

April 3, 2014

TO: Members of the MAG Street Committee

FROM: Dana Owsiany, P.E., Chair

SUBJECT: MEETING NOTIFICATION AND TRANSMITTAL OF TENTATIVE AGENDA

**Tuesday, April 8, 2014 - 1:00 p.m.**  
MAG Office, Suite 200, Chaparral Room  
302 North First Avenue, Phoenix

The next meeting of the MAG Street Committee will be held at the time and place noted above. **Please note the earlier starting time of 1:00 pm.** Committee members or their proxies may attend in person, via video-conference or by telephone conference call. Those attending video conference must notify the MAG site three business days prior to the meeting. Those attending by telephone conference please contact MAG offices for conference call instructions.

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

The next meeting of the MAG Street Committee will be held at the time and place noted above. If you have any questions or need additional information, please contact Teri Kennedy or Steve Tate at (602) 254-6300.

TENTATIVE AGENDA

	<u>COMMITTEE ACTION REQUESTED</u>
<p>1. <u>Call to Order</u></p> <p>The April 2014 meeting, the quorum requirement is 14 committee members.</p>	
<p>2. <u>Introductions and Attendance</u></p> <p>An opportunity for new members to introduce themselves and record member attendance at the meeting will be provided.</p>	<p>2. For information.</p>
<p>3. <u>Approval of the March 18, 2014 Meeting Minutes</u></p>	<p>3. Review and approve the minutes from the March 18, 2014 meeting.</p>
<p>4. <u>Call to the Audience</u></p> <p>An opportunity will be provided to members of the public to address the Street 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. Members of the public 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 Street Committee requests an exception to this limit. Please note that those wishing to comment on action agenda items will be given an opportunity at the time the item is heard.</p>	<p>4. For information.</p>
<p>5. <u>Transportation Programming Manager's Report</u></p> <p>The MAG Transportation Programming Manager will review recent transportation planning activities and upcoming agenda items for MAG Committees and other related regional transportation activities.</p>	<p>5. For information and discussion.</p>
<p>6. <u>Arterial Life Cycle Program Project Changes Technical Review: Deletion of the Price at Germann Road and Ray at Rural Road Projects and Addition of the Ocotillo Road: Gilbert Road to 148<sup>th</sup> Street Project</u></p> <p>The Arterial Life Cycle Program (ALCP)</p>	<p>6. For information, discussion, and possible recommendation to include the proposed project change in the Draft FY 2015 ALCP.</p>

Policies and Procedures (Policies) approved on December 9, 2009 require Lead Agencies to present proposed substitute projects or changes in project scope to the MAG Street Committee for a technical review and recommendation for approval through the MAG Committee Process. The City of Chandler will present proposed deletions of the Price at Germann Road and Ray at Rural Road projects and addition of the Ocotillo Road: Gilbert Road to 148<sup>th</sup> Street project. Please refer to the attached memorandum and excerpt from the ALCP Policies. Additional information specific to this project change request will be provided at the meeting.

7. Arterial Life Cycle Program Project Changes Technical Review: Deletion of the Chandler Blvd at Kyrene Road and Kyrene at Ray Road Projects and Addition of the Cooper Road: South of Queen Creek to Riggs Road Project

The Arterial Life Cycle Program (ALCP) Policies and Procedures (Policies) approved on December 9, 2009 require Lead Agencies to present proposed substitute projects or changes in project scope to the MAG Street Committee for a technical review and recommendation for approval through the MAG Committee Process. The City of Chandler will present proposed deletions of the Chandler Blvd at Kyrene Road and Kyrene at Ray Road projects and addition of the Cooper Road: South of Queen Creek to Riggs Road project. Please refer to the attached memorandum and excerpt from the ALCP Policies. Additional information specific to this project change request will be provided at the meeting.

8. Arterial Life Cycle Program Project Changes Technical Review: Old Price Road at Queen Creek Road

The Arterial Life Cycle Program (ALCP) Policies and Procedures (Policies) approved on December 9, 2009 require Lead Agencies to present proposed substitute projects or changes in project scope to the MAG Street Committee for a technical review and recommendation for

7. For information, discussion, and possible recommendation to include the proposed project change in the Draft FY 2015 ALCP.

