

MINUTES OF THE
MARICOPA ASSOCIATION OF GOVERNMENTS
TRANSPORTATION REVIEW COMMITTEE

February 26, 2009

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

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, City of Mesa	*Pedestrian Working Group: Brandon Forrey, City of Peoria
*Street Committee: Darryl Crossman, City of Litchfield Park	*Transportation Safety Committee: Kerry Wilcoxon, City of Phoenix
*ITS Committee: Mike Mah	
* Members neither present nor represented by proxy.	+ - Attended by Videoconference # - Attended by Audioconference

OTHERS PRESENT

Eric Anderson, MAG	Andy Granger, City of Peoria
Maureen DeCindis, MAG	Clem Ligoeki, Maricopa County
Bob Hazlett, MAG	Jim Hash, City of Mesa
Roger Herzog, MAG	Jennifer Jack, SRP-MIC
Sarath Joshua, MAG	Ethan Rauch AECOM
Nathan Pryor, MAG	Jackie Pfeiffer AECOM
Steve Tate, MAG	Jim Creedon, Landry & Creedon
Tim Strow, MAG	David Johnson, Town of Buckeye
Eileen Yazzie, MAG	

1. Call to Order

Mr. Tom Callow from the City of Phoenix called the meeting to order at 10:06 a.m.

2. Approval of January 29, 2009 Draft Minutes

Mr. Callow asked if there were any changes or amendments to the meeting minutes, and there were none. Mr. David Moody from the City of Peoria moved to approve the minutes. Mr. Mike Sabatini from Maricopa County seconded the motion, and the minutes were subsequently approved by unanimous voice vote of the Committee.

3. Call to the Audience

Mr. Callow stated that he had not received any request to speak cards from the audience, and moved on to the next item on the agenda.

4. Transportation Director's Report

Mr. Callow invited Mr. Eric Anderson from MAG to present the Transportation Director's Report. Mr. Anderson informed the Committee that Mr. Tom Callow would be retiring from the City of Phoenix. Mr. Anderson thanked Mr. Callow for his work as Chair of the Transportation Review Committee, and his involvement in other MAG activities as well.

Mr. Anderson reported on the MAG Regional Council meeting held the previous evening, which included an extensive discussion on the Arizona Department of Transportation (ADOT) allocation of stimulus funding. He reported that the State Transportation Board (STB) met the previous Friday in Bullhead City to discuss ADOT's allocation of the \$350 million in stimulus funds. Mr. Anderson informed the Committee that the STB decided to allocate the stimulus according to the Resource Allocation Advisory Committee's (RAAC) allocations. Based on the RAAC's allocation, the MAG Region would receive approximately 37 percent or \$130 million in funding.

Mr. Anderson explained that a considerable portion of the Regional Council discussion focused on the fact that the STB did not take into consideration the State Transportation Acceleration Needs (STAN) funding, which was swept to balance the State budget. According to Mr. Anderson, the expectation that the STB would take into consideration the swept STAN funding when determining the current allocations was discussed at Regional Council. One expectation was that swept funds would be "taken off the top" of the ADOT allocation of stimulus funding, before the RAAC allocation was distributed.

Mr. Anderson informed the Committee that two members of the State Transportation Board also held membership positions on the MAG Regional Council. Both members explained that while serving on the STB, their position was to look at transportation interests statewide. Mr. Anderson explained that the net loss to region as a result of the decision was between \$46 and \$55 million.

Continuing on, Mr. Anderson announced that the MAG Regional Council approved a prioritized list of projects, which would be sent to ADOT for funding consideration. He stated that the majority of the projects listed would be construction ready within the 120 days. Mr. Anderson noted that five projects identified by asterisks would take longer to be “shovel ready;” however, he expressed confidence that the projects would be ready within a year. He explained that under the stimulus act the money had to be obligated by February 17, 2010 and that half of the money allocated to ADOT had to obligate by July 8, 2009.

Mr. Anderson announced that MAG Staff would delay the approval of the 2009-2014 Transportation Improvement Program and the Regional Transportation Update. He explained the delay was due to the stimulus act as well as balancing the Freeway Life Cycle Program. He stated that he would inform the Committee as soon as a revised schedule was available.

Next, Mr Anderson addressed the Regional Area Road Fund (RARF) revenues, which continued to be weak. He reported that January revenues decreased 13.3 percent from the previous fiscal year (FY), and the year-to-date revenues were down 11.5 percent. He informed the Committee that ADOT revised the RARF Revenue Forecast. According to Mr. Anderson, the revised RARF Revenue Forecast was down \$1.9 billion over the life of the tax from the forecast released in November 2008.

