MARICOPA ASSOCIATION of GOVERNMENTS

302 North 1st Avenue, Suite 300 ▲ Phoenix, Arizona 85003
Phone (602) 254-6300 ▲ Fax (602) 254-6490
E-mail: mag@mag.maricopa.gov ▲ Web site: www.mag.maricopa.gov

January 3, 2006

TO: Members of the MAG Management Committee

FROM: Ed Beasley, Glendale, Chair

SUBJECT: MEETING NOTIFICATION AND TRANSMITTAL OF TENTATIVE AGENDA

Wednesday, January 11, 2006 - noon to 1:00 p.m. (Meeting will begin promptly at noon)
MAG Office, Suite 200 - Saguaro Room
302 North 1st Avenue, Phoenix

The next Management Committee meeting will be held at the MAG offices at the time and place noted above. Members of the Management Committee may attend the meeting either in person, by videoconference or by telephone conference call. The agenda and summaries are being transmitted to the members of the Regional Council to foster increased dialogue regarding the agenda items between members of the Management Committee and Regional Council. You are encouraged to review the supporting information enclosed. Lunch will be provided at a nominal cost.

Please park in the garage under the building, bring your ticket, parking will be validated. For those using transit, Valley Metro/RPTA will provide transit tickets for your trip. For those using bicycles, please lock your bicycle in the bike rack in the garage.

Pursuant to Title II of the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA), MAG does not discriminate on the basis of disability in admissions to or participation in its public meetings. Persons with a disability may request a reasonable accommodation, such as a sign language interpreter, by contacting Valerie Day at the MAG office. Requests should be made as early as possible to allow time to arrange the accommodation.

Members are reminded of the importance of attendance by yourself or a proxy. Any time that a quorum is not present, we cannot conduct the meeting. Please set aside sufficient time for the meeting, and for all matters to be reviewed and acted upon by the Management Committee. Your presence and vote count.

MAG MANAGEMENT COMMITTEE
TENTATIVE AGENDA
January 11, 2006

		COMMITTEE ACTION REQUESTED
1.	Call to Order	
2.	Pledge of Allegiance	
3.	Call to the Audience An opportunity is provided to the public to address the Management Committee on items that are not on the agenda that are within the jurisdiction of MAG, or non-action agenda items that are on the agenda for discussion or information only. Citizens will be requested not to exceed a three minute time period for their comments. A total of 15 minutes will be provided for the Call to the Audience agenda item, unless the Management Committee requests an exception to this limit. Please note that those wishing to comment on agenda items posted for action will be provided the opportunity at the time the item is heard.	3. Information.
4.	Executive Director's Report The MAG Executive Director will provide a report to the Management Committee on activities of general interest.	4. Information and discussion.
5.	Approval of Consent Agenda Prior to action on the consent agenda, members of the audience will be provided an opportunity to comment on consent items that are being presented for action. Following the comment period, Committee members may request that an item be removed from the consent agenda. Consent items are marked with an asterisk (*).	5. Recommend approval of the Consent Agenda.

ITEMS PROPOSED FOR CONSENT*

MINUTES

*5A.	Approval of November 9, 2005 Meeting Minutes	5A. Review and approve the November 9, 2005 meeting minutes.

TRANSPORTATION ITEMS

*5B. MAG Vehicle Occupancy Study Consultant Selection

The FY 2006 MAG Unified Planning Work Program and Annual Budget includes $170,000 to conduct the Vehicle Occupancy Study. The auto occupancy data resulting from the study will be used to calibrate the mode choice model in order to produce accurate high occupancy vehicle estimates. A request for proposals was advertised and one response was received. A multi agency evaluation team reviewed the proposal, interviewed the consultant, and recommended to MAG the selection of United Civil Group Corp. to conduct the project for an amount not to exceed $170,000. Please refer to the enclosed material.

5B. Recommend that United Civil Group Corp. be selected to conduct the MAG Vehicle Occupancy Study for an amount not to exceed $170,000.

*5C. 2006 MAG Freeway Level of Service Study Consultant Study

The FY 2006 MAG Unified Planning Work Program and Annual Budget includes $120,000 to conduct the 2006 MAG Freeway Level of Service (LOS) Study. By using aerial survey technology, this study will update information on freeway traffic conditions and evaluate freeway LOS in the MAG urbanized area. The information from this study will be used to help identify freeway bottlenecks and to help prioritize improvement projects. A request for proposals was advertised and one response was received. A multi-agency proposal evaluation team reviewed the proposal, interviewed the consultant, and recommended to MAG the selection of Skycomp, Inc. to conduct the project for an amount not to exceed $120,000. Please refer to the enclosed material.

5C. Recommend that Skycomp, Inc. be selected to conduct the 2006 MAG Freeway Level of Service Study for an amount not to exceed $120,000.

*5D. Recommendation of Projects for MAG Federal Funding in FY 2011 of the FY 2007-2011 MAG Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) - the MAG Federally Funded Program

The MAG Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) targets all future MAG Federal Funds to specific modes and, in some cases, identifies specific

5D. Recommend approval of the projects for CMAQ discretionary funding in FY 2011 and to include those projects in the Draft FY 2007-2011 MAG Transportation Improvement Program for public review and comment.

projects for the funds. For ITS, Bicycle, Pedestrian and Air Quality projects, the RTP identified funds, but did not specify individual projects. Requests for projects for MAG Federal Funds expected to be available for FY 2011 have been received, ranked by modal technical advisory committees and those rankings were reviewed by the Transportation Review Committee (TRC) on December 8, 2005. The approved projects from these modes will be combined with other recommendations for the life cycle programs for freeways, arterials and transit, to form a MAG Federally Funded program. This program will then be added to the regionally funded components of the freeway, arterial and transit life cycle programs, projects from the state highway program and any locally/privately funded projects being submitted for inclusion in the TIP to form the draft TIP (Listing of Projects). Please refer to the enclosed material.

*5E. Commuter Rail Update Study – Formation of Stakeholder Group

In 2003, MAG completed the High Capacity Transit Study that examined commuter rail, bus rapid transit, light rail, and express bus service for the region. The 2003 Regional Transportation Plan included a $5 million allocation over the 20-year period of the sales tax for commuter rail implementation work. Since that time, fuel costs have risen substantially which has raised the interest in commuter rail in the region. In addition, a number of changes to the rail operations have been made or are being planned since the 2003 High Capacity Transit Study. MAG is proposing that a stakeholder group be formed to provide input on a scope of work for a consultant study to update the commuter rail portion of the previous study. The proposed study would be coordinated with a parallel study being proposed by ADOT that will inventory and evaluate the rail infrastructure across the state with a particular emphasis on freight operations. The rail inventory information for the MAG region from the ADOT study would be used as input into the MAG Commuter Rail Study.

5E. Recommend that MAG form a commuter rail stakeholders group to assist in the preparation of a draft scope of work for a commuter rail study.

*5F. Changes to the Approved June 29, 2005 Arterial Life Cycle Program (ALCP) Policies and Procedures

Since the approval of the ALCP Policies and Procedures in June 2005, the development of the project agreement and other aspects of the ALCP implementation process has proceeded. During this time, a number of minor changes to the Policies and Procedures were suggested to clarify and refine them to improve the administration of the ALCP. The proposed changes have been discussed with MAG member agencies during the development of the other elements of the ALCP. The MAG Transportation Review Committee recommended approval of the changes. Please refer to the enclosed material.

5F. Recommend approval of the proposed changes to the approved June 29, 2005 Arterial Life Cycle Program (ALCP) Policies and Procedures.

GENERAL ITEMS

*5G. Draft MAG 208 Water Quality Management Plan Amendment for the Expansion of the Town of Buckeye Sundance Wastewater Treatment Plant

The Town of Buckeye has requested that MAG amend the 208 Water Quality Management Plan to include the expansion of the Sundance Wastewater Treatment Plant. The plant is identified in the current MAG 208 Plan for a capacity of 3.6 million gallons per day (mgd). The expansion would increase ultimate capacity to 8.9 mgd. Reclaimed water from the expanded facility would be disposed of through reuse, recharge, and an Arizona Pollutant Discharge Elimination System Permit discharge to the Buckeye Irrigation District Canal. The cities of Glendale and Goodyear and unincorporated Maricopa County are within three miles of the project, and all have indicated that they do not object to the facility expansion. A public hearing on the draft amendment was conducted on December 13, 2005. Following the hearing, the MAG Water Quality Advisory Committee unanimously recommended approval of the Draft 208 Plan Amendment. Please refer to the enclosed material.

5G. Recommend approval of the Draft MAG 208 Water Quality Management Plan Amendment for the Expansion of the Town of Buckeye Sundance Wastewater Treatment Plant.

*5H. Amendment to the FY 2007 Public Safety Answering Point (PSAP) Annual Element/Funding Request and FY 2007-2011 Equipment Program for the MAG 9-1-1 System

On September 28, 2005, the MAG Regional Council approved the MAG FY 2007 PSAP Annual Element/Funding Request and FY 2007-2011 Equipment Program. Since approval, it has become necessary to amend the budget to allow for equipment upgrades at the El Mirage, Glendale, Mesa, and Tempe Police Departments and for call reporting equipment at the MAG 9-1-1 Office. These equipment costs are currently paid by the 9-1-1 state excise tax. The MAG PSAP Managers and the MAG Oversight Team recommended approval of the Amendment. Please refer to the enclosed material.

5H. Recommend approval of the Amendment to the FY 2007 PSAP Annual Element/Funding Request and FY 2007-2011 Equipment Program to include upgrades to the computerized telephone 9-1-1 systems at the El Mirage Police Department for $118,300, the Glendale Police Department for $441,000, the Mesa Police Department for $804,000, and the Tempe Police Department for $441,000, and a Positron MIS tool for the MAG 9-1-1 Office for $45,000.

