MEETING MINUTES
MARICOPA ASSOCIATION OF GOVERNMENTS
TRANSIT COMMITTEE

December 9, 2010
Maricopa Association of Governments Office
302 North First Avenue, Suite 200, Saguaro Room
Phoenix, Arizona

MEMBERS ATTENDING

Phoenix: Debbie Cotton, Chair
*ADOT: Mike Normand
Avondale: Kristen Sexton for Rogene Hill
#Buckeye: Andrea Marquez
Chandler: Dan Cook for RJ Zeder
*El Mirage: Pat Dennis
Gilbert: Ken Maruyama for Tami Ryall
Glendale: Cathy Colbath
#Goodyear: Christine McMurdy for Cato Esquivel
Maricopa County: Mitch Wagner
Mesa: Mike James
*Paradise Valley: William Mead
Peoria: Maher Hazine
*Queen Creek: Wendy Kaserman
Scottsdale: Madeline Clemann for Theresa Huish
Surprise: Michael Celaya
Tempe: Robert Yabes for Jyme Sue McLaren
*Tolleson: Chris Hagen
Valley Metro Rail: Wulf Grote
Regional Public Transportation Authority: Carol Ketcherside

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

OTHERS PRESENT

Kevin Wallace, MAG
Marc Pearsall, MAG
Alice Chen, MAG
Jorge Luna, MAG
Eileen Yazzie, MAG
Jenna Goad, Glendale
Tom Remes, Phoenix
Jorie Bresnahan, Phoenix
Dave Moody, Peoria
Greg Jordan, Tempe
Bob Antila, Valley Metro-RPTA
Stuart Boggs, Valley Metro-RPTA
Jim Schumann, The CK Group

.

1. Call to Order

The meeting was called to order at 1:33p.m. by Chair Debbie Cotton. Chair Cotton welcomed everyone in attendance and announced that a quorum was present. She noted that two members were participating via teleconference, Andrea Marquez and Christine McMurdy. Chair Cotton asked if there were any public comment cards, and there being none, proceeded to the next item on the agenda.

2. Approval of Draft December 9, 2010 Minutes

Chair Cotton asked if there were any comments or corrections to the Draft December 9, 2010 meeting minutes. Hearing no comments or corrections to the meeting minutes, Chair Cotton called for a motion to approve both draft meeting minutes. Mr. Robert Yabes moved to approve the motion. Ms. Cathy Colbath seconded, and the motion passed unanimously.

3. Call to the Audience

Chair Cotton stated that she had not received any request to speak cards from the audience and moved onto the next item on the agenda.

4. Transit Program Manager's Report

Mr. Kevin Wallace from MAG stated that there were a few items from the Transit Program Manager's Report this month.

Mr. Wallace reported that the October sales tax revenues for Proposition 400 were up by three percent, the first positive change and increase in over 38 months. He also noted that at the previous night's Regional Council meeting, the Tempe Streetcar Project was approved and will now be amended and included in the Regional Transit Plan.

Mr. Wallace also briefed the committee on the new MAG Sustainable Transportation and Land Use Integration Study and that the consultant Arup received a Notice to Proceed on November 1, 2010. He noted that due to the in depth analysis of transportation and land use issues in the Region, the next few months would be spent collecting data for the study. The first stakeholders meeting would most likely be held in the February 2011 time-frame, with stakeholder designee request letters being sent to each cities' City Manager in the coming weeks. He added that the Transit Committee would also receive regular updates on the status of the project.

Mr. Wallace referred members to copies of the new 2011 Transit Committee meeting schedule. The time and location of the 2011 meetings had changed. The meetings would still be held on the second Thursday of each month, but now at 10:00 a.m. in the Cholla Room. Chair Cotton thanked Mr. Wallace for his report and asked if there were any further questions or comments. Hearing no further comments, Chair Cotton proceeded to the next item on the agenda.

5. 5307 Urbanized Area Formula Funds Distribution Scenarios for Preventive Maintenance

Chair Cotton introduced Jorge Luna of MAG to brief the committee on the 5307 Urbanized Area Formula Funds Distribution Scenarios for Preventive Maintenance.