Mr. Anderson informed that Committee that the Arizona Transit Association (AzTA) currently was conducting a Legislative and Rail Conference in Tempe. He stated that Congressman James Oberstar, Chair of the U.S. House of Representative’s Transportation and Infrastructure Committee, would be the conference luncheon speaker on Friday.

Mr. Anderson announced the release of the National Surface Transportation Infrastructure Financing Commission Report. He stated that MAG Staff had received an advance copy of the report. According to Mr. Anderson, the report called for a movement toward a vehicle miles traveled (VMT) tax by 2020 and a median increase in gas and diesel fuel tax by 10 and 15 cents, respectively.

Mr. Carlos de Leon from the City of Tempe inquired about the difference between the \$94 million in swept STAN funding and the \$86 million in funding recommended by the MAG Regional Council the previous evening. Mr. Anderson explained the differing amounts could be tied to the Interstate 17 widening project. He stated that the \$22.5 million noted on the handout was ADOT’s current cost estimate for the project and that \$30 million in STAN funding was swept from the project.

Mr. Callow asked if the \$130 million allocated to the MAG Region by the STB would be allocated to the top four projects listed on the handout. Mr. Anderson stated yes. He added that the third project listed, the Williams Gateway Airport Project, was currently under discussion with the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) and ADOT because of federal

eligibility concerns. Mr. Anderson stated that if the Williams Gateway Airport Project was ineligible that the fifth and sixth projects listed would be recommended for funding.

Mr. Callow asked if there were any additional questions or comments about this agenda item. There were none, and this concluded the Transportation Director's Report.

5. Arterial Life Cycle Program Regional Area Road Fund Revenue Projections

Mr. Callow announced to the Committee that the agenda item on the Arterial Life Cycle Program (ALCP) RARF Revenue Projections would be heard before the item on amendments and administrative modifications to the MAG Transportation Improvement Program. Ms. Hopes informed the Committee that her presentation would focus on the revised RARF Revenue Projections released by ADOT as well as the implications for the ALCP.

Ms. Hopes reported that the Fiscal Year (FY) 2009 Arterial Life Cycle Program was fiscally balanced. She stated that the November 2008 Forecast indicated a decrease of \$132 million (m) in RARF revenues from the original forecast produced in November 2003. She explained that prior to the November 2008, the fluctuations in the revenue forecast had a minimal impact of the ALCP.

Ms. Hopes informed the Committee that ADOT was in the process of revising the November 2008 Forecast. She stated that the latest forecast indicated a \$330 million decrease in RARF funding for the ALCP from the original forecast. She stated that MAG Staff might have avoided pushing projects into unfunded years of the Arterial Life Cycle Program if the November 2008 forecast had remained. However, the sharpened decline in expected revenues listed in the February 2009 forecast would require MAG Staff to push projects into unfunded years in order to maintain the fiscal balance of the program.

Next, Ms. Hopes summarized the estimated expenditures and revenues for the Arterial Life Cycle Program. She informed the Committee the February 2009 forecast indicated projected RARF revenues of \$937m for the ALCP over the life of the tax. She added that currently \$1.1 billion in RARF reimbursements are programmed, a difference of \$190 million.

Ms. Hopes informed the Committee the ALCP's projected revenues for Surface Transportation Program (STP) funds were \$683 and \$115m for Congestion Mitigation and Air Quality (CMAQ) funds. She reported that \$615m of the available STP funds had been programmed for ALCP Projects and \$60m of the available CMAQ funds had been programmed. Ms. Hopes explained that over \$122 million in STP and CMAQ funding was available to fund ALCP projects; however, the current programming of ALCP Projects reported by MAG Member Agencies prohibited the appropriate programming of the available funding. She explained that in the FY 2009 ALCP CMAQ funding had not been programmed in fiscal years 2019 through 2026 and that STP funds had not been programmed for 2026.

Ms. Hopes announced that MAG Staff had meet with Lead Agencies in the ALCP to discuss the programming of projects in Phase III (FY 2016-2020) and Phase IV (2021-2026). She stated that she encouraged the agencies in attendance to review the programming of projects in these years to maximize the amount of STP and CMAQ funds programmed. She stated that to date

she had not received updated information from the agencies.