*5I. Approval of the Report on the Need for Increased Domestic Violence Shelter in the MAG Region

The MAG Regional Domestic Violence Council, through the Victim Services Subcommittee, has produced a report on the unduplicated need for shelter beds to serve current domestic violence victims in the MAG Region. The Council determined that 325 more beds are needed by researching data from local service providers and conducting a statistically reliable study in all nine domestic violence shelters in the MAG Region. This effort was undertaken in partnership with Arizona State University's Partnership for Community Development. Please refer to the enclosed material.

5I. Recommend acceptance of the Report on the Need for Domestic Violence Shelter in the MAG Region.

*5J. MAG Continuum of Care Regional Committee on Homelessness Guidelines

The MAG Continuum of Care Regional Committee on Homelessness has produced committee guidelines to add structure and formality to the Committee. Development of the guidelines began in 2002 by MAG staff and has recently been modified. The Committee reached consensus on the guidelines at the November 17,

5J. Recommend approval of the MAG Continuum of Care Regional Committee on Homelessness Guidelines.

2005 meeting. Please refer to the enclosed material.

*5K. Status Report on 2005 Census Survey

The data collection phase of the 2005 Census Survey is now complete and the local census office is closed. The Census Bureau is now in the data capture and processing phase. Results will be received in Spring 2006. These results will be used to distribute billions of dollars in state-shared revenues to cities and towns, Maricopa County, and Indian communities within the MAG region from 2006 to 2011. Please refer to the enclosed material.

5K. Information and discussion.

*5L. Discussion of the Development of the FY 2007 MAG Unified Planning Work Program and Annual Budget

Each year, the Unified Planning Work Program and Annual Budget is developed in conjunction with member agency and public input. The Work Program is reviewed each year by the federal agencies in the spring and approved by the Regional Council in May. This overview of MAG's draft Dues and Assessments and the proposed budget production timeline provides an opportunity for early input into the develop of the Work Program and Budget. Please refer to the enclosed material.

5L. Input on the development of the FY 2007 MAG Unified Planning Work Program and Annual Budget.

*5M. Status Update on the June 30, 2005 Single Audit and Management Letter Comments, MAG's Comprehensive Annual Financial Report (CAFR) and OMB Circular A-133 Reports (i.e., "Single Audit") for the Fiscal Year Ended June 30, 2005

The public accounting firm of Deloitte & Touche LLP has completed the audit of MAG's Comprehensive Annual Financial Report (CAFR) and Single Audit for the fiscal year ended June 30, 2005. The firm's opinion is being completed and will be forwarded to the MAG office. When the opinion is received it will be forwarded under separate cover.

5M. Recommend acceptance of the audit opinion issued on the MAG Comprehensive Annual Financial Report and Single Audit Report for the year ended June 30, 2005.

ITEMS PROPOSED TO BE HEARD

TRANSPORTATION ITEM

6. Update on Construction Costs and Possible Impact on the ADOT Life Cycle Program

On January 6, 2006, MAG is sponsoring a Challenge of Construction Forum to gain insight into the causes and possible solutions to mitigate the recent large increases in construction costs. The Forum includes representatives from both the American General Contractors (AGC) Association and the Arizona Chapter of the AGC, and experts familiar with recent cost trends for highways, schools, home building, and commercial construction. A summary of the Forum, including possible solutions to mitigate increases in construction costs, will be provided. In addition, the possible impacts of higher construction costs on the ADOT Life Cycle Program with emphasis on projects scheduled in Phase 1 of the Proposition 400 program will be discussed.

6. Information and discussion.

AIR QUALITY ITEM

7. Particulate Pollution Update

In recent weeks, this region has experienced high readings at two of the PM-10 monitor sites. Although these readings will need to be checked by Maricopa County air quality personnel, it appears that MAG will need to initiate the preparation of a Five Percent Plan for submission to EPA by December 31, 2007. It is important that the region attain the 24-hour PM10 standard as quickly as possible. Every monitor in the nonattainment area must be clean in 2006, 2007 and 2008 in order for the region to attain the standard by 2008. A report will be provided on current efforts to meet the standard. In this regard, at the December MAG Regional Council meeting, staff was requested to forward the City of Peoria ordinance that assists in dust control. This ordinance has been forwarded to the MAG member agencies and a presentation will be made on the key elements of the ordinance. Please refer to the enclosed material.

7. Information and discussion.

GENERAL ITEMS

8. Homeless Planning Strategies

At the November Management Committee meeting, Maricopa County presented a request for $1 million to help support the Human Services Campus. Since the presentation, additional ideas have been discussed to establish a multi-source, permanent funding stream that is not dependent on state and local government funds, with which to build/purchase permanent housing options and supportive services. Potential sources include revenue generated from the sale of naming rights and utilization of vacant Maricopa County land parcels. Industrial Development Authorities will also be discussed as a financing tool. A representative from Maricopa County will provide an update on these possible strategies.

8. Information, discussion and possible action.

9. Local Government Partnership to Address Crime Prevention

With increasing costs in the criminal justice system for enforcement, adjudication, and corrections, Maricopa County is exploring the possibility of working with local government stakeholders to cooperatively address crime prevention efforts. A representative from the County will discuss the current challenges facing the County criminal justice system. To assist the County in this effort, a stakeholders group could be formed to develop crime prevention programs and alternative strategies. Please refer to the enclosed material.

9. Information and discussion on forming a stakeholders group to provide input to Maricopa County on crime prevention strategies.

10. Phoenix Urban Area Security Initiative Weapons of Mass Destruction Tabletop Exercise Series

The MAG Management Committee will be provided with an overview of the Phoenix Urban Area Security Initiative Weapons of Mass Destruction Tabletop Exercise Series that will be conducted throughout the Urban Area during calendar year 2006.

10. Information and discussion.

11. Comments from the Committee

An opportunity will be provided for Management Committee members to present a brief summary of current events. The Management Committee is not allowed to propose, discuss, deliberate or take action at the meeting on any matter in the summary, unless the specific matter is properly noticed for legal action.

11. Information.

MINUTES OF THE
MAG MANAGEMENT COMMITTEE MEETING
November 9, 2005
MAG Office Building - Saguaro Room
Phoenix, Arizona

MEMBERS ATTENDING

Mike Hutchinson, Mesa, Chair
Ed Beasley, Glendale, Vice Chair
George Hoffman, Apache Junction
Stephanie Prybyl for Charlie McClendon, Avondale
Carroll Reynolds, Buckeye
* Jon Pearson, Carefree
* Usama Abujbarah, Cave Creek
Mark Pentz, Chandler
* B.J. Cornwall, El Mirage
* Orlando Moreno, Fort McDowell Yavapai Nation
Tim Pickering, Fountain Hills
* Lynn Farmer, Gila Bend
* Urban Giff, Gila River Indian Community
George Pettit, Gilbert
Stephen Cleveland, Goodyear
Mark Johnson, Guadalupe
Darryl Crossman, Litchfield Park
Tom Martinsen, Paradise Valley
Terry Ellis, Peoria
Frank Fairbanks, Phoenix
Cynthia Seelhammer, Queen Creek
* Bryan Meyers, Salt River Pima-Maricopa Indian Community
Jan Dolan, Scottsdale
Jim Rumpeltes, Surprise
Will Manley, Tempe
* Reyes Medrano, Tolleson
* Shane Dille, Wickenburg
Mark Fooks, Youngtown
Dale Buskirk for Victor Mendez, ADOT
David Smith, Maricopa County
David Boggs, Valley Metro/RPTA

* Those members neither present nor represented by proxy.
# Participated by telephone conference call.
+ Participated by videoconference call.

1. Call to Order

The meeting was called to order by Chair Mike Hutchinson at 12:20 p.m.

2. Pledge of Allegiance

The Pledge of Allegiance was recited.

Chair Hutchinson announced that George Hoffman and Cynthia Seelhammer were attending via teleconference. Chair Hutchinson stated that transit tickets were available from Valley Metro/RPTA for those using transit to come to the meeting. Parking validation was available from MAG staff for those who parked in the parking garage. Chair Hutchinson stated that the addendum to the agenda, item #5K, and material for agenda item #10 were at each member's place.

3. Call to the Audience

Chair Hutchinson stated that Call to the Audience provides an opportunity to the public to address the Management Committee on items that are not on the agenda that are within the jurisdiction of MAG, or non-action agenda items that are on the agenda for discussion or information only. Chair Hutchinson noted that those wishing to comment on agenda items posted for action will be provided the opportunity at the time the item is heard. Public comments have a three minute time limit and there is a timer to help the public with their presentations. Chair Hutchinson stated that for members of the audience who wish to speak, comment cards were available from the staff.

Chair Hutchinson recognized public comment from Dianne Barker, who expressed her thanks for the transit tickets. She encouraged using inspiration and motivation for increasing alternative transportation. Ms. Barker said that she had received a call from Mr. McKnight on how to siphon off 50 percent of traffic. She commented that Mr. McKnight is very knowledgeable about the state of Arizona, and knows every back road. Ms. Barker noted upcoming MAG meetings. Ms. Barker commented on bonding if you cannot meet expenses. She stated that she thought there was a mistake on page five of the Annual Report where it says that the remaining projects in the Proposition 300 will be completed by mid-2008 and costs for the program are in balance with projected future funds available. Ms. Barker noted that the report goes on to say that program costs for the completion of the Proposition 300 Program are in balance with the projected future funds available, with costs exceeding available funds by about one-half of one percent. Chair Hutchinson thanked Ms. Barker for her comments.

Chair Hutchinson recognized public comment from William Crowley, who commented that 150 square miles of the region are not represented on the MAG bike map. He said that the supergrid only goes to the same line. Mr. Crowley asked if intersections and roadways are being upgraded, don't you want buses to go there also? Mr. Crowley commented that 4,000 out of 7,000 bus stops are not covered. He requested that the situation be reappraised, because people need to be covered first, before cars. Mr. Crowley added that when it is 117 degrees and no shade, people die. Chair Hutchinson thanked Mr. Crowley for his comments.