Mr. Luna presented an update on 5307 Urbanized Area Formula Funds distribution methodology for Preventive Maintenance(PM). He noted that originally there was a July 28, 2010 Regional Council request to address the distribution of 5307 funds for preventive maintenance (PM) no later than December 2010. He added that the distribution methodology had been in place since 2002 with funding amounts adjusted annually by 2%. He further noted that since 2002, bus revenue miles had increased, the region had changed dramatically, new operators had arrived in the region and operators were now reporting directly to the National Transit Database (NTD).

Mr. Luna reported that on October 14, 2010, the Transit Committee was presented with three different distribution methodologies for preventive maintenance (PM) for 5307 funds. On November 9, 2010 the Transit Committee was presented with five distribution methodologies for an allocation of preventive maintenance (PM) 5307 funds of $11.7 million. He added that the committee decided to split the money out between FY2011 and FY2012 and that at the November meeting, the committee requested that the transit operators meet to review and discuss the methodologies. The operators met on November 17, 2010 and again December 1, 2010 and returned to the Committee with additional recommendations and scenarios.

Mr. Luna noted that the operators did meet in November and December and returned to the Committee with a recommendation that only FY2011 preventative maintenance funds be addressed. He explained that the amount to be distributed was $12.4 million, with $6.5 million distributed as identified in FY2011 TIP, and another additional $5.8 million allocated based on modes, operating expenses, bus and rail, with bus distributed to the operators on revenue miles. Further explanation continued. He explained that the item was on the agenda for information, discussion, and possible action.

Chair Cotton thanked Mr. Luna for his presentation and asked if there were any further questions or comments.

Mr. Robert Yabes inquired if there would be any action taken today on FY2012-2015 TIP. Mr. Luna replied that it was up to the Committee to decide whether to take any action on 2012-2015. Mr. Wallace added that at the last Informal Transit Operators Working Group meeting, the recommendation for the Transit Committee was to address 2011 which was time sensitive, but that there would be additional time to make decisions for funding beyond 2011. Mr. Wallace also thanked the transit operators who worked diligently over the past few months to help prepare the recommendations for the 2011 scenario.

Ms. Madeline Clemann stated that the City of Scottsdale supports the efforts and recommendations of the Informal Transit Operators Working Group. She also requested that in the future years, the formula considers maximizing the benefit back in terms of 5307 funds for the region. Chair Cotton added that it was a topic that could also be discussed at the Informal Transit Operators Working Group.

Chair Cotton asked if there were any further questions or comments. Hearing none, Chair Cotton then asked if there was a motion for the agenda item. Mr. Robert Yabes moved to approve the motion a follows: A motion to approve the recommended two-tiered distribution of FY 2011 5307 federal funds for Preventative Maintenance (PM) and direct the Transit Operator's Working Group to evaluate alternatives and recommend a transparent, data-driven, and regionally equitable method for allocating FY 2012-2015 5307 federal funds for PM funds by March 2011. Ms. Madeline Clemann seconded, and Chair Cotton asked for comments.

Mr. Luna asked for clarification and suggested that modifying the TIP accordingly also be added to the motion. Chair Cotton further asked for clarification if the motion was non-precedent setting. Mr. Yabes answered in the affirmative in accordance with the motion.

Chair Cotton noted that the pending motion with a second was as follows: A motion to approve the recommended two-tiered distribution of FY 2011 5307 federal funds for Preventative Maintenance (PM) and direct the Transit Operator's Working Group to evaluate alternatives and recommend a transparent, data-driven, and regionally equitable method for allocating FY 2012-2015 5307 federal funds for PM by March 2011, to amend the MAG TIP accordingly, and is non-precedent setting. The motion passed unanimously.

Chair Cotton thanked Mr. Luna for his presentation and asked if there were any further questions or comments. Hearing no further comments, Chair Cotton proceeded to the next item on the agenda.

