupe	Mike Taylor for David Boggs, Valley Metro/RPTA
Darryl Crossman, Litchfield Park	

\* Those members neither present nor represented by proxy.

# Participated by telephone conference call.

+ Participated by videoconference call.

MAG Regional Council: On February 25, 2009, the MAG Regional Council approved, with two abstentions (**shaded**) the list of projects listed in priority order for the Arizona Department of Transportation portion of the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act funds of 2009 and that the projects be forwarded to the Arizona Department of Transportation contingent upon projects finally selected receiving the necessary administrative adjustments and amendments to the MAG Transportation Improvement Program and air quality conformity and consultation. Further that the Chair of the Regional Council to send a letter to the State Transportation Board and Chairs of the Arizona House and Senate committees with the responsibility for transportation on behalf of the Regional Council requesting that the formula for the ADOT portion of the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act funds take the State Transportation Acceleration Needs (STAN) projects in this region totaling \$94 million off the top of the funds before the allocation is made. Intervention by the State legislative leadership is requested due to ADOT previously being directed to hold two of the MAG projects totaling \$74 million that were ready to advertise in October 2008 and one project ready in January 2009 for \$20 million. This enabled the Arizona Legislature to sweep the funds from this region to assist with state budget issues, with the legislative understanding being that the funding swept would come off the top of the ADOT American Recovery and Reinvestment Act funds before the allocation is made in order to not penalize the MAG region.

## MEMBERS ATTENDING

- Councilmember Peggy Neely, Phoenix, Chair
- Mayor Thomas Schoaf, Litchfield Park,  
Vice Chair
- # Councilmember Robin Barker, Apache Junction
- # Mayor Marie Lopez Rogers, Avondale
- Mayor Jackie Meck, Buckeye
- \* Mayor Wayne Fulcher, Carefree
- \* Councilmember Dick Esser, Cave Creek
- Mayor Boyd Dunn, Chandler
- Mayor Fred Waterman, El Mirage
- # Treasurer Pamela Mott for President Clinton Pattea, Fort McDowell Yavapai Nation
- Mayor Jay Schlum, Fountain Hills
- Mayor Fred Hull, Gila Bend
- Lt. Governor Joseph Manuel for Governor William Rhodes, Gila River Indian Community
- # Mayor Steven Berman, Gilbert
- Mayor Elaine Scruggs, Glendale
- Mayor James M. Cavanaugh, Goodyear
- \* Mayor Frank Montiel, Guadalupe
- Supervisor Max W. Wilson, Maricopa Co.
- Vice Mayor Kyle Jones for Mayor Scott Smith, Mesa
- \* Mayor Vernon Parker, Paradise Valley
- Councilmember Ron Aames for Mayor Bob Barrett, Peoria
- # Mayor Arthur Sanders, Queen Creek
- \* President Diane Enos, Salt River Pima-Maricopa Indian Community
- Mayor Jim Lane, Scottsdale
- Mayor Lyn Truitt, Surprise
- # Mayor Hugh Hallman, Tempe
- \* Mayor Adolfo Gamez, Tolleson
- # Mayor Kelly Blunt, Wickenburg
- Mayor Michael LeVault, Youngtown
- Felipe Zubia, State Transportation Board**
- Victor Flores, State Transportation Board**
- Vacant, Citizens Transportation Oversight Committee

\* Those members neither present nor represented by proxy.

# Attended by telephone conference call.

+ Attended by videoconference call.

## **CONTACT PERSON:**

Eric J. Anderson (602) 254-6300.

March 11, 2009

TO: Members of the Transportation Policy Committee

FROM: Eric Anderson, Transportation Director

SUBJECT: ACTION BY THE STATE TRANSPORTATION BOARD ON THE AMERICAN RECOVERY AND REINVESTMENT ACT (ARRA)

The State Transportation Board met March 3, 2009, to discuss and approve projects for the Arizona Department of Transportation (ADOT) portion of the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act (ARRA). The Board reaffirmed the previous action of the Board to allocate the \$350 million of funding to MAG, PAG and the balance of the state. At the Board meeting on February 20, 2009, the Board agreed that 37 percent of the funding would be allocated to the MAG region, 13 percent to the PAG region, and 50 percent the remaining 13 counties. The allocation to the MAG region is about \$129.4 million. There was no consideration of the impact of the sweep of the Statewide Transportation Acceleration Needs (STAN) account by the legislature that resulted in a loss of \$94 million of funding for the MAG region.

ADOT staff presented the list of projects in priority order to the Board. For the most part, the list presented followed the priorities approved by the MAG Regional Council on February 25, 2009. ADOT staff struck the Williams Gateway freeway project, which was the third project on the MAG priority list, from the list presented to the Board. ADOT staff did not believe this project would be eligible for stimulus funding since the Environmental Assessment (EA) is still underway. This means that projects one through six on the MAG list, with the exception of the Williams Gateway Freeway project, will be funded with the \$129.4 million of ADOT funds allocated to the MAG region. MAG staff will be working with ADOT to ensure that the remaining priority projects as approved by the Regional Council are presented in the MAG priority order. ADOT staff had also put other projects in the MAG region in priority order without discussion with MAG staff. MAG staff testified at the Board meeting that the Regional Council action prioritized only the first 13 projects and the remaining projects submitted to ADOT were not in priority order.

An issue that was discussed at the meeting relates to the provision of the ARRA that states that priority be given to projects in economically disadvantaged areas as defined by the U.S. Economic Development Administration (EDA). According to information provided by the Federal Highway Administration, the counties of Maricopa, Pima and Coconino are not economically disadvantaged as defined by EDA. The remaining 12 counties do meet the definition. Further clarification of this provision in the ARRA is being sought by ADOT.

If you have any questions, please contact me at the MAG Office.

A Voluntary Association of Local Governments in Maricopa County

**List of Highway Projects in the MAG Region for the ADOT/State Portion of  
American Recovery and Reinvestment Act - 2009 Funds  
Approved at Regional Council 2-25-2009**

COOPERATIVELY DEVELOPED ADOT PROJECTS									
Priority Order	Current Funding	TIP #	Prop. 400 Project	Project Location	Project Description	Fiscal Year in TIP	Total Cost	Project Notes	Cummulative Total
1	State (STAN)	DOT09-815	Yes	I-10: Verrado Way - Sarival Rd	Construct General Purpose Lane	2009	\$43,200,000	This project was advanced from Phase IV (2021-2026). The 2009 State Budget fix, removed the State-STAN funds; this project is currently unfunded.	\$43,200,000
2	State (STAN)	DOT09-818	Yes	I-17: SR74-Anthem Way	Construct General Purpose Lane	2009	\$22,500,000	This project was advanced from Phase IV (2021-2026). The 2009 State Budget fix, removed the State-STAN funds; this project is currently unfunded. The project was originally programmed with \$30.5 million in State-STAN funds, but project estimate is lower.	\$65,700,000
3	State (STAN)	Not in TIP	Yes	SR802: L202 to Ellsworth	Design & ROW	Not in TIP	\$20,400,000	This project was advanced from Phase III (2016-2020). The 2009 State Budget fix, removed the State-STAN funds; this project is currently unfunded. The design component is \$12 million. The completion of the Environmental Assessment is uncertain at this time. This project will not be ready to obligate in 120 days.*	
4	NHS	DOT09-6C00R	Yes	US 60: SR 303L - 99th Ave	10 Miles Widening	2009	\$45,000,000	The project is projected to be ready to advertise by June 2009.	\$110,700,000
5	NHS	DOT07-332	Yes	US 60: 99th Ave - 83rd Ave	2.5 Miles Widening	2009	\$11,200,000	Project is ready to advertise.	\$121,900,000
6	State	DOT12-840	Yes	Loop 101: Beardsley Rd / Union Hills	TI Improvement - Widening Union Hills and Bridge with Beardsley connector	2009	\$9,125,000	This project is connected to the Prop. 400 Arterial Projects - PEO100-07AC2 & PEO100-07AC1. The Frontage Road construction 75th Ave to Union Hills and U-turn structure at Union Hill - \$20,000,000 is currently being funded with 100% of Peoria funds; ADOT is the lead on both the TI, and Frontage U-turn.	\$131,025,000
7	NHS	DOT06-613	Yes	SR 85: Southern Ave - I 10	2 Miles New Roadway	2009	\$20,000,000	Project is ready to advertise.	\$151,025,000
8	State	DOT08-673	Yes	SR 74: MP 20 - MP 22	2 Miles Passing Lane	2009	\$3,600,000	Added to Freeway Life Cycle Program in 2006.	\$154,625,000
9	State	Not in TIP	Yes	Loop 101: Northern to Grand SB	Auxiliary lane - 3 miles	Not in TIP	\$3,000,000	Conformity would have to be assessed.	\$157,625,000
10*	Not in TIP	Not in TIP	Yes	Loop 101: Olive Avenue	TI Improvements	Not in TIP	\$3,000,000	Conformity would have to be assessed. This project will not be ready to obligate in 120 days.*	\$160,625,000
11*	State	DOT10-6C32	Yes	SR 74: MP 13 - MP 15	Construct Passing Lanes	2010	\$2,000,000	Added to Freeway Life Cycle Program in 2006. This project will not be ready to obligate in 120 days.*	\$162,625,000
12*	Not in TIP	Not in TIP	Yes	I-17: I-10 to Indian School	Southbound Roadway Improvements	Not in TIP	\$1,500,000	This project will not be ready to obligate in 120 days.*	\$164,125,000
13*	Not in TIP	Not in TIP	Yes	Regionwide	Construct Noise Walls	Not in TIP	\$10,000,000	This funding would supplement Prop. 400 funding. This project will not be ready to obligate in 120 days.*	\$174,125,000
<b>TOTAL</b>							<b>\$194,525,000</b>		

\* The four projects in the Cooperatively Developed list will not be ready to obligate in 120 days.

OTHER ADOT PROJECTS - NON-PRIORITIZED PROP. 400 PROJECTS							
Current Funding	TIP #	Prop. 400 Project	Project Location	Project Description	Fiscal Year	Total Cost	Project Notes
RARF	DOT10-828	Yes	SR 87: Four Peaks - Dos S Ranch Road	Construct Roadway Improvements	2010	\$23,000,000	The project is projected to be ready to advertise by November 2009.
NHS/RARF	Breakout from the DOT12-846	Yes	Loop 303: Greenway to Mountain View	Construction	2012	\$135,000,000	Conformity would have to be redetermined. This project is being advanced from 2012 to 2010.
STP-AZ/State	DOT07-323	Yes	99th Ave: I-10 to MC85	99th Avenue/Van Buren Street intersection with the SRP well relocation, pavement rehabilitation for 99th Avenue from I-10 to Van Buren Street, and acquiring right-of-way.	2010	\$2,500,000	This is a carry-over from Prop. 300.
<b>TOTAL</b>						<b>\$160,500,000</b>	

OTHER ADOT PROJECTS - NON-PRIORITIZED & NON-PROP. 400 PROJECTS							
Current Funding	TIP #	Prop. 400 Project	Project Location	Project Description	Fiscal Year	Total Cost	Project Notes
Not in TIP	Not in TIP	No	SR 87: Gilbert - Shea	Pavement Preservation	Not in TIP	\$3,000,000	
Not in TIP	Not in TIP	No	Loop 202: MP 10 - MP 17	Sign Replacement	Not in TIP	\$1,150,000	
Not in TIP	Not in TIP	No	SR 51: MP 7 - MP 14	Sign Replacement	Not in TIP	\$1,500,000	
Not in TIP	Not in TIP	No	I-10: MP 112 - MP 129	Sign Replacement	Not in TIP	\$1,500,000	
Not in TIP	Not in TIP	No	I-10: MP 129 - MP 146	Sign Replacement	Not in TIP	\$1,500,000	
Not in TIP	Not in TIP	No	I-17: MP 194 - MP 201	Sign Replacement	Not in TIP	\$1,500,000	
Not in TIP	Not in TIP	No	I-8: Gila Bend Rest Area	Pavement Preservation	Not in TIP	\$10,000,000	
Not in TIP	Not in TIP	No	I-8: MP 121 - Rest Area	Pavement Preservation	Not in TIP	\$21,000,000	
Not in TIP	Not in TIP	No	US 60: San Domingo - Whitmann	Pavement Preservation	Not in TIP	\$11,000,000	
Not in TIP	Not in TIP	No	US 60: Wickenburg to San Domingo Wash	Pavement Preservation	Not in TIP	\$3,777,000	
Not in TIP	Not in TIP	No	Various Routes	Guard Rails	Not in TIP	\$1,800,000	
Not in TIP	Not in TIP	No	I-17: 19th Avenue - 16th Street	Pavement Replacement	Not in TIP	\$1,500,000	
Not in TIP	Not in TIP	No	Loop 101: 51st Ave to 27th Ave EB	Auxiliary lane	Not in TIP	\$3,000,000	
<b>TOTAL</b>						<b>\$62,227,000</b>	

# **MARICOPA ASSOCIATION OF GOVERNMENTS**

## **INFORMATION SUMMARY... for your review**

**DATE:**

March 11, 2009

**SUBJECT:**

MAG Sub-Allocation Portion of the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act Funds Project and Allocation Scenarios

**SUMMARY:**

The American Recovery and Reinvestment Act (ARRA) legislation sub-allocates 30 percent (\$156.57 million) of Arizona's funding to local jurisdictions. The amount being sub-allocated to MAG is approximately \$104.6 million. This amount is tentative and the final amount is expected from the Arizona Department of Transportation by March 13, 2009. Metropolitan Planning Organizations (MPOs) have one year to obligate the funds. The Transportation Policy Committee met on February 18, 2009, and requested that a set of scenarios be developed to fund projects for the MAG sub-allocated portion of the ARRA funds. These scenarios were presented and discussed at the MAG Transportation Review Committee meeting on February 26, 2009.

Scenario #1 has an A option and a B option. Scenario #1 is a Member Agency Allocation; option A calculates a minimum agency allocation and then adds population to the minimum agency allocation. Option B provides jurisdictions with a minimum agency allocation and calculates population distribution after the minimum agency allocations are provided. MAG has historically used option A calculations when considering member agency allocations.

Scenario #2 presents an option of using the MAG sub-allocation to fund Proposition 400 freeway projects in addition to the ADOT/State Portion. The projects in the list are the remaining Freeway/Highway ADOT projects approved in priority order by Regional Council, which are not funded by the ADOT/State Portion. These total \$43.1 million. In addition, there is a table of Freeway Non-prioritized Prop. 400 projects totaling \$160.5 million. The projects in this scenario total more than \$200 million. If Scenario #2 is chosen, projects would have to be selected to be funded as the number of candidate projects is higher than the MAG sub-allocated amount.