4. Executive Director's Report

Dennis Smith reported that the 2005 MAG Continuum of Care Regional Committee on Homelessness Annual Appreciation Luncheon was held on Friday, November 4, 2005. He stated that the Continuum of Care works on the Stuart B. McKinney grants each year. Last year, the Continuum was successful in bringing about $20 million of these grants to the MAG region. Mr. Smith noted that many elected officials attended the event. He expressed appreciation to Jerry Bisgrove from the Stardust Foundation for his sponsorship of this event and commitment to sponsor this event for the next five years. Mr. Smith noted that Gregg Holmes, who presented information to MAG committees on workforce housing, is involved in the Foundation. Mr. Smith stated that Phoenix Councilmember Greg Stanton spoke about his immersion experience in which he was homeless for a 24-hour period in an effort to better understand homelessness. Mr. Smith stated that the Maricopa County Board of Supervisors and Maricopa County Manager David Smith were acknowledged with Star Awards for their efforts and dedication to the Human Services Campus.

Mr. Smith noted that the November 16, 2005 Transportation Policy Committee meeting has been canceled. He advised that due to the December 21, 2005 meeting being close to the holiday season, it is anticipated that this meeting also will be canceled. Mr. Smith noted that during the time the TPC is not meeting, ADOT and Associated General Contractors are forming a stakeholders group to examine possible improvements to enhance the current construction delivery system. Chair Hutchinson thanked Mr. Smith for his report. No questions from the Committee were noted.

5. Approval of Consent Agenda

Chair Hutchinson stated that public comment would be heard before action was taken on the consent items. Each speaker is provided with a total of three minutes to comment on the consent agenda. After hearing public comments, any member of the Committee can request that an item be removed from the consent agenda and considered individually. Chair Hutchinson stated that agenda items #5A, #5B, #5C, #5D, #5E, #5F, #5G, #5H, #5I, #5J, and #5K were on the consent agenda.

Chair Hutchinson recognized public comment from Mr. Crowley, who voiced his concern that all of the action items are on the consent agenda which means that there are only three minutes to comment on all of the items. Mr. Crowley wondered if the park and ride lot at 19th Avenue and Peoria was related to light rail not going across I-17. He said if it is called the Metrocenter Extension you would figure it would go there. Mr. Crowley pointed out that the map shows light rail goes to Metrocenter, but the document says it stops in the Metrocenter area. He stated that light rail needs to go across I-17 to the Metrocenter transit center, and he added that a lot of money was recently spent for improvements to the center. Mr. Crowley stated that ADOT needs to understand that the bridge needs to be strengthened to accommodate light rail. Chair Hutchinson thanked Mr. Crowley for his comments.

Chair Hutchinson asked members if there was discussion on any of the consent agenda items. Mr. Buskirk requested that agenda item #5D be removed from the consent agenda. He explained that he would be abstaining from the vote because ADOT will be reviewing that classification at a later date.

Mr. Pettit moved to recommend approval of consent agenda items #5A, #5B, #5C, #5E, #5F, #5G, #5H, #5I, #5J, and #5K. Mr. Pickering seconded, and the motion carried unanimously.

5A. Approval of October 12, 2005 Meeting Minutes

The Management Committee, by consent, approved the October 12, 2005 meeting minutes.

5B. Consultant Selection for the MAG Human Services and Senior Transportation Assessment and Coordination Project

The Management Committee, by consent, recommended approval of selecting RLS and Associates, Inc. for the MAG Human Services and Senior Transportation Assessment and Coordination Project for an amount not to exceed $65,000. The FY 2005 MAG Unified Planning Work Program and Annual Budget, approved by the MAG Regional Council, includes $65,000

of Surface Transportation funding for the development of the MAG Human Services and Senior Transportation Assessment and Coordination Project. The purpose of the project is to develop recommendations on coordinating a human services transportation plan in conjunction with the state Arizona Rides program and the federal United We Ride program. A request for proposals was advertised and two proposals were received. A multi-agency review team evaluated the proposals and recommended to MAG the selection of RLS and Associates, Inc.

5C. Proposed Amendment and Administrative Adjustment to the FY 2006-2010 Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) for Highway and Transit Projects

The Management Committee, by consent, recommended approval of a TIP Amendment and Administrative Adjustment to the FY 2006-2010 MAG Transportation Improvement Program to add one new Safety (STP-HES) Funded project and one new High Priority (HPP) Funded project in Phoenix and one new Enhancement (STP-TEA) Funded project in Scottsdale and to make several adjustments to transit projects, and changes to existing highway projects as shown in the attached tables. Since approval of the Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) in July 2005, MAG has been notified of two projects from Phoenix and one from Scottsdale that need to be added to the TIP. A TIP Amendment is necessary to carry out these additions. Furthermore, there are several other changes needed that can be accomplished by means of an Administrative Adjustment. These include: (1) several changes to the funding of Valley Metro transit projects; (2) the deferral of two projects in Tempe and one in Paradise Valley; (3) a change to the funding of an intersection project in Mesa; (4) a restructure of a project in Glendale to advance design a FY 2009 project to FY 2006; (5) and a change to the funding of an ADOT Santan freeway project. Consultation on the air quality conformity assessment for both of the proposed Amendment and Adjustment changes is considered under a separate agenda item. The TRC recommended approval of the project changes described above.

5E. Request by Gila Bend to Utilize the HURF Exchange Mechanism

The Management Committee, by consent, recommended approval of allowing Gila Bend to utilize the HURF Swap mechanism for the project along Martin Avenue in the vicinity of Pima Street, also known as State Route 85, and to authorize a TIP Administrative Adjustment to allow the project to proceed. The FY 2006-2010 MAG TIP was approved by the Regional Council on July 28, 2005. The TIP contains a Gila Bend project to carry out pedestrian improvements to a facility along Martin Avenue in the vicinity of Pima Street, also known as State Route 85. This project is currently funded with $188,600 in MAG Surface Transportation Program (STP) funds and a local match of $11,400. The Town would like to take the option to exchange the STP-MAG funds for State Highway User Revenue Funds (HURF) utilizing the HURF Swap mechanism. This would allow the Town to develop the project as a locally funded project and not as a federally funded project, which simplifies the process. ADOT could then utilize the STP funds wherever they feel is appropriate on another part of the State highway system. Generally, MAG member agencies are not eligible to utilize the HURF Swap option, but the funds concerned are a special subset of STP funds (known as "Outside Urban" funds, or State-Flex funds) and are therefore eligible for this exchange program. A TIP Administrative Adjustment is also requested to allow this project to proceed. The Street Committee and the TRC unanimously recommended approval.

5F. Conformity Consultation

MAG is conducting consultation on a conformity assessment for an amendment to the FY 2006-2010 MAG Transportation Improvement Program. The proposed amendment includes new Safety and Transportation Enhancement funded projects for addition to FY 2006. In addition, some projects that were previously requested for deferral, need to be added to the TIP. The amendment includes projects that are categorized as exempt from conformity determinations and minor project revisions that do not require a conformity determination. This item was on the agenda for consultation.

5G. Update on Critical Issues with the Maricopa County Dust Control Program

Maricopa County has continued its efforts to address the enforcement of the Maricopa County Dust Control Rules. In total, the County Dust Control Program has 40 positions: 30 positions are filled and 10 are vacant. The recruitment notice for the remaining ten vacant positions was posted October 28, 2005. This item was on the agenda for information and discussion.

5H. Draft MAG 208 Water Quality Management Plan Amendment for the City of Glendale West Area Water Reclamation Facility Arizona Pollutant Discharge Elimination System Permit Discharge

The Management Committee, by consent, recommended approval of the Draft MAG 208 Water Quality Management Plan Amendment for the City of Glendale West Area Water Reclamation Facility Arizona Pollutant Discharge Elimination System Permit Discharge. The City of Glendale is requesting that MAG amend the 208 Water Quality Management Plan to include the West Area Water Reclamation Facility Arizona Pollutant Discharge Elimination System Permit Discharge. The project is within three miles of the City of Avondale, City of El Mirage, City of Litchfield Park, City of Peoria, City of Phoenix, Luke Air Force Base, and unincorporated Maricopa County. To date, six of the seven entities have indicated that have no objections. A public hearing on the draft amendment was conducted on October 12, 2005. Following the hearing, the MAG Water Quality Advisory Committee unanimously recommended approval of the Draft 208 Plan Amendment.

5I. Proposed 2006 Revisions to MAG Standard Specifications and Details for Public Works Construction

The MAG Standard Specifications and Details Committee has completed its review of proposed 2006 revisions to the MAG Standard Specifications and Details for Public Works Construction and these revisions are currently being reviewed by MAG Member Agency Public Works Directors and/or Engineers. It is anticipated that the annual update packet will be available for purchase in early January 2006. This item was on the agenda for information and discussion.

