

**Technical/Management Committee Meeting
Minutes of October 5, 2005**

Andy Gunning, Director of Planning

ATTENDANCE

MEMBERS IN ATTENDANCE

Jim Glock	Michael Reuwsaat	Paul Cella
Chuck Sweet	Bob Iannarino	Jill Merrick
Benny Young	George Caria	John Pein
John Bernal	Marshall Worden	Carl Russell
Jim Stahle	Roger Caldwell	Jim Schoen
Frank Thomson	Chet Davis	Walker Smith for Fernando Castro
Fred Stevens	Barbara Becker	

PAG RTA STAFF

Gary Hayes	Dan Sullivan	Natalie Clark
Andy Gunning	Cherie Campbell	Paul Casertano
Tim Ahrens	Rosie Soto	Tom Fisher
Jeff Hildebrand	Sheila Storm	Tom Cooney

GUESTS

Daniel Hochuli	Ed Stillings	M.J. Yee
Paul Mackey	Kurt Weinrich	Sheila Bowen
Curt Lueck	Vern Pall	John Litteer
F. Ann Rodriguez	Gary Oaks	Andy Dinauer
Michael Toney	Bill Dorgan	Levi Jackson
Lori Lustig	Ramon Gaandere	Amber Moore
Curt Lueck	Lorraine Hernandez	Bill Dorgan
Priscilla Cornelio	Joe Herrick	Magdalena Barajas
Bob Cook		

1. Call to order

Chairman Jim Glock called the meeting to order at 11:05 a.m.

2. Approval of minutes dated Sept. 7, 2005, and Sept. 23, 2005

Carl Russell moved to approve the minutes. Chet Davis seconded. The motion passed unanimously.

3. Report from the RTA Citizens Advisory Committee

Mr. Gary Hayes reported that the next CAC meeting is scheduled Tuesday, Oct. 11, at the El Rio Neighborhood Center located at 1390 W. Speedway. At the last CAC meeting, Carolyn Campbell provided a PowerPoint presentation addressing wildlife crossings and the implications. Gary also mentioned that we are awaiting confirmation of availability from members to schedule a joint CAC TMC meeting. Rick Myers would prefer an evening meeting either on Oct. 20 or Oct. 24. The purpose of this joint session is to provide a set of specific recommendations to the RTA board at the Oct. 26 RTA Board meeting.

4. Cost Estimates

Tim Ahrens provided an overview of the project schedule which is the cash flow forecasts with all the projects including the projects added in phase II, transit and lump sum items. Cost estimates are not much higher than the original estimates. Over the last several months the costs of materials have been rising, especially in steel, asphalt and concrete. At this point, the estimates reflect the increase of material costs.

Tim confirmed that we are off about \$107 million and, in fiscal year 2016, we are \$366 million short without bonding. Tim explained for fiscal years 2012-2026 25 percent of regional funds are committed, which means the specified areas will get the 12.6 percent funds and federal aid.

Marshall Worden questioned if there were further funds required for the RTA to operate?

Tim Ahrens responded, according to statutes there are \$300,000 a year to operate and is included in the RTP project schedule.

Chuck Sweet expressed his concerns regarding the amount of money to be spent on design fees.

Tim Ahrens added that the construction amount is net development impact fees and other items. The design cost includes environmental mitigation and is 15 percent of total construction.

Chuck Sweet commented that bonding needs to be done in order for people to see projects get done. It is too difficult to complete projects on a pay as you go method.

Benny Young questioned what the legislation states regarding an allowance for smaller jurisdictions.

Gary Hayes responded that the allowance is 1 percent for smaller jurisdictions.

Frank Thomson commented that his understanding was that bonding would be used. The plan is to address traffic needs for current residents. The cost estimates schedule shows that some projects won't start construction until 15 years from now. That is not addressing existing traffic needs.

Jim Glock responded from the city's perspective, even with all the money upfront, it would take 15 years to complete the projects within city limits due to environmental issues and the need to not have parallel streets under construction at the same time. There are a lot of constraints involved.