6. Scottsdale/Rural Road Alternatives Analysis Update

Chair Cotton introduced Mr. Stuart Boggs of RPTA to brief the committee on the Scottsdale/Rural Road Alternatives Analysis project. Mr. Boggs provided an overview of the Scottsdale/Rural Road Alternatives Analysis (AA) and noted that it was one of the five arterial street based Bus Rapid Transit (BRT) routes identified in the Regional Transportation Plan and funded under Proposition 400. He explained that the Scottsdale/Rural BRT would connect with the initial operating segment of the METRO light rail system in downtown Tempe and noted that the study evaluated higher capacity transit alternatives within the Scottsdale/Rural Road corridor. He said the study would recommend a Locally Preferred Alternative (LPA) BRT option that will provide service between the planned Thunderbird Park & Ride lot in Scottsdale and the Metro Rail light rail transit line in Tempe and that it will be the third arterial BRT route implemented by the RPTA.

He further explained the purpose and need for the project: to address current and forecast travel demand in the Scottsdale Rd/Rural Rd Study Corridor, to improve and expand mobility options for north-south travel, connect large and diverse activity centers, promote planned urban growth and development patterns, lay the foundation and build demand for future high-capacity transit, address the strong north-south travel demand has been demonstrated in this corridor, and the socioeconomic conditions and travel markets in the corridor. Mr. Boggs noted that recent plans and studies have identified a need for this type of service, specifically the MAG Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) and the MAG Regional Transit Framework Study.

Mr. Boggs explained that the objective of the study was to define the operational characteristics and associated capital requirements for the Scottsdale/Rural Road Bus Rapid Transit line that would operate in the cities of Scottsdale and Tempe. He explained that the study location and duration of the Primary Study Corridor, was Rural Road and Scottsdale Road from the light rail starter line to Shea Boulevard, slightly over 11 miles, and included Goldwater Boulevard/Drinkwater Boulevard couplet through downtown Scottsdale, with a secondary study corridor, Scottsdale Road from Shea Boulevard to Frank Lloyd Wright Boulevard (an additional 4 miles). He added that the study began in February 2010 and concluded in December 2010.

Mr. Boggs mentioned that upon acceptance of the LPA by the Cities of Scottsdale and Tempe, RPTA would undertake a Design Concept Report (DCR) that would include preliminary design of the capital improvements that will support the implementation of BRT service in the project corridor. He noted that the funding for the service would be provided by the half-cent county wide sales tax approved by county voters in Proposition 400. Funding for bus purchases would come from FTA 5309 funds identified in the Transportation Improvement Program (TIP). Mr. Boggs added that funding for right-of-way and BRT station construction would come from FTA 5307 funds identified in the TIP.

Mr. Boggs explained that a BRT system provided shorter travel times than fixed route buses using one or more of the features such as traffic signal priority, intersection improvements including queue jumpers, limited stop service, exclusive bus lanes and off vehicle fare collection. He noted that the study showed that the travel time savings and the frequency of service will encourage more transit usage which will alternatively reduce traffic congestion, lessen the demand for parking and also contribute to clean air. He also gave a brief overview of the alternative options evaluated for the downtown Scottsdale alignments: limited stop bus - no bus priority or special amenities, BRT sharing general traffic lanes throughout the corridor, BRT sharing restricted "BAT(Business Access and Transit)/HOV" lanes with right turning vehicles and HOVs where appropriate, and lastly median transit lanes, where feasible.

Mr. Boggs gave an overview of the next steps for the project. He explained that the project expected to submit a final report in mid-December along with a draft executive summary. The project was also expected to complete a formal review and approval process for an AA with the Scottsdale Transportation Commission and City Council in December as well. The project would present to the Tempe Transportation Commission/City Council in spring 2011, followed by the MAG Transit Committee and MAG Regional Council. He noted that the RPTA hoped to initiate the DCR and Very Small Starts (VSS) Grant Application in spring 2011, followed by final design, construction, and operation of service (planned for FY 2015).

Mr. Boggs clarified that the study may have to defer the initiation of the DCR phase and that alternative options would be discussed at the next project Technical Advisory Committee meeting. He added that one possible alternative to the recommendation would be adding an interim Skip-Stop Service to Scottsdale-Rural Road.