Scenario #3 presents an option of using the MAG sub-allocation to fund Freeway projects and local Arterial projects in the Arterial Life Cycle Program (ALCP) that are in Proposition 400. The projects in the Freeway list are the remaining Freeway/Highway ADOT projects approved in priority order by Regional Council, which are not funded by the ADOT/State Portion. These total \$43.1 million. In addition, there is a table of Freeway Non-prioritized Prop. 400 projects totaling \$160.5 million. The projects in the freeway tables total more than \$200 million. There are four ALCP projects with TIP status A and NEPA status A, which means that they could obligate in the short term; these projects total \$49.8 million. There are an additional four ALCP projects that have other TIP and NEPA rankings that could possibly obligate within one year, which total \$138 million. Together, the Freeway/Highway and Arterial projects total over \$388 million. If Scenario #3 is chosen, projects would have to be selected to be funded as the number of candidate projects is higher than the MAG sub-allocated amount.

Scenario #4 shows the list of Freeway/Highway ADOT led projects, local Arterial projects in the Arterial Life Cycle Program (ALCP), and Transit projects in the Transit Life Cycle Program (TLCP) that are in Proposition 400. The projects in the Freeway list are the remaining Freeway/Highway ADOT projects approved in priority order by Regional Council, which are not funded by the ADOT/State Portion. These total \$43.1 million. In addition, there is a table of Freeway Non-prioritized Prop. 400 projects totaling \$160.5 million. The projects in the freeway tables total more than \$200 million. There are four ALCP projects with TIP status A and NEPA status A, which means that they could obligate in the short term; these projects total \$49.8 million. There are an additional four ALCP projects that have other TIP and NEPA rankings that could possibly obligate within one year, which total \$103 million. The Transit list provided in this table includes Prop. 400 projects that are not in the recommended scenario per the February 27, 2009, Regional Public Transportation Authority (RPTA) Memorandum. Fleet acquisition projects are also not included per the RPTA Board recommendation that they are not to be funded with ARRA funds. Together, the Freeway/Highway, Arterial, and Transit projects in this Scenario #4 total \$647 million. If Scenario #4 is chosen, projects would have to be selected to be funded as the number of candidate projects is higher than the MAG sub-allocated amount. Using the Prop. 400 allocation, the Arterial would receive \$10.98 million (10.5%), Transit would receive \$34.8 million (33.3%), and the Freeway/Highway section would receive \$58.78 million (56.2%). Please note, there may be updated Transit material presented at the meeting.

Scenario #5 lists projects that are ready to obligate with the TIP status of A and NEPA status of A or B. There are three calculations in this Scenario due to the nature of Transportation Enhancement (STP-TEA) funded projects. The ARRA directs \$15 million of STP-TEA funds statewide and at this time, it is unsure how the state will program these funds. In preparation, the MAG region has identified seven STP-TEA projects that are ready to obligate any possible additional funding through ARRA. The amount needed to fund projects in the TIP Status A and NEPA Status A list is \$84 million. Adding the STP-TEA projects, raises the needed funding amount to \$95 million, and then adding projects in the TIP Status A and NEPA Status B list increases the funding need to \$121 million. If Scenario #5 is chosen, projects would have to be selected to be funded as the number of candidate projects is higher than the MAG sub-allocated amount.

This item is on the agenda for information, discussion and possible action to recommend a scenario for projects/allocation of the MAG Sub-Allocation Portion of the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act of 2009 funds.

**PUBLIC INPUT:**

None.

**PROS & CONS:**

PROS: The transportation infrastructure portion of the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act (ARRA) of 2009 is time sensitive. The ARRA requires the MPO sub-allocated funds to be obligated within one year of enactment of legislation.

CONS: None.

**TECHNICAL & POLICY IMPLICATIONS:**

TECHNICAL: Projects that wish to utilize transportation federal funds, including the ARRA funds, need to be shown and programmed in the TIP in the year that they expect to commence and may need to undergo an air quality conformity analysis or consultation. This programming process is discussed through the MAG Committee process.

POLICY: This amendment request is in accord with MAG guidelines. The federal planning requirements for the ARRA funds remain.

**ACTION NEEDED:**

Recommend approval of Scenario #1, Option A, with a Minimum Agency Allocation of \$500,000 plus population dated March 10, 2009, for the distribution of the MAG Sub-Allocation Portion of the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act Funds in accordance with the following: 1. Establish a deadline of April 3, 2009, to have MAG member agencies define and submit projects to MAG for the sub-allocated funds due to the very limited time to obligate the projects. 2. Have MAG prepare the necessary administrative adjustments/amendments to the FY 2008-2012 MAG Transportation Improvement Program and or Regional Transportation Plan as appropriate. 3. Have MAG conduct the air quality consultation/conformity if necessary. 4. Establish a deadline of November 30, 2009 for projects to be obligated. Funds from projects that are not obligated will be reprogrammed to meet the federal obligation date of February 17, 2010 in order for Arizona to be eligible to receive funding from other states that are unable to obligate their funds.

**PRIOR COMMITTEE ACTIONS:**

Management Committee: On March 11, 2009, the Management Committee recommended approval of Scenario #1, Option A, with a Minimum Agency Allocation of \$500,000 plus population dated March 10, 2009, for the distribution of the MAG Sub-Allocation Portion of the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act Funds in accordance with the following: 1. Establish a deadline of April 3, 2009, to have MAG member agencies define and submit projects to MAG for the sub-allocated funds due to the very limited time to obligate the projects. 2. Have MAG prepare the necessary administrative adjustments/amendments to the FY 2008-2012 MAG Transportation Improvement Program and or Regional Transportation Plan as appropriate. 3. Have MAG conduct the air quality consultation/conformity if necessary. 4. Establish a deadline of November 30, 2009 for projects to be obligated. Funds from projects that are not obligated will be reprogrammed to meet the federal obligation date of February 17, 2010 in order for Arizona to be eligible to receive funding from other states that are unable to obligate their funds. The motion passed with three voting no (*italics*).

MEMBERS ATTENDING

- |  |  |
|--|--|
| Rogene Hill for Charlie McClendon,<br>Avondale                                 | <i>Darryl Crossman, Litchfield Park</i>                      |
| Mark Pentz, Chandler   | Christopher Brady, Mesa                                      |
| # Matt Busby for George Hoffman,<br>Apache Junction                            | Jim Bacon, Paradise Valley                                   |
| David Johnson for Jeanine Guy, Buckeye   | Carl Swenson, Peoria   |
| Jon Pearson, Carefree  | Frank Fairbanks, Phoenix                                     |
| Wayne Anderson for Usama Abujbarah,<br>Cave Creek                              | John Kross, Queen Creek                                      |
| Pat Dennis for B.J. Cornwall, El Mirage  | * Bryan Meyers, Salt River Pima-Maricopa<br>Indian Community |
| <i>Alfonso Rodriguez for Phil Dorchester,<br/>Fort McDowell Yavapai Nation</i> | John Little, Scottsdale                                      |
| * Rick Davis, Fountain Hills   | # Michael Celaya for Randy Oliver,<br>Surprise               |
| * Rick Buss, Gila Bend   | Charlie Meyer, Tempe   |
| David White, Gila River Indian<br>Community                                    | Reyes Medrano, Tolleson                                      |
| George Pettit, Gilbert   | Gary Edwards, Wickenburg                                     |
| <i>Jessica Blazina for Ed Beasley, Glendale</i>                                | Lloyce Robinson, Youngtown                                   |
| John Fischbach, Goodyear   | John Halikowski, ADOT  |
| RoseMary Arellano, Guadalupe   | Kenny Harris for David Smith, Maricopa<br>County             |
|  | Mike Taylor for David Boggs,<br>Valley Metro/RPTA            |

- \* Those members neither present nor represented by proxy.
- # Participated by telephone conference call.
- + Participated by videoconference call.

Transportation Review Committee: The scenarios for the MAG Sub-Allocation portion of the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act of 2009 were presented at the February 26, 2009, Transportation Review Committee meeting.

**MEMBERS ATTENDING**

- |  |  |
|--|--|
| Phoenix: Tom Callow                            | Maricopa County: Mike Sabatini for John Hauskins |
| ADOT: Steve Hull for Floyd Roehrich            | Mesa: Scott Butler                               |
| Avondale: David Fitzhugh                       | * Paradise Valley: Robert M. Cicarelli           |
| Buckeye: Scott Lowe                            | Peoria: David Moody                              |
| Chandler: Patrice Kraus                        | Queen Creek: Mark Young                          |
| El Mirage: Pat Dennis for Lance Calvert        | RPTA: Bryan Jungwirth                            |
| Fountain Hills: Randy Harrel                   | Scottsdale: Dave Meinhart for Mary O'Connor      |
| * Gila Bend: Vacant                            | Surprise: Randy Overmyer                         |
| Gila River: Sreedevi Samudrala for David White | Tempe: Carlos de Leon                            |
| Gilbert: Tami Ryall                            | Valley Metro Rail: John Farry                    |
| Glendale: Terry Johnson                        | Wickenburg: Gary Edwards                         |
| Goodyear: Cato Esquivel                        | Youngtown: Grant Anderson for Lloyce Robinson    |
| Guadalupe: Jim Ricker                          |  |
| Litchfield Park: Mike Cartsonis                |  |

**EX-OFFICIO MEMBERS ATTENDING**

- |                                       |  |
|---------------------------------------|--|
| Regional Bicycle Task Force: Jim Hash | *Pedestrian Working Group: Brandon Forrey        |
| * Street Committee: Darryl Crossman   | *Transportation Safety Committee: Kerry Wilcoxon |
| *ITS Committee: Mike Mah              |  |

- \* Members neither present nor represented by proxy. + - Attended by Videoconference
- # - Attended by Audioconference

**CONTACT PERSON:**

Eileen O. Yazzie (602) 254-6300.

**SCENARIO #1A  
Member Agency Allocation**

Jurisdiction	Share of County	Population Distribution	Minimum Agency Allocation of \$250K Plus Population	Minimum Agency Allocation of \$500K Plus Population	Minimum Agency Allocation of \$750K Plus Population	Minimum Agency Allocation of \$1 Million Plus Population
Apache Junction (a)	0.942%	\$ 985,106	\$ 1,166,826	\$ 1,348,547	\$ 1,530,268	\$ 1,711,988
Avondale	1.904%	\$ 1,991,360	\$ 2,103,336	\$ 2,215,311	\$ 2,327,287	\$ 2,439,262
Buckeye	1.245%	\$ 1,302,737	\$ 1,462,443	\$ 1,622,148	\$ 1,781,853	\$ 1,941,558
Carefree	0.098%	\$ 102,581	\$ 345,471	\$ 588,361	\$ 831,251	\$ 1,074,141
Cave Creek	0.127%	\$ 133,322	\$ 374,081	\$ 614,841	\$ 855,600	\$ 1,096,359
Chandler	6.070%	\$ 6,349,038	\$ 6,158,976	\$ 5,968,913	\$ 5,778,851	\$ 5,588,789
El Mirage	0.836%	\$ 874,165	\$ 1,063,575	\$ 1,252,986	\$ 1,442,396	\$ 1,631,806
Fort McDowell	0.020%	\$ 21,408	\$ 269,924	\$ 518,440	\$ 766,957	\$ 1,015,473
Fountain Hills	0.646%	\$ 675,377	\$ 878,565	\$ 1,081,754	\$ 1,284,942	\$ 1,488,131
Gila Bend	0.047%	\$ 49,348	\$ 295,928	\$ 542,507	\$ 789,087	\$ 1,035,667
Gila River (b)	0.068%	\$ 71,239	\$ 316,301	\$ 561,363	\$ 806,426	\$ 1,051,488
Gilbert	5.336%	\$ 5,581,146	\$ 5,444,308	\$ 5,307,469	\$ 5,170,631	\$ 5,033,792
Glendale	6.171%	\$ 6,454,493	\$ 6,257,121	\$ 6,059,750	\$ 5,862,378	\$ 5,665,007
Goodyear	1.476%	\$ 1,544,176	\$ 1,687,147	\$ 1,830,117	\$ 1,973,088	\$ 2,116,058
Guadalupe	0.149%	\$ 155,628	\$ 394,841	\$ 634,054	\$ 873,268	\$ 1,112,481
Litchfield Park	0.127%	\$ 132,329	\$ 373,157	\$ 613,985	\$ 854,813	\$ 1,095,641
Mesa	11.418%	\$ 11,942,803	\$ 11,365,028	\$ 10,787,252	\$ 10,209,477	\$ 9,631,701
Paradise Valley	0.359%	\$ 375,273	\$ 599,262	\$ 823,252	\$ 1,047,241	\$ 1,271,230
Peoria (b)	3.864%	\$ 4,041,540	\$ 4,011,414	\$ 3,981,288	\$ 3,951,162	\$ 3,921,036
Phoenix	38.784%	\$ 40,568,294	\$ 38,006,438	\$ 35,444,582	\$ 32,882,726	\$ 30,320,870
Queen Creek (a)	0.592%	\$ 619,039	\$ 826,133	\$ 1,033,226	\$ 1,240,319	\$ 1,447,413
Salt River	0.171%	\$ 178,722	\$ 416,334	\$ 653,947	\$ 891,559	\$ 1,129,172
Scottsdale	6.019%	\$ 6,296,049	\$ 6,109,659	\$ 5,923,270	\$ 5,736,880	\$ 5,550,490
Surprise	2.701%	\$ 2,825,661	\$ 2,879,810	\$ 2,933,959	\$ 2,988,108	\$ 3,042,256
Tempe	4.288%	\$ 4,485,317	\$ 4,424,432	\$ 4,363,548	\$ 4,302,663	\$ 4,241,778
Tolleson	0.170%	\$ 177,538	\$ 415,232	\$ 652,927	\$ 890,621	\$ 1,128,316
Wickenburg	0.160%	\$ 167,377	\$ 405,776	\$ 644,175	\$ 882,574	\$ 1,120,973
Youngtown	0.162%	\$ 169,451	\$ 407,706	\$ 645,961	\$ 884,216	\$ 1,122,471
Maricopa County (c)	6.051%	\$ 6,329,481	\$ 6,140,774	\$ 5,952,067	\$ 5,763,360	\$ 5,574,654
<b>Total</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>\$ 104,600,000</b>	<b>\$ 104,600,000</b>	<b>\$ 104,600,000</b>	<b>\$ 104,600,000</b>	<b>\$ 104,600,000</b>

Jurisdictions would have to identify specific projects for the use of the Economic Recovery funds. The normal federal requirements still hold; this is a reimbursement program. It is suggested that projects that have an 'A' or a 'B' status for TIP and NEPA are used. Projects that would require a lengthy NEPA/environmental review process, 'C' projects, are not good candidates for these funds. The projects will have to be identified and agreed to prior to amending the TIP.