5J. Status Report on 2005 Census Survey

The 2005 Census Survey is now in progress. The results of the survey will be used to distribute billions of dollars in state shared revenue to cities and towns from 2006 to 2011. On August 30, 2005, the Census Bureau mailed out the 2005 Census Survey questionnaires to randomly

selected households in Maricopa County. On September 22, 2005, the Census Bureau mailed the 2005 Census Survey questionnaire a second time to those households that did not return their first census questionnaire. Mail returns of the questionnaires are nearing completion and telephone follow-up is being conducted up to November 6, 2005. Where there is no response to the telephone calls or phone numbers are not available, the Census Bureau will need to conduct a personal visit. It is anticipated that field work will be completed by Thanksgiving. For its original estimate, the Census Bureau assumed that 50 percent of the questionnaires would be returned by mail, 25 percent of the responses would be handled by telephone and 25 percent by a personal visit. As of October 27, 2005, the Census Bureau's revised estimate shows 46 percent of the questionnaires completed by mail, 8 percent completed by telephone interview and 46 percent completed by a personal visit. The cost for the 2005 Census Survey and count of population in group quarters has been estimated at $7.7 million. The Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) has authorized the use of FHWA funds to cover a portion of the estimated cost, while the remaining estimated cost will be incurred by MAG member agencies. The help and support of MAG member agencies, especially pertaining to creating address files for Census Bureau use, helped to keep initial cost increases down. MAG staff is meeting with the Census Bureau twice a week to discuss measures to control costs. The final costs will be based upon expenses actually incurred by the Census Bureau and will be determined in 2006. The goal of promotional and publicity efforts is to emphasize the importance of the 2005 Census Survey results to Valley residents and encourage those receiving a Census Survey to return their questionnaires or cooperate with a census enumerator who contacts them via phone or in person. Additional publicity efforts are crucial to control Census Bureau costs. The Census Bureau tracked return rates of the 2005 Census Survey mail questionnaire. MAG used the return rate data to create maps for each member agency. The maps identified census tracts that had low return rates of the 2005 Census Survey. Using the maps, member agencies increased publicity efforts by placing census door hangers, fliers and brochures in areas that had a low return rate of the 2005 Census Survey. Census publicity efforts continue. Many member agencies promoted the 2005 Census Survey at their Getting Arizona Involved In Neighborhoods (GAIN) events in October. In addition, census information was provided to citizens at the Arizona State Fair on October 29-30, 2005.

5K. Amendment of the FY 2006 MAG Unified Planning Work Program and Annual Budget to Accept Additional Funds to Support the MAG Human Services Program

The Management Committee, by consent, recommended approval to amend the FY 2006 MAG Unified Planning Work Program and Annual Budget to accept $16,732 from the Arizona Department of Economic Security for regional homeless planning and to accept an amount up to $10,000 from the Stardust Foundation for the annual Continuum of Care luncheon. MAG has recently received notice from the Arizona Department of Economic Security that $16,732 is being provided to MAG for regional homeless planning. The Stardust Foundation has also notified MAG that it will reimburse MAG up to $10,000 in costs for the annual Continuum of Care luncheon to support homeless advocacy efforts. It is necessary to amend the FY 2006 MAG Unified Planning Work Program and Annual Budget to receive these funds.

5D. Requested Changes to Federal Functional Classification of Roads

This item was removed from the consent agenda.

MAG member agencies recently submitted requests for upgrades to the functional classification of rural roadways in the region. In addition, the City of Scottsdale has requested a change to downgrade an urban road segment from urban collector to local street. The MAG Street Committee and the TRC unanimously recommended concurrence with these changes. Upon concurrence by the MAG Regional Council, these requested changes will be forwarded to ADOT for further action.

Chair Hutchinson asked Mr. Buskirk if he requested a presentation on agenda item #5D. Mr. Buskirk replied that a presentation was not necessary.

Mr. Pettit moved to recommend concurrence with the changes in Federal Functional Classification as recommended by the TRC and as shown in the attached map. Mr. Manley seconded. Chair Hutchinson asked if there were questions.

Mr. Cleveland asked how many road segments were on the map being considered. Paul Ward replied there were about 40 to 50. Mr. Cleveland suggested that a list of the roads might be helpful to include in the Regional Council agenda packet.

Mr. Pettit amended his motion to include that stipulation. Mr. Manley, as second, agreed. The vote taken on the motion passed, with Mr. Buskirk abstaining.

6. Annual Report on the Implementation of Proposition 400

Roger Herzog stated that A.R.S. 28-6354 requires that MAG issue an annual report on the status of projects funded by the sales tax. He stated that the report also includes changes to the RTP and plan priorities, and project financing. Mr. Herzog noted that the RTP Partners group, composed of representatives from MAG. ADOT, RPTA, and Valley Metro Rail, has been meeting to coordinate the implementation of Proposition 400 and provide input to the Annual Report.

Mr. Herzog stated that the Annual Report will be updated for each fiscal year from FY 2006 through FY 2026. He said that the Annual Report represents a snapshot at a particular point in time and includes information through FY 2005. He noted that the remaining Proposition 300 projects, which MAG is required to report on, are also included in the Annual Report. Mr. Herzog indicated that a Public Hearing on the Report will take place November 14, 2005.

Mr. Herzog displayed a chart of the funding sources for FY 2006 to FY 2026, totaling $31.7 billion, and uses of the funds. He noted that the use of funds includes an allowance for inflation, debt service, and return of principal.

Mr. Herzog reviewed the Freeway/Highway Program. He said that ADOT put together a life cycle program for the freeway/highway portion of the Plan and hired three management/engineering consultants. Mr. Herzog stated that $279 million for litter pickup and landscape maintenance and $75 million for noise mitigation are included in Proposition 400 funding. He stated that the TPC Freeway Maintenance/Noise Mitigation Subcommittee was formed to make recommendations on these two programs.

Mr. Herzog stated that ADOT has a number of preliminary engineering projects underway, which include design concept reports and environmental assessments for I-17, Loop 101 to the Carefree Highway; Loop 101, Princess Drive to Loop 202; and SR-51, Loop 101 to Shea Boulevard. He added that studies are also underway on Loop 303, the South Mountain Freeway corridor, and I-10.

Mr. Herzog indicated that the Proposition 300 Regional Freeway Program is almost complete, with segments remaining on the Santan and Red Mountain. He said that the Red Mountain Freeway completion is anticipated in mid-2008. Mr. Herzog displayed a chart that showed the funding sources and uses for the freeway/highway program from FY 2006 to FY 2026.

Mr. Herzog then addressed the Arterial Streets Program in the Annual Report. He stated that local jurisdictions will implement the projects in the program. Mr. Herzog stated that the Arterial Program Policies and Procedures were approved in June 2005 and the Arterial Life Cycle program was adopted in October 2005. Mr. Herzog stated that a number of project assessments have been prepared by member agencies to identify project design concepts and costs. The project assessments will be used in the development of project agreements. Mr. Herzog noted that federal funding legislation was recently reauthorized and the program will be refined based on the amount that the region receives. Mr. Herzog stated that work continues on drafting the model project agreement. He displayed a chart of funding sources and uses for the Arterial Street Program for FY 2006 to FY 2026, totaling $3 billion, that shows the program is in balance.

Mr. Herzog then reviewed the Transit Program in the Annual Report. He said that the Valley Metro Board adopted the program's guiding principles, financial model, and the program policies. Mr. Herzog stated that staff are working on bus service planning, park and ride predesign, and LRT standards and system studies. He noted that the LRT 20-mile minimum operating segment is expected to be completed in December 2008. Mr. Herzog displayed a chart of funding sources and uses of the Transit Program for FY 2006 to FY 2026.

Mr. Herzog addressed the key findings of the report. He said that the report found that a strong coordination effort is being pursued by the agencies implementing Proposition 400, of which the RTP Partners is an important element. He advised that the report found that the life cycle programming process has been initiated for all transportation modes, in keeping with state statute; the preliminary life cycle programs are consistent with the RTP and costs are in balance with projected revenues; and construction on the Proposition 300 Freeway Program will be completed by mid-2008 and costs are in balance with available revenues.

Mr. Herzog then reviewed future issues found by the report. He said that potential cost of future right-of-way will require careful monitoring and may warrant periodic program adjustments; material prices are facing an environment of global competition and limits on supply, affecting future construction costs and cost/revenue balance; the Federal New Starts Program for light rail may have a major effect on the schedule for implementing LRT route extensions; minimizing "scope creep," which is expansion of projects, will be a continuing challenge. Chair Hutchinson thanked Mr. Herzog for his report. No questions from the Committee were noted.

7. Commuter Rail Update

Eric Anderson gave an overview of commuter rail. He said that the High Capacity Transit (HCT) Study was completed in 2003, and as a result of the study, $5 million was placed in the Regional Transportation Plan to examine future implementation issues regarding commuter rail. Mr. Anderson advised that if further action on commuter rail is desired by member agencies, an update of commuter rail information could be considered as a consultant study in the FY 2007 MAG Unified Planning Work Program and Annual Budget.

Mr. Anderson stated that the commuter rail piece of the HCT study involved a comparison of commuter rail and light rail characteristics, a summary of commuter rail operations in other areas, an inventory and evaluation of rail infrastructure in the MAG region, ridership projections based on 2040 population and employment projections, cost estimates for commuter rail capital and operations by corridor. Mr. Anderson also reported on the Trinity Railway Express in Dallas.

Mr. Anderson showed a table of operating data for peer commuter rail systems in Los Angeles, San Diego, San Jose, Dallas, Chicago, and Toronto. He stated that commuter rail and light rail are complementary to each other; commuter rail is for longer trips and light rail is for shorter trips. Mr. Anderson noted that the average trip length for commuter rail was 25 miles with an average distance between stations of about five miles. He said that the light rail commutes average about five miles with stations located one mile or less apart.

Mr. Anderson showed a map of rail service in the MAG region, which is served by the Burlington Northern Santa Fe (BNSF) and the Union Pacific (UP). He stated that the BNSF line from Phoenix to Wickenburg is a single track of about 53 miles in length with 55 at-grade street crossings. He noted that about five trains per day use the track, although this number might have increased since the study was done. Mr. Anderson noted that the right-of-way is 100 feet wide, making the installation of another track possible. The track does not have an existing train signal system, which would probably be necessary for commuter rail service. Mr. Anderson stated that the corridor has a maximum speed of 49 miles per hour, although for most of the track in the more populated areas the speeds are closer to 15 to 25 miles per hour. Mr. Anderson noted that freight traffic has a priority use for the track.

Mr. Anderson then spoke about the BNSF yard facilities. He said that BNSF has a maintenance and switch yard facility near 19th Avenue and McDowell Road. Another facility, at 51st Avenue along Grand Avenue, is used to load and unload truck trailers onto the rail line, which could be an impediment to commuter rail operations. Mr. Anderson stated that the BNSF operating facilities are at capacity and BNSF has plans to move most of its operations farther out on the Grand Avenue corridor.

