

CITIZEN'S TRANSPORTATION OVERSIGHT COMMITTEE

Arizona Department of Transportation

Minutes

November 30, 2010

A Citizen's Transportation Oversight Committee (CTOC) meeting was held at the Arizona Department of Transportation, 206 South 17th Avenue, Phoenix, Arizona 85007 on November 30, 2010, 4:00 p.m., with Chairman Roc Arnett presiding.

Members Present:

F. Roc Arnett, Chairman
Jack Lunsford, Member-at-Large
Kyle Robinson, Maricopa County District 1
Susan Brechbill, Maricopa County District 2
Nelson Ladd, Maricopa County District 3
Larry Woods, Maricopa County District 4
Sharolyn Hohman, Maricopa County District 5

Members Absent:

There were no members absent.

Others Present:

William "Blue" Crowley, Citizen	Dianne Barker, Citizen
Bob Hazlett, MAG	Steve Wilcox, AECOM
Bill Cowdrey, HDR Eng.	Kwi-Sung Kang, ADOT
James LaSalvia, Citizen	Greg Haggerty, Dibble Corp
Bill Jameson, Atty. Gen. Office	Roger Herzog, MAG
Steve Hull, ADOT	Elizabeth Neville, ADOT
Richard Tracy, Citizen	Steve Wilcox, AECOM
Jim Poggemeyer, Sundt Const.	Two ASU students

One additional citizen that did not sign in.

1. Call to Order:

Chairman Roc Arnett called to order the Citizen's Transportation Oversight Committee meeting at 4:00 p.m.

2. Pledge of Allegiance:

The Chair led the CTOC members and the public in the Pledge of Allegiance.

3. Roll Call:

The Chair asked for roll call.

Roll Call was completed by Elizabeth Neville, Board Secretary.

4. Welcome and Opening Remarks:

The Chair welcomed the public, public officials, members of CTOC and staff to the meeting.

5. Call to the Public:

Mr. Blue Crowley, citizen, distributed some Transit book supplements. He stated, I came down here on the 660, transferred at Arrowhead Mall and took four other buses to get here. The supplement has one paragraph on the 660 rather than doing it the actual that it's supposed to.

Recently at MAG they had input on Prop 400 which will be discussed I believe on Item 7 and when I talked to Jason he said \$700 million is what the freeways are going to be cutting back; \$735 million is what transit is going to be cutting back. Freeways get 58% of the funding and transit gets 32% of the funding. When I called RPTA and asked what the reason is for this, they said the freeways are going to be cutting back one thousand two hundred forty-one million. I said why am I getting one from Jason who is taking the minutes and the input and another from RPTA? Then I talked to Roger and his statement was it depends on how you look at it. The freeways are only going to be cutting back \$700 million but with the amount of debt service and bonding, in their opinion, it will be another \$800 million. Well the difference is they are still only cutting back \$700 million that is not 58% of the total.

I have a document that I gave one of the members that is the possible Valley Metro service reductions when they first did that, which were pretty draconian and mostly on the west side. What they also did was change the times and this is another one of the MAG documents I can show you after the meeting, the different routes and when they were going to be implemented. What they did is move some of the routes past 2025. The tax runs out in 2025 so how are you going to implement something when there is no money for it? How do you look at it when Roger is going to come up here and say we're going to be cutting \$1.2 billion when all they are doing is cutting back \$700 million? It needs to equate to the percentage of funding. If freeways are getting 58%, which they are, we need to cut back 58% and not say it's because we didn't pay for it in bonds. And of the transit, how much of the transit if going to be taken out of the rail? I don't see any of that being done.

I would also like to point out from Saturday, January 20, 2007, where it said, extend the rail, it was a Napolitano thing, and it had it going all the way to Wickenburg. Right now the rail part of MAG is saying they are going to be stopping in Wittmann. Part of the reason for that myopic thought is this is their Hassayampa Study, it stopped below Wickenburg. They've now done another Hassayampa Study to include Wickenburg where they are stating there will be 300,000 people. If we are going to have 300,000 people, why can't we get the train to come all the way too? We need to have better numbers and it's not the way you look at it, it's the way it is and we need more cuts for the freeway and less cuts for transit. Like I said on this supplement, if you look on the first page, it has rural route and it has one paragraph, they changed all the time points. Why isn't that in the book?