(a) Maricopa and Pinal County portions

(b) Maricopa County Portion only

(c) The Maricopa County portion of the dues and assessments includes the balance of the county, excluding Gila River Indian Community, the Fort McDowell Yavapai Nation, and the Salt River Pima-Maricopa Indian Community

(d) MAG July 1, 2008 Approved Population

**SCENARIO #1B**  
**Member Agency Allocation**

<b>Jurisdiction</b>	<b>Share of County</b>	<b>Population Distribution</b>	<b>Minimum Agency Allocation of \$250K</b>	<b>Minimum Agency Allocation of \$500K</b>	<b>Minimum Agency Allocation of \$750K</b>	<b>Minimum Agency Allocation of \$1 Million</b>
Apache Junction (a)	0.942%	\$ 985,106	\$ 971,955	\$ 944,373	\$ 913,230	\$ 1,000,000
Avondale	1.904%	\$ 1,991,360	\$ 1,964,776	\$ 1,909,021	\$ 1,846,065	\$ 1,769,441
Buckeye	1.245%	\$ 1,302,737	\$ 1,285,346	\$ 1,248,872	\$ 1,207,686	\$ 1,157,559
Carefree	0.098%	\$ 102,581	\$ 250,000	\$ 500,000	\$ 750,000	\$ 1,000,000
Cave Creek	0.127%	\$ 133,322	\$ 250,000	\$ 500,000	\$ 750,000	\$ 1,000,000
Chandler	6.070%	\$ 6,349,038	\$ 6,264,281	\$ 6,086,517	\$ 5,885,796	\$ 5,641,494
El Mirage	0.836%	\$ 874,165	\$ 862,496	\$ 838,020	\$ 750,000	\$ 1,000,000
Fort McDowell	0.020%	\$ 21,408	\$ 250,000	\$ 500,000	\$ 750,000	\$ 1,000,000
Fountain Hills	0.646%	\$ 675,377	\$ 666,361	\$ 647,451	\$ 750,000	\$ 1,000,000
Gila Bend	0.047%	\$ 49,348	\$ 250,000	\$ 500,000	\$ 750,000	\$ 1,000,000
Gila River (b)	0.068%	\$ 71,239	\$ 250,000	\$ 500,000	\$ 750,000	\$ 1,000,000
Gilbert	5.336%	\$ 5,581,146	\$ 5,506,640	\$ 5,350,376	\$ 5,173,931	\$ 4,959,177
Glendale	6.171%	\$ 6,454,493	\$ 6,368,328	\$ 6,187,611	\$ 5,983,556	\$ 5,735,197
Goodyear	1.476%	\$ 1,544,176	\$ 1,523,562	\$ 1,480,327	\$ 1,431,509	\$ 1,372,091
Guadalupe	0.149%	\$ 155,628	\$ 250,000	\$ 500,000	\$ 750,000	\$ 1,000,000
Litchfield Park	0.127%	\$ 132,329	\$ 250,000	\$ 500,000	\$ 750,000	\$ 1,000,000
Mesa	11.418%	\$ 11,942,803	\$ 11,783,371	\$ 11,448,989	\$ 11,071,425	\$ 10,611,883
Paradise Valley	0.359%	\$ 375,273	\$ 370,263	\$ 500,000	\$ 750,000	\$ 1,000,000
Peoria (b)	3.864%	\$ 4,041,540	\$ 3,987,517	\$ 3,874,361	\$ 3,746,592	\$ 3,591,083
Phoenix	38.784%	\$ 40,568,294	\$ 40,026,723	\$ 38,890,866	\$ 37,608,323	\$ 36,047,315
Queen Creek (a)	0.592%	\$ 619,039	\$ 598,017	\$ 581,047	\$ 750,000	\$ 1,000,000
Salt River	0.171%	\$ 178,722	\$ 250,000	\$ 500,000	\$ 750,000	\$ 1,000,000
Scottsdale	6.019%	\$ 6,296,049	\$ 6,211,999	\$ 6,035,718	\$ 5,836,672	\$ 5,594,410
Surprise	2.701%	\$ 2,825,661	\$ 2,787,940	\$ 2,708,825	\$ 2,619,494	\$ 2,510,766
Tempe	4.288%	\$ 4,485,317	\$ 4,425,440	\$ 4,299,857	\$ 4,158,056	\$ 3,985,468
Tolleson	0.170%	\$ 177,538	\$ 250,000	\$ 500,000	\$ 750,000	\$ 1,000,000
Wickenburg	0.160%	\$ 167,377	\$ 250,000	\$ 500,000	\$ 750,000	\$ 1,000,000
Youngtown	0.162%	\$ 169,451	\$ 250,000	\$ 500,000	\$ 750,000	\$ 1,000,000
Maricopa County (c)	6.051%	\$ 6,329,481	\$ 6,244,985	\$ 6,067,768	\$ 5,867,665	\$ 5,624,116
<b>Total</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>\$ 104,600,000</b>	<b>\$ 104,600,000</b>	<b>\$ 104,600,000</b>	<b>\$ 104,600,000</b>	<b>\$ 104,600,000</b>

Jurisdictions would have to identify specific projects for the use of the Economic Recovery funds. The normal federal requirements still hold; this is a reimbursement program. It is suggested that projects that have an 'A' or a 'B' status for TIP and NEPA are used. Projects that would require a lengthy NEPA/environmental review process, 'C' projects, are not good candidates for these funds. The projects will have to be identified and agreed to prior to amending the TIP.

(a) Maricopa and Pinal County portions

(b) Maricopa County Portion only

(c) The Maricopa County portion of the dues and assessments includes the balance of the county, excluding Gila River Indian Community, the Fort McDowell Yavapai Nation, and the Salt River Pima-Maricopa Indian Community

(d) MAG July 1, 2008 Approved Population

**SCENARIO #2**

**Use the \$104.6 Million MAG Sub-Allocation 100% for Freeway/Highway Projects in Addition to the ADOT/State Portion\***

\* There is a total of \$104.6 million sub-allocated to MAG; it would have to be decided which projects receive funding.

**COOPERATIVELY DEVELOPED ADOT PROJECTS**

**These projects were prioritized by the MAG Regional Council on 2-25-09 and are the not funded by the ADOT/State Portion**

Priority Order	Current Funding	TIP Status	TIP #	Prop. 400 Project	Agency	Project Location	Project Description	Fiscal Year in TIP	Total Cost	Project Notes	
7	NHS	A	DOT06-613	Yes	ADOT	SR 85: Southern Ave - I 10	2 Miles New Roadway	2009	\$20,000,000	Project is ready to advertise.	
8	State	A	DOT08-673	Yes	ADOT	SR 74: MP 20 - MP 22	2 Miles Passing Lane	2009	\$3,600,000	Added to Freeway Life Cycle Program in 2006.	
9	State	B-C	Not in TIP	Yes	ADOT	Loop 101: Northern to Grand SB	Auxiliary lane - 3 miles	Not in TIP	\$3,000,000	Conformity would have to be assessed.	
10	Not in TIP	B-C	Not in TIP	Yes	ADOT	Loop 101: Olive Avenue	TI Improvements	Not in TIP	\$3,000,000	Conformity would have to be assessed. This project will not be ready to obligate in 120 days.*	
11	State	A	DOT10-6C32	Yes	ADOT	SR 74: MP 13 - MP 15	Construct Passing Lanes	2010	\$2,000,000	Added to Freeway Life Cycle Program in 2006. This project will not be ready to obligate in 120 days.*	
12	Not in TIP	B	Not in TIP	Yes	ADOT	I-17: I-10 to Indian School	Southbound Roadway Improvements	Not in TIP	\$1,500,000	This project will not be ready to obligate in 120 days.*	
13	Not in TIP	B	Not in TIP	Yes	ADOT	Regionwide	Construct Noise Walls	Not in TIP	\$10,000,000	This funding would supplement Prop. 400 funding. This project will not be ready to obligate in 120 days.*	
									<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>\$43,100,000</b>	

**ADOT PROJECTS - NON PRIORITIZED PROP. 400 PROJECTS**

Current Funding	TIP Status	TIP #	Prop. 400 Project	Agency	Project Location	Project Description	Fiscal Year in TIP	Total Cost	Project Notes		
RARF	A	DOT10-828	Yes	ADOT	SR 87: Four Peaks - Dos S Ranch Road	Construct Roadway Improvements	2010	\$23,000,000	The project is projected to be ready to advertise by November 2009.		
NHS/RARF	C	Breakout from the DOT12-846	Yes	ADOT	Loop 303: Greenway to Mountain View	Construction	2012	\$135,000,000	Conformity would have to be redetermined. This project is being advanced from 2012 to 2010.		
STP-AZ/State	A	DOT07-323	Yes	ADOT	99th Ave: I-10 to MC85	99th Avenue/Van Buren Street improvements	2010	\$2,500,000	This is a carry-over from Prop. 300.		
									<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>\$160,500,000</b>	

**SCENARIO #3**

**Use the \$104.6 Million MAG Sub-Allocation to fund Freeway (in addition to the ADOT/State portion) and Arterial Projects in Prop. 400\***

\* There is a total of \$104.6 million sub-allocated to MAG; it would have to be decided which projects receive funding between the Freeway and Arterial projects

**COOPERATIVELY DEVELOPED ADOT PROJECTS**

These projects were prioritized by the MAG Regional Council on 2-25-09 and are not funded by the ADOT/State Portion.

Priority Order	Current Funding	TIP Status	TIP #	Prop. 400 Project	Agency	Project Location	Project Description	Fiscal Year in TIP	Total Cost	Project Notes	
7	NHS	A	DOT06-613	Yes	ADOT	SR 85: Southern Ave - I 10	2 Miles New Roadway	2009	\$20,000,000	Project is ready to advertise.	
8	State	A	DOT08-673	Yes	ADOT	SR 74: MP 20 - MP 22	2 Miles Passing Lane	2009	\$3,600,000	Added to Freeway Life Cycle Program in 2006.	
9	State	B-C	Not in TIP	Yes	ADOT	Loop 101: Northern to Grand SB	Auxiliary lane - 3 miles	Not in TIP	\$3,000,000	Conformity would have to be assessed.	
10	Not in TIP	B-C	Not in TIP	Yes	ADOT	Loop 101: Olive Avenue	TI Improvements	Not in TIP	\$3,000,000	Conformity would have to be assessed. This project will not be ready to obligate in 120 days.*	
11	State	A	DOT10-6C32	Yes	ADOT	SR 74: MP 13 - MP 15	Construct Passing Lanes	2010	\$2,000,000	Added to Freeway Life Cycle Program in 2006. This project will not be ready to obligate in 120 days.*	
12	Not in TIP	B	Not in TIP	Yes	ADOT	I-17: I-10 to Indian School	Southbound Roadway Improvements	Not in TIP	\$1,500,000	This project will not be ready to obligate in 120 days.*	
13	Not in TIP	B	Not in TIP	Yes	ADOT	Regionwide	Construct Noise Walls	Not in TIP	\$10,000,000	This funding would supplement Prop. 400 funding. This project will not be ready to obligate in 120 days.*	
									<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>\$43,100,000</b>	

**ADOT PROJECTS - NON PRIORITIZED PROP. 400 PROJECTS**

Current Funding	TIP Status	TIP #	Prop. 400 Project	Agency	Project Location	Project Description	Fiscal Year in TIP	Total Cost	Project Notes		
RARF	A	DOT10-828	Yes	ADOT	SR 87: Four Peaks - Dos S Ranch Road	Construct Roadway Improvements	2010	\$23,000,000	The project is projected to be ready to advertise by November 2009.		
NHS/RARF	C	Breakout from the DOT12-846	Yes	ADOT	Loop 303: Greenway to Mountain View	Construction	2012	\$135,000,000	Conformity would have to be redetermined. This project is being advanced from 2012 to 2010.		
STP-AZ/State	A	DOT07-323	Yes	ADOT	99th Ave: I-10 to MC85	99th Avenue/Van Buren Street improvements	2010	\$2,500,000	This is a carry-over from Prop. 300.		
									<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>\$160,500,000</b>	

**SCENARIO #3 - continued**

ALCP Projects Identified with TIP Status - A & NEPA Status A*											
Current Funding	TIP Status	NEPA Status	TIP #	Prop. 400	Agency	Project Location	Project Description	Fiscal Year in TIP	Total Cost	Project Notes	
RARF/Local	A	A	CHN120-07C	Yes	Chandler	Chandler Boulevard/Dobson Road Intersection Improvements	Add dual left turns, right turns, auxiliary thru lanes, bus pullouts and related improvements	2009	\$ 10,383,000		
RARF/Local	A	A	PEO100-07AC2 & PEO100-07AC1	Yes	Peoria	Loop 101: Beardsley Phase I	The project extends Beardsley Road from 83rd Ave to the New Frontage Road along Loop 101. Roadway, Bridge and Bank Stabilization are the major project components.	2009	\$ 17,000,000	This project is currently planned as a CM@Risk project, however, it could be combined with Phase 2 (frontage road) to be led by ADOT. There are no ADOT funds for this project.	
Local	A	A	DOT12-840	Yes	ADOT	Loop 101: Beardsley Rd / Union Hills - Phase 2	Frontage Road construction 75th Ave to Union Hills and U-turn structure at Union Hills	2009	\$20,000,000	This project is being constructed by ADOT with 100% of funding from the City of Peoria. This project is in the Arterial Life Cycle Program	
STP-MAG	A	A	FTH07-301	No	Fountain Hills	Shea Blvd. - Palisades Blvd. to Fountain Hills Blvd.	Widen for 3rd WB Lane, Bike Lane, Sidewalk, and Overlay	2009	\$ 2,484,000	The Total Cost listed for this project is the Local cost. There are currently STP-MAG funds committed to the project.	
									<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>\$ 49,867,000</b>	

ALCP Projects Identified with other TIP and NEPA rankings*											
Current Funding	TIP Status	NEPA Status	TIP #	Prop. 400	Agency	Project Location	Project Description	Fiscal Year in TIP	Total Cost	Project Notes	
RARF & Local	A	C	SCT220-08AC	Yes	Scottsdale	Pima Rd. - Thompson Peak Parkway to Pinnacle Peak Rd.	Widen from 4 to 6 travel lanes, turn lanes, bike lanes, multi-use path, multi-use trail, raised medians, flood control protection	2010	\$ 23,400,000	With the help of ADOT consultant team, project could possibly obligate within one year.	
STP-MAG & Local	C	B	Not in TIP	Yes	MAG/Multi Agency	Northern Parkway - Overpass at Sarival	Project will be to build the overpass at Sarival.	Not in TIP	\$ 30,000,000	NEPA is submitted; FONSI is anticipated June 2009. This project is coded as a C for TIP Status because conformity would be redetermined.	
STP-MAG & Local	C	B	Not in TIP	Yes	MAG/Multi Agency	Northern Parkway - Overpass at El Mirage	Project will be to build the overpass at El Mirage.	Not in TIP	\$ 30,000,000	NEPA is submitted; FONSI is anticipated June 2009. This project is coded as a C for TIP Status because conformity would be redetermined.	
STP-MAG & Local	C	B	Not in TIP	Yes	MAG/Multi Agency	Northern Parkway - Overpass at Reems	Project will be to build the overpass at Reems.	Not in TIP	\$ 20,000,000	NEPA is submitted; FONSI is anticipated June 2009. This project is coded as a C for TIP Status because conformity would be redetermined.	
									<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>\$ 103,400,000</b>	

\* There is a total of \$104.6 million sub-allocated to MAG; it would have to be decided which projects receive funding between the Freeway and Arterial projects

**SCENARIO #4**

**Use the \$104.6 Million MAG Sub-Allocation to fund Arterial, Transit, and Freeway Projects found in Prop. 400\***

**Prop. 400 Percent Allocation: Arterial - \$10.98 million (10.5%), Transit - \$34.8 million (33.3%), and Freeway - \$58.7 million (56.2%)**

\* There is a total of \$104.6 million sub-allocated to MAG; it would have to be decided which projects receive funding between the Freeway, Arterial, and Transit projects.