Mr. Anderson noted that upgrades or changes in the BNSF corridor that would be desirable for implementing commuter rail include installing a train signal control system, laying a second track, lengthening sidings, and reducing main track switching activity by moving BNSF operations. He added that the right-of-way is suitable for accommodating another track.

Mr. Anderson stated that the UP track is about 75 miles long and includes 109 mainline grade crossings. It is a single-track configuration with sidings to allow trains to pass at certain points. Mr. Anderson said that the mainline is signalized and has a speed limit that varies from 15 to 60 miles per hour, with lesser speeds at grade crossings. The right-of-way is generally 100 feet wide. He said that when the HCT study was done, the UP operated about six trains per day.

Mr. Anderson stated that the principal UP operating yard is located in downtown Phoenix, bounded by 7th Street and 16th Street. He stated that changes in the UP corridor that would be desirable for implementing commuter rail include upgrading rails and replacing ties, replacing the signal systems, and good coordination with freight traffic.

Mr. Anderson stated that there are operational issues common to both companies that would need to be addressed, including the ownership (whether an agency purchases or leases the line), liability and risk management, freight/passenger capacity conflicts, grade crossings, noise impacts, station impacts, capital needs, operating and maintenance costs, and governance structure.

Mr. Anderson stated that ridership projections were produced based in the interim population and employment projections. Phase 1 was based on 2020 projections with three inbound and three outbound peak hour daily trains. Phase 3 was based on the 2040 population and employment forecasts with full commuter service.

Mr. Anderson then addressed cost estimates for commuter rail capital and operations by corridor. He stated that Phase 1 capital costs for BNSF are estimated at more than $300 million, with a little less for UP. Mr. Anderson reviewed the projected operating costs by corridor.

Mr. Anderson spoke about the Dallas Area Rapid Transit (DART), which operates fixed route bus service, as well as light rail transit (LRT) and commuter rail. He displayed a chart of the operating subsidy per passenger for the various transit services provided by DART.

Mr. Anderson stated that the commuter rail study update could include a review of peer commuter rail systems, an inventory of rail infrastructure and operations, including freight, which was not included in the HCT study, updated ridership projections, capital and operating costs, and implementation steps over the next decade or so. Mr. Anderson stated that there will most likely be discussion with ADOT on rail on a statewide basis. He said that a group of stakeholders could be formed to assist in the development of the scope of work if the consultant study is done.

Mr. Rumpeltes suggested including a review of funding options to ensure there is no competition with funding for freeways and light rail.

Mr. Fooks asked for clarification of uses for the $5 million in the RTP for commuter rail. Mr. Anderson stated that the $5 million was put into the RTP for implementation, and could be used for advance planning, contract negotiations, etc. He added that it was not allocated to a particular year, but over 20 years. Mr. Anderson commented that the study update is estimated to cost approximately $300,000 to $500,000. He said that the study would provide an understanding of the approach, then the $5 million could be used for implementation. Mr. Fooks

asked what would be needed to process this sooner than next year. Dennis Smith replied that staff proposes this be considered on the January 2006 agenda. He said that a stakeholders group could start discussion on the scope of work and have the recommendation for the selection of a consultant in June or July.

Mr. Rumpeltes asked if the study update could look at the demographics of users and what drives demand to see if results would be more positive than the last study. Dennis Smith commented that staff thinks that a statewide look is probably needed. He added that the area west of the White Tanks would studied. Mr. Smith noted that because of geographic features only I-10 and Bell Road have through-access.

Mr. Buskirk commented that a number of studies on rail have been conducted over the past 20 years. He suggested one thing to include in the scope would be the review of these earlier works.

8. Presentation and Discussion on the Cost Estimation Process for Freeway Projects

Mr. Anderson gave an overview of highway construction costs. He said that supply and demand are affecting material costs. He said that transportation costs, material availability, increasing demand for materials from China and the Pacific rim countries, the Gulf Coast rebuilding, the 75 percent tariff on Mexican cement, railroad capacity, and energy are all factors in rising costs.

Mr. Anderson stated that there have been recent significant increases on cement, aggregate, steel, lumber, petroleum products, and PVC conduit. For example, the cost for cement was $100 per ton in August and $117 per ton in October. Steel rose from 55 cents per pound in 2003 to $1.03 per pound in 2005. Mr. Anderson stated that the cost of aggregate, which is used in concrete, increased 30 percent in the past year due to processing and hauling costs and reduced availability of sources. Mr. Anderson noted that difficulties in obtaining governmental permits due to environmental concerns also added to the cost of aggregate. He added that PM-10 is a great concern for this region. Mr. Anderson stated that another significant factor is the price of diesel fuel, which increased 70 percent in the past year.

Mr. Anderson stated that even though there are thousands of people moving here there still is a shortage of skilled available labor. He said that some of it is due to the high level of construction in the state and Gulf Coast rebuilding. Mr. Anderson noted that rail and trucking are at capacity. In addition, railroads are tending to carry higher value products at the expense of high-weight, low-value commodities.

Mr. Anderson then addressed the impact of these factors on recent bids. He said that the State's estimate was $59.7 million for the US-60 widening from Gilbert to Power Road project. Two bids were received and the low bid was $73.7 million, which was 23 percent over the estimate. Mr. Anderson stated that the State's estimate was $52.4 million for the Red Mountain, University to Southern project. He said that only one bid was received in the amount of $68.4 million, which was 38 percent over the estimate. Mr. Anderson stated that the State's estimate for the I-17, Cactus Road traffic interchange project was $3.6 million. One bid was received in the amount of $5.9 million, which was 64 percent over the estimate. Mr. Anderson noted that

this summer, bids received were 20 to 45 percent higher than estimates. He added that ADOT is currently raising cost estimates to reflect current prices.

Mr. Anderson advised that the strategies may vary whether the current situation is a result of short term price spikes that will come back down, higher prices that will form a new plateau, or prices that will continue to climb. He said that the situation will continue to be monitored.

Mr. Anderson stated that a Task Force with ADOT and industry representatives are examining program delivery options, such as cost adjustment clauses and the size of projects. He said that a progress report will be given to the TPC in January 2006. Mr. Anderson stated that contingencies were built into the RTP. He said that one piece of good news is that revenue from the sales tax was up 18 percent in the July to September period, which is a record level. Mr. Anderson noted that ADOT has been looking at the main source of this increase, and it seems to be coming from all sectors. He added that this rate of growth probably will not continue.

Chair Hutchinson asked Mr. Anderson if he had ever seen the situation so critical before. Mr. Anderson replied that there were a lot of issues with Proposition 300. He said that there is now increased communication among agencies and dialogue taking place between ADOT and contractors that never happened after the 1985 vote. Mr. Anderson indicated that it is a serious concern. We need to produce a fiscally balanced plan and are taking proactive measures to deal with it now.

Mr. Buskirk commented that low number of bids being received is also impacting the prices being paid.

Mr. Rumpeltes asked if assembling a database of comparable costs, unit pricing, etc. was being considered. Mr. Anderson replied that ADOT maintains such a database on the highway side. He added that developing such a database for street projects was discussed recently by the MAG Street Committee.

9. Presentation and Discussion of the Status of Freeway Projects by Corridor

Mr. Anderson reported on the implementation of Phase 1 of RTP by ADOT. He displayed a map of widenings and improvements to the existing corridors of Grand Avenue, SR-85, I-10, Loop 202 and US60. Mr. Anderson reviewed the HOV lane projects on SR-51, Loop 101 and Loop 202 and HOV and general purpose lanes on I-17, I-10, and US-60. He then showed the new freeway corridors and right-of-way for Loop 303 and Loop 202 (South Mountain). Mr. Anderson explained the ongoing and upcoming studies on corridors.

Mr. Anderson moved on to more detail on the South Mountain project. He said that the Environmental Impact Statement was initiated in 2001, and completion is expected in 2007. Mr. Anderson noted that three connections with I-10 being considered: the MAG-adopted connection at 55th Avenue, one at 71st Avenue, and one at Loop 101. He advised that at this time, Pecos Road is the only alignment being considered because the Gila Indian Community has not indicated it will allow the freeway onto its land. Mr. Anderson displayed a map that showed the three options for a connection to I-10. He noted that three public meetings on the alignment will be held by ADOT during the month of November, with a preliminary recommendation from

ADOT and FHWA is anticipated in February or March 2006. Mr. Anderson advised that an alignment change from the MAG-adopted connection would require a major amendment to the RTP. Chair Hutchinson thanked Mr. Anderson for his report. No questions from the Committee were noted.

10. Request by Maricopa County for Financial Participation in the Human Services Campus

David Smith, Maricopa County Administrator, reported on the Human Services Campus that opened November 7, 2005. He said that the Campus is a partnership of private, faith-based, and government agencies to create a solution for homelessness. He said that the funding goal was 50 percent private and 50 percent public. Mr. Smith said that the Campus houses state, county and nonprofit services for the homeless, including Central Arizona Shelter Services, Maricopa County Healthcare for the Homeless, NOVA Safe Haven, St. Vincent de Paul and St. Joseph the Worker. Mr. Smith displayed the Campus plan. He noted that a key facility at the Campus is the Day Resource Center, which was instrumental in getting 300 people off the street in the past 16 months. Mr. Smith noted that completion of Phase 2 of the Campus is anticipated in January 2007.

Mr. Smith stated that the Campus is projected to impact the community and economy by revitalizing the area and being a significant employer. He said that the County conducted an economic study that showed shelters are more cost effective in providing health care on a preventive basis than other settings. Mr. Smith added that the Public Health Department and the Emergency Planning Department are currently working on a collaborative approach to help homeless people deal with the summer heat.