Mr. Richard Tracy, citizen, said he's lived in Phoenix over 40 years. I titled my request to speak on failures. I've been here 40 years and I could spend the next hour talking to you about the failures and inadequacies of matters which touch on transportation. I was a Judge. I come from New York, and then Ohio and now here. I was familiar with the fact that this was an area destined for a great population increase and it came. We have one court in the middle of the City of Phoenix. I wanted to have six satellite courts. What would that do to the transportation in Maricopa County and Phoenix if you had six local courts rather than one downtown? It would relieve the congestion that you have in the center of the city. Years ago they decided to put all jury trials downtown. All the jury people in this community, which is bigger than 26 states, have to travel downtown. Sunday's paper said this is a great success.

We're putting the light rail to a cemetery and an area that is vacant six months out of the year instead of putting it to a shopping plaza that has probably 75 empty stores because urban renewal has taken off one time and then twice. I came through a blighted area in the heart of your city.

This is the citizen's oversight committee. The pamphlet I gave you touches on a lot of subjects on transportation. If you want to take the attitude that anything anybody else does doesn't affect you, then fine, but you are not doing your job. Regarding Pecos Road, they don't want the freeway on that; go a little more south they say. That is going to be the road to nowhere, 22 miles; they won't be able to go into the city of Phoenix because of South Mountain.

On the other hand if you go to Baseline tomorrow morning, you will find a great traffic jam. And you will find if you travel all the way to 51st Avenue a lot of vacant land, a lot of good places where a freeway would relieve the traffic. They talked about 28/4 lanes around Tempe, it wouldn't accomplish anything and it

would be vacant half of the time. On the other hand an overpass at I-10 with 60 going over there would relieve the traffic congestion. Nobody is going to go from Chandler south in order to get to 202 and anybody coming up from Tucson can take 8 to bypass the city.

I ask you; start becoming critical because the errors that have occurred the past 40 years are because of apathy. I have lived in a community that grew and it grew in an orderly fashion. I was there when Long Island University was a small area and Long Island was really not developed and had potato farmers. But they did some planning and the community cooperated and you don't find the problems we have here in that area. And there are a lot of separate communities. Regarding the light rail, people can't take it if it will take two hours to come 20 miles.

They talk about not having money to hire police officers. Half of our budget is going to photo radar. They are the only ones making money. Millions of dollars went from that \$50 million raised when we had the lights on the freeway, but at the same time we had one of the highest fatality rates in the country. They don't know how to drive and the Department of Transportation doesn't take the time to put a program on the air to tell people how to merge, how to use light signals and different things safe drivers need. Our insurance rates are high but everybody ignores it and you can find the sports page, sometimes ten pages, but nothing about traffic and nothing about safety. Thank you for your attention. I hope you read this.

Mr. James LaSalvia, citizen, mentioned he has a question about progress on the Loop 202 freeway on the South Mountain portion. I understand that east west is still being looked at on the Reservation but the north south portion from 53rd to 59th Avenue.

The Chair stated that the Committee cannot discuss that because it is not an agenda topic but suggested that perhaps Bob Hazlett of MAG could give a brief update on the Loop 202.

Bob Hazlett with MAG stated that right now the Loop 202 is being studied. They are trying to figure out what makes the most sense in terms of where it's located north south as well as east west, including discussion with the Gila Indian River Community. A lot of things in the study are still underway. Within the next month or two, based on studies being completed, there will be more up-to-date information. An update can be provided at a future meeting.

Ms. Dianne Barker, citizen, stated, I stand on what Mr. Tracy is saying, I've read many of his different papers and he really is on target about safety, distracted drivers, not only with the at grade rail but the intersection where we have most of the accidents. People are making decisions or they are not making a good decision there. As much as I can remember being a tour bus driver we were allowed in the right hand lane but were not allowed with school bus driving to make a turn on red and it does expedite the traffic but it creates accidents. People are turning without looking to see who is in the intersection. I was a victim not too long ago and I am fortunate to be here and Arizona has great doctors. We need so much, whatever you folks can do about driving around here and how can we expedite people into areas whether it's going to be in their cars or mass transit, I'd like to see a bigger shift into mass transit to increase, get out of the way of others and go faster. And to think that we continue to construct at grade rail. What happens is the system publicized years ago and our contractors got in with the federal government and made the rules how to get the money for Light Rail, through study, study and more studies? Then friendly competition with San Diego got all this money because they made all these studies. We get studied to death even with public input at meetings; the alternative analysis always comes back to a predetermined Light Rail at grade. In a meeting with Mr. Blue Crowley and the Environmental Department at ASU in 1990, they had business, government and a few citizens. Blue said let's fix the bus system. We have rapid buses, we do the right advertising, it gets people up and going in its own way, let's fix it and then we can do the Light Rail. What happened is Mr. Wolf said no Blue because we won't be able to do the studies. I would like to have you look into see where they are studying now, the Light Rail is at grade in Tempe; and they are getting two more grants from the Federal Government. It showed up on MAG's Light Rail list for apparently poor maintenance. Of course they need to maintain it but I want to see that it's coming through the right money. It's 5309. I would like to have this body figure out if they are using the money properly because I know the first money that came in through the airport came in a package of \$27 million, \$10 million went to Light Rail, it went through the city of Phoenix, RPTA, contractors and it went to alternative analysis and it was 5309 and it