**COOPERATIVELY DEVELOPED ADOT PROJECTS**

These projects were prioritized by the MAG Regional Council on 2-25-09 and are the not funded by the ADOT/State Portion.

Priority Order	Current Funding	TIP Status	TIP #	Prop. 400 Project	Agency	Project Location	Project Description	Fiscal Year in TIP	Total Cost	Project Notes
7	NHS	A	DOT06-613	Yes	ADOT	SR 85: Southern Ave - I 10	2 Miles New Roadway	2009	\$20,000,000	Project is ready to advertise.
8	State	A	DOT08-673	Yes	ADOT	SR 74: MP 20 - MP 22	2 Miles Passing Lane	2009	\$3,600,000	Added to Freeway Life Cycle Program in 2006.
9	State	B-C	Not in TIP	Yes	ADOT	Loop 101: Northern to Grand SB	Auxiliary lane - 3 miles	Not in TIP	\$3,000,000	Conformity would have to be assessed.
10	Not in TIP	B-C	Not in TIP	Yes	ADOT	Loop 101: Olive Avenue	TI Improvements	Not in TIP	\$3,000,000	Conformity would have to be assessed. This project will not be ready to obligate in 120 days.*
11	State	A	DOT10-6C32	Yes	ADOT	SR 74: MP 13 - MP 15	Construct Passing Lanes	2010	\$2,000,000	Added to Freeway Life Cycle Program in 2006. This project will not be ready to obligate in 120 days.*
12	Not in TIP	B	Not in TIP	Yes	ADOT	I-17: I-10 to Indian School	Southbound Roadway Improvements	Not in TIP	\$1,500,000	This project will not be ready to obligate in 120 days.*
13	Not in TIP	B	Not in TIP	Yes	ADOT	Regionwide	Construct Noise Walls	Not in TIP	\$10,000,000	This funding would supplement Prop. 400 funding. This project will not be ready to obligate in 120 days.*
<b>TOTAL</b>									<b>\$43,100,000</b>	

**ADOT PROJECTS - NON PRIORITIZED PROP. 400 PROJECTS**

Current Funding	TIP Status	TIP #	Prop. 400 Project	Agency	Project Location	Project Description	Fiscal Year in TIP	Total Cost	Project Notes	
RARF	A	DOT10-828	Yes	ADOT	SR 87: Four Peaks - Dos S Ranch Road	Construct Roadway Improvements	2010	\$23,000,000	The project is projected to be ready to advertise by November 2009.	
NHS/RARF	C	Breakout from the DOT12-846	Yes	ADOT	Loop 303: Greenway to Mountain View	Construction	2012	\$135,000,000	Conformity would have to be redetermined. This project is being advanced from 2012 to 2010.	
STP-AZ/State	A	DOT07-323	Yes	ADOT	99th Ave: I-10 to MC85	99th Avenue/Van Buren Street improvements	2010	\$2,500,000	This is a carry-over from Prop. 300.	
<b>TOTAL</b>									<b>\$160,500,000</b>	

**SCENARIO #4 - continued**

**ALCP Projects Identified with TIP Status - A & NEPA Status A\***

Current Funding	TIP Status	NEPA Status	TIP #	Prop. 400	Agency	Project Location	Project Description	Fiscal Year in TIP	Total Cost	Project Notes
RARF/ Local	A	A	CHN120-07C	Yes	Chandler	Chandler Boulevard/Dobson Road Intersection Improvements	Add dual left turns, right turns, auxiliary thru lanes, bus pullouts and related improvements	2009	\$ 10,383,000	
RARF/ Local	A	A	PEO100-07AC2 & PEO100-07AC1	Yes	Peoria	Loop 101: Beardsley Phase I	This project constructs the City of Peoria's portion of the Beardsley Connector. The project extends Beardsley Road from 83rd Ave to the New Frontage Road along Loop 101. Roadway, Bridge and Bank Stabilization are the major project components.	2009	\$ 17,000,000	This project is currently planned as a CM@Risk project, however, it could be combined with Phase 2 (frontage road) to be led by ADOT. There are no ADOT funds for this project.
Local	A	A	DOT12-840	Yes	ADOT	Loop 101: Beardsley Rd / Union Hills - Phase 2	Frontage Road construction 75th Ave to Union Hills and U-turn structure at Union Hills	2009	\$20,000,000	This project is being constructed by ADOT with 100% of funding from the City of Peoria. This project is in the Arterial Life Cycle Program
STP-MAG	A	A	FTH07-301	No	Fountain Hills	Shea Blvd. - Palisades Blvd. to Fountain Hills Blvd.	Widen for 3rd WB Lane, Bike Lane, Sidewalk, and Overlay	2009	\$ 2,484,000	The Total Cost listed for this project is the Local cost. There are currently STP-MAG funds committed to the project.
<b>TOTAL*</b>									<b>\$ 49,867,000</b>	

**ALCP Projects Identified with other TIP and NEPA rankings\***

Current Funding	TIP Status	NEPA Status	TIP #	Prop. 400	Agency	Project Location	Project Description	Fiscal Year in TIP	Total Cost	Project Notes
RARF & Local	A	C	SCT220-08AC	Yes	Scottsdale	Pima Rd. - Thompson Peak Parkway to Pinnacle Peak Rd.	Widen from 4 to 6 travel lanes, turn lanes, bike lanes, multi-use path, multi-use trail, raised medians, flood control protection	2010	\$ 23,400,000	With the help of ADOT consultant team, project could possibly obligate within one year.
STP-MAG & Local	C	B	Not in TIP	Yes	MAG/Multi-Agency	Northern Parkway - Overpass at Sarival	Project will be to build the overpass at Sarival.	Not in TIP	\$ 30,000,000	NEPA is submitted; FONSI is anticipated June 2009. This project is coded as a C for TIP Status because conformity would be redetermined.
STP-MAG & Local	C	B	Not in TIP	Yes	MAG/Multi-Agency	Northern Parkway - Overpass at El Mirage	Project will be to build the overpass at El Mirage.	Not in TIP	\$ 30,000,000	NEPA is submitted; FONSI is anticipated June 2009. This project is coded as a C for TIP Status because conformity would be redetermined.
STP-MAG & Local	C	B	Not in TIP	Yes	MAG/Multi-Agency	Northern Parkway - Overpass at Reems	Project will be to build the overpass at Reems.	Not in TIP	\$ 20,000,000	NEPA is submitted; FONSI is anticipated June 2009. This project is coded as a C for TIP Status because conformity would be redetermined.
<b>TOTAL*</b>									<b>\$ 103,400,000</b>	

**SCENARIO #4 - continued**

**TRANSIT PROJECTS**

This list of projects include Prop. 400 projects that are not in the proposed scenario as proposed per February 27, 2009 RPTA Memorandum. Fleet Acquisition projects are not included in the list since the RPTA. There will most likely be additional information regarding transit at the Management meeting; additional projects or tables maybe presented.

Operating Costs	TIP Status	NEPA Status	TIP ID	Prop 400	Agency	Project Location	Project Description	Fiscal Year in TIP	Total Cost	Project Notes	
n/a	A	A		Yes	VMR	CPEV LRT	Security Enhancements		\$9,000,000	These improvements were not included in the initial Central Phoenix/East Valley LRT Project because funding was not available. Falls under Listed CEs (23 CFR 771.117(c)) that does not need further NEPA approval by the FTA	
n/a	B	A		Yes	Phoenix	South facility	Upgrade/rehab		\$30,000,000	Expand/rehab maintenance facility	
n/a	B	A		Yes	RPTA	Regional	Security projects		\$5,000,000	Security improvements at RPTA facilities	
	B	A		Yes	RPTA	Regional	ITS/VMS projects		\$30,000,000	Purchase of replacement equipment for regional VMS and ITS systems	
	B	A		Yes	Tempe	EVBOM	Expansion/Upgrade		\$12,744,200	Expansion/upgrade to provide additional bus parking shade structures; full LNG/bio-diesel fueling capability; and parking area for new generation of neighborhood circulator buses	
	A	B	GLN12-811T	Yes	Glendale	Glendale/Grand	Transit Center		\$4,400,000	Regional transit center currently in design	
	A	B	MES12-809T	Yes	Mesa	US 60/Country Club	Park and Ride		\$9,800,000	Regional park and ride currently in site selection process	
	A	B	TMP09-805T	Yes	Tempe	South Tempe	Transit Center		\$14,800,000	Regional transit center/park and ride. Currently in site selection process	
	A	B	VMR09-804T	Yes	VMR	Northwest Corridor	LRT Extension - Phase 1 Capital Improvements		\$102,000,000	The design for this project is 95% complete and a contractor has been hired. This project would require an EA to comply with NEPA. Draft environmental tech reports have been completed to support an EA.	
	A	B		Yes	VMR	Tempe South Corridor	BRT Park-and-Rides and Transit Centers		\$40,000,000	An Alternatives Analysis and Conceptual Engineering are nearly complete for this project. Minimal land acquisition is required. A Categorical Exclusion will be required to comply with NEPA.	
	A	B		Yes	VMR	Northwest Corridor	LRT Extension - Phase 1 Park-and-Ride Construction		\$16,000,000	The design for this project is 95% complete and a contractor has been hired. A Categorical Exclusion will be required to comply with NEPA.	
	B	B		Yes	Glendale	Arrowhead Towne Center	Transit center and park-and-ride		\$17,252,661	Regional multi-use park and ride and transit center currently in design process.	
									<b>TOTAL*</b>	<b>\$290,996,861</b>	

\* There is a total of \$104.6 million sub-allocated to MAG; it would have to be decided which projects receive funding between the Freeway, Arterial, and Transit projects.

**SCENARIO #5**

**Use the \$104.6 Million MAG Sub-Allocation to fund Local Sponsored Projects that are categorized as TIP Status A & NEPA Status A, with Transportation Enhancement projects, and Projects that are categorized as TIP Status A & NEPA Status B\***

\* There is a total of \$104.6 million sub-allocated to MAG, it would have to be decided which projects receive funding.

<b>TIP STATUS - A &amp; NEPA STATUS A</b>											
Current Funding	TIP #	Prop. 400	Agency	Project Location	Project Description	Total Cost	Current Federal	Current Local/Reg. Cost	TIP Status	NEPA Status	Project Notes
CMAQ	AVN08-624	No	Avondale	McDowell Road: Aqua Fria Bridge to 119th Avenue (North Side)	Construct pedestrain improvements on the north side of McDowell Road	\$ 700,000	\$ 497,000	\$ 203,000	A	A	Please Clarify the NEPA Status and add notes if needed. Has already gone through Local government but has not bid. P.S. & E at 98% Completion, Environmental Clearance-Obtained Utility Clearance-Obtained & ROW Clearance-Obtained
CMAQ	AVN11-706AC & AVN11-706FIN	No	Avondale	Buckeye Road: Avondale Blvd to 117th Alignment	construct sidewalks and landscaping	\$600,000	\$ 305,900	\$ 294,100	A	A	Project has finished the federal process and is out for advertisement. Project is advance constructed.
RARF/ Local	CHN120-07C	Yes	Chandler	Chandler Boulevard/Dobson Road Intersection Improvements	Add dual left turns, right turns, auxiliary thru lanes, bus pullouts and related improvements	\$ 10,383,000		\$ 10,383,000	A	A	
STP-MAG	FTH07-301	Yes	Fountain Hills	Shea Blvd. - Palisades Blvd. to Fountain Hills Blvd.	Widen for 3rd WB Lane, Bike Lane, Sidewalk, and Overlay			\$ 2,484,000	A	A	The Total Cost listed for this project is the Local cost. There are currently STP-MAG funds committed to the project.
CMAQ	FTH09-602	No	Fountain Hills	Fountain Hills Blvd.: Fayette Dr to Fountain Hills Middle School	Sidewalk and Overlay (Project in TIP is just for sidewalk)	\$ 1,730,000	\$ 354,200	\$ 1,375,800	A	A	Project in TIP is just for sidewalk
CMAQ	GLB05-107R	No	Gilbert	Eastern Canal: Baseline Rd to Guadalupe Rd (Santan Vista Trail Phase I)	Design & construct multi-use path	\$ 1,000,000	\$ 549,769	\$ 450,231	A	A	
CMAQ	GLB06-201R	No	Gilbert	Eastern Canal: Guadalupe Rd to Elliot Rd (Santan Vista Trail Phase II)	Design & construct multi-use path	\$ 1,000,000	\$ 500,000	\$ 500,000	A	A	
CMAQ	GLB07-302	No	Gilbert	Eastern Canal: Elliot Rd to Warner Rd (Santan Vista Trail phase III)	Design & construct multi-use path	\$ 1,000,000	\$ 636,000	\$ 364,000	A	A	
STP-HES	GLN05-501	No	Glendale	51st Avenue at Northern Avenue	Improve intersection by adding turn lane, bus bay, and raised medians.	\$ 1,159,710	\$ 900,000	\$ 259,710	A	A	All federal approvals have been completed. Holding for ADOT to award contract.
CMAQ	GLN08-604	No	Glendale	63rd Avenue at Loop 101 Expressway	Multi-use overpass over Loop 101. Overpass is 290 feet in length with 14-foot wide bicycle/pedestrian bridge.	\$ 6,488,705	\$ 1,657,383	\$ 4,831,322	A	A	All federal approvals have been completed. Holding for ADOT to award contract.
CMAQ	LPK05-101C, LPK13-901	No	Litchfield Park	Litchfield Road - North of Wigwam Blvd.	Pedestrian Underpass	\$ 2,237,744	\$ 886,420	\$ 1,351,324	A	A	Plans, specifications and cost estimate are 60% complete