Mr. Smith stated that total construction costs are estimated to be $24.6 million, to be paid through a private and public partnership including Maricopa County and the City of Phoenix. He said that $20.7 million in cash has been committed, leaving a $4 million gap. Mr. Smith displayed a list of public and private donors to the Campus. He stated that Maricopa County is requesting assistance from the remaining MAG member agencies to help with $1 million of funding for the project.

Mr. Smith then explained the Point in Time Procedure, a survey where clients were asked which cities they lived in prior to intake at Central Arizona Shelter Services. Mr. Smith noted that the survey showed that homeless people lived in cities throughout the region. He then presented a tentative chart of proportional share of the $1 million that was put together based on population. Mr. Smith noted that Phoenix was not included on the list because it had already given a substantial amount of money to the Campus. He stated that cities could spread their pledge over a period of years or in conjunction with the creation of an additional funding stream. Mr. Smith stated that the Human Services Campus is mainly for adult men and women and there is a need for facilities for families and domestic violence victims. If a fund is created, money every year could pay off the campus and create opportunities for developing regionally sited facilities specific to the needs of communities.

Chair Hutchinson expressed his appreciation to Mr. Smith for his leadership in this issue and complimented him on the fund raising. He commended the County and the City of Phoenix for the efforts.

Mr. Ellis stated that the Campus is a great project and model for the country. He said that homelessness is a regional problem and extended his congratulations to the County and Phoenix for their efforts to bring the Campus to the region. Mr. Ellis stated that when his city begins the budget process, he will recommend his city provide its share of the funding.

Mr. Rumpeltes echoed Mr. Ellis's comments. He said he had spent 20 years in county government and there is never enough money to pay for all projects.

11. Election of Management Committee Officers

At the June 15, 2005 Management Committee meeting, an election was held to select the positions of Chair and Vice Chair. Recently, Mike Hutchinson, Chair of the Management Committee, has announced that he is retiring from his city management position by the end of calendar year 2005. Traditionally, the Chair and Vice Chair have served for two one-year terms. The current Chair and Vice Chair are nearing the end of serving their two one-year terms (June 30, 2006). In the past, these positions have rotated to achieve geographic balance for the officers. The practice has been to have the outgoing Chair be responsible for working with members to nominate a Manager for the vacated Vice Chair position. In doing so, the Chair would pay particular attention to seeking a nominee which provides geographic balance in the Chair and Vice Chair positions. The current Vice Chair would, as in the past, be nominated for the Chair position.

Mr. Martinsen moved to nominate Ed Beasley as Chair and Jan Dolan as Vice Chair to serve the remainder of the term to June 30, 2006. Mr. Fairbanks seconded, and the motion carried unanimously.

12. Comments from the Committee

An opportunity will be provided for Management Committee members to present a brief summary of current events. The Management Committee is not allowed to propose, discuss, deliberate or take action at the meeting on any matter in the summary, unless the specific matter is properly noticed for legal action.

Mr. Beasley presented a Resolution of Appreciation to Mr. Hutchinson for his dedicated service to the MAG region over the years. Mr. Beasley stated that Mr. Hutchinson dealt with issues using patience and dignity. He said that Mr. Hutchinson is a model for those who worked with him and for those who wish to enter the profession.

Mr. Hutchinson thanked the Committee. He said that he has worked with Dennis Smith and MAG for years. MAG has experienced some bumps, but has solved some serious regional issues. Mr. Hutchinson complimented Mr. Smith and his staff, member agency staff, and intergovernmental representatives for their work on complicated issues. He said that the member agencies accomplish great things through the MAG organization and should be proud.

Mr. Rumpeltes expressed his thanks to Dennis Smith for coming to the Surprise Citizens Academy for an evening presentation on transportation, which is his city's number one priority. Mr. Rumpeltes noted that he heard many comments on how good the presentation was.

There being no further business, the meeting adjourned at 1:45 p.m.

Chairman

Secretary

Agenda Item #5B

MARICOPA ASSOCIATION OF GOVERNMENTS INFORMATION SUMMARY... for your review

DATE:
January 3, 2006

SUBJECT:
MAG Vehicle Occupancy Study Consultant Selection

SUMMARY:
The FY 2006 MAG Unified Planning Work Program and Annual Budget includes $170,000 to conduct the Vehicle Occupancy Study. The study will determine the number of people who are sharing rides in High Occupancy Vehicle (HOV) lanes, the number of single occupant vehicles in the HOV lanes, the auto occupancy in the general purpose lanes, and the number of vehicles by classification. The auto occupancy data will be used to calibrate the mode choice model in order to produce accurate high occupancy vehicle estimates. The vehicle classification data collected will be used to calibrate the MAG truck travel model. Understanding truck travel has many important uses in the regional planning process. These uses include air quality modeling, pavement design, and noise studies. Also, the data from this study will be used in a following study to check the accuracy of detectors on the MAG Freeway System.

The request for proposals was advertised in September 2005. One proposal was received from United Civil Group Corporation. United Civil Group met the requirements outlined in the request for proposals. On November 3, 2005, a multi jurisdictional evaluation team consisting of MAG member agencies and MAG staff interviewed the firm. Their recommendation to MAG was to select United Civil Group to conduct the study in an amount not to exceed $170,000.

PUBLIC INPUT:
No public input was received.

PROS & CONS:
PROS: The information gathered from this study will be used to document the use of the existing HOV lanes, plan for new HOV lanes and refine the MAG travel demand model to better forecast travel on HOV lanes. Also, the vehicle classification data will be used to refine the truck travel model to better forecast truck travel.

CONS: None.

TECHNICAL & POLICY IMPLICATIONS:
TECHNICAL: This study will enable MAG to better understand HOV behavior and truck travel which will help refine the MAG travel demand model.

POLICY: This study will help to make better decisions with respect to HOV lanes on the MAG Freeway Management System as well as truck travel in the region.

ACTION NEEDED:
Recommend that United Civil Group Corp. be selected to conduct the MAG Vehicle Occupancy Study for an amount not to exceed $170,000.

PRIOR COMMITTEE ACTIONS:
On November 3, 2005, the proposal evaluation team interviewed the firm and recommended to MAG the selection of United Civil Group to conduct the study in an amount not to exceed $170,000.

PROPOSAL EVALUATION TEAM

Frank McCullagh, Arizona Department of Transportation
Allan Grover, City of Glendale
Dave Wolfson, Maricopa County Department of Transportation
Patrick Pittenger, City of Mesa
Ron Amaya, City of Peoria
Ali Makarchi, City of Phoenix
Dave Meinhart, City of Scottsdale
Stuart Boggs, Valley Metro/RPTA
Mark Schlappi, Maricopa Association of Governments

CONTACT PERSON:
Ratna Korepella, MAG (602) 254-6300

Agenda Item #5C

MARICOPA ASSOCIATION OF GOVERNMENTS INFORMATION SUMMARY... for your review

DATE:
January 3, 2006

SUBJECT:
2006 MAG Freeway Level of Service Study Consultant Selection

SUMMARY:
The FY 2006 MAG Unified Planning Work Program and Annual Budget includes $120,000 to conduct the 2006 MAG Freeway Level of Service (LOS) study. The work plan provides a complete overview of peak-period traffic conditions on the whole freeway system of Phoenix metro area. It also will compare current congestion with congestion observed in 2001. By using aerial survey technology, this study will update information on freeway traffic conditions and evaluate freeway LOS in the MAG urbanized area. The data derived from the aerial survey include freeway traffic density/LOS, ramp queues, etc. Information from this study will be used to help identify freeway bottlenecks, to help prioritize improvement projects, and to calibrate the MAG travel demand model.

One proposal, from Skycomp, Inc., was received in response to the request for proposals (RFP) advertised in October 2005. A multi-agency proposal evaluation team consisting of MAG and member agency staff reviewed the proposal document. On December 13, 2005, the evaluation team interviewed the firm and recommended to MAG the selection of Skycomp to conduct the study in an amount not to exceed $120,000.

PUBLIC INPUT:
None.

PROS & CONS:
PROS: This study will enable MAG to fully grasp current freeway congestion, and it will help decision-makers to conceive and prioritize freeway projects.

CONS: None.

TECHNICAL & POLICY IMPLICATIONS:
TECHNICAL: This study will obtain information of spatio-temporal traffic conditions (LOS) on all freeways during peak periods. The study will help to identify causes of bottlenecks and impacts of ramps. This study will further enable MAG to observe the traffic characteristics at locations with the absence of any surveillance device. This data will also be used to calibrate the MAG travel forecast model for estimating congestion in the future.

POLICY: Obtaining peak hour LOS data on freeways will help with freeway operations/management, transportation planning, and programming decisions.

ACTION NEEDED:
Recommend that Skycomp, Inc. be selected to conduct the 2006 MAG Freeway Level of Service Study for an amount not to exceed $120,000.

PRIOR COMMITTEE ACTIONS:

On December 13, 2005, the multi-jurisdictional proposal evaluation team interviewed the firm and recommended to MAG that Skycomp, Inc. be selected to conduct the 2006 MAG Freeway Level of Service Study for an amount not to exceed $120,000.

PROPOSAL EVALUATION TEAM

Frank McCullagh, Arizona Department of Transportation
Greg Davis, City of Glendale
Dave Wolfson, Maricopa County Department of Transportation
Patrick Pittenger, City of Mesa
David Moody, City of Peoria
Donald J. Herp, City of Phoenix
John Lynch, City of Scottsdale
Mark Schlappi, Maricopa Association of Governments

CONTACT PERSON:

Wang Zhang, MAG (602) 254-6300

Agenda Item #5D

MARICOPA ASSOCIATION OF GOVERNMENTS INFORMATION SUMMARY... for your review

DATE:
January 3, 2006

SUBJECT:
Recommendation of Projects for MAG Federal Funding in FY 2011 of the FY 2007-2011 MAG Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) - the MAG Federally Funded Program

SUMMARY:
The MAG Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) targets all future MAG Federal Funds to specific modes and, in some cases, identifies specific projects for the funds. For ITS, Bicycle, Pedestrian and Air Quality projects, the RTP identified funds, but did not specify individual projects. Requests for projects for the MAG Federal funds expected to be available for FY 2011 have been received, ranked by modal technical advisory committees (TACs) and those rankings were reviewed by the Transportation Review Committee (TRC) on December 8, 2005. The attached table contains the most recently recommended projects from the Air Quality, Bicycle, Pedestrian and ITS modes. The approved projects from these modes will be combined with other recommendations for the life cycle programs for freeways, arterials and transit, to form a MAG Federally Funded program. This program will then be added to the regionally funded components of the freeway, arterial and transit life cycle programs, projects from the state highway program and any locally/privately funded projects being submitted for inclusion in the TIP to form the draft TIP (Listing of Projects).