wasn't supposed to be spent that way. When you don't build the house with the right foundation, and where things are done crooked and not right. If the rules are wrong, let's get in and use our intelligence and change the rules but don't break the rules. When that happens we get divided in our transportation. It gets done because of the political body and it doesn't serve the public. The reason we have transportation is for mobility of the public, and we need to have it number one safe and then cost efficient. I rode my bicycle quite a bit and when I rode over to the Light Rail I knew it was going to come in about ten minutes and that was good but why do we have to take that away from the bus system that was working and running regular and then do Light Rail at grade. A man just got ran into by the Light Rail at Indian School and he is in the hospital. Where I got hit, we both had 20 seconds the transportation system was over ridden on Washington to allow the train which wasn't there at the time, then train and the rest of the traffic have 65 seconds and they all go too fast downtown. I talked to the city of Phoenix and I got a remark I don't like. They said the city has to get around fast. No, we have to think about people. People are first. The day we stop thinking about people and their safety first, we die as a society. People think they can't do anything in the Federal Government, now because it's Christmas, and we have these A bombs, 27,000 of them, and the START treaty which expires December 5th. We need to have people that can make smart decisions and do it in time.

The Chair thanked all the citizens for their comments and input.

6. Approval of Minutes for the 07/27/10 Meeting:

The Chair called for a motion to approve the minutes of the September 14, 2010, meeting.

Board Action: Susan Brechbill moved to approve the September 14, 2010, minutes. The motion was seconded by Larry Woods and carried. The Chair and Jack Lunsford did not vote as they were not at the meeting.

Mr. Crowley, citizen, stated I know these minutes aren't supposed to be verbatim, in this case they weren't. I did point out asking for the letter to be sent to me announcing your agenda items because I'm not computer literate, I also have dyslexia, I have a problem staring at these things and I get headaches. But that wasn't mentioned. It also wasn't mentioned I asked for a reopening of public comment and the reason is I had used mass transit to get here but Sharon Robinson didn't feel that was necessary. You are a citizens committee you are supposed to be doing more citizen outreach. I've tried to always adhere to the time periods, etc. but as I've stated, at the last meeting, that it only takes a 40 cent stamp to send it to me. I'm not asking for anything other than what will be covered and taking care of those that have specific needs and mine is that I don't use the computer. I need to know when the meetings are. I will be speaking when that agenda item does come up, but it doesn't state in there that I was asking ADA so I'm expressing it again under ADA. I need you to make the concessions and send me the letter letting me know about the meeting on the 25th because that is a reminder. I did have someone go onto the computer and find out about today's meeting and where there were attachments so I could find it deeper than what was shown on the agenda, the computer didn't work. Now I asked Steve about that and he said it's on multiple sites. The site I went to was ADOT/CTOC agendas. It had a side bar. On the side bar were two things of paper and binoculars, a paperclip and one more item that said these are for attachments. If I'm trying to use the computer to find these things out I need more of that information and it didn't work for me. If you could, please send me the agendas, with the backup material as I do enjoy participating in these meetings and it does give me a reason for living. And on public comment, I did miss one thing, is that also covering on agenda item 8, the RARF money, is that on pavement preservation?

The Chair replied that Agenda Item number 8 is not open to action which includes public comments.

Mr. Crowley, citizen said that with the roundabout, we have two large holes and it's only been there for about six months. In the minutes, I know it doesn't have to be verbatim but when I do say it's ADA and I need this, you need to put that in the minutes because it makes you responsible to send it to me. And when I did ask for the opening back of the citizen's comments, I also stated it was because I use mass transit and

with cut backs, I got here ten minutes late but it didn't state that. It says that I requested it and I think it's just both of those sentences.