Current Funding	TIP #	Prop. 400	Agency	Project Location	Project Description	Total Cost	Current Federal	Current Local/Reg. Cost	TIP Status	NEPA Status	Project Notes
STP-Rural/CMAQ	MMA09-610	No	Maricopa County	Rio Verde Drive: Forest Road to 136th St. Alignment	Pave shoulders to include a bicycle lane	\$ 1,440,000	\$ 507,500	\$ 932,500	A	A	Please Clarify the NEPA Status and add notes if needed. RESPONSE: NEPA submittal anticipated by Feb 17, 2009. Could obligate funds within 75 days. MAG & FHWA STP-Rural Check.
CMAQ	PEO06-202C	No	Peoria	91 Avenue and Olive Avenue Intersection	Design, ROW acquisition and construction of the widening existing intersection to accommodate 3 thru lanes each direction, dual left turn lanes and separate right turn lanes, reconstruction of traffic signal, landscape/irrigation, and utility relocation . Environmental, utility, ROW clearances have been received. 100% plans have ben submitted to ADOT.	\$ 3,776,388	\$ 800,000	\$ 2,976,388	A	A	The ROW, utility and environmental clearances have been issued by ADOT for this project.
CMAQ	PEO07-312	No	Peoria	Skunk Creek Corridor: 75th Ave to New River confluence (follows Greenway Ave)	Develop multi-use path	\$ 1,350,000	\$ 900,000	\$ 450,000	A	A	
CMAQ	PEO08-602	No	Peoria	84th Ave: Peoria Ave to Monroe St	Pedestrian Improvements	\$ 4,000,000	\$ 1,164,057	\$ 2,835,943	A	A	
RARF/Local	PEO100-07AC2 & PEO100-07AC1	Yes	Peoria	Loop 101: Beardsley Phase I	This project constructs the City of Peoria's portion of the Beardsley Connector. The project extends Beardsley Road from 83rd Ave to the New Frontage Road along Loop 101. Roadway, Bridge and Bank Stabalization are the major project components.	\$ 17,000,000		\$ 17,000,000	A	A	This project is currently planned as a CM@Risk project, however, it could be combined with Phase 2 (frontage road) to be led by ADOT. There are no ADOT funds for this project.
Local	DOT12-840	Yes	Peoria / ADOT	Loop 101: Beardsley Rd / Union Hills - Phase 2	Frontage Road construction 75th Ave to Union Hills and U-turn structure at Union Hills	\$20,000,000		\$ 20,000,000	A	A	This project is being constructed by ADOT with 100% of funding from the City of Peoria. This project is in the Arterial Life Cycle Program
CMAQ	SCT08-608	No	Scottsdale	Indian Bend Wash: Jackrabbit Rd. to Chaparral Rd.	Construct new pedestrian/bicycle underpass and multi-use path	\$ 1,640,000	\$ 907,451	\$ 732,549	A	A	Project cleared by ADOT
STP/CMAQ	DOT09-6C00R*	No	Surprise	Grand Avenue widening and Dysart/Grand intersection upgrade	Intersection Improvement in Partnership with ADOT.	\$ 3,000,000		\$ 3,000,000	A	A	Project added due to FHWA eligibility. Environmental Clearance by ADOT for Grand Avenue Wideing Project from 99 Avenue to SR 303 as part of ADOT managed RTP project
CMAQ	TMP04-102	No	Tempe	Curry Road- Scottsdale Rd to McClintock Dr	Design and Construct Pedestrian Facilities	\$ 1,288,820	\$ 902,160	\$ 386,660	A	A	
CMAQ	TMP-07-312	No	Tempe	West Dam: South Bank to North Bank	Construct Bicycle/Pedestrian Bridge	\$ 6,150,000	\$ 1,750,000	\$ 4,400,000	A	A	
CMAQ	TMP04-104R	No	Tempe	Western Canal	Construct Multi-Use Path	\$ 9,500,000	\$ 3,350,000	\$ 6,150,000	A	A	

Current Funding	TIP #	Prop. 400	Agency	Project Location	Project Description	Total Cost	Current Federal	Current Local/Reg. Cost	TIP Status	NEPA Status	Project Notes
CMAQ	TMP-08-602	No	Tempe	College Ave- US60 to Apache BLVD	Construct Bike Improvements	\$ 4,550,000	\$ 2,550,000	\$ 2,000,000	A	A	College is on ly func classed from Southern to Apache (STP eligible)
CMAQ	TMP-09-802	No	Tempe	Citywide	Purchase and install MMUs in all traffic control cabinets	\$ 203,348	\$ 135,950	\$ 67,398	A	A	ONLY ON FUNC CLASS ROADWAYS
CMAQ	TMP-10-803	No	Tempe	Citywide	Install Video Detection System	\$ 486,988	\$ 305,568	\$ 181,420	A	A	ONLY ON FUNC CLASS ROADWAYS
CMAQ	TMP11-703	No	Tempe	Citywide	Install wireless communications and CCTV monitoring at 26 intersections	\$ 312,000	\$ 218,400	\$ 93,600	A	A	ONLY ON FUNC CLASS ROADWAYS
CMAQ	TMP12-804	No	Tempe	Citywide	Install Fiber Optic Cables	\$ 603,699	\$ 242,528	\$ 361,171	A	A	ONLY ON FUNC CLASS ROADWAYS
<b>TOTAL</b>						<b>\$ 101,600,402</b>	<b>\$ 20,020,286</b>	<b>\$ 84,064,116</b>			

**Scenario #5 with STP-TEA PROJECTS**

Current Funding	TIP #	Prop. 400	Agency	Project Location	Project Description	Total Cost	Federal Cost	Current Local*	TIP Status	NEPA Status	Project Notes
STP-TEA	MMA09-725	No	Maricopa County	Bush Highway: Utery Pass Road to Stewart Mountain Dam Road	Design and construct bicycle lane	\$ 1,137,000	\$ 500,000	\$ 637,000	A	A	Please Clarify the NEPA Status and add notes if needed. RESPONSE: NEPA compliance complete. Obligation authority anticipated in February.
STP-TEA & BR	MMA09-811	No	Maricopa County	Old US80 at Gila River	Bridge rehabilitation: scour protection; deck rehab; repair of rails & bent members; bearing pad repair, crash protection; painting, lighting, sidewalks.	\$ 7,450,000	\$ 1,500,000	\$ 5,950,000	A	A-B	
STP-TEA	MES11-812	No	Mesa	Consolidated Canal Bank (8th Street to Broadway Road)	Construct a 10-foot wide concrete multi-use path with lighting and signing.	\$ 2,000,000	\$ 500,000	\$ 1,500,000	A	B-C	
STP-TEA	SCT09-703	No	Scottsdale	Crosscut Canal: Thomas Rd. to Indian School Rd.	Construct new pedestrian/bicycle bridge and multi-use path	\$ 1,620,000	\$ 500,000	\$ 1,231,000	A	A	Project cleared by ADOT - Total cost is lower than TIP; TIP Total is \$1,731,000
STP-TEA	TMP09-704	No	Tempe	Croscut Canal -South End of Existing Path to Town Lake	Construct Multi-Use Path	\$ 1,971,235	\$ 500,000	\$ 1,471,235	A	A	
STP-TEA	PHX08-641	No	Phoenix	Papago Trail - Arcadia Portal. (ties into the intersection of Indian School Rd (FUNCTIONALLY CLASSIFIED) and 48th Dr)	Design and construct multi-use trail enhancements.	\$ 830,282	\$ 500,000	\$ 330,282	A	A	
STP-TEA	PHX08-642	No	Phoenix	Three Historic Phoenix Neighborhoods	Restore 123 historic streetlights	\$ 377,970	\$ 328,133	\$ 49,837	A	A-B	
<b>TOTAL</b>						<b>\$ 15,386,487</b>	<b>\$ 4,328,133</b>	<b>\$ 11,169,354</b>			

**TOTAL WITH TEA PROJECTS \$ 116,986,889 \$ 24,348,419 \$ 95,233,470**

**Scenario #5 with TIP STATUS - A & NEPA STATUS B**

Eligible	Current Funding	TIP #	Agency	Project Location	Project Description	Total Cost	Current Federal Funding	Current Local/Reg. Cost	TIP Status	NEPA Status	Project Notes
Yes	CMAQ	FTH11-801	Fountain Hills	Shea Blvd. from 142nd Street to Eagle Mountain Parkway. Southside only	Multi-use path/Sidewalk	\$ 500,000	\$ 273,000	\$ 227,000	A	B	Please Clarify the NEPA Status and add notes if needed
STP	Local	GDY07-304C	Goodyear	Yuma Road Bridge over Bullard Wash	New construction	\$ 8,000,000		\$ 8,000,000	A	B	
Yes	Local	MMA09-811	Maricopa County	Old US80 Bridge over Gila River	Bridge rehabilitation; Scour protection; deck rehab; repair of rails & bent members; bearing pad repair, crash protection.	\$ 7,450,000	\$ 1,500,000	\$ 5,950,000	A	B	CE in progress - submittal expected in March-April timeframe. Could not likely obligate funding within 75 days.
Yes	CMAQ	MES09-809	Mesa	Broadway (West city limit to Country Club Dr.), Dobson Rd. (Broadway to Southern), Alma School Dr. (Broadway to Southern), Baseline (Harris to Lindsay)	Fiber Optic Lines - Signal System Phase 4A. Install fiber optic communication lines, convert signals and traffic cameras to new control system, and install additional traffic cameras and detectors.	\$ 1,900,000	\$ 651,254	\$ 1,248,746	A	B	NEPA started,--clearance will take more than 90 days but less than one year.
Yes	CMAQ	MES10-810	Mesa	Southern Ave (West city limits to Extension Rd.), Alma School Rd. (Southern to Baseline), Baseline Rd. (West city limit to Horne), Mesa Dr. (Baseline to US 60), Longmore (Southern to US 60), and Extension (Southern to Grove)	Fiber Optic Lines - Signal System for US 60 Connectivity, Phase 4B. Install fiber optic communication lines, convert signals and traffic cameras to new control system, and install additional traffic cameras and detectors.	\$ 2,500,000	\$ 709,973	\$ 1,790,027	A	B	NEPA started,--clearance will take more than 90 days but less than one year. Depends on what the project is, Please specify Project description
Yes	Bridge	PHX09-829	Phoenix	Throughout City of Phoenix	Bridge Systems Maintenance: Upgrades of computer software for bridge inspection	\$69,000		\$69,000	A	B	
Yes	STP/BR	PHX09-828	Phoenix	Bridge Inspection Program (PHX09-828)	Inspection of bridges, upgrades of computer software and rental of necessary inspection equipment	\$500,000		\$ 500,000	A	B	There is \$250,000 in TIP for Local Costs
Yes	STP/BR	PHX09-827	Phoenix	Bridge Rehabilitation (PHX09-827)	Bridge Rehabilitation Program	\$ 58,000		58000	A	B	Rehabilitation and strengthening the bridges to carry standard design loads.
Yes	CMAQ	SCT09-611	Scottsdale	Scottsdale Rd.: Roosevelt St. to EarlI Dr.	Upgrade sidewalks, add bicycle lanes, access management, transit shelters, streetscape	\$ 7,000,000	\$ 2,458,415	\$ 4,541,585	A	B	Project clearance nearly complete
Yes	CMAQ	SCT09-805	Scottsdale	South Scottsdale	Replace traffic signal controllers and cabinets	\$ 500,000	\$ 525,000	\$ (25,000)	A	B	Request to fund local match
Yes	CMAQ	SCT12-813	Scottsdale	South Scottsdale	Replace traffic signal controllers and cabinets	\$ 500,000	\$ 249,054	\$ 250,946	A	B	Request to fund local match
Yes	CMAQ/STP	TMP12-806	Tempe	LRT Corridor	CCTV Monitoring Stations	\$ 425,099	\$ 285,456	\$ 361,171	A	B	
Yes	CMAQ	TMP10-620	Tempe	Broadway Road Between Rural Road and Mill Ave	Pedestrian and Bike Improvement	\$ 5,500,000	\$ 2,571,780	\$ 2,928,220	A	B	
<b>TOTAL</b>						<b>\$ 34,902,099</b>	<b>\$ 9,223,932</b>	<b>\$ 25,899,695</b>			

**TOTAL WITH AA and AB projects with TEA** \$ 151,888,988 \$ 33,572,351 \$ 121,133,165

\* There is a total of \$104.6 million sub-allocated to MAG, it would have to be decided which projects receive funding.

# **MARICOPA ASSOCIATION OF GOVERNMENTS**

## **INFORMATION SUMMARY... for your review**

**DATE:**

March 11, 2009

**SUBJECT:**

MAG Regional Portion of the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act - Transit

**SUMMARY:**

The American Recovery and Reinvestment Act (ARRA) regional portion for transit is in the range of \$65 to \$75 million. The legislation requires that 50 percent of the transit funds be obligated within 180 days. The Regional Planning Transportation Authority (RPTA) board met on February 19, 2009, and recommended project selection criteria. RPTA, MAG, and member agencies are working collaboratively in this analysis. A memorandum from RPTA explaining a draft ARRA transit funding scenario recommendation is attached for your review. The Board is expected to meet on March 19, 2009, for further review.

**PUBLIC INPUT:**

None.

**PROS & CONS:**

PROS: The transportation infrastructure portion of the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act (ARRA) of 2009 is time sensitive. This information and discussion are timely since 50 percent of the transit portion of the ARRA funds are required to be obligated within 180 days after the Federal Highway Administration releases their official funding tables.

CONS: None.

**TECHNICAL & POLICY IMPLICATIONS:**

TECHNICAL: Projects that wish to utilize transportation federal funds, including the ARRA funds, need to be shown and programmed in the TIP in the year that they expect to commence and may need to undergo an air quality conformity analysis or consultation. This programming process is discussed through the MAG Committee process.

POLICY: This amendment request is in accord with MAG guidelines. The federal planning requirements for the ARRA funds remain. Federal law requires that the financial plan be developed by the Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO) in cooperation with the state and transit operators. The state and transit operators must provide the MPO with estimates of available federal and state funds.

**ACTION NEEDED:**

Information and discussion.

**PRIOR COMMITTEE ACTIONS:**

Management Committee: This item was on the March 11, 2009, Management Committee agenda for information and discussion.

