MINUTES OF THE
MARICOPA ASSOCIATION OF GOVERNMENTS
INTELLIGENT TRANSPORTATION SYSTEMS COMMITTEE

February 19, 1999
MAG Office Building, Saguaro Room
302 North First Avenue
Phoenix, Arizona

MEMBERS ATTENDING

Steve Hogan, Scottsdale, Chairman
Jim Book, Glendale
Brian Latte, Chandler
Gary Thomas, Gilbert
Pierre Pretorius, Maricopa County
Alan Sanderson, Mesa
Mike Frisbie, Phoenix
Scott Miller, RPTA
* Ellis Perl, Surprise
Ed VanDerGinst, Tempe
* Tim Wolfe, ADOT
Alan Hansen, FHWA
* David Cowley, AAA Arizona
* Richard Traill, Phoenix Aviation

* Not present or represented by proxy

OTHERS PRESENT

Jessie Yung, FHWA
Paul Ward, MAG
Sarath Joshua, MAG

1. Call to Order

The meeting was called to order at 10:10 a.m. by Chairman Steve Hogan.

2. Approval of the January 20, 1999 & February 2, 1999 Meeting Minutes

The minutes of the January 20, 1999 meeting were unanimously approved. The minutes of February 2, 1999 minutes were modified to reflect that the motion to combine the two Tempe Parking System projects was made by Pierre Pretorius and seconded by Alan Sanderson. The minutes of February 2, 1999, meeting as modified were unanimously approved.

3. Call to Audience

Chairman Hogan made a call to the audience providing an opportunity to members of the public to address the ITS Committee. None in the audience spoke.

4. New ITS Projects

Chairman Hogan pointed out that the purpose of the emergency meeting was to discuss three topics regarding the selection of projects for the TIP.

A. Acceleration of Projects to FY 2000

Under the 3-year program for the TIP developed by MAG staff, all existing ITS projects have been accelerated to FY 2000. Members representing the respective jurisdictions were asked if they had concerns on this acceleration. MAG staff states that the jurisdictions affected were Mesa, Gilbert, Glendale, Peoria and Chandler. Sarath Joshua indicated that Mesa and Peoria had already informed him that they had no objections to accelerating their projects. Gary Thomas stated that Gilbert would has no concerns about accelerating their project. Jim Book stated that Glendale he had has no concerns on the two Glendale projects. Brian Latte commenting on the two Chandler projects listed for FY 2000 indicated that he had no concerns about accelerating Project No. CHN99-601R to FY 2000. He stated that he had a concern about Project No.CHN03-903 as it was tied to other activities. He requested that it be accelerated to FY2001 instead.

During this discussion a questions were raised regarding what needs to be accomplished on the project by when of the listed project year. Paul Ward responded it was sufficient if the project is ready to go to bid by September 30th of the program year. That means the project must have gone through the three processes for clearances, plans approved through the ADOT process and have the PS&E package completed by end of fiscal year.

B. New Projects in TIP

Mr. Paul ward explained the process followed by MAG in arriving at the 3-year program. He indicated that next year's TIP would include programming projects for FY 2003, FY 2004 and FY 2005. Mr. Ward indicated that higher amounts of CMAQ funds are likely to be available next year. Members discussed the need to consider projects ranked high in the current prioritized list of ITS projects but did not get programmed in the FY 2000-2002 TIP. There was general agreement that if additional funds became available this year from redistributed obligation authority, then ITS projects should be programmed based on their final ranking. Jim Book moved that the ITS committee recommend the prioritized list of ITS projects beyond the 3-year program for any additional funding that may become available in the future. The motion was seconded by Ed VanderGinst and was passed unanimously.

C. ITS Rating System

Sarath Joshua briefly described what the system consists of and what it was intended to carry out. He emphasized that the Rating System that was developed by the subcommittee was not expected to generate a combined ranking of all ITS projects. Much of the data required for the rating system were not available during the TIP project rating/ranking process just completed. As a result default values had to be used for some variables. Although the final project ratings in each category was

a good indicator of the project's relative value, this information was not found to be useful in the process that was followed in generating a combined rank. He went on to state that the Rating System was far from perfect and that a number issues needed to be addressed. Chairman Hogan indicated that better definition of projects are needed with more details about the projects provided when projects are submitted to MAG. Brian Latte suggested that at least one paragraph description of the project be required. Due to the many long term implications of the project rating and ranking process the committee decided to begin reviewing the process in March. Sarath Joshua indicated that the topic will be included as an agenda item for the March meeting.

Ed VanDerGinst asked if transit ITS projects will be ranked against other ITS projects in the future. Steve Hogan indicated that the TRC approach on modal allocations to transit, streets, ITS etc as guidance for TIP programming is likely to ensure that transit ITS projects do not compete for ITS funds. He stated that transit ITS projects must be considered in the ITS project rating system.

5. Next Meeting Date

The next meeting date was confirmed as March 17, 1999.

6. Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned at 11:30 a.m.