8. For information, discussion, and possible recommendation to include the proposed project change in the Draft FY 2015 ALCP.

approval through the MAG Committee Process. The City of Chandler will present a proposed change in project scope to move the Price Road at Queen Creek Road intersection improvement project to Old Price Road at Queen Creek Road. Please refer to the attached memorandum and excerpt from the ALCP Policies. Additional information specific to this project change request will be provided at the meeting.

9. Enhanced NHS: Review of Network Scenarios

At the March 18, 2014 meeting of the Street Committee, staff was directed to develop revised Principal Arterial System (PAS)/National Highway System (NHS) network options that incorporated the MAG and Pinal County Roads of Regional Significance (RRS) networks.

At the meeting two additional approaches and a methodology for developing a revised PAS/NHS network will be discussed. The two additional approaches are listed as follows:

- Approach 2A: the Pinal County and MAG RRS
- Approach 2B: an adjusted RRS network that accounts for freeway and other roadway changes.

10. Highway Performance Monitoring Data (HPMS) Collection

At the meeting HPMS data collection will be discussed

11. Member Agency announcements

An opportunity will be provided for member agencies to announce issues of concern to them.

12. Requests for future agenda items

An opportunity will be provide for member agencies to request future agenda items.

Adjournment

9. For information and discussion.

10. For information and discussion.

11. For information and discussion.

12. For information and discussion.

MINUTES OF THE  
MARICOPA ASSOCIATION OF GOVERNMENTS  
STREET COMMITTEE

Tuesday March 18, 2014 1:00 p.m.  
MAG Offices, Suite 300,  
302 North First Avenue, Phoenix, Arizona 85003

MEMBERS ATTENDING

Dana Owsiany, Phoenix, Chair Woman	Bill Fay, Maricopa City
Patrick Stone for Steve Beasley ADOT	Jack M. Lorbeer, Maricopa County
Dana Chamberlin for Charles Andrews, Avondale	Maria Angelica Deeb, Mesa
* Jose Heredia, Buckeye	* James Shano, Paradise Valley
Dan Cook, Chandler	Scott Bender, Pinal County
Chris Hauser, El Mirage	Ben Wilson, Peoria
Tom Deitering for Aryan Lirange, FHWA	* Janet Martin, Queen Creek
# Morris Talyor for Wayne Costa, Florence	* Elaine Cabrera, Salt River Pima-Maricopa Indian Community
Tim Oliver, Gila River Indian Community	# Todd Taylor for Phil Kercher, Scottsdale
# Tom Condit, Gilbert	Suneel Garg, Surprise
Purab Adabala for Bob Darr, Glendale	* Isaac Chivera, Tempe
# Hugh Bigalk, Goodyear	Richard Rawnsley for Jason Earp, Tolleson
* Darryl Crossman, Litchfield Park	Grant Anderson, Youngtown

\* Members neither present nor represented by Proxy  
# Members attending by phone

OTHERS PRESENT

Natalie Clark, ADOT	Stephen Ganstrom, Mesa
Willian Faber, ADOT	John Bullen, MAG
Jim Meyer, ADOT	Teri Kennedy, MAG
Neal Schmidt, Apache Junction	David Massey, MAG
Christy Sipos, Little John Engineering	Stephen Tate, MAG
John Tuter, Little John Engineering	

1. Call to Order

Chair Woman Dana Owsiany called the meeting to order at 1:00 p.m.

2. Introductions and Attendance

A roll call of members attending the meeting was conducted. The following member agencies were not represented at the meeting: Buckeye, Paradise Valley, Queen Creek, Salt-River Pima-Maricopa Indian Community, Litchfield Park and Tempe.

3. Approval of the January 14, 2014 Meeting Minutes

Chair Woman Dana Owsiany, noted that the minutes inaccurately indicated that she was the Vice Chair at the previous meeting. Mr. Grant Anderson moved approval of the minutes with the correction noted by the Chair Woman. Mr. Dan Cook seconded the motion. The motion carried unanimously.

4 Call to the Audience

No members of the audience requested to speak before the Committee.

5. Transportation Programming Manager's Report

Ms. Teri Kennedy briefed the Committee. She noted that the MAG Regional Council is anticipated to approve PM-10 Street Sweepers project requests at their March meeting, that MAG is anticipating a second call for Safe Routes to School projects and that MAG had received a letter from the ADOT EPG group.