## MEMBERS ATTENDING

- Rogene Hill for Charlie McClendon, Avondale  
Mark Pentz, Chandler
- # Matt Busby for George Hoffman,  
Apache Junction  
David Johnson for Jeanine Guy, Buckeye  
Jon Pearson, Carefree  
Wayne Anderson for Usama Abujbarah,  
Cave Creek  
Pat Dennis for B.J. Cornwall, El Mirage  
Alfonso Rodriguez for Phil Dorchester,  
Fort McDowell Yavapai Nation
- \* Rick Davis, Fountain Hills
- \* Rick Buss, Gila Bend  
David White, Gila River Indian  
Community  
George Pettit, Gilbert  
Jessica Blazina for Ed Beasley, Glendale  
John Fischbach, Goodyear  
RoseMary Arellano, Guadalupe  
Darryl Crossman, Litchfield Park
- Christopher Brady, Mesa  
Jim Bacon, Paradise Valley  
Carl Swenson, Peoria  
Frank Fairbanks, Phoenix  
John Kross, Queen Creek
- \* Bryan Meyers, Salt River Pima-Maricopa  
Indian Community  
John Little, Scottsdale
- # Michael Celaya for Randy Oliver,  
Surprise  
Charlie Meyer, Tempe  
Reyes Medrano, Tolleson  
Gary Edwards, Wickenburg  
Lloyce Robinson, Youngtown  
John Halikowski, ADOT  
Kenny Harris for David Smith, Maricopa  
County  
Mike Taylor for David Boggs,  
Valley Metro/RPTA

- \* Those members neither present nor represented by proxy.  
# Participated by telephone conference call.  
+ Participated by videoconference call.

### **CONTACT PERSON:**

Eileen O. Yazzie (602) 254-6300.



## Regional Public Transportation Authority

302 N. First Avenue, Suite 700, Phoenix, Arizona 85003

602-262-7433, Fax 602-495-0411

---

# Board of Directors Information Summary

Agenda Item #4

### **Date**

March 12, 2009

### **Subject**

American Recovery and Reinvestment Act (ARRA) Project Recommendations

### **Summary**

The ARRA has several different sources of funding for transit. The funds are distributed through existing formulas and discretionary programs and several new discretionary programs. The region's list of stimulus projects has been prioritized based on the Board adopted criteria and the recommended projects are presented.

### **Fiscal Impact**

The ARRA will bring additional federal funds into the Transit Life Cycle Program which will help offset the loss of forecasted future tax revenues.

### **Considerations**

There are three main sources of formula funding for the region: 5307 and 5340 formula funds for the Phoenix-Mesa urbanized area, 5307 and 5340 formula funds for the Avondale urbanized area and Fixed Guideway Modernization formula funds for the Phoenix-Mesa urbanized area. The funds for each urbanized area are intended to be used in those areas and not transferred to other areas without an official process. 49 U.S.C 5336 allows for transfers of formula funds from the State's 5311 allocation to urbanized areas (under 200,000 population), for transfers from urbanized areas' (under 200,000 population) 5307 allocations to supplement the State's programs, and for transfers from urbanized areas (greater than 200,000 population) to the Governor for redistribution to urbanized areas (under 200,000 population). These transfers must be done in consultation with the designated recipients for each area.

Federal regulations require that projects that receive federal assistance must be included in a transportation improvement program (TIP), developed by the metropolitan planning organization (MPO) and included in the statewide transportation improvement

program (STIP), and approved by the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) and Federal Transit Administration (FTA). The MPO in this region, which includes both the Phoenix-Mesa and Avondale urbanized areas, is the Maricopa Association of Governments (MAG). MAG contracts with RPTA for the programming of transit projects, as RPTA is the agency identified in statute responsible for regional public transportation system planning (A.R.S. 48-5121). The statute requires that planning efforts be coordinated with MAG's regional transportation plan.

RPTA has coordinated the regional effort for programming federal funds. In the past, RPTA has received member agency consent of established criteria and priorities to help in the programming process. These have never been officially adopted by the Board, but have been used through general agreement with member agencies. Since the passage of Proposition 400, the priority for programming federal funds has been for TLCP projects. There have been inadequate federal funds to date to fully match TLCP projects.

Typically, through the regular programming process, the projects are sent directly to MAG. MAG tentatively approves the TIP, which then enters into air quality conformity analysis. Once the analysis is complete, the TIP is formally approved by the MAG Regional Council. Because of the additional steps and analysis necessary through MAG, the RPTA Board of Directors does not take an official action on the transit projects. The official actions are taken by MAG, who has the authority and responsibility to do so as the MPO for the region. This process also eliminates redundancy as all RPTA members are represented at MAG.

ARRA Requirements – The Act requires that funds be obligated within certain time frames or be lost and redistributed to other regions. The Act clearly has a preference for projects which are ready to construct or purchase in order to get the funds into the economy. It is important to make the distinction between projects that are ready to obligate and projects that are ready to construct. In order for a project to be ready to obligate, certain federal criteria must be met. The project must be in an approved TIP/STIP and National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) requirements must be met. A project can be ready to obligate but still be months or years away from construction. Conversely, a project that was started only with local funds may not have followed the federal regulations and may be ready to construct but are not ready to obligate federal funds. The priority for selecting projects, especially in identifying projects to obligate the first 50 percent of the funds, is to first identify projects that are ready to obligate, then identify which of those projects are ready to construct.

Timeline for selecting projects – The ARRA has a deadline of 180 days to obligate at least 50 percent of the area's apportionment. FTA has confirmed that obligate means grant award for transit purposes. FTA published the final apportionments on March 5, which means the deadline to obligate at least 50 percent of the funds is September 1. The City of Phoenix is the designated recipient for federal transit funding and as such is responsible for the application process and funds distribution to sub-recipients. The application process must include a public hearing with 30 days prior notice, it includes a 60 day review by the US Department of Labor, a pre-submission review by FTA, and an official review by FTA after submission, among other steps. In order to meet the

September 1 award deadline, the public hearing notice would need to be published by April 12. This does not allow for any elongated deliberation process to select projects.

If not all of the funds are obligated by September 1, then the remaining funds must be obligated by March 5, 2010 in order to not be lost to the region. Following the general timeline identified earlier, the public hearing notice for those projects to obligate the remaining funds would need to be published no later than October 14, 2009. The detailed timeline for obligating funds is attached.

The ARRA funds are new funds, not appropriated through the usual process. However, they are apportioned through existing formulas and programs for the specific uses of those formula programs, except that they cannot be spent on operations in any urbanized areas. Because the intended purpose for the funds is different and more immediate than the usual transit appropriations, RPTA staff working cooperatively with its members and MAG discussed some alternative criteria to help filter the list of projects to ones that met the legislative intent. The Board of Directors was briefed and given the opportunity to provide guidance on the project selection criteria. It is not the intent to have the Board adopt the list of projects, but rather to take the Board's guidance and send the project list to MAG for adoption as is done for the normal programming process.

The Board of Directors approved a set of criteria for use in recommending projects for ARRA funding through the formula programs. The criteria were applied to the full list of projects and the remaining eligible projects were evaluated. The criteria are attached for information. Although not an adopted criterion, there was some concern at the Board that funds would be spent on facilities for which no operating funds were available. This was considered during the project review. Following is a summary of the recommendations for project funding by funding source.

Avondale Urbanized Area Formula Funds – The preliminary apportionment of funds for the Avondale area is \$1,333,602. There are not any Prop 400 projects that are ready to go in the Avondale area. In order to obligate the funds in a timely manner, the recommendation is to fund non-Prop 400 projects. The Goodyear Park-and-Ride is 30 percent complete with design work and should be ready to begin construction by July 2009. Avondale would like to do some preliminary work for a future park-and-ride in Avondale. The recommendation is to fund Avondale's site selection and preliminary design, with the remaining funds to the Goodyear Park-and-Ride for construction.

<i>Project</i>	<i>Amount Requested</i>	<i>Amount Recommended</i>
Avondale park-and-ride site selection	\$250,000	\$250,000
Goodyear park-and-ride construction	\$13,137,928	\$1,083,602
<i>Total</i>	<i>\$13,387,928</i>	<i>\$1,333,602</i>

Fixed Guideway Modernization – There is a small apportionment of funds through this program for the Phoenix-Mesa urbanized area. The funds must be spent on specific projects that are related to the area’s fixed guideway system, which includes the high occupancy vehicle lanes on freeways. Park-and-ride facilities that feed into the freeway system are eligible projects. The recommendation is to allocate these funds, \$640,070, to the Happy Valley Park-and-Ride in north Phoenix.

<i>Project</i>	<i>Amount Requested</i>	<i>Amount Recommended</i>
Happy Valley Park-and-Ride	\$14,606,108	\$640,070

Phoenix-Mesa Urbanized Area Formula Funds – The preliminary apportionment to the Phoenix Mesa urbanized area is \$64,421,217 through the FTA Section 5307 formula.

The first recommendation for the projects remaining on the list is to upgrade existing facilities to ensure that they are ready for future service. The Mesa maintenance facility, the Phoenix South maintenance facility, the East Valley maintenance facility and Central Station are all existing facilities in the TLCP that require some upgrades to ensure they are at full readiness for future growth. These projects will not significantly increase operating expenses and have the potential to decrease ongoing operating expenses incurred by members agencies that purchase bus service. Funding these projects now (all are accelerations of TLCP projects except the East Valley Bus Operations and Maintenance facility upgrades) will ensure that the facilities are ready when the economy turns around and the region is able to increase the amount of transit service. However, the Phoenix South facility upgrade is not at the same state of readiness as the other projects and may not meet the intent of the Act. It is recommended to not allocate funds to this project now, but to continue work on the project to make it ready should additional funds be available in the future.

The Mesa facility expansion requested \$10 million for the expansion. The TLCP has programmed \$11.9 million. It is recommended that the full request amount of \$10 million be allocated to this project.

The East Valley facility was constructed recently with local, regional and federal funds. However, due to fiscal constraints, the facility was not constructed to the full scope. The requested \$7.2 million would upgrade the facility to the full scope that was designed. Although no additional funds are programmed in the TLCP, it is recommended to allocate the full amount requested.

Upgrades to Central Station are programmed in the TLCP at approximately \$7.8 million. Phoenix has requested \$10 million to upgrade the facility. It is recommended that this project be allocated the full amount requested.

The regional park-and-ride lots on the light rail line were constructed with regional and federal funds. Shade canopies were not constructed due to fiscal constraints. The \$15 million request would build shade canopies to protect vehicles during the summer months especially. It is recommended that a little more than half of the requested funds be allocated to this project.

The Arizona Avenue bus rapid transit project is unlikely to receive federal funds through any other program. It may qualify for Very Small Starts funds, but is on the low end of the performance criteria. With any significant competition for funds, it is very unlikely that the project would receive a federal grant award. It is recommended that \$15 million be allocated from ARRA funds to this project. This amount will fund the existing design for station construction and intersection upgrades. Additional design work may be needed for additional elements to expend the full TLCP allocation. Those elements cannot be included in ARRA funding because there may be environmental issues depending on the outcome of the design process.

The Happy Valley Park-and-Ride currently has funds in awarded grants and in the TIP. An additional \$10.6 million is requested to construct the facility to the full design scope. The full request amount includes funds currently programmed. It is recommended that this project be allocated the full amount not currently included in awarded grants. The amount recommended along with the funds in the Fixed Guideway Modernization apportionment equal the requested \$14.6 million for the project.

<i>Project</i>	<i>Amount Requested</i>	<i>Amount Recommended</i>
Mesa facility expansion	\$10,000,000	\$10,000,000
East Valley facility expansion	\$7,200,000	\$7,200,000
Central Station upgrades	\$10,000,000	\$10,000,000
Park-and-Ride shade canopies	\$15,000,000	\$8,255,179
Arizona Avenue Bus Rapid Transit	\$21,920,000	\$15,000,000
Happy Valley Park-and-Ride	\$14,606,108	\$13,966,038
<i>Total</i>	<i>\$78,726,108</i>	<i>\$64,421,217</i>

Future funding – The projects recommended fully obligate the funds apportioned to the region. Further, these are all projects that can commit and spend the funds relatively quickly. This will put the region in an excellent position to receive additional funds from areas that cannot obligate their apportionments. Should the region receive additional funds, either flexed from highway funds or redistributed from other regions, it is recommended that the funds be applied to projects on the current lists for the following purposes: to fully fund any partially funded requests for recommended projects, and to unfunded projects that are ready to go. At such time as additional funds are identified, the list of remaining projects, including the list of projects with NEPA status B or C, will be re-evaluated for readiness and prioritized.

Distribution by Jurisdiction – The recommendation allocates funds to six different agencies. However, both RPTA and METRO will utilize allocated funds within member jurisdictions. The total number of jurisdictions that will receive funds either directly or indirectly is 7. Allocations were further distributed using programmed expenditures by city for RPTA's Arizona Avenue BRT project and using an allocation based on track miles for METRO's park-and-ride project. Given those estimated distributions, the following table summarizes the recommended amounts by jurisdiction.

<i>Jurisdiction</i>	<i>Allocation</i>	<i>Percent</i>
Avondale	\$250,000	0.38%
Chandler	\$9,375,000	14.12%
Gilbert	\$615,000	0.93%
Goodyear	\$1,083,602	1.63%
Mesa	\$17,323,927	26.09%
Phoenix	\$30,143,682	45.40%
Tempe	\$7,603,678	11.45%
<b>Total</b>	<b>\$66,394,889</b>	

The staff recommendation follows the Board adopted criteria for project selection. There are a limited number of projects which should ease the grant process and minimize the additional reporting requirements of the ARRA. Although only a few cities benefit directly, all of the projects are important to the regional public transportation system and the system will see benefits as a whole. The projects also provide some relief to the TLCP financial model by bringing in federal revenues that were unanticipated. This benefits all members by helping to ensure that future projects can be implemented. One drawback to the adopted criteria is that the Prop 400 requirement eliminates potentially worthy projects from consideration. Facilities that were constructed with local and federal funds prior to Prop 400 were higher in priority for those cities than the projects that are funded through Prop 400. Existing facilities, such as the park-and-ride at Pecos/40<sup>th</sup> St. in Phoenix, may need upgrades or expansion and could be a higher priority for the system than fully constructing another facility that is funded in Prop 400. The Board could consider allocating funds for facilities that existed prior to Prop 400.

Alternative distributions – The Budget and Finance Subcommittee did not take an action on the staff recommendation. Instead, the Chair asked staff to develop alternative distribution methods that would allocate the ARRA funds to all jurisdictions and allow the jurisdictions to prioritize their own projects. The Chair asked for distribution formulas by population, by revenue miles operated and by TLCP jurisdictional equity percentage. The alternative formulas were developed for distribution to RPTA members only and for all cities. The six resultant distributions are attached, with a comparison to the distribution for the current staff recommendation.

The alternative distribution methodologies would allow for funds to be allocated to more cities to ensure that funds are spent throughout the entire regional. However, there are some drawbacks. Not all cities have projects that are ready to obligate federal funds. Some of those cities may not be able to get projects ready to obligate within the 180 days or possibly not even within the year. Those cities would have to will their funds to another city or to a specific project in another city or risk losing the funds entirely. Many cities may have projects that are not ready now, but could be ready by October to meet the year obligation requirement. If many cities want to be included in the second half of the obligation window, it may mean that there are not enough projects to obligate the first 50 percent.

Other funding opportunities – If the region can obligate and spend the apportioned funds, then there is an opportunity to receive additional funds re-distributed from regions that could not obligate. In addition, there are discretionary and competitive opportunities in the ARRA for projects that meet certain criteria. These opportunities include funds through the U.S. Department of Energy, the U.S. Department of Homeland Security and the U.S. Department of Transportation. These additional opportunities are summarized in an attachment.