7. Proposition 400 Status Report:

Roger Herzog, MAG Senior Project Manager, provided information on the MAG 2010 Annual Report on the Status of Implementation of Proposition 400. Proposition 400 was passed in 2004 extending the half-cent sales tax through 2025. As part of the legislation, MAG has to do an annual report on the status of the half-cent program. A public hearing was held on November 19, 2010. There is a parallel process to update the Regional Transportation Plan and the Life Cycle programs. Deferred projects remain in the Plan, which extends through FY 2031. Revenues are a key element in the report and continue to decline. This is the third consecutive decline in year-over-year receipts. As part of the Life Cycle Program, an effort was made to rebalance the costs and revenues in the program and included value engineering, project re-scoping, project deferrals, program management and updated cost estimates. As a result, \$2.4 billion in cost savings were identified and \$4.4 billion in project deferrals were identified. As a result, costs and revenues are now in balance in the \$8.3 billion to \$8.4 billion. As part of the rebalancing effort, a number of major projects were retained within the original timeframe and certain projects were deferred beyond FY 2026. There has been significant progress since the start of the Freeway Life Cycle Program including new freeways under construction, new HOV lanes, new general purpose lanes and interchange improvements. Arterial Streets also are part of the Proposition 400 program and through FY 2010, 20 projects have been completed. Some reimbursements were shifted beyond FY 2026 and additional adjustments are needed. With the adjustments, the estimated future reimbursements and projected revenues are in balance at approximately \$1.5 billion to \$1.6 billion. The Transit component faced similar issues. A balance was achieved by delaying a number of projects. The balance maintained between estimated future costs and projected revenues is about \$4.6 billion to \$4.8 billion. Projects maintained and projects deferred were briefly reviewed. There has been significant progress with the Transit Life Cycle Program with Light Rail and with regional bus routes. Future and ongoing issues include economic recovery and transportation revenue collections, federal transportation funding, project scope/cost updates and program adjustments and performance audit by the Auditor General.

Questions Asked:

A question was asked about funding of the Light Rail Starter System before Proposition 400. Mr. Herzog stated that some funding did go for certain support elements. The majority was not part of Prop. 400.

Larry Woods, Board member asked in regard to Arizona being a donor state how we can get out of that status?

In reply, Mr. Herzog said we will be reviewing future legislation on that subject. There is a component that restricts the amount of donation which is an issue.

Ms. Brechbill, Board member asked if the revenue source for reimbursements is being pushed out beyond 2026.

Mr. Herzog stated the source in the Regional Transportation Plan would be federal funds as well as the Regional Transportation Plan consistent with the federal planning guidelines that assume reasonably available revenue sources into the future. Those sources would include the half-cent sales tax, the continuation of federal funding and the continuation of HURF funding.

Ms. Brechbill asked a question about work performed prior to 2026.

Mr. Herzog said the guidelines for the Arterial Life Cycle Program identify that if funding is not available, for a project done prior to the end of the program, the agency would not be reimbursed.

The Chair stated there is about \$4 billion or \$5 billion pushed beyond the system, where is that money going to come from? Part of the answer is that we don't know. There is talk about a Proposition 500 in the future.