Chair Cotton thanked Mr. Boggs for his presentation and asked if there were any further questions or comments. Hearing no further comments, Chair Cotton proceeded to the next item on the agenda.

7. Phoenix West Alternatives Analysis Update and Operating Plan

Chair Cotton introduced Mr. Tom Callow of Valley Metro Rail to brief the committee on the Phoenix West Alternatives Analysis. Mr. Callow presented an update on the Phoenix West Extension Study Area and the preliminary staff recommendations for the Phoenix West Alternatives Analysis study. He also discussed options on how the project could operate with the existing and proposed bus system enhancements.

Mr. Callow explained that the two technologies considered for the service were light rail and bus rapid transit. The Median I-10 Option was one of the alignment options considered, as it minimized utility and property impacts and the existing I-10 freeway median dimensions accommodated trackway and stations. He noted however that it also presented difficult access to stations in an undesirable station environment, with noise, heat and pollution.

He explained that the North Side of I-10 Freeway Option was the other alignment option and that it was deemed optimal for a variety of rationale. It featured better access to stations, better interface with buses on arterials and frontage roads, opportunities for Transit Oriented Development (TOD), and room for freeway improvements in the unused median. He added that while cost may be an issue due to the embankment and canal issues, the overall cost-benefit would most likely deem it a better investment in the long run in contrast to the median running option.

Mr. Callow then discussed an early action bus option that would establish a permanent I-10 transit presence by allowing interim bus rapid transit service to use the future LRT trackway and ramps with a connection from the capitol area to the median of I-10, while the actual trackway is constructed in the succeeding years. The enhanced connectivity would provide six to eight minute bus travel time savings to the state capital and downtown Phoenix, and the $175k to $250k annual reduced operating cost would be a benefit, while later conversion to LRT with minimal cost/impact would reduce the cost of a future LRT investment. Mr. Callow noted that the next steps for the LPA adoption schedule included additional neighborhood meetings and public meetings in late 2010, with City Council, Regional Council and LPA adoption expected in spring 2011.

Chair Cotton thanked Mr. Callow for his presentations and asked if there were any further questions or comments.

Mr. David Moody inquired about the recent newspaper article on the St. Matthews neighborhood west of the State Capitol and how METRO was working with them on their concerns. Mr. Albert Santana of the City of Phoenix noted that METRO and Phoenix had vast public outreach to the community and that support was overwhelming for the alignment and light rail service, especially among those who lived along the alignment as well as adjacent property and business owners. He added that much of the vocal and petition opposition was actually coming from residents and business owners who lived not on the alignment, but over a mile away in other parallel neighborhoods.

Mr. Abi Dayal of METRO light rail then gave a brief summary of the technical analysis for bus and rail interface within the corridor, with an emphasis on new bus neighborhood circulators and connections to the light rail stations. He also gave an overview of Phoenix west travel

markets and how the 2030 AM peak travel pattern estimates benefitted both light rail and the underlying bus network. Mr. Wulf Grote of METRO added that the underlying bus network was the backbone of the transit system and that a neighborhood feeder system would bolster the light rail extension.

Chair Cotton added that one detail that the regional transit providers need to stay aware of in regards to the underlying bus network was the issue of transfers, and more specifically 'one and two-seat rides'. She noted that many transit users in the Valley had become accustomed to 'one-seat rides' in their daily travels and that with the new fiscal reality, in the future many of the traditional lines that featured this service may no longer offer one seat rides as routes are adjusted. She added that an strong bus feeder system may help bridge some of these issues.

Ms. Carol Ketcherside inquired with Mr. Dayal on the time savings/travel distance between both bus rapid transit and light rail within the I-10 corridor. She asked if the existing RAPID express service in the I-10 median would still offer quicker service to patrons than light rail within the corridor. Specifically, she asked about the time penalty that light rail would have due to its frequent station stops versus the limited and direct service that the BRT offers. Mr. Dayal responded that while METRO had an overall lower average speed than the BRT service, due to its dedicated trackway it was not prone to the HOV lane delays that may sometimes ensnare rapid service. Additionally, he noted that the METRO's ability to transport passengers en-route to multiple stations translated into a larger carrying capacity and transit interface than the parallel BRT service, which could only pick up and deposit passengers at the initial and end stations. He noted that these overall savings and efficiencies translated into increased service frequency in the rail corridor.