### **Prior Committee Action**

Transit Management Committee – March 4, 2009 for action  
    Motion to consider alternative distribution methods failed 5-9  
    Motion to approve staff recommendation passed 9-5  
Budget and Finance Subcommittee – March 5, 2009 for action  
    No action on staff recommendation  
    Chair asked staff to look at alternative distribution methods  
Board of Directors – March 19, 2009 for information and possible action

### **Recommendation**

It is recommended that the Board forward the staff recommendations to the Maricopa Association of Governments for inclusion in the Transportation Improvement Program.

### **Contact Person**

Paul Hodgins  
Manager, Capital Programming  
602-262-7433

### **Attachments**

Board approved criteria for project selection  
Timeline to obligate funds  
5307 Avondale urbanized area projects  
5307 Phoenix-Mesa urbanized area projects, NEPA status A  
5309 Phoenix-Mesa Fixed Guideway Modernization projects  
Alternative distribution by population – RPTA Members only  
Alternative distribution by population – All cities  
Alternative distribution by revenue miles – RPTA Members only  
Alternative distribution by revenue miles – All cities  
Alternative distribution by jurisdictional equity distribution – RPTA Members only  
Alternative distribution by jurisdictional equity distribution – All cities  
Discretionary and competitive funding opportunities  
Powerpoint presentation

## Criteria For Economic Recovery Package Project Selection Adopted by the Board of Directors – February 19, 2009

- Prop 400 projects
- Construction Projects or Projects that generate significant local job creation
- Ready to go projects (timing)
  - AA or BA
  - Construction ready
- Project size (larger is better)
- Projects that may not qualify for federal funds
- Projects that typically receive less federal funding

## Timeline for Obligating Federal Funds

FTA published apportionments in Federal Register	3/5/2009	
	<u>First 50%</u>	<u>Remainder</u>
Publish notice of public hearing (30 days notice)	4/12/2009	10/14/2009
Proceed with TIP/STIP amendment		
Gather information for application		
Obtain grant number		
Enter info into FTA grant system (TEAM)		
Conduct public hearing	5/12/2009	11/13/2009
Finalize grant application (21 days)	5/13/2009	11/14/2009
Obtain concurrence of MPO		
FTA pre-submission review (30 days)	6/3/2009	12/5/2009
Ensure all info is included		
Allows for additional info based on FTA questions		
Submit grant application (60 days)	7/3/2009	1/4/2010
FTA review period		
DOL review and certification		
Grant award/obligation deadline	9/1/2009	3/5/2010

American Recovery and Reinvestment Act  
 Project List - Avondale Urbanized Area  
 5307 Formula Funds  
 NEPA Code - A  
 TIP Code - A or B

Agency	Project Location	Project Description	TLCF Amount	Total Request	Recommended Allocation	Supplanting	Contract Award Date	Project Completion Date
Goodyear	I-10/Litchfield Rd	Park and Ride construction	\$0	\$13,137,928	\$1,083,602	Yes	Jul 2009	Mar 2010
Avondale	Avondale Blvd/I-10	Park and Ride site selection	\$0	\$250,000	\$250,000	No		Apr 2010
Project Totals			\$0	\$13,387,928	\$1,333,602			

NOTE

Contract award date is for construction contracts and was estimated by the agency and used as a guide for readiness.

**American Recovery and Reinvestment Act  
 Project List - Phoenix/Mesa Urbanized Area  
 5307 Formula Funds**  
 NEPA Code - A  
 TIP Code - A or B

Agency	Project Location	Project Description	TLCF Amount	Total Request	Recommended Allocation	Supplanting	Contract Award Date	Project Completion Date
VMR	Light Rail	Park-and-Ride Shade Canopies	\$19,034,540	\$15,000,000	\$8,255,179	No	Jun 2009	Dec 2009
Tempe	East Valley Operations and Maintenance Facility	Expansion/Upgrade	\$0	\$7,200,000	\$7,200,000	No	Jun 2009	Sep 2010
RPTA	Mesa Operations and Maintenance Facility	Expansion	\$11,940,747	\$10,000,000	\$10,000,000	No	Jul 2009	Feb 2010
RPTA	Arizona Avenue	Bus Rapid Transit capital improvements	\$22,510,057	\$21,920,000	\$15,000,000	Yes	Oct 2009	Jun 2010
Phoenix	Happy Valley I-17	Park and Ride construction	\$4,575,569	\$14,606,108	\$13,966,038	No	Nov 2009	Dec 2010
Phoenix	Central Station	Upgrade and rehabilitate	\$7,794,504	\$10,000,000	\$10,000,000	No	Feb 2010	Sep 2010
Phoenix	Phoenix South Operations and Maintenance Facility	Upgrade and rehabilitate	\$11,940,747	\$30,000,000		No	Sep 2010	Dec 2011
<b>Project Totals</b>			<b>\$77,796,164</b>	<b>\$108,726,108</b>	<b>\$64,421,217</b>			

**NOTE**

Contract award date is for construction contracts and was estimated by the agency and used as a guide for readiness.

American Recovery and Reinvestment Act  
 Project List - Phoenix/Mesa Urbanized Area  
 Fixed Guideway Modernization  
 NEPA Code - A  
 TIP Code - A or B

Agency	Project Location	Project Description	TLCF Amount	Total Request	Recommended Allocation	Supplanting	Contract Award Date	Project Completion Date
VMR	CPEV LRT	Park-and-Ride Shade Canopies	\$19,034,540	\$15,000,000		No	Jun 2009	Dec 2009
Phoenix	Happy Valley/I-17	Park and Ride	\$4,575,569	\$14,606,108	\$640,070	No	Nov 2009	Dec 2010
Project Totals			\$53,230,457	\$128,658,769	\$640,070			

**NOTE**

Contract award date is for construction contracts and was estimated by the agency and used as a guide for readiness.

**ARRA 2009**  
**Estimated Formula Funds Distributed by Population**  
RPTA Members Only

	<u>Population</u>	<u>Population Share</u>	<u>Formula Allocation</u>	<u>Recommended Allocation</u>	<u>Difference</u>
<b>Avondale Urbanized Area</b>					
<i>Avondale</i>	76,648	56.324%	\$751,140	\$250,000	\$501,140
<i>Goodyear</i>	59,436	43.676%	\$582,460	\$1,083,602	-\$501,142
Litchfield Park		0.000%	\$0	\$0	\$0
<b>Totals</b>	<b>136,084</b>		<b>\$1,333,602</b>		
<b>Phoenix-Mesa Urbanized Area</b>					
Apache Junction		0.000%	\$0	\$0	\$0
<i>Chandler</i>	244,376	6.631%	\$4,314,200	\$9,375,000	-\$5,060,800
<i>El Mirage</i>	33,647	0.913%	\$594,000	\$0	\$594,000
<i>Gilbert</i>	214,820	5.829%	\$3,792,420	\$615,000	\$3,177,420
<i>Glendale</i>	248,435	6.741%	\$4,385,860	\$0	\$4,385,860
Guadalupe		0.000%	\$0	\$0	\$0
<i>Maricopa County</i>	243,624	6.611%	\$4,300,930	\$0	\$4,300,930
<i>Mesa</i>	459,682	12.473%	\$8,115,210	\$17,323,927	-\$9,208,717
Paradise Valley		0.000%	\$0	\$0	\$0
<i>Peoria</i>	155,557	4.221%	\$2,746,200	\$0	\$2,746,200
<i>Phoenix</i>	1,561,485	42.370%	\$27,566,390	\$30,143,682	-\$2,577,292
<i>Scottsdale</i>	242,337	6.576%	\$4,278,210	\$0	\$4,278,210
<i>Surprise</i>	108,761	2.951%	\$1,920,060	\$0	\$1,920,060
<i>Tempe</i>	172,641	4.685%	\$3,047,800	\$7,603,678	-\$4,555,878
Tolleson		0.000%	\$0	\$0	\$0
Youngtown		0.000%	\$0	\$0	\$0
<b>Totals</b>	<b>3,685,365</b>		<b>\$65,061,287</b>		
<b>Non-Urbanized Area</b>					
<i>Buckeye</i>	50,143				
Carefree	3,948				
Cave Creek	5,132				
Fountain Hills	25,995				
Gila Bend	1,899				
<i>Queen Creek</i>	23,329				
Wickenburg	6,442				
<b>Totals</b>	<b>116,888</b>				

**ARRA 2009**  
**Estimated Formula Funds Distributed by Population**  
All Cities and Towns

	<u>Population</u>	<u>Population</u> <u>Share</u>	<u>Formula</u> <u>Allocation</u>	<u>Recommended</u> <u>Allocation</u>	<u>Difference</u>
<b>Avondale Urbanized Area</b>					
<i>Avondale</i>	76,648	54.292%	\$724,040	\$250,000	\$474,040
<i>Goodyear</i>	59,436	42.100%	\$561,450	\$1,083,602	-\$522,152
<i>Litchfield Park</i>	5,093	3.608%	\$48,110	\$0	\$48,110
<b>Totals</b>	<b>141,177</b>		<b>\$1,333,602</b>		
<b>Phoenix-Mesa Urbanized Area</b>					
<i>Apache Junction</i>	276	0.007%	\$4,830	\$0	\$4,830
<i>Chandler</i>	244,376	6.570%	\$4,274,690	\$9,375,000	-\$5,100,310
<i>El Mirage</i>	33,647	0.905%	\$588,560	\$0	\$588,560
<i>Gilbert</i>	214,820	5.776%	\$3,757,690	\$615,000	\$3,142,690
<i>Glendale</i>	248,435	6.679%	\$4,345,690	\$0	\$4,345,690
<i>Guadalupe</i>	5,990	0.161%	\$104,780	\$0	\$104,780
<i>Maricopa County</i>	243,624	6.550%	\$4,261,540	\$0	\$4,261,540
<i>Mesa</i>	459,682	12.359%	\$8,040,880	\$17,323,927	-\$9,283,047
<i>Paradise Valley</i>	14,444	0.388%	\$252,660	\$0	\$252,660
<i>Peoria</i>	155,557	4.182%	\$2,721,050	\$0	\$2,721,050
<i>Phoenix</i>	1,561,485	41.982%	\$27,313,920	\$30,143,682	-\$2,829,762
<i>Scottsdale</i>	242,337	6.515%	\$4,239,030	\$0	\$4,239,030
<i>Surprise</i>	108,761	2.924%	\$1,902,480	\$0	\$1,902,480
<i>Tempe</i>	172,641	4.642%	\$3,019,880	\$7,603,678	-\$4,583,798
<i>Tolleson</i>	6,833	0.184%	\$119,520	\$0	\$119,520
<i>Youngtown</i>	6,522	0.175%	\$114,080	\$0	\$114,080
<b>Totals</b>	<b>3,719,430</b>		<b>\$65,061,287</b>		
<b>Non-Urbanized Area</b>					
<i>Buckeye</i>	50,143				
<i>Carefree</i>	3,948				
<i>Cave Creek</i>	5,132				
<i>Fountain Hills</i>	25,995				
<i>Gila Bend</i>	1,899				
<i>Queen Creek</i>	23,329				
<i>Wickenburg</i>	6,442				
<b>Totals</b>	<b>116,888</b>				

**ARRA 2009**  
**Estimated Formula Funds Distributed by Revenue Miles**  
RPTA Members Only

	<u>Revenue</u>		<u>Formula</u>	<u>Recommended</u>	<u>Difference</u>
	<u>Miles</u>	<u>Miles Share</u>	<u>Allocation</u>	<u>Allocation</u>	
<b>Avondale Urbanized Area</b>					
<i>Avondale</i>	257,578	90.503%	\$1,206,950	\$250,000	\$956,950
<i>Goodyear</i>	27,029	9.497%	\$126,650	\$1,083,602	-\$956,952
<i>Litchfield Park</i>		0.000%	\$0	\$0	\$0
<b>Totals</b>	<b>284,607</b>		<b>\$1,333,602</b>		
<b>Phoenix-Mesa Urbanized Area</b>					
<i>Apache Junction</i>		0.000%	\$0	\$0	\$0
<i>Chandler</i>	1,091,750	3.265%	\$2,124,380	\$9,375,000	-\$7,250,620
<i>El Mirage</i>	0	0.000%	\$0	\$0	\$0
<i>Gilbert</i>	481,646	1.441%	\$937,210	\$615,000	\$322,210
<i>Glendale</i>	1,742,317	5.211%	\$3,390,280	\$0	\$3,390,280
<i>Guadalupe</i>		0.000%	\$0	\$0	\$0
<i>Maricopa County</i>	38,603	0.115%	\$75,110	\$0	\$75,110
<i>Mesa</i>	2,871,496	8.588%	\$5,587,480	\$17,323,927	-\$11,736,447
<i>Paradise Valley</i>		0.000%	\$0	\$0	\$0
<i>Peoria</i>	44,382	0.133%	\$86,360	\$0	\$86,360
<i>Phoenix</i>	18,549,651	55.478%	\$36,094,730	\$30,143,682	\$5,951,048
<i>Scottsdale</i>	2,154,033	6.442%	\$4,191,410	\$0	\$4,191,410
<i>Surprise</i>	42,688	0.128%	\$83,060	\$0	\$83,060
<i>Tempe</i>	6,419,455	19.199%	\$12,491,260	\$7,603,678	\$4,887,582
<i>Tolleson</i>		0.000%	\$0	\$0	\$0
<i>Youngtown</i>		0.000%	\$0	\$0	\$0
<b>Totals</b>	<b>33,436,019</b>		<b>\$65,061,287</b>		
<b>Non-Urbanized Area</b>					
<i>Buckeye</i>	0				
<i>Carefree</i>	0				
<i>Cave Creek</i>	0				
<i>Fountain Hills</i>	4,755				
<i>Gila Bend</i>	179,270				
<i>Queen Creek</i>	0				
<i>Wickenburg</i>	97,386				
<b>Totals</b>	<b>281,411</b>				