Next, Ms. Hopes summarized Section 270 of the ALCP Policies and Procedures, which provides guidance in the event of a program deficit. According to Section 270, ALCP Projects may be delayed in priority order if there is a deficit of program funds. She reported that a tentative financial analysis indicated that a one year shift in reimbursements would begin in FY 2013. She added that a two year shift in reimbursements would occur in Phase III, with a two to three shift in reimbursements occurring in Phase IV of the program.

Ms. Hopes requested the Committee's input on the agenda item. Mr. Callow inquired about the type of input being requested. Ms. Hopes explained that various individuals had expressed concerns about the ambiguous language in Section 270. Mr. Anderson explained that the ALCP must be fiscally balanced according to State law. He noted that an additional issue, particularly on the federal fund side, was that reauthorization was upcoming in the future. He stated that the amount of federal funding in the future was uncertain. Mr. Anderson stated that the impact of the decreased RARF Revenues was being felt by multiple programs. He added that the typical MAG policy was to delay projects in the order.

Mr. David Moody from the City of Peoria stated that he had attended the Lead Agency meeting referenced earlier by Ms. Hopes. Mr. Moody inquired if agencies could convert projects to be eligible for both regional and federal funds. Ms. Hopes encouraged all Lead Agencies to become eligible for both regional and federal funds, where feasible.

Ms. Hopes stated that the tentative draft of the FY 2010 Arterial Life Cycle Program increased the amount of CMAQ funds programmed and reduce the overall hit to the program. She informed the Committee that the estimated two to three year deferral was contingent on the increased programmed of federal funds. She anticipated approximately \$100 million in programmed reimbursements to be deferred into unfunded years of the program.

Mr. Moody inquired how a Lead Agency could officially inform MAG that a project was eligible for both federal and regional funds. Mr. Anderson stated that he also encouraged agencies to be eligible for multiple sources of funding. He stated agencies with federally eligible projects should submit a letter to MAG Staff requesting the consideration of federal funds.

Mr. Anderson added that MAG Staff was looking to member agencies to provide accurate projects schedules to aid staff in addressing revenue shortfalls and in programming the maximum amount of available revenue. He cautioned that member agencies may need to review the prioritization of the ALCP projects in the event projects must be removed to balance the program. Mr. Anderson clarified that the removal of projects from the program entirely was not required at this point.

Mr. Grant Anderson from the Town of Youngtown asked if ALCP project deferral notifications would be accepted earlier for ALCP projects. Mr. Eric Anderson stated yes. Then, Mr. Grant Anderson asked if member agencies should indicate funding eligibility during the TIP update as well. Mr. Eric Anderson stated yes adding that the eligibility for regional and federal funding gave MAG Staff increase flexibility in programmed funds.

Mr. Dave Meinhart stated that it would be helpful if MAG Staff provided the Committee a draft of the ALCP that demonstrated the projects that would be programmed in unfunded years due

to the deficit. Mr. Anderson asked Ms. Hopes where MAG Staff was in the process of updating ALCP Project information. Ms. Hopes replied that MAG Staff was currently updating project information; however, a few member agencies had been late in submitting their updates. As a result, the first draft of the FY 2010 ALCP was delayed. She stated that she anticipated releasing the first draft of the FY 2010 ALCP for review and comment within the next two weeks.

Ms. Hopes informed the Committee that several Member Agencies had not updated the project schedules for ALCP Projects programmed in Phase III and Phase IV. She stated it was common for agencies to tie to the fiscal years for work to the fiscal year the reimbursement was programmed in the ALCP. She encouraged member agencies with such projects to contact her directly so MAG Staff could take this into consideration when balancing the ALCP.

Continuing on, Ms. Hopes reminded member agencies could exchange ALCP project reimbursements under certain conditions. She explained that member agencies should consider an exchange if the reimbursement for a high priority project was pushed into unfunded years. During an exchange, the member agency could switch the timing of a reimbursement on a high priority project with a lower priority project. She added that exchanges were constrained by the limitations listed in the ALCP Policies and Procedures, and that MAG Staff would work with member agencies to facilitate an exchange if desired.

