

**Technical/Management Committee Meeting  
Minutes of October 12, 2005**

---

Andy Gunning, Director of Planning

**ATTENDANCE**

**MEMBERS IN ATTENDANCE**

Chuck Huckelberry	Jim Glock	Michael Reuwsaat
Carl Russell	Benny Young	George Caria
John Bernal	Marshall Worden	Paul Cella
Roger Caldwell	Jim Schoen	Martin Roush for Jim Stahle
Barbara Becker	Fred Stevens	Walker Smith for Fernando Castro
Frank Thomson	Farhad Moghimi	

**PAG RTA STAFF**

Gary Hayes	Andy Gunning	Cherie Campbell
Paul Casertano	Manny Rosas	Tim Ahrens
Rosie Soto	Tom Fisher	Jeff Hildebrand
Sheila Storm		

**GUESTS**

Daniel Hochuli	Paul Mackey	Kurt Weinrich
Sheila Bowen	Rick Myers	Curt Lueck
John Litteer	F. Ann Rodriguez	Gary Oaks
Bill Dorgan	Tom Bush	Ramon Gaandere
Lorraine Hernandez	Priscilla Cornelio	Ryan Matchett
Jim DeGrood	Martin Willett	Dewey Brown
Katie Dusenberry		

1. Call to order

Chairman Chuck Huckelberry called the meeting to order at 11:02 a.m.

2. Approval of minutes dated Oct. 5, 2005

Carl Russell moved to approve the minutes. Marshall Worden seconded. The motion passed unanimously.

3. Report from the RTA Citizens Advisory Committee

Rick Myers of the CAC reported that the CAC meeting, Oct. 11, was long and productive. The CAC came up with a list of lower priority projects to be eliminated or scaled back, resulting in an estimated \$300 million savings. The list is for the RTA committee to review and is only the personal view of the CAC. The Oct. 24 joint CAC TMC meeting will be a good opportunity for feedback.

4. Review and refinement of draft RTA plan elements

Per direction of the Chair, Andy Gunning started by reviewing the handouts. The proposed schedule of projects (with graphic) shows the phasing of projects and in what period of time they will occur over the 20-year process. The candidate project cuts list discussed by the sub-committee shows projects with a proposed action and an estimated savings. The roadway projects map, modeling data tables showing the number of different categories of data, volume to capacity for existing corridors, average volume-to-capacity measure and vehicle miles of travel.

Tim Ahrens continued with reviewing the project schedule (3 pages) showing the initial project list, the projects in red have either been changed or eliminated, totaling almost \$300 million. The second page is the pay-as-you-go scenario, with \$298 million in reductions and including \$154.7 million of additional federal aid revenues. The third page is the bonding scenario, \$350 million in bonding paying back \$445 million in principal and interest with \$298 million in reductions and \$154.7 million additional revenues and ending with a \$64 million balance. The finance summary matrix handout provides options for the pay-as-you-go with and without the 25 percent regional funds to supplement the RTA, and options of bonding with and without the 25 percent regional funds to supplement the RTA.

Frank Thomson questioned if there was data to show how much of an impact there will be on roadways spending money on transit in the first few years versus spending the money on a roadway. How much will the ridership increase?

George Caria responded that with the improvement of service frequencies there will be an increase in ridership. However, the buses and facilities have to be up before the service frequencies.

5. Cost Estimates

Chair Huckelberry mentioned making cuts from the 56 percent that was added to construction. Taking 5 percent off mobilization, 5 percent off engineering and planning and apply it to construction, you get roughly \$100 million.

Jim Glock stated that he is not comfortable doing that. It is better to have a high estimate than low. On larger projects it would be legitimate to bring it down to 5 percent.

6. Revenues

Mike Reuwsaat added that he would like to see a commitment from local entities to cover some of that basis to provide a little more balance.

John Bernal questioned if URS used unit prices drawn from local projects, because projects in this scale aren't done very often. Will all the percentages hold up with \$20 million and \$30 million projects?

Chair Huckelberry confirmed that it was a good idea to look at the \$154.7 million of the 25 percent regional money to know how it would be spread out so we know whose money we are dealing with.

Roger Caldwell mentioned that there hasn't been any conclusion about bonding. In order for people to see results from election, we will have to bond.

Chair Huckelberry stated that in his opinion, bonding is necessary, a component to get started. When people go out to vote they will expect to see something happen.

7. Project implementation and phasing schedule

Marshall Worden commented that the list of project cuts from the CAC is not based on technical formulation. When the TMC decided to put Grant rd. in the plan there was not a technical foundation to exclude it, and the TMC did not want to be guided by political determination.

Rick Myers responded that the CAC was waiting to hear from the TMC to see if there was an acceptable way to re-scope that project, but the CAC is not trying to be politically driven.

Chair Huckelberry questioned if anyone was working on de-scoping Grant.

Jim Glock responded yes, from a cost estimation standpoint, but the traffic engineers have not started on the systems performance.

8. Project evaluation and selection criteria

Chair Huckelberry stated the changes or cuts he would make to the plan.

Chair Huckelberry asked PAG staff to distribute a survey to each of the TMC members to select what projects they would like to see changed or eliminated.

Barbara Becker questioned what exactly was happening with Grant?

Jim Glock responded that the City's traffic engineering staff is going to compare how a 6-lane section performs vs. a section where just improvements are done to the intersection. The results will tell us what the travel time delay reduction will be, one vs. the other. A cost estimate will also be done for intersection improvements as opposed to the cost estimate we have now for the 6-lane section.

Rick Myers added that in order to have a successful meeting on Oct. 24, by the end of the TMC meeting Oct. 19, a list of recommendations should be given to PAG to review before the CAC TMC meeting next week.

Gary Hayes suggested that if anyone has any questions or needs technical back up, please call ahead of time, so for next week's meeting we can have some closure.

John Bernal suggested that we continue to put dates on tables so there is no confusion.

9. Future RTA meetings and agenda items

The next TMC meeting is scheduled for Oct. 19, 2005, and the joint CAC TMC meeting is scheduled for Oct. 24. Agenda items will include:

Results from project evaluation survey

10. Call to the audience

Ann Rodriguez of the CAC addressed the committee with her concerns to include right hand turn money.

Anthony K. King addressed the committee regarding Grant rd.

Sanda Schuldmann addressed the committee opposing the Snyder rd. bridge.

11. Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned at 12:45 p.m.