8. RARF/HURF Revenue Forecast and Collections:

Steve Hull, ADOT Special Assistant to CTOC, provided a report on the updated RARF/HURF revenue forecasts and current revenue collections. The Regional Area Road Fund (RARF), otherwise known as Proposition 400, the sales tax money for the months of July-September actual 2010 revenue is slightly below what was collected in the same months as 2010. Year-to-date is down about -3.6% total and down -3.6% from the estimate. The area that makes up most of the revenue is Retail Sales. It has been down for the past couple years and is now stabilizing. Preliminary October data for sales tax revenue show an increase of about 3% as compared to 2009. That is the first month in 36 months that there is a positive change in income. It is too soon to say that it has stabilized. Contracting is still seriously low as compared to past years. Looking at the growth, the change in revenue from one year to the next, there is positive growth from 2001 to 2007 in varying amounts. The rate of decline has slowed and may be stabilizing. The Highway User Revenue Fund (HURF) is another component of income. It's a large amount but is divided statewide. Of the balance after the initial distribution, about half goes to ADOT, the other half is divided by cities, counties and towns. For the ADOT portion, after paying for operational expenses, the remainder is added to the balance of federal funds and a portion is distributed to projects in the MAG area for highways and freeways. Although HURF overall is a larger number than the RARF revenue, only a portion ends up in the MAG area. There have been two months of positive growth so far this year and two months of negative growth. Year-to-date is down -1.3% and 0.6% above the estimate. The Gas Tax revenue is a large component and it has stabilized. Vehicle License tax is still a negative amount as people are not buying new cars. The year-by-year change in revenues was shared. The 2010 year-to-date is positive compared to the previous year. Looking at the 2010 forecast, there is no rebound. Annual forecasts were shared. The \$2.2 billion decline in revenue is divided by Statute between the Freeway Program, the Arterial Street Program and the Transit Program; 56.2% goes to freeway, 10.5% goes to arterial streets and 33.3% goes to the transit program. Money cannot be moved from one category to another. Of that \$2.2 billion, about \$1.2 billion is the portion allocated to the freeway program. Growth rates are slower than expected and costs are rising slower than expected affecting an elaborate cost calculation of today's costs for the future program resulting in about \$700 million to \$800 million dollars in project deferrals. HURF revenue forecasts were shared. The forecast this year is a little lower than last year but not to the same degree as the RARF revenue. Federal funds are in question. Continuing Resolutions by Congress keep funding in place for the time being. This makes it difficult to balance programs not knowing what the future revenue will be.

Questions Asked:

Mr. Lunsford, Board Member comment about sales looking flat but not necessarily declining.

Mr. Hull stated year-to-date it is a little lower than last year but it's not the huge decline seen a year and two before that. Overall, this category of revenue is starting to stabilize.

9. Freeway Managed Lane Concept and P3 Applications:

Bob Hazlett, MAG Senior Project Manager, provided a MAG presentation to introduce the freeway managed lane concept used in P3 (public private partnerships) elsewhere and a feasibility study for its potential application here. Issues thus far are taxes versus tolls. Toll could augment or leverage private sector investment. They may not supplant the need for additional public-sector revenue. This region has a good history of identifying and securing additional tax revenues. Additional issues are, do we do tolling for Proposition 400 projects? In October 2009, there was a \$6.6 billion rebalancing where some projects were deferred. There is another rebalancing needed. The Transportation Policy Committee identified three issues: 1) Does the MAG Region want to explore the use of P3, and tolls specifically, in the context of the overall transportation system? 2) What is the potential pool of projects that this region might consider? Should projects include those from Proposition 400? 3) How should the region use potential net revenues

from P3 projects? P3 applications could include maintenance, operations, transit and new highway capacity. A leveraging example was shared. Managed lanes could offer trip reliability, commuter choices and transit enhancements. Approved by the Transportation Policy Committee, MAG developed a Managed Lanes Network Development Strategy. Phase I includes a System-Wide Managed Lanes Feasibility. Phase II includes an analysis of Pilot Corridors and Phase III is an analysis of other promising corridors.

Questions Asked:

Mr. Ladd, Board member commented about the toll road E-470 in Denver with high tolls. In reply Mr. Hazlett said, no, we are not planning a full toll way type facility in Arizona like the E-470 eastern bypass in Denver. Ours would be an option for people to take.

Mr. Ladd shared additional information about the Kansas Turnpike.

Kyle Robinson, Board member asked if they've looked at the 91 freeway and the 241 bypass in California.

Mr. Hull added that managed lanes are an optional toll and allows the opportunity for those who are willing to pay to use those less congested lanes and those who do not can continue to use the regular lanes at no cost.

Mr. Hazlett added that the idea behind managed lanes is that it would be applied to those lanes only, not to the existing general capacity lanes. Those would remain free, although they may be subject to congestion.

The Chair commented that these ideas should be discussed. He added information about the Salt Lake City HOV lane on the inside of I-15.

10. Staff Report:

Mr. Hull, ADOT Special Assistant to CTOC, provided a status update on the Annual Financial Compliance Audit, Five Year Performance Audit and CTOC Annual Report. Statute requires that CTOC oversees a Financial Compliance Audit for each fiscal year to ensure the sales tax fund is properly divided by Statute into the three different accounts for arterial roads, freeway and transit and to make sure expenditures out of those accounts are for items the Statute says the money may be used for. The audit began in September 2010 and is in progress. They have completed the review of the ADOT data but are still reviewing MAG and RPTA data. They expect to be done by the end of the year with a report by early 2011. The Five Year Performance Audit is initiated by the State Auditor General's Office. It is a required audit in Statute for Proposition 400 Projects. It encompasses more than the financial money expenditures. It looks at performance of the entire plan. The auditor has been selected. Initial interviews with various MAG, ADOT and RPTA staff and others have been held and are ongoing. The detailed field investigation work is planned for early in 2011. A draft report is expected by mid-year with a final report due in October 2011. The CTOC Annual Report was last published in 2008. Reports in past years have been done based on calendar years. Most other reports by ADOT, MAG and RPTA are done on a fiscal year basis. To simplify the reporting, the CTOC annual report is being shifted to a fiscal year basis. The next report will be an 18 month report due to the overlap of the two systems. It is nearly complete and will be available in about a week.