Mr. Anderson explained that limitations on funds varied by funding source. Ms. Hopes agreed. She explained that the tentative draft of the ALCP showed a shift of one to three years for projects programmed with RARF revenues; whereas, projects programmed with federal funds experienced a shift of one year, if at all. Mr. Meinhart asked if the shift in federal funds applied to any project currently programmed for FY 2013 or earlier. Ms. Hopes replied no and that the federal funds for FY 2013 or earlier had been allocated to projects, such as Northern Parkway. She mentioned the possibility of funding the Beardsley Connector with federal funds during Closeout adding that if that occurred, projects currently slated to receive federal funds may be shifted a year to accommodate the project.

Mr. Callow asked if there were any additional questions or comments about this agenda item. There were none. Ms. Hopes announced that the agenda item on the ALCP Policies and Procedures would be rescheduled for the March meeting of the Transportation Review Committee.

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

Mr. Callow invited Ms. Eileen Yazzie, the MAG Transportation Programming Manager, to present on amendments and administrative modifications to the FY 2008-2012 MAG Transportation Improvement Program (TIP). Ms. Yazzie stated that the agenda item would not include project changes to the TIP at this time. She informed the Committee that the agenda item would focus on funding allocation scenarios for stimulus funds received through the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act of 2009 (ARRA) as well as a summary of the discussion held at the Regional Council meeting the previous evening.

Ms. Yazzie directed the Committee's attention to handouts provided at each place. She reminded the Committee that ADOT's allocation of funds for highway infrastructure

investments was \$521 million excluding competitive grants. Of that, approximately, \$133 million would be directed to the MAG Region for highway projects. She added that the MAG regional suballocation was \$88 million.

Ms. Yazzie reported that the “Use It or Lose It Provisions” differed for States and Metropolitan Planning Organizations (MPOs). She explained that MPOs did not have a short-term deadline to obligate funds. However, 100 percent of the MPO sub-allocation must be obligated by February 17, 2010.

Ms Yazzie announced that the available funding would be either Surface Transportation Program (STP) or Transportation Enhancement (TE) funds. Any unobligated balances would be withdrawn and subject to redistribution to the States. She stated the STP and TE funds were the most flexible federal program. Eligible projects would include road projects on functionally classified roadways, transit, bicycle and pedestrian, and ITS projects.

Continuing on, Ms. Yazzie directed the Committee’s attention to handout of projects listed in priority order. She stated that the project listing was approved by the MAG Regional Council contingent upon projects receiving the necessary administrative adjustments and amendments to the MAG TIP and air quality conformity and consultation.

Ms. Yazzie reported that the transit agencies were also working to program projects to use stimulus funds. She stated that the Regional Public Transit Authority (RTPA) would hold a Board meeting in mid to late March to discuss the issue further. She announced that at the February Board meeting, RTPA had taken action on project criteria. She stated that the Board focused on projects that were part of Proposition 400. Another criterion approved by the RTPA Board was that stimulus funds would not be used to procure more buses.

Next, Ms. Yazzie directed the Committee’s attention to the second handout, which listed projects according to the five different funding scenarios. Mr. Anderson inquired if the funding scenarios came from the Transportation Policy Committee (TPC) meeting discussion in February. Ms. Yazzie replied yes. She stated that the TPC directed MAG Staff to review funding scenarios pertaining to the Proposition 400 projects as well as a minimum allocation to each member agency. Ms. Yazzie explained that the current discussion was to obtain input from the Committee on any technical issues or concerns about the various funding scenarios presented.

Ms. Yazzie presented funding Scenario 1A and 1B to the Committee. According to Ms. Yazzie, funding Scenario 1A included a minimum agency allocation plus additional funds based on population. She explained that historically Scenario 1A had been used by MAG to distribute funds. Ms. Yazzie explained that Scenario 1B provided a minimum agency allocation; however, if a member agency did not meet a minimum population threshold, then additional funds for population would not be provided.

Ms. Yazzie informed the Committee that with Scenario 1A and 1B that MAG Member Agencies would need to work very quickly to identify specific projects to receive funding. She added that projects with a ranking of “A” or “B” would be good candidates under the scenario; however, projects with a ranking of “C” would not be good candidates because projects would be unable to obligate within the year time frame require by law.

Referring to the handout, Mr. Dave Moody questioned the reimbursement nature of the scenarios. Ms. Yazzie replied that the stimulus funding would operate the same as normal federal funds. She added that initially the member agency would front the money for the project and then be reimbursed with federal funds. A brief discussion followed.

Mr. Terry Johnson from the City of Glendale asked Ms. Yazzie to clarify the project rankings in regards to NEPA project status. Mr. Johnson asked if a NEPA Status of “A” indicated signed approval. Ms. Yazzie replied that the “A” status indicated that all clearances had been obtained.