Bob Iannarino commented that we have 10 percent mobilization on all the projects, 15 percent construction contingency, 15 percent construction management, 15 percent engineering and planning and 1 percent contingency equaling 56 percent of the cost. Are we willing to recommend to the CAC that we are comfortable with these costs without looking to see if they can be trimmed down?

Frank Thomson commented that we need to look at the process and look at what some of the other jurisdictions in the state have done in the state and propose that maybe there are ways to deal with mobilization and design fees.

5. Revenue Forecasts

Tim Ahrens updated that the ½ cent sales tax revenue is now \$2.1 billion. The three major reasons for the increase was a much higher population, building permits were at an all-time high last year and sales tax revenue reported by the state for Pima County was higher than the original estimate.

Jim Glock asked Tim to talk about revenue forecasts associated with regional funds.

Tim Ahrens responded that the revenue forecasts are based on past performances. The 12.6 highway user revenue forecast (HURF) annually looks at gasoline sales, diesel fuel usage, vehicle license tax and other revenues entered into HURF. This is distributed to the cities, counties and regions. Both MAG and PAG are beneficiaries and receive \$18 million a year from the 12.6 percent. We also receive \$15 million indirectly from the federal government and the state, totaling \$33 million a year.

6. Bonding Options

Benny Young questioned if a separate election was necessary to authorize taking on debt, or would it be embodied in the initial ballot question.

Dan Hochuli responded that we have bonding authority without going back to the voters.

Benny Young referred to Chair Huckelberry's memo and commented that we should try and execute this program without executing debt.

Chuck Sweet suggested that a bond consultant be brought in to assist engineers with working out the numbers.

7. Project implementation and phasing schedule

Cherie Campbell reviewed the detailed implementation schedule handout showing each of the project's start of service, major right-of-way, purchase and start/complete construction. Cherie also explained how each are separated into periods, 1st five years, 2nd five years, 3rd and 4th, and for each of the projects initiated or completed during those periods, a sector of the community is divided into areas, SE, NE, NW, SW and Central. This is an attempt to get the information condensed down into something that might be more reader friendly.

Benny Young suggested showing more projects in the first five-year period. Broadway and Grant need to have actual construction early in the program.

8. Project evaluation and selection criteria

Cherie Campbell reviewed the TIP evaluation criteria handout which uses the standard TIP process to evaluate projects. It recognizes projects that have substantial commitment of funds and are at the top of the list to be completed. The second grouping shows the items that are popular with the public and safety benefits. The rest of the RTA proposals are ranked using the TIP criteria.

Tom Cooney reviewed the volume over capacity ratio handout which shows each of the projects being considered with existing volume over capacity ratios, future volume over capacity, measures of utilization. Tom sorted the projects based on rankings 1-4 focusing on congestion impacts and accessibility. If you add the projects ranked 1, 2 or 3 the total is about \$1.1 million. Keep in mind new projects don't have volumes or capacities, so those projects are not included in the rankings.

John Bernal questioned what the TIP evaluation criteria improves.

Benny Young supported John Bernal's question and added that we should think about the system implications associated with making some of the continuity improvements, and the link's impact to the system needs to be considered.

Frank Thomson questioned if transit was already phased.

Chet Davis commented that he would like to see a summary of routes being improved on weekend, night service and additional buses.

Frank Thomson questioned how many people are impacted with early transit vs. roads.

George Caria updated that there have been 60,000 trips or more a day in the month of September and are dealing with overcrowding on 11 routes.

9. Review and refinement of draft RTA plan elements

Jim Glock asked PAG staff to put elements into a package of final recommendations to forward to the CAC.

10. Future RTA meetings and agenda items

The next TMC meeting is scheduled for Oct. 12, 2005. Agenda items will include:

Put categorical in a revised cost package.

11. Call to the Audience

Michael Toney addressed the committee countering criticisms of the RTA.

12. Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned at 12:40 p.m.