**ARRA 2009**

**Estimated Formula Funds Distributed by Revenue Miles**

All Cities and Towns

	<u>Revenue</u> <u>Miles</u>	<u>Miles Share</u>	<u>Formula</u> <u>Allocation</u>	<u>Recommended</u> <u>Allocation</u>	<u>Difference</u>
<b>Avondale Urbanized Area</b>					
<i>Avondale</i>	257,578	90.503%	\$1,206,950	\$250,000	\$956,950
<i>Goodyear</i>	27,029	9.497%	\$126,650	\$1,083,602	-\$956,952
Litchfield Park	0	0.000%	\$0	\$0	\$0
<b>Totals</b>	<b>284,607</b>		<b>\$1,333,602</b>		
<b>Phoenix-Mesa Urbanized Area</b>					
Apache Junction	0	0.000%	\$0	\$0	\$0
<i>Chandler</i>	1,091,750	3.247%	\$2,112,820	\$9,375,000	-\$7,262,180
<i>El Mirage</i>	0	0.000%	\$0	\$0	\$0
<i>Gilbert</i>	481,646	1.433%	\$932,110	\$615,000	\$317,110
<i>Glendale</i>	1,742,317	5.183%	\$3,371,840	\$0	\$3,371,840
Guadalupe	63,518	0.189%	\$122,920	\$0	\$122,920
<i>Maricopa County</i>	38,603	0.115%	\$74,710	\$0	\$74,710
<i>Mesa</i>	2,871,496	8.541%	\$5,557,100	\$17,323,927	-\$11,766,827
Paradise Valley	69,422	0.206%	\$134,350	\$0	\$134,350
<i>Peoria</i>	44,382	0.132%	\$85,890	\$0	\$85,890
<i>Phoenix</i>	18,549,651	55.176%	\$35,898,470	\$30,143,682	\$5,754,788
<i>Scottsdale</i>	2,154,033	6.407%	\$4,168,620	\$0	\$4,168,620
<i>Surprise</i>	42,688	0.127%	\$82,610	\$0	\$82,610
<i>Tempe</i>	6,419,455	19.095%	\$12,423,340	\$7,603,678	\$4,819,662
Tolleson	49,862	0.148%	\$96,500	\$0	\$96,500
Youngtown	0	0.000%	\$0	\$0	\$0
<b>Totals</b>	<b>33,618,822</b>		<b>\$65,061,287</b>		
<b>Non-Urbanized Area</b>					
<i>Buckeye</i>	0				
Carefree	0				
Cave Creek	0				
Fountain Hills	4,755				
Gila Bend	179,270				
<i>Queen Creek</i>	0				
Wickenburg	97,386				
<b>Totals</b>	<b>281,411</b>				

**ARRA 2009**

**Estimated Formula Funds Distributed by TLCP Jurisdictional Equity**  
**RPTA Members Only**

	<u>JE \$\$</u>	<u>JE Share</u>	<u>Formula Allocation</u>	<u>Recommended Allocation</u>	<u>Difference</u>
<b>Avondale Urbanized Area</b>					
<i>Avondale</i>	\$ 23,760,688	85.613%	\$1,141,740	\$250,000	\$891,740
<i>Goodyear</i>	\$ 3,992,949	14.387%	\$191,870	\$1,083,602	-\$891,732
<i>Litchfield Park</i>		0.000%	\$0	\$0	\$0
<b>Totals</b>	<b>\$ 27,753,637</b>		<b>\$1,333,602</b>		
<b>Phoenix-Mesa Urbanized Area</b>					
<i>Apache Junction</i>	\$ -	0.000%	\$0	\$0	\$0
<i>Chandler</i>	\$ 146,149,676	5.387%	\$3,504,880	\$9,375,000	-\$5,870,120
<i>El Mirage</i>	\$ 3,487,914	0.129%	\$83,650	\$0	\$83,650
<i>Gilbert</i>	\$ 94,467,482	3.482%	\$2,265,470	\$615,000	\$1,650,470
<i>Glendale</i>	\$ 108,008,538	3.981%	\$2,590,200	\$0	\$2,590,200
<i>Guadalupe</i>		0.000%	\$0	\$0	\$0
<i>Maricopa County</i>	\$ 10,073,686	0.371%	\$241,580	\$0	\$241,580
<i>Mesa</i>	\$ 365,252,929	13.463%	\$8,759,300	\$17,323,927	-\$8,564,627
<i>Paradise Valley</i>		0.000%	\$0	\$0	\$0
<i>Peoria</i>	\$ 34,244,991	1.262%	\$821,250	\$0	\$821,250
<i>Phoenix</i>	\$ 1,495,131,065	55.110%	\$35,855,440	\$30,143,682	\$5,711,758
<i>Scottsdale</i>	\$ 160,727,464	5.924%	\$3,854,480	\$0	\$3,854,480
<i>Surprise</i>	\$ 3,577,547	0.132%	\$85,790	\$0	\$85,790
<i>Tempe</i>	\$ 291,860,477	10.758%	\$6,999,240	\$7,603,678	-\$604,438
<i>Tolleson</i>		0.000%	\$0	\$0	\$0
<i>Youngtown</i>		0.000%	\$0	\$0	\$0
<b>Totals</b>	<b>\$ 2,712,981,769</b>		<b>\$65,061,287</b>		
<b>Non-Urbanized Area</b>					
<i>Buckeye</i>	\$ 1,120,089				
<i>Carefree</i>	\$ -				
<i>Cave Creek</i>	\$ -				
<i>Fountain Hills</i>					
<i>Gila Bend</i>					
<i>Queen Creek</i>	\$ 942,073				
<i>Wickenburg</i>					
<b>Totals</b>	<b>\$ 2,062,162</b>				

**ARRA 2009**

**Estimated Formula Funds Distributed by TLCP Jurisdictional Equity**

All Cities and Towns

	<u>JE \$\$</u>	<u>JE Share</u>	<u>Formula Allocation</u>	<u>Recommended Allocation</u>	<u>Difference</u>
<b>Avondale Urbanized Area</b>					
<i>Avondale</i>	\$ 23,760,688	75.994%	\$1,013,460	\$250,000	\$763,460
<i>Goodyear</i>	\$ 3,992,949	12.771%	\$170,310	\$1,083,602	-\$913,292
<i>Litchfield Park</i>	\$ 3,512,813	11.235%	\$149,830	\$0	\$149,830
<b>Totals</b>	<b>\$ 31,266,450</b>		<b>\$1,333,602</b>		
<b>Phoenix-Mesa Urbanized Area</b>					
<i>Apache Junction</i>	\$ -	0.000%	\$0	\$0	\$0
<i>Chandler</i>	\$ 146,149,676	5.361%	\$3,487,680	\$9,375,000	-\$5,887,320
<i>El Mirage</i>	\$ 3,487,914	0.128%	\$83,230	\$0	\$83,230
<i>Gilbert</i>	\$ 94,467,482	3.465%	\$2,254,350	\$615,000	\$1,639,350
<i>Glendale</i>	\$ 108,008,538	3.962%	\$2,577,490	\$0	\$2,577,490
<i>Guadalupe</i>	\$ 110,099	0.004%	\$2,630	\$0	\$2,630
<i>Maricopa County</i>	\$ 10,073,686	0.369%	\$240,400	\$0	\$240,400
<i>Mesa</i>	\$ 365,252,929	13.397%	\$8,716,300	\$17,323,927	-\$8,607,627
<i>Paradise Valley</i>	\$ 8,260,309	0.303%	\$197,120	\$0	\$197,120
<i>Peoria</i>	\$ 34,244,991	1.256%	\$817,210	\$0	\$817,210
<i>Phoenix</i>	\$ 1,495,131,065	54.840%	\$35,679,430	\$30,143,682	\$5,535,748
<i>Scottsdale</i>	\$ 160,727,464	5.895%	\$3,835,560	\$0	\$3,835,560
<i>Surprise</i>	\$ 3,577,547	0.131%	\$85,370	\$0	\$85,370
<i>Tempe</i>	\$ 291,860,477	10.705%	\$6,964,880	\$7,603,678	-\$638,798
<i>Tolleson</i>	\$ 4,758,604	0.175%	\$113,560	\$0	\$113,560
<i>Youngtown</i>	\$ 254,648	0.009%	\$6,080	\$0	\$6,080
<b>Totals</b>	<b>\$ 2,726,365,429</b>		<b>\$65,061,287</b>		
<b>Non-Urbanized Area</b>					
<i>Buckeye</i>	\$ 1,120,089				
<i>Carefree</i>	\$ -				
<i>Cave Creek</i>	\$ -				
<i>Fountain Hills</i>	\$ 1,308,537				
<i>Gila Bend</i>	\$ 2,094,075				
<i>Queen Creek</i>	\$ 942,073				
<i>Wickenburg</i>	\$ 339,324				
<b>Totals</b>	<b>\$ 5,804,098</b>				

## **Discretionary and Competitive Funding Opportunities**

### U.S. Department of Transportation - Multi-modal program

Provides \$1.5 billion to new competitive program

Criteria to be established by May 18, 2009

All transportation modes eligible

Minimum \$20 million project size

Maximum \$300 million awarded to any one state

### Federal Transit Administration - 5309 New Starts

Provides \$750 million to existing discretionary program

Existing or nearly ready Full Funding Grant Agreements eligible

METRO has \$38 million in eligible costs that may receive funding

### Federal Transit Administration - Energy program

Provides \$100 million to new competitive program

Criteria not yet established

For projects that reduce transit agency's energy consumption

### U.S. Department of Energy - Energy Efficiency and Conservation Block Grants

Provides \$3.2 billion for block grant program

\$2.8 billion distributed by formula

\$400 million through competitive grants

Cities are eligible

### U.S. Department of Homeland Security - Transportation Security grants

Provides \$150 million for competitive grants through existing program

## **MARICOPA ASSOCIATION OF GOVERNMENTS** **INFORMATION SUMMARY... for your review**

**DATE:**

March 11, 2009

**SUBJECT:**

Project Changes – Administrative Modification to the FY 2008-2012 MAG Transportation Improvement Program for Funding from the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act of 2009

**SUMMARY:**

On February 17, 2009, President Obama signed the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act (ARRA). The components of the bill and policy implications are discussed in a separate agenda item: American Recovery and Reinvestment Act . In response to the expedited time frames for transportation projects in the Act, administratively modifying the 2008-2012 Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) and, as appropriate, the Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) 2007 Update, is necessary to move projects forward.

The FY 2008-2012 TIP and RTP 2007 Update were originally approved by the MAG Regional Council on July 25, 2007. On February 25, 2009, the MAG Regional Council voted to approve a cooperatively developed list of MAG Region Highway - ADOT/State projects in priority order for the ADOT portion of the ARRA funds of 2009 and that the projects be forwarded to the ADOT contingent upon projects finally selected receiving the necessary administrative adjustments and amendments to the MAG Transportation Improvement Program and air quality conformity and consultation. The Arizona State Transportation Board met on Tuesday, March 3, 2009, and agreed to fund the projects on the attached table with ARRA funds from the state. These five projects need to be administratively modified in the TIP to annotate the new funding source of American Recovery and Reinvestment Funds (ARRA).

**PUBLIC INPUT:**

None.

**PROS & CONS:**

PROS: Approval of this Administrative Modification to the TIP will allow the projects to proceed in a timely manner.

CONS: None.

**TECHNICAL & POLICY IMPLICATIONS:**

TECHNICAL: Projects that wish to utilize transportation federal funds need to be shown in the TIP in the year that they expect to commence and may need to undergo an air quality conformity analysis or consultation.

POLICY: This Administrative Modification request is in accord with MAG guidelines.

**ACTION NEEDED:**

Recommend approval of administrative modifications to the FY 2008-2012 Transportation Improvement Program, as appropriate, to the Regional Transportation Plan 2007 Update, and material cost changes to the ADOT Program, for funding from the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act of 2009 as shown in the attached table.

**PRIOR COMMITTEE ACTIONS:**

Management Committee: On March 11, 2009, the Management Committee recommended approval of administrative modifications to the FY 2008-2012 Transportation Improvement Program, as appropriate, to the Regional Transportation Plan 2007 Update, and material cost changes to the ADOT Program, for funding from the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act of 2009 as shown in the attached table.

**MEMBERS ATTENDING**

Rogene Hill for Charlie McClendon, Avondale	Darryl Crossman, Litchfield Park
Mark Pentz, Chandler	Christopher Brady, Mesa
# Matt Busby for George Hoffman, Apache Junction	Jim Bacon, Paradise Valley
David Johnson for Jeanine Guy, Buckeye	Carl Swenson, Peoria
Jon Pearson, Carefree	Frank Fairbanks, Phoenix
Wayne Anderson for Usama Abujbarah, Cave Creek	John Kross, Queen Creek
Pat Dennis for B.J. Cornwall, El Mirage	* Bryan Meyers, Salt River Pima-Maricopa Indian Community
Alfonso Rodriguez for Phil Dorchester, Fort McDowell Yavapai Nation	John Little, Scottsdale
* Rick Davis, Fountain Hills	# Michael Celaya for Randy Oliver, Surprise
* Rick Buss, Gila Bend	Charlie Meyer, Tempe
David White, Gila River Indian Community	Reyes Medrano, Tolleson
George Pettit, Gilbert	Gary Edwards, Wickenburg
Jessica Blazina for Ed Beasley, Glendale	Lloyce Robinson, Youngtown
John Fischbach, Goodyear	John Halikowski, ADOT
RoseMary Arellano, Guadalupe	Kenny Harris for David Smith, Maricopa County
	Mike Taylor for David Boggs, Valley Metro/RPTA

\* Those members neither present nor represented by proxy.

# Participated by telephone conference call.

+ Participated by videoconference call.

**CONTACT PERSON:**

Eileen O. Yazzie (602) 254-6300.

**Request for Project Change  
Administrative Modifications to the FY08-12 TIP  
Transportation Policy Committee - March 2009**

Highway Projects - TIP FY2008-2012 Administrative Modifications										
TIP #	Agency	Project Location	Project Description	FY	Length	Fund Type	Local Cost	Federal Cost	Total Cost	Requested Change
DOT09-815	ADOT	I-10: Verrado Way - Sarival Rd	Construct General Purpose Lane	2009	1	ARRA		\$43,200,000	\$ 43,200,000	Admin Mod: Change funding type from State (STAN funding not available) to American Recovery and Reinvestment Act (ARRA) funds.
DOT09-818	ADOT	I-17: SR74-Anthem Way	Construct General Purpose Lane	2009	5	ARRA		\$20,868,488	\$ 20,868,488	Admin Mod: Change funding type from State (STAN funding not available) to American Recovery and Reinvestment Act (ARRA) funds. Budget has decreased from \$30.5 million to \$20.9 million.
DOT09-6C00R	ADOT	US 60: SR 303L - 99th Ave	10 Miles Widening	2009	10	ARRA		\$45,000,000	\$ 45,000,000	Admin Mod: Change funding type from NHS funds to American Recovery and Reinvestment Act (ARRA) funds.
DOT07-332	ADOT	US 60: 99th Ave - 83rd Ave	2.5 Miles Widening	2009	1.7	ARRA		\$11,200,000	\$ 11,200,000	Admin Mod: Change funding type from NHS funds to American Recovery and Reinvestment Act (ARRA) funds.
DOT12-840	ADOT	Loop 101: Beardsley Rd / Union Hills	TI Improvement - Widening Union Hills and Bridge with Beardsley connector	2009	0.2	ARRA	\$18,250,000	\$9,250,000	\$ 27,500,000	Admin Mod: Change funding type from State funds to American Recovery and Reinvestment Act (ARRA) funds.