Ms. Pat Dennis from the City of El Mirage inquired if projects ranked “BB” would be under funding consideration. Ms. Yazzie replied that projects ranked “BB” and projects eligible for a categorical exclusion would be considered under Scenario 1. Ms. Dennis requested scenarios with \$750,000 and \$1 million as the base allocation to each member agency. Ms. Yazzie stated she would run scenarios with additional base allocation amounts per the Committee’s request. Mr. Callow inquired if Ms. Yazzie would also run a scenario with no minimum allocation per member agency. Ms Yazzie replied she would that scenario as well.

Mr. Anderson stated that comments had been made that a project could not be constructed for less than \$500,000. He stated the comment was untrue. He added that certain categorical exclusion projects, such as intelligent transportation systems, could be completed for under \$500,000.

Mr. David Fitzhugh from the City of Avondale inquired about the type of projects eligible to receive the funds. Ms. Yazzie replied the funds could be used for any project that would be eligible under the Surface Transportation Program. Mr. Fitzhugh asked if the funds could be used for design. Ms. Yazzie replied that STP funds could be used for design; however, many of the projects submitted for consideration were construction projects.

Mr. Fitzhugh asked for clarification on the action for the agenda item as well as the role of the TRC in regards to the allocation of stimulus funding. Ms. Yazzie explained that she was seeking technical input on the scenarios developed thus far with the input of the TPC. Mr. Fitzhugh asked if any action was being sought by the Committee. Ms. Yazzie replied no.

Mr. Fitzhugh inquired if federal funds, such as Congestion Mitigation and Air Quality (CMAQ) funds, that are eligible for the federal closeout process should be considered as part of the scenarios presented. Ms. Yazzie replied that the TPC had discussed including funds from the federal closeout process earlier and did not recommend that scenarios include federal funds for closeout. A brief discussion followed.

Mr. Meinhart stated he would support allocating stimulus funds based on population. Mr. Fitzhugh stated he too would support a scenario that considering population. Mr. Callow asked if the specific scenario used to allocate funds would be presented to the Committee before approval through the MAG Committee Process. Ms. Yazzie stated that it was not the intent to revisit scenarios during the next committee meeting cycle. She stated that the Committee could recommend one the scenarios for approval at the current meeting, if desired. A brief discussion followed.

Moving on, Ms. Yazzie introduced Scenario 2. She informed the Committee that MAG Staff

developed scenario that allocated 100 percent of the sub-allocation funds to Proposition 400 highway projects at the request of the TPC. Ms. Yazzie directed the Committee's attention to the handout. She explained that the three projects listed were not in priority order and were in addition to the thirteen approved projects. She cautioned the Committee that the projects and amounts listed may change dependent on the final funding amounts set by the Arizona State Transportation Board and the prioritized project list.

Ms. Dennis suggested that future versions of the handout in light of potential changes that may occur. She suggested that non-selected projects that might receive funding be listed on the handout. She explained that the change would facilitate a discussion on the allocation of funds in the event a change was made. Ms. Yazzie agreed.

Next, Ms. Yazzie summarized Scenario 3, which allocated funds to Proposition 400 highway and arterial street projects. She explained that three projects in the Arterial Life Cycle Program (ALCP) have met the required federal clearances and were ranked "AA." Ms. Yazzie informed the Committee that in the analysis for Scenario 3, MAG Staff only included ALCP projects with an "AA" ranking.

Mr. Callow asked if there were any questions about the scenario, and there were none. Mr. Johnson stated that he would support the scenario adding the NEPA status for the Northern Parkway project was closer to an "A" than a "B" as previously indicated. Mr. Meinhart suggested that future handouts of Scenario 3 include projects ranked "AB" or "BB."

Then, Ms. Yazzie presented Scenario 4, which would give priority to Proposition 400 highway, arterial streets, and transit projects. She informed the Committee that Scenario 4 also was run at the request of the TPC. She explained that under Scenario 4, each Proposition 400 category would receive the a share of the stimulus funds based on the percentage allocations outlined in the Regional Transportation Plan. According to the scenario, the funding by category would be highways \$49.8 million (56.2%), arterial streets \$9.3 million (10.5%), and transit projects- \$29.5 million (33.3%).