She went on to indicate that the Management Committee had set up a working group to address changes and corrections to the MAG programming policies. It is anticipated that the Street Committee will be involved in updating the policies.

The ALCP update for 2015 is underway and agencies should contact Mr. John Bullen to provide updates. The TIP is also now available. Should member find errors, they should send change requests to Mr. Stephen Tate.

Member agency HSIP project packages are due to ADOT by May 15. Unobligated, HSIP funding will be swept at the end of the fiscal year.

Teri concluded by welcoming new members: Mr. Chris Hauser from El Mirage and Mr. Tom Condit from Gilbert.

6. Arterial Life Cycle Program Project Changes Technical Review: Mesa Drive at Broadway Road

Mr. John Bullen briefed the Committee on MAG ALCP policies. He noted that the policies required that project changes be reviewed by the Street Committee and that this review should take into account:

- the consistency of the change with the Regional Transportation Plan, and
- address changes to major arterial or an intersection of a major arterial.

Ms. Maria Deeb directed members to written material concerning the proposed change and introduced Mr. Stephen Ganstrom, the Mesa manager of the project.

He began noting that the project was initially programmed in a single phase, but was subsequently divided into two phases. The first phase is largely complete. This phase upgraded Mesa Drive into a gateway corridor from US 60 with lane improvements and art work and landscaping. This phase cost approximately \$20 million and greatly improved pedestrian safety.

The proposed change is to increase the scope of phase two to connect with improvements at 8<sup>th</sup> Avenue and in the Main Street corridor. Increased costs from the scope change will be borne by the City of Mesa. Improvements will include under grounding utilities, new traffic lights and lane improvements.

Mr. Grant Anderson asked what the initial funding was for the project. Ms. Deeb noted that the initial funding split called for Mesa to bear a forty percent share. With the change the funding share would be around fifty percent.

Mr. Dan Cook noted that the project was needed and worthwhile.

Ms. Deeb provided information on scheduling. She noted that the City was moving rapidly to obtain a consultant and that design and right of way acquisition was expected to be completed within eighteen months. She stressed that the City wanted to get started on the project as soon as possible.

Mr. Cook moved approval of the change. Mr. Anderson seconded the motion. The motion was approved.

#### 7. Enhanced NHS

Mr. Stephen Tate briefed the Committee. He noted that the passage of MAP-21 resulted in the addition of all locally owned principal arterial facilities in Maricopa County to the National Highway System (NHS), that MAG had acted to request the removal of the designation, but that the FHWA had not acted on the request as it had determined that it was the intent of the Congress to add all principal arterial facilities to the NHS and it was concerned about attempts to circumvent regulations by removing the NHS designation of facilities.

The NHS designation of facilities can be removed in two ways. First, the FHWA headquarters can remove facilities on a case by case basis, but has indicated that it will not use this method for large scale removals. Second, principal arterial facilities can be removed by changing their classification to minor arterial. This would not affect roadways that are on the NHS because they are identified as intermodal connectors or as part of STRANET. Any attempt to remove facilities from the NHS through reclassification would need to fully comply with federal functional classification criteria and avoid the appearance of attempting to circumvent federal regulations.

Federal regulations that apply to NHS routes include design requirements, FHWA approval of design exceptions, a quality assurance program, increased federal oversight of federally funded projects, limitations on the use of warrantees and junkyard and sign control measures. Rule making is pending for asset management and performance management systems. Also, NHS facilities require more HPMS data collection.

Despite these current and pending requirements there has been no flight from the NHS. MAG staff contacted a number of state departments of transportation and metropolitan planning organizations and all of them indicate that they have not attempted major removals of NHS facilities and that at this time they are not concerned by the expansion of the NHS.

It should be noted that rules for implementing the current regulations on locally owned facilities for locally funded projects have not been developed and that rule making for asset management and performance management has not been completed. Until implementing rules have been developed the impacts of regulations are highly uncertain.

If member agencies were to remove NHS facilities through functional classification it would not affect the eligibility of roadways to receive federal funding available to MAG as the projects would be reclassified to minor arterial. It would remove National Highway Performance Program funding eligibility for member agency roadways, but this funding source is under the control of the State and is primarily a freeway funding source.

Also, the reclassification would not affect the amount of the federal funding received by the State. Total federal funding allocated to the states has been for a number of years based on contributions to the Highway Account of the Highway Trust Fund and it is not expected to change.