Chair Cotton asked if there were any further questions or comments. Hearing no further comments, Chair Cotton proceeded to the next item on the agenda.

8. Glendale Phase I Alternatives Analysis Update

Chair Cotton introduced Mr. Ben Limmer of METRO light rail to brief the committee on the Glendale Phase I Alternatives Analysis Update.

Mr. Limmer presented an update on the Glendale Phase I Alternatives Analysis. In the presentation he explained that the Glendale High Capacity Transit (HCT) extension was included in the original RTP, and was approved for funding by Maricopa County voters within Proposition 400 in 2004. He noted that the corridor extended from the Northwest Extension at 19th and Glendale Avenues in Phoenix to downtown Glendale. He also explained that Glendale and Phoenix had engaged with MAG and METRO to discuss alternatives to the Glendale extension currently shown in the RTP, due to changing demographics and activity centers since 2004, and to ensure service to those prominent activity centers and additional anticipated growth areas along the Loop 101. He added that as an initial step, METRO was conducting an 18 month study to evaluate corridor options and their performance.

Mr. Limmer further explained that within the 18 month study evaluation, the existing MAG RTP 5-mile corridor from 19thAve in Phoenix to downtown Glendale would be reviewed. He

noted that the study recommendations were fiscally constrained as additional funds would be needed for anything beyond what was allocated in the RTP. He added that Glendale Corridor changes that had transpired since 2002, namely the new Westgate City Center, and the expansion of development along the Loop 101 Corridor had created significant development opportunities near the freeway. These and other land use changes in the corridor created a need to reevaluate the RTP designated Glendale corridor beyond downtown Glendale.

Mr. Limmer added that in the study further consideration would be given to Glendale corridor, the I-10/Loop 101 option and the Glendale corridor to evaluate strengths and weaknesses. Each corridor's proximity to transit dependent populations, economic redevelopment opportunities, commuter markets, high special event ridership, best opportunities for LRT speed and capacity, enhanced mobility improvements and cost effectiveness, community and environmental impacts, would be measured. He explained that ridership forecasting and cost model runs done with coordination with MAG would include an analysis based on MAG 2031 data as well as an analysis fn the Westgate Center area. The usual components of ridership, cost effectiveness, capital cost estimates, O&M (Operation and maintenance) estimates, with a simplified version of FTA assessment featuring effectiveness quantified through model/ridership results would be applied. Mr. Limmer also mentioned that transit-supportive land use and economic development options would be reviewed.

Mr. Limmer explained that there were two tiers of analysis. Tier I featured corridor compatibility, general land use assessment of corridor areas, and baseline data collection and analysis. Tier 2 included corridor economic analysis, station-area level TOD analysis, half-mile analysis, primary impact areas, summation of stations for corridors, an East/West vs. North/South summary, and community & environmental impacts. Other evaluation criteria in the review included construct-ability challenges, utility constraints, right-of-way impacts, and environmentally sensitive land use impacts on residential, businesses, historic structures, schools, and churches.

Chair Cotton thanked Mr. Limmer for his presentation and asked if there were any further questions or comments. Hearing no further comments, Chair Cotton proceeded to the next item on the agenda.

9. Request for Future Agenda Items

Chair Cotton asked the members of the Committee if there were any issues that they would like added as future agenda items. Hearing no further comments, Chair Cotton proceeded to the next item on the agenda.

10. Next Meeting Date

Chair Cotton thanked those present for attending the MAG Transit Committee meeting. She announced that the next meeting of the MAG Transit Committee would be held on Thursday January 13, 2011 at 10:00 a.m. in the MAG Cholla room. There being no further business, Chair Cotton adjourned the meeting at 2:30 p.m.