Ms. Yazzie stated that based on the comments received from Mr. Meinhart and Mr. Johnson, she would expand the arterial street list to include "AB" and "BB" arterial street projects. Ms. Dennis expressed concerns about Scenario 4 referencing the separate transit allocation included in the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act (ARRA). A brief discussion followed.

Continuing on, Ms. Yazzie presented Scenario 5. Under the scenario, priority would be given to projects with a TIP status of "A" and a NEPA status of "A." She reported that \$84 million in project costs would be funded for "AA" projects according to the scenario. An additional \$5.2 million in transportation enhancement projects also would be funded. Mr. Sabatini requested that the transportation enhancement project list be updated to include the old US 80 bridge, which has been allocated some transportation enchantment funding. Ms. Yazzie replied that she would update the listing.

Ms. Dennis inquired if the funds would be supplanting projects at the local level under Scenario 5. Ms. Yazzie replied yes. Ms. Dennis asked if the local jurisdiction would need to demonstrate the local funding had been reallocated to another project in order to be eligible for the stimulus funding. Ms. Yazzie replied yes. Mr. Meinhart inquired that if a project were supplanted, would the supplanted funds be required to a capital project or could it be allocated to transit operations.

Ms. Yazzie replied that MAG Staff had not received final guidance on the supplanting provision of the Act. A brief discussion followed.

Mr. Dave Fitzhugh asked what would happen to the programmed funds if a Proposition 400 project were supplanted. Ms. Yazzie stated that the programmed funds would be used to alleviate to the budgetary shortfall in the Freeway, Arterial, and/or Transit Life Cycle Programs depending on which project(s) were supplanted. She added that MAG Staff would work with the jurisdiction in question to reprogram projects, as necessary, in the event supplanting occurred.

Mr. Eric Anderson stated that there were two general directions the funding allocations could go. First, jurisdictions may be allocated a specific amount of money and then be required to notify MAG which projects would be eligible for federal funds. The second option would be to fund specific projects that are, or will be shortly, eligible for federal funds. Mr. Anderson encouraged a general discussion on the direction MAG Staff should take.

Mr. Callow stated that the City of Phoenix would be supportive of a population based allocation adding that the intent of the Act was to stimulate the economy not to fund Proposition 400 projects. He explained that all jurisdictions are hurting financially and that Proposition 400 projects were not the only projects experiencing a shortfall. Mr. Sabatini echoed Mr. Callow's comments and encouraged MAG Staff to present Scenarios 1 and 5 as the funding moves through the MAG Committee Process. Mr. Fitzhugh and Mr. Meinhart also expressed support for the population based allocation.

Mr. Johnson expressed support for a regional approach, particularly projects included in the Regional Transportation Plan. He voiced concerns about the job creation that would occur if a population based approach was implemented. Mr. Grant Anderson and Ms. Dennis acknowledged the benefit of the population based approach with a minimum allocation per jurisdiction. Mr. Randall Overmyer from the City of Surprise expressed support for a minimum allocation per jurisdiction.

Mr. Anderson acknowledged to dichotomy the proposed scenarios. He stated that he expected the highway and transit allocations would go directly to Proposition 400 project. However, he acknowledged the inability of the Arterial Life Cycle Program to use to the MPO sub-allocation, in a similar fashion.

Then, Ms. Yazzie informed the Committee of the next steps in the process. She stated that MAG Staff would continue to work with Valley Metro and ADOT on the financial analysis and coordination required. She reported that MAG Staff would present the scenario results at the MAG Management and Transportation Policy Committee meetings in March. Ms. Yazzie stated that she hoped that the MAG Regional Council would hear the scenarios and make the final decision at the March committee meeting. In addition, she hoped to present a possible TIP

amendment that included the projects to selected to receive the MAG sub-allocation. A brief discussion followed.

Mr. Callow asked if there were any questions about Ms. Yazzie's presentation, and there were none.

7. Update to the Arterial Life Cycle Program Policies and Procedures

Mr. Callow informed the Committee that the update to the Arterial Life Cycle Policies and Procedures would not be heard at this time. Mr. Callow announced that he would need to leave the meeting due to a prior engagement and requested that Mr. Moody be in charge of the meeting in his absence. Mr. Moody then moved on to the next item on the agenda.