A reclassification of a facility to minor arterial would reduce the importance of the roadway as federal regulations define principal arterial roadways and roadways on the NHS as the most important in the Nation. Should federal revenues become highly constrained and a needs based approach be implemented for federal funding, federal funding for these roadways could be affected.

Mr. Tate then discussed four scenarios for revising the NHS. Two scenarios, Approach Three and Four would remove the NHS designation from all locally owned principal arterial facilities, but are not feasible as the FHWA has indicated that it would not approve them.

Approach One, the first scenario, would make no changes in functional classification or NHS designation and wait upon events to determine if action is needed. It leaves intact a badly defined principal arterial system and ignores regulations currently in place.

Approach Two would use functional classification to remove approximately eighty percent of all locally owned roadway from the NHS. It would leave in place a few high volume corridors to connect freeways and facilities that are part of the NHS.

Ms. Kennedy noted that she had recently returned from a conference in North Carolina and that in that state, most roadways were owned by the State. Perhaps this difference in roadway ownership explains the federal policy.

Mr. Anderson suggested that Approach One was the best at the present time. Mr. Cook concurred with Mr. Anderson. Both noted that to date they had experienced no problems with NHS regulations.

Mr. Tom Deitering indicated that Approach Two is an acceptable option to the FHWA and that it might be difficult to make changes in the future so action is needed. He added that the requirements have not yet been enforced as MAP-21 has been in a transitional period.

Mr. Cook noted that Approach Two looked to be too similar to Approach Four. He suggested that the Committee use the Roads of Regional Significance network as a basis for modifying the NHS.

A general discussion of NHS requirements ensued. Mr. Deitering noted that the quality assurance requirements could prove very difficult for agencies to meet. Ms. Deeb asked if it would affect Mesa. Mr. Deitering indicated that certified accepted agencies would need to meet the quality assurance program requirements when working on NHS facilities.

It was noted by Mr. Patrick Stone that self-certification agreements would need to be reviewed in the future, particularly for actions on NHS facilities. Mr. Deitering noted that design exceptions would need to be approved by FHWA and that this could require a NEPA clearance.

Mr. Cook noted that Approach Two appeared to circumvent regulations.

Mr. Tate indicated that to avoid the appearance, MAG would need to emphasize that the principal arterial system did not meet federal functional classification requirements and that when the principal arterial system was defined in 1994, the application of percentage roadway requirements had resulted in maximizing the principal arterial classification.

It was noted that the Road of Regional Significance (RRS) network had been developed in the early 1990s prior to the functional classification of roadways. This network generally focused on major roadways with spacing of approximately three miles. This system has not been updated in recent years to reflect freeway openings and may be overly large due to concerns about geographical equity.

A general discussion ensued in which concern about future federal funding and possible refocusing of federal funding on the NHS occurred. In passing it was noted that most principal arterial roadways are owned by state departments of transportation and that only five states - Arizona, Michigan, New York, Texas and California - had a large number of principal arterial facilities owned by local agencies.

Mr. Cook moved that MAG staff develop an Approach 2A based on the MAG and CAAG RRS networks and an Approach 2B that adjusts Approach 2A to account for freeway and other development since the RRS networks were developed. Mr. Anderson seconded the motion. The motion was approved.

8. Member Agency announcements

The MAG closeout was briefly discussed and projects that were to receive additional funding were announced.

9. Requests for future agenda items

Ms. Deeb requested that once revisions to the NHS had been finalized that ADOT present to the Committee on how it would address locally funded projects on the NHS.

Adjournment

The meeting adjourned at 2:37 pm

April 2, 2014

TO: Members of the Streets Committee

FROM: John Bullen, Transportation Planner II

SUBJECT: ARTERIAL LIFE CYCLE PROGRAM (ALCP) PROJECT CHANGES TECHNICAL REVIEW

The Arterial Life Cycle Program (ALCP) is the financial management tool for the arterial street component of the Regional Transportation Plan (RTP). Management of the program is guided by the ALCP Policies and Procedures, which were approved by the MAG Regional Council on December 9, 2009. The Policies and Procedures require Lead Agencies to present proposed substitute projects or changes in project scope to MAG Street Committee for a technical review and recommendation for approval. Pending the Street Committee approval, proposed changes will be incorporated into the draft ALCP and presented through the MAG Committee Process for a final approval.