Questions Asked:

In reply to a question about the Statute being limited to Proposition 400 funds for the financial compliance audit, the answer is yes.

11. Recommendation for Future Agenda Items:

The Chair asked for recommendation for future agenda items.

Mr. Robinson, Board member asked about the managed lane concept and if that is in our jurisdiction to discuss further.

The Chair thought the answer would be yes because it's in conjunction with funds spent if we put a managed lane concept on the I-10 south near Ray Road over to the Agua Fria.

Mr. Robinson, Board member said he would like to discuss managed lane concepts and for CTOC to weigh in on the subject if possible.

Mr. Hull mentioned that MAG is getting ready to do a study of all the concepts and over the course of the next year will have information and feedback of what may have potential to work in our area. He suggested we wait to see what MAG comes out with first according to the studies.

The Chair stated that perhaps there are some studies already done in other parts of the country regarding managed lanes and the process of making those decisions for example in Dallas or Utah.

Mr. Hull stated that we can look into that and provide a briefing of what is found.

Mr. Lunsford, Board member said that MAG is embarking on a rail study and asked if that will be information that we might be interested in receiving?

Mr. Hull stated he will look into that as well.

Mr. Woods, Board member said he was told people have waited 2 ½ hours on I-10 due to bridge construction around the Palo Verde Nuclear Facility coming in to the valley and asked why are they doing extensive construction over a holiday weekend on I-10? How much thought is put into traffic control in these high traffic areas?

Mr. Hull stated a great deal of planning has gone into scheduling the bridge reconstruction. The project itself requires a long period of time to complete and portions of the deck have to be removed, therefore it is impossible for the project not to effect weekends and certain holidays.

Ms. Brechbill, Board member noted that over the holidays, she heard information from ADOT that nothing is going on and also wanted to add in her experience she has found ADOT to be very good at letting the public know about such things.

Mr. Lunsford, Board member also asked if we could put the Local Transportation Assistance Fund on a future agenda.

Mr. Crowley, citizen, what I would like you to do is things like the Mr. Tracy brought up but we can't move monies because they have to change the Statutes. One of the things you do is you're advisory to the legislature, not just MAG and the RPTA, and if you are doing things after the hopper is closed, they took all the local area transportation. Would you suggest they pass a motion that they need to re-establish; if you are doing it after the hopper is closed they can't do it. When they discussed Route 24, which is the I-10, the gentleman didn't have the reliever road up there and I would like to see it bifurcated to where we can get both rail and highway done at the same time on that section. And also things like bike routes. I would like anytime when the state, county or city are doing roadway improvements or putting them in, I want my bike lane and if we can get that in Statute. You can't suggest that or pass a Resolution on that and tell the Legislature to do so if you are having your meeting after the hopper is closed. And are we going to be addressing any of those things like with Proposition 500; that needs to be addressed now? And I would like to see it bifurcated and I would like this committee to say that because without the statement that Steve made about the percentages, that's the percentage of cutbacks. The actual is that freeway gets 58%, transit only gets 32%. You say 56.2 and 33. I might be wrong but that is what I was told. I would like to see some of the agenda items, resolutions that this committee would be expressing to the legislature to get

those things like the Local Transit Area Fund. That was totally negated which cost us in our transit 400 because we did not have the extra money to match.

12. Next Scheduled Meeting:

Tuesday, January 25, 2011 at 4:00 p.m.
Arizona Department of Transportation
206 South 17th Avenue, Auditorium
Phoenix, Arizona 85007

Chairman Arnett stated that he has a conflict with the next meeting date and would like to entertain the possibility of changing the date. It was suggested that January 18th might be better.

Board Action: Mr. Lunsford moved to change the January 25, 2011, meeting to January 18, 2011.
The motion was seconded by Mr. Ladd and carried unanimously.

13. Adjournment:

The meeting adjourned at 5:40 p.m.