8. Update on the Interstates 8 and 10-Hidden Valley Transportation Framework Study

Next, Mr. Moody invited Mr. Bob Hazlett to present on the Interstate 8 (I-8) and Interstate 10 (I-10) Hidden Valley Transportation Framework Study (Study). Mr. Hazlett informed the Committee that the Study had been underway for almost two years. He stated the Study was being conducted by MAG in conjunction with the project's funding partners, which included the cities of Goodyear and Maricopa, the Town of Buckeye, the Maricopa County Department of Transportation, the Pinal County Department of Public Works, and the Arizona Department of Transportation. In addition, he acknowledged the contributions from the Central Association of Governments (CAAG) and the City of Casa Grande on the Study.

Mr. Hazlett outlined the study area for the Committee. He explained that the study area encompassed approximately 3,000 square miles of land in Maricopa and Pinal counties. The study boundaries included the Gila River to the north, the I-8 corridor to the south, Overfield Road to the east, and 459th Avenue to the west. He informed the Committee that the study area also contained two Native American Indian communities, five wilderness areas and the Sonoran Desert National Monument.

Mr. Hazlett explained that a Study Review Team (SRT) comprised of numerous local, regional, and national entities were participating in the Study. He stated that a variety of key stakeholders had also been involved in the Study. Some of the key stakeholders involved included economic development organizations, public/private utilities, individual land owners, affected citizens, neighborhood groups, and development firms. Mr. Hazlett reported extensive public involvement on the project, which included six public workshops, 17 funding partner meetings, and 12 Study Review Team meetings.

Next, Mr. Hazlett discussed the Study background. According to Mr. Hazlett, the Study was needed for a variety of reason, such as the anticipated population and employment growth and the need to preserve critical rights-of-way. He informed the Committee that an environmental scan of the study area had been conducted. He reported that 36 environmental factors were considered during the scan. Some of the factors assessed included cultural resources, air quality, natural vegetation, major economic centers, conservation areas, and wildlife corridors.

Mr. Hazlett informed the Committee that the Study assessed the framework for surface

transportation and transit in the area. In regards to surface transportation, the Study reviewed additional high capacity corridors, including freeways, parkways and arterials. For transit, the Study assessed high capacity peak hour service for commuters, local service for local trips, and feeding into high capacity transit corridors.

Mr. Hazlett explained that the Study included several framework alternatives. The framework alternatives included balanced capacity, maximum capacity, minimum capacity, base transit and enhanced transit. He directed the Committee to the MAG website for more detailed information on the alternatives. He also welcomed individuals to contact him directly to discuss the various alternatives as well as the subsets of the alternatives presented.

Mr. Hazlett summarized the key recommendations for the Study. The recommendations included providing additional high capacity corridors and defining the Hassayampa Freeway as more of east-west facility during the transition from the Hassayampa Valley to the Hidden Valley in order to provide more connections to Goodyear, Buckeye, and Casa Grande. Other recommendations included additional improvements to State Road 85 and additional definition to Loop 303 south of the Gila River.

According to Mr. Hazlett, the Study also identified a network of parkways and incorporated the results of Pinal County's Regional Significant Routes Study for Safety and Mobility. Mr. Hazlett stated that the Study did not identify any new corridors for the Gila River Indian Communities. The decision to avoid new corridors in the Indian Community was made at the request of several partnering agencies, who wanted the new alignments to circulate around the Gila River Indian Community instead. Mr. Hazlett informed the Committee that the Study also identified potential transit corridors, including potential rail corridors.

Next, Mr. Hazlett outlined the next steps of the Study. He stated the project team would identify preliminary cost opinions, develop an implementation plan, and complete the project document and executive summary brochure. He reported that the Study would likely be before the MAG Regional Council for acceptance in May 2009 and be heard by CAAG in June 2009. He informed the Committee that the Study would be presented for recommendation at the April meeting of the TRC.

Mr. Hazlett acknowledged the efforts of the consultant team, AECOM, on the project. He encouraged the Committee to contact the consultant team for additional information on the project, if desired. Then, he provided the Committee with a CD-ROM that included the latest reports on the Study.

Mr. Moody asked if there were any questions about Mr. Hazlett's presentation, and there were none.

8. Member Agency Update

Mr. Moody asked members of the Committee if they would like to provide updates; address any issues or concerns regarding transportation at the regional level; and asked if any members in

attendance would like to address recent information that was relevant to transportation within their respective communities. There were none, and Mr. Moody moved to the next agenda item.

9. Next Meeting Date

Mr. Moody informed members in attendance that the next meeting of the Committee would be held on March 26, 2009. There being no further business, Mr. Moody adjourned the meeting at 11:47 a.m.