#### BACKGROUND

The RTP identifies that ALCP capacity and intersection improvements may include:

- (1) Widening of existing arterial streets (some of these projects will focus on intersection improvements);
- (2) Extensive upgrading of facilities;
- (3) Constructing new facilities on new alignments; and/or,
- (4) Improving individual intersections.

Per the ALCP Policies and Procedures, updates to the Arterial Life Cycle Program or projects (scope, schedule, and budget) are required to go through the MAG Committee process, which typically involves the Transportation Review Committee, Management Committee, Transportation Policy Committee and Regional Council. Section 220 of the ALCP Policies requires the technical recommendation of the Street Committee on proposed substitute projects or project scope changes for ALCP Projects.

#### TECHNICAL REVIEW PROCESS

Before a project change may be included in the Draft ALCP, the Lead Agency is required to present the proposed changes to the Street Committee for a technical review. A project change summary sheet for each proposed change is required and has been attached for review. The project change form summarizes current and planned facility features, ALCP project budgets, and project cost estimates. In addition, the form requires Lead Agencies to address:

- (1) the reason for and feasibility of the requested change;
- (2) how the change would improve safety/mobility and reduce congestion; and,
- (3) the benefit to the MAG Region.

ALCP project change requests may not include project segments completed prior to the inclusion of the project in an ALCP approved by the MAG Regional Council. Presentations to the Street Committee will explain:

- (1) Why the original project was deemed not feasible,
- (2) How the change would relieve congestion and improve mobility, and
- (3) The new/revised project cost estimate.

Excerpts from the ALCP Policies and Procedures are attached for review. Project change forms and related materials will be provided at the meeting. For further information or questions, please contact me at [jbullen@azmag.gov](mailto:jbullen@azmag.gov) or at (602) 254-6300.

## ARTERIAL LIFE CYCLE PROGRAM POLICIES AND PROCEDURES EXCERPTS

The Arterial Life Cycle Program (ALCP) Policies and Procedures approved by the MAG Regional Council on December 9, 2009 require Lead Agencies to present proposed substitute projects or changes in project scope to MAG Street Committee for a technical review and recommendation before the request will be presented through the MAG Committee Process for approval. Key excerpts from the Policies regarding the program, proposed substitute projects, and changes in project scope are provided below. The complete version of the ALCP Policies and Procedures may be downloaded from the MAG website at:

<http://www.azmag.gov/Projects/Project.asp?CMSID2=1065&MID=Transportation>.

### SECTION 100: PROGRAM OBJECTIVES

A. The ALCP has five key objectives:

1. Effective and Efficient Implementation of the RTP: Facilitate the effective and efficient implementation of the arterial component of the RTP. In support of this objective, the Program should:
  - a. Ensure Projects are implemented in a manner consistent with the RTP, including any updates or amendments;
  - b. Include the means to track Project implementation against requirements established in the RTP and the ALCP; and,
  - c. Be administratively simple.
2. Fiscal Integrity: Ensure the fiscal integrity of the regionally funded arterial component of the RTP. In support of this objective, the Program should:
  - a. Establish comprehensive financial and reporting requirements for each Project; and
  - b. Coordinate with the RTP and the other modal programs on key financial, accounting and reporting policies, procedures and practices.
3. Accountability: Provide the means to track and ensure effective and efficient Project implementation. In support of this objective, the Program should:
  - a. Employ comprehensive Project Agreements, or other legal instruments, that detail agency roles and responsibilities in the implementation of specific Projects; and
  - b. Provide the means within each Project Agreement, Project Overview and Project Reimbursement Request to track Project implementation, performance and successful completion of individual Projects and the Program.
4. Transparency: Provide members of the public, elected officials, stakeholders, participating agencies and others with ready access to information on the Program and on each Project. In support of this objective, the Program should:
  - a. Include substantial public and stakeholder consultation as part of the implementation process for each Project; and
  - b. Require that material changes to Projects in the Program be subject to public and stakeholder consultation through the MAG Committee Process as well as any other consultation processes, including within the community or communities affected, as specified in the associated Project Agreements.
5. Compliance: Comply with all applicable federal, state and local requirements in the implementation of Projects.

B. Consistency with the RTP generally means that an ALCP Project meets Project the eligibility requirements specified in Section 300, the Project regional reimbursement is fiscally constrained, and the reimbursement is in the original RTP phase.

- C. The Program must be flexible and allow adjustments as needed in support of meeting the key objectives.

**SECTION 200: PROGRAMMING THE ALCP**

- A. The RTP establishes regional funding limits, reimbursement phases, as well as general scopes and priorities for all ALCP Projects.
- C. Programming of Projects funded by the ALCP must be consistent with the ALCP Program and the ALCP Policies and Procedures. The Maricopa Association of Governments (MAG) is the agency designated by law to implement the Arterial Life Cycle Program ensuring the estimated cost of the program improvements does not exceed the total amount of available revenues.
  - 1. Initially, Projects will be programmed based on the regional funding specified in the RTP plus local match contributions, as well as scopes and termini as described in the RTP.
    - a. In order to support the development of Project Agreements that include a scope and schedule for each Project, programming of each ALCP Project shall include a separate scoping or design phase that precedes right-of-way acquisition and construction, unless otherwise agreed to by MAG. Environmental clearances may be funded as part of the scoping or design phase.

**SECTION 210: UPDATING ALCP PROJECTS IN THE ALCP**

- A. All ALCP Projects will be updated annually (refer to Section 200C.2).
- B. Any necessary changes to an ALCP Project must be submitted by a written request stating the new updated schedule and budget and any other necessary justifications.
  - 1. Requests will be approved through the MAG Committee Process by the approval of the ALCP.
  - 2. Update forms will be provided by MAG.

**SECTION 220: TYPES OF ALCP PROJECT UPDATES**

- E. If an original ALCP Project is deemed not feasible, a substitute Project may be proposed for substitution in the same jurisdiction as the original Project.
  - 1. The Lead Agency may propose a substitute Project that would use the regional funds allocated to the original Project. The substitute Project shall relieve congestion and improve mobility in the same general area addressed by the original Project, if possible.
  - 2. Substitute projects may not be completed prior to inclusion in the Arterial Life Cycle Program.
  - 3. The Lead Agency must submit a written request to MAG. The written request must include:
    - a. Justification, such as a feasibility study, level of service justification, or other documents explaining why the Project is deemed not feasible, and the description of steps to overcome any issues related to deleting the original Project from the ALCP and RTP.
    - b. How the proposed project would relieve congestion and improve mobility;
    - c. The proposed substitute project budget and schedule; and,
    - d. MAG Staff will work with jurisdictions on a case-by-case basis to ensure proper justification.
- F. An original ALCP Project can change its original Project scope due to environmental issues, public concerns, costs and other factors.
  - 1. The Lead Agency must submit a written request to MAG. The written request must include justification, such as a feasibility study, level of service justification, revised budget and/or other documents explaining why the change to the original Project is required, and the description of steps to overcome any issues related to changing the original scope of the ALCP Project.
    - a. MAG Staff will work with jurisdictions on a case-by-case basis to ensure proper justification.
  - 2. The scope change should relieve congestion and improvement mobility in the same area addressed by the original planned Project, if possible.

3. Project scope changes may not include completed portions of a project or project segment, which are not included in an Arterial Life Cycle Program approved through the MAG Committee process.
- G. All requests to change original ALCP project scope or a substitute a project in the ALCP must meet all requirements established in Sections 200, Section 210, and Section 220.
1. Before being approved through the standard MAG Committee Process, the requests will be presented by an employee of the Lead Agency to the MAG Street Committee for a technical review and recommendation. The presentation will address:
    - a. The reason(s) the original project was deemed not feasible;
    - b. Explain how the change the original ALCP project scope or substitute project would relieve congestion and improve mobility;
    - c. The new/revised project cost estimate; and,
    - d. And other information as requested by the MAG Street Committee.
  2. After the Streets Committee technical review and recommendation on the proposed changes, the project(s) will be approved through the MAG Committee Process.
  3. Requests to change original ALCP project scope or substitute a project must be made by the deadline established in the ALCP Schedule published annually in the MAG Transportation Programming Guidebook.
  4. Reimbursements for substitute projects will:
    - a. Be programmed in the same fiscal year(s) as the original project
    - b. Be programmed with the same funding amount and type as the original project.

**SECTION 320: PROJECT ELIGIBILITY**

- A. To be funded or constructed under the ALCP Program, Projects must:
1. Have a scope, budget (including amounts of regional funding and local match contributions) and a schedule consistent with the Project as included in the RTP, ALCP, and as appropriate, the TIP. In addition, Projects must be consistent with federal requirements, where applicable.
  2. Be considered new in keeping with voter expectations, and as such:
    - a. Cannot include costs for any pre-existing, programmed or planned element or improvement that is not part of the specific improvement Project described or included in the RTP as of November 25, 2003 or later.
    - b. Cannot have started design, acquired right-of-way or started construction before the date specified in Section 340 or the date of the Project addition to the RTP.
- B. Facilities eligible for improvements under the ALCP include:
1. Major arterials as defined in Appendix A. Major arterials include:
    - a. Roadway facilities on the regional arterial or mile arterial grid system;
    - b. Roadway facilities that connect freeways, highways or other controlled access facilities; and,
    - c. Other key arterial corridors.
  2. Intersections of eligible major arterials.
- C. All Projects must be designed to the standards agreed to by the designated local jurisdictions and the Lead Agency established in the Project Agreement.
1. The agreed standards, which may be higher than the standards used in the local jurisdiction(s), must be specified or referenced in the Project Agreement.
  2. Standards for multi-jurisdictional Projects should be consistent to the extent feasible.

- D. Reimbursable items for regionally funded Projects are limited to:
1. Design, right-of-way and construction, as required in ARS: 28-6304(C)(5) and ARS: 28-6305(A). Design Concept Reports, planning studies and related studies, such as environmental and other studies, are also eligible.
  2. Capacity Improvement Projects.
  3. Safety Improvement Projects.
  4. Projects or components directly related to capacity and safety improvements, including:
    - a. Intelligent Transportation Systems (ITS);
    - b. Signals;
    - c. Lighting;
    - d. Transit stops and pullouts, as well as queue jumper lanes, for example, for bus rapid transit;
    - e. Bicycle/pedestrian facilities integral to the roadway, including wide sidewalks separated from curbs;
    - f. Utility relocations, including under grounding of utility lines where required for safety or other reasons relating to function, and not purely for aesthetic reasons, and not otherwise considered an enhancement;
    - g. Drainage improvements for the Project (with limitations), such as retention basins required for the Project that would not normally be handled through County or other drainage funds, within reasonable limits (and generally not exceeding typical practice for the local jurisdiction);
    - h. Landscaped medians, shoulders, and other improvements within reasonable limits (and generally not exceeding typical practice for the local jurisdiction);
    - i. Reconstruction Projects, as identified in or supported by the RTP and as specified in Project Agreements, for eligible Project elements;
    - j. Access management;
    - k. Rubberized asphalt and concrete paving;
    - l. Staff time directly attributable to Project; and,
    - m. Noise, privacy and screen wall, and other buffers, if found to be necessary to meet applicable local, state or federal standards.
- E. Notwithstanding findings or recommendations from the Design Concept Report or a similar study, Projects, Project components or other costs that are not reimbursable from the ALCP include:
1. Enhancement Projects or enhancement components of Projects.
  2. Right-of-way not used by the ALCP Project, with potential exceptions on a case-by-case basis for land that is identified by the Lead Agency and/or the local jurisdiction or jurisdictions as not marketable for sale.
  3. Any Project or Project element that exceeds the reasonable limits or typical practice for the local jurisdiction in which the Project or Projects are located.
  4. Administrative overhead costs by the Lead Agency and other agency(ies)/jurisdiction(s) listed in the Project Agreement that are not attributed to the Project.
  5. Other expenses, such as bad debts and lump-sum incentives, as determined by MAG.
  6. Expenditures that occur after a project or project segment is completed. This includes salaries, applied overhead, record keeping and facility maintenance.

- 7. Salaries and other administrative expenditures pertaining to the completion of ALCP Project Requirements.
- F. The use of federal funds or other funding sources may involve further restrictions on the use of funds or eligible matching contributions.
- K. The MAG Committee Process has the final determination on the eligibility of any Project or Project component for reimbursement from the ALCP Program.

**APPENDIX A. GLOSSARY AND ACRONYMS**

Major Arterial                    “an interconnected thoroughfare whose primary function is to link areas in the region and to distribute traffic to and from controlled access highways, generally of region wide significance and of varying capacity depending on the travel demand for the specific direction and adjacent land uses.” (ARS 28-6304(c)(5))