PUBLIC INPUT:
The results of the early phase public input meetings for the Regional Transportation Plan and TIP are presented in the FY 2006 Early Phase Input Opportunity Report. An opportunity for input will also occur at the mid-phase meetings in March/April 2006 and at the final phase meetings to be conducted upon completion of the air quality conformity analysis. Continuous opportunities for public input are also available. There were no direct comments on this item from members of the public at the TRC meeting on December 8, 2005.

PROS & CONS:
PROS: Approval of the funding for these projects will enable their inclusion in the TIP and will allow jurisdictions to develop their projects in a timely and integrated manner.

CONS: If these projects are not approved, the time to develop projects will be limited and the availability of contingency projects will be less. Timely development of projects is needed to ensure that MAG federal funds are fully utilized and to enhance opportunities for additional federal funds.

TECHNICAL & POLICY IMPLICATIONS:
TECHNICAL: Project selection has been addressed by members of MAG technical advisory committees. Congestion Management System and Air Quality Emission Reduction scores were considered and the program is fiscally balanced.

POLICY: The MAG federally funded program has been developed in accord with federal regulations and MAG policies.

ACTION NEEDED:
Recommend approval of the projects for CMAQ discretionary funding in FY 2011 and to include those projects in the Draft FY 2007-2011 MAG Transportation Improvement Program for public review and comment.

PRIOR COMMITTEE ACTIONS:
Transportation Review Committee: On December 8, 2005, the TRC unanimously recommended approval of the projects submitted for consideration for MAG Federal Funds in FY 2011 in the Draft FY 2007-2011 MAG TIP, as shown in the attached tables.

MEMBERS ATTENDING

Maricopa County: Mike Ellegood, Chairman
ADOT: Dan Lance
Avondale: David Fitzhugh
* Chandler: Patrice Kraus
* El Mirage: B.J. Cornwall
Fountain Hills: Randy Harrel
* Gila Bend: Lynn Farmer
* Gilbert: Tami Ryall
Glendale: Terry Johnson
* Goodyear: Cato Esquivel
* Guadalupe: Jim Ricker
* Litchfield Park: Mike Cartsonis
Mesa: Jeff Martin
* Paradise Valley: Robert M. Cicarelli
* Peoria: David Moody
Phoenix: Don Herp for Tom Callow
Queen Creek: Mark Young
RPTA: Bryan Jungwirth
Scottsdale: Mary O'Connor
Surprise: Randy Overmyer
Tempe: Carlos De Leon
* Wickenburg: Shane Dille
Valley Metro Rail: John Farry

EX-OFFICIO MEMBERS ATTENDING

* Regional Bicycle Task Force: Randi Alcott, RPTA
* Street Committee: Larry Shobe, Tempe
* ITS Committee: Alan Sanderson, Mesa
* Pedestrian Working Group: Eric Iwersen, Tempe
* Telecommunications Advisory Group:

* Those members neither present nor represented by proxy.

Air Quality Technical Advisory Committee (AQTAC): On October 6, 2005, the AQTAC unanimously recommended approval of the projects submitted for consideration for MAG Federal Funds in FY 2011 in the Draft FY 2007-2011 MAG TIP, as shown in the attached table.

MEMBERS ATTENDING

Stephen Cleveland, City of Goodyear, Chair
Avondale: Michael Powell
Buckeye: Cathy Charney for Carroll Reynolds
#Chandler: Jim Weiss
* El Mirage: Lucky Roberts
Gilbert: Greg Svelund for Tami Ryall
Glendale: Doug Kukino
Mesa: Scott Bouchie
Phoenix: Joe Gibbs for Gaye Knight
Scottsdale: Larry Person
* Surprise: Jim Nichols
Tempe: Oddvar Tveit
* Citizen Representative: Walter Bouchard
* American Lung Association of Arizona: Bill Pfeifer
Salt River Project: Sunil Varma
Southwest Gas Corporation: Brian O'Donnell
* Greater Phoenix Chamber of Commerce: Michelle Rill
* Associated General Contractors: Amanda McGennis
* Homebuilders Association of Central Arizona: Connie Wilhelm-Garcia
* American Institute of Architects - Central Arizona: Stephen J. Andros
* Valley Forward: Peter Allard
* University of Arizona - Cooperative Extension: Patrick Clay
Arizona Department of Transportation: Beverly Chenausky
Arizona Department of Environmental Quality: Peter Hyde
* Environmental Protection Agency: Wienke Tax
Maricopa County Air Quality Department:

* Arizona Public Service Company: Jim Mikula
* Western States Petroleum Association: Gina Grey
Valley Metro: Betsy Turner for Randi Alcott
* Arizona Motor Transport Association: Dave Berry
* Maricopa County Farm Bureau: Jeannette Fish
* Arizona Rock Products Association: Rusty Bowers
Jo Crumbaker
* Arizona Department of Weights and Measures: Duane Yantorno
Federal Highway Administration: Ed Stillings
Arizona State University: Hank Dabibi for Judi Nelson
Salt River Pima-Maricopa Indian Community: Allison Bree Desmond for B. Bobby Ramirez

* Members neither present nor represented by proxy.
#Participated via telephone conference call.

Combined Pedestrian Working Group and Regional Bicycle Task Force: On October 25, 2005, at a combined meeting of the Pedestrian Working Group and Regional Bicycle Task Force, the combined committee unanimously recommended CMAQ funding for six bicycle projects and eight pedestrian projects as shown in the attached tables.

MEMBERS ATTENDING

Tami Ryall, Gilbert, Chair, Bicycle Task Force and Acting Chair, Pedestrian Working Group
Bruce Meyers, ADOA Gen. Services
Michael Sanders, ADOT
* Michael Eagan, ASLA, Arizona Chapter
Anna Bertanzetti, Avondale
Michael Normand, Chandler
Bill Lazenby, Coalition of Arizona Bicyclists
Steve Hancock, Glendale
Farhad Tavassoli, Goodyear
* Michael Cartsonis, Litchfield Park
Peggy Rubach, Maricopa County
Mitch Foy, Mesa
Karen Flores, Peoria
* Katherine Coles, Phoenix
Briiana Leon, Phoenix
Randi Alcott, RPTA
* Dawn Coomer, Scottsdale
Reed Kempton, Scottsdale
Eric Iwersen, Tempe
Randy Overmeyer for Lee Lambert, Surprise
Mark Smith, El Mirage

* Those members neither present nor represented by proxy.

Intelligent Transportation Systems (ITS) Committee: On October 12, 2005, the ITS committee unanimously recommended CMAQ funding for thirteen projects as shown in the attached tables.

MEMBERS ATTENDING

Alan Sanderson, Mesa, Chairman
Jimmie Dixon for Debbie Burdette, Glendale
Mike Mah, Chandler
Bruce Ward, Gilbert
Faisal Saleem for Nicolaas Swart, Maricopa County
Ron Doubek, City of Phoenix
Bob Ciotti, RPTA
Mike Lockhart, DPS
Bob Maki for Nick Mascia, Surprise
* Carrol Reynolds, Town of Buckeye
Bruce Dressel, Scottsdale
Jim Decker, Tempe
Debra Barker for Tim Wolfe, ADOT
Ron Amaya, Peoria
Scott Nodes, Goodyear
Mary Kihl, ASU
* Alan Hansen, FHWA
* Dennis Murphy, Phoenix Aviation
* Michael Smith, City of Avondale
* BJ Cornwall, City of El Mirage
* Mark Young for Michael Shine, Queen Creek

* Those members neither present nor represented by proxy.

CONTACT PERSON:
Paul Ward, (602) 254-6300

REPORT: FY 2011 MAG Fed Project Recommendations

RECOMMENDATIONS FOR MAG FEDERAL FUNDS IN FY 2011 OF THE DRAFT FY 2007-2011 MAG TIP

TABLE : TRC - 07-11 TIP MAG FED FUNDS 010306

MODE: *AQ or TDM*

Recommended by TRC

ID#	Location	Type of Work	Fund Type	AQ Score	Local Cost	Federal Cost	Total Cost
MAGFED 07-05	Regionwide	Pave dirt roads program	CMAQ	862	$221,131	$3,658,362	$3,879,493
MAGFED 07-06	Regionwide	Purchase PM-10 certified street sweepers	CMAQ	1,825	$54,401	$900,000	$954,401
MAGFED 07-01	Regionwide	MAG/Valley Metro telework outreach and ozone education program	CMAQ	2,195	$0	$330,000	$330,000
MAGFED 07-07	Regionwide	Travel reduction program	CMAQ	4,732	$0	$910,000	$910,000
MAGFED 07-02	Regionwide	Regional rideshare program	CMAQ	5,447	$0	$721,000	$721,000
MAGFED 07-03	Regionwide	Capitol rideshare program	CMAQ	92,272	$0	$135,000	$135,000

TOTALS FOR Recommended / NOT Recommended:

LOCAL:	FEDERAL:	TOTAL:
$275,532	***$6,654,362***	***$6,929,894***

TOTALS FOR ALL REQUESTS BY MODE: *AQ or TDM*

LOCAL:	FEDERAL:	TOTAL:
$275,532	***$6,654,362***	***$6,929,894***

MODE: *Bicycle*

Recommended by TRC

ID#	Location	Type of Work	Fund Type	AQ Score	Local Cost	Federal Cost	Total Cost
MMAFED 07-01R	Forrest Rd: McDowell Mountain Rd to Rio Verde Dr	Add paved dirt shoulder and bike lane on both sides	CMAQ	20,315	$464,751	$400,000	$864,751
MAGFED 07-04S	Regionwide	Bicycle safety education program	CMAQ	22,665	$8,500	$20,000	$28,500
GDYFED 07-01	Estrella Pkwy: Gila River Bridge to Yuma Rd	Design and construct on-road bike lane	CMAQ	38,323	$33,855	$78,994	$112,849
PEOFED 07-01R	New River Trail at Peoria and Olive Aves	Acquire right of way, design and construct roadway crossings	CMAQ	374,280	$820,000	$700,000	$1,520,000
GLNFED 07-01R	New River (East Bank): Northern Ave to Bethany Home Rd	Construct multi-use path and underpasses, with landscaping, lighting, parking and pedestrian facilities	CMAQ	379,342	$1,619,000	$1,000,000	$2,619,000
PHXFED 07-01R	24th St: Chipman Rd to Roeser Rd	Acquire right of way and construct multi-use path	CMAQ	2,529,452	$2,719,000	$1,700,000	$4,419,000

TOTALS FOR Recommended / NOT Recommended:

LOCAL: ***$5,665,106***

FEDERAL: ***$3,898,994***

TOTAL: ***$9,564,100***

NOT Recommended by TRC

ID#	Location	Type of Work	Fund Type	AQ Score	Local Cost	Federal Cost	Total Cost
CHNFED 07-01	Citywide	Update bicycle plan	CMAQ		$45,000	$105,000	$150,000
SCTFED 07-04	Various locations	Purchase and install upgraded bicycle racks	CMAQ		$45,000	$105,000	$150,000
SCTFED 07-01	Arizona Canal: 64th St to Goldwater Blvd	Design and construct multi-use path	CMAQ	200,642	$487,306	$591,919	$1,079,225
GDYFED 07-02	Old Litchfield Industrial Lead Railroad: Yuma Rd to McDowell Rd	Design and convert an unused rail corridor into a multi-use path	CMAQ	300,754	$249,000	$581,000	$830,000

MODE: ***Bicycle***

NOT Recommended by TRC

ID#	Location	Type of Work	Fund Type	AQ Score	Local Cost	Federal Cost	Total Cost
SCTFED 07-03	CAP Canal: Via Linda to Sweetwater Ave	Design and construct multi-use path	CMAQ	361,402	$1,503,238	$1,213,238	$2,716,476
PHXFED 07-02	Rio Salado Pathway: 28th St to Tempe Drain	Construct multi-use path, including landscape, irrigation and rest facilities	CMAQ	775,905	$757,000	$1,764,000	$2,521,000
SCTFED 07-02	Crosscut Canal: Thomas Rd to Indian School Rd	Design and construct multi-use path	CMAQ	943,533	$624,074	$779,506	$1,403,580
MESFED 07-01	Pueblo St (alignment): Crismon Rd to half mile east (Parkwood Ranch Subdivision)	Design and construct multi-use pathway	CMAQ	954,256	$268,111	$625,593	$893,704

TOTALS FOR Recommended / NOT Recommended:

LOCAL: ***$3,978,729*** **FEDERAL:** ***$5,765,256*** **TOTAL:** ***$9,743,985***

TOTALS FOR ALL REQUESTS BY MODE: ***Bicycle***

LOCAL: ***$9,643,835*** **FEDERAL:** ***$9,664,250*** **TOTAL:** ***$19,308,085***

MODE: *ITS*

Recommended by TRC

ID#	Location	Type of Work	Fund Type	AQ Score	Local Cost	Federal Cost	Total Cost
TMPFED 07-03R	Various locations	Install fibre optic connection between ADOT FMS backbone and signal cabinets at 22 interchanges	CMAQ	13,926	$54,400	$100,294	$154,694
TMPFED 07-04	Various locations	Install wireless communications and CCTV monitoring at 26 intersections	CMAQ	13,926	$93,600	$218,400	$312,000
SCTFED 07-05R	Scottsdale and Hayden Rds: Shea Blvd to McDowell Rd	Install detection equipment, variable message signs and software	CMAQ	15,068	$177,500	$102,500	$280,000
GDYFED 07-03R	Citywide	Implement traffic signal system, including installation of ITS backbone and communications equipment	CMAQ	94,753	$700,000	$700,000	$1,400,000
QNCFED 07-01R	Townwide	Design and construct/implement ITS hardware and software	CMAQ	113,624	$300,000	$490,000	$790,000
SURFED 07-01R	Peoria Ave: Litchfield Rd to Jackrabbit Rd	Design and construct fibre optic cable interconnection of existing and future ITS facilities	CMAQ	131,754	$1,000,000	$700,000	$1,700,000
PHXFED 07-03R	Various locations	Construct regional ITS telecommunications expansion	CMAQ	193,176	$500,000	$700,000	$1,200,000
CHNFED 07-03	Arizona Ave: Pecos Rd to Riggs Rd	Install fibre optic cable for interconnecting traffic signals (4 out of 5 miles)	CMAQ	271,626	$147,450	$344,050	$491,500
MMAFED 07-03R	5 Different Locations	Upgrade traffic signals, including CCTV facilities	CMAQ	335,180	$150,000	$100,000	$250,000
MESFED 07-03R	Various locations	Install fibre optic communications and upgrade traffic signal controllers	CMAQ	476,087	$500,000	$700,000	$1,200,000
PEOFED 07-02R	Various locations	Design and construct extension to fibre optic backbone and install CCTV cameras	CMAQ	642,281	$500,000	$700,000	$1,200,000
MMAFED 07-02R	Bell Rd: Loop 303 (Estrella Pkwy) to 75th Ave	Construct Dynamic Message Signs and fibre optic conduit and cable	CMAQ	915,765	$234,000	$382,200	$616,200
GLNFED 07-02R	Various Glendale Sports Facilities	Purchase and Install Dynamic Message Signs	CMAQ	1,391,027	$794,311	$156,018	$950,329

TOTALS FOR Recommended / NOT Recommended:

LOCAL:	FEDERAL:	TOTAL:
$5,151,261	***$5,393,462***	***$10,544,723***

MODE: *ITS*

NOT Recommended by TRC

ID#	Location	Type of Work	Fund Type	AQ Score	Local Cost	Federal Cost	Total Cost
QNCFED 07-02	Townwide	Design and construct/implement ITS hardware and software	CMAQ		$155,100	$361,900	$517,000
QNCFED 07-03	Townwide	Design and construct/implement ITS hardware and software	CMAQ		$155,100	$361,900	$517,000
SCTFED 07-06	Area bounded by Shea Blvd, Carefree Hwy, 56th St and 136th St	Install TPZ cameras	CMAQ	15,728	$338,000	$338,000	$676,000
CHNFED 07-07	Various Loop 202 (Santan Fwy) interchanges	Install CCTV cameras	CMAQ	100,243	$39,780	$92,820	$132,600
CHNFED 07-05	Ray Blvd: 54th St to Loop 101 (Price Fwy)	Install fibre optic cable for interconnecting traffic signals	CMAQ	169,341	$127,560	$297,640	$425,200
CHNFED 07-04	Chandler Blvd: McQueen Rd to Gilbert Rd	Install fibre optic cable backbone for interconnecting traffic signals	CMAQ	198,478	$65,400	$152,600	$218,000
CHNFED 07-06	Arizona Ave, within City of Chandler	Pilot program to study, design and operate a transit signal priority system	CMAQ	345,692	$324,930	$758,170	$1,083,100

TOTALS FOR Recommended / NOT Recommended:

LOCAL: ***$1,205,870*** **FEDERAL:** ***$2,363,030*** **TOTAL:** ***$3,568,900***

TOTALS FOR ALL REQUESTS BY MODE: *ITS*

LOCAL: ***$6,357,131*** **FEDERAL:** ***$7,756,492*** **TOTAL:** ***$14,113,623***

MODE: ***Pedestrian***

Recommended by TRC

ID#	Location	Type of Work	Fund Type	AQ Score	Local Cost	Federal Cost	Total Cost
SURFED 07-02	Bell Rd: US-60 (Grand Ave) to 114th Ave	Design, acquire right of way and construct a multi-use path	CMAQ	153,559	$500,000	$1,000,000	$1,500,000
CHNFED 07-02	Western Canal bike path at Dobson Rd, Alma School Rd and Arizona Ave	Install three pedestrian actuated crossing signals	CMAQ	324,231	$117,000	$271,000	$388,000
SCTFED 07-07R	McDowell Rd: Scottsdale Rd to Granite Reef Rd	Enhance sidewalks and add bicycle lanes	CMAQ	493,577	$3,106,743	$600,000	$3,706,743
GLBFED 07-01	Town of Gilbert Heritage District	Design and construct sidewalks, landscaping and other pedestrian improvements	CMAQ	528,946	$180,000	$420,000	$600,000
AVNFED 07-01	Buckeye Rd: Avondale Blvd to 117th Ave alignment	Design and construct sidewalk and landscaping	CMAQ	745,084	$64,500	$150,500	$215,000
MESFED 07-02	Lewis St (alignment): Library to Centennial Center	Design and construct Town Center pathway extension	CMAQ	831,152	$115,568	$269,658	$385,226
TMPFED 07-05R	University Dr: Priest Dr to SPRR	Improve bicycle and pedestrian facilities	CMAQ	1,408,224	$5,425,080	$1,100,000	$6,525,080
FTHFED 07-01R	Fountain Hills Blvd: Shea Blvd to Crystal Point Dr	Design and construct new sidewalk	CMAQ	2,311,736	$1,058,000	$300,000	$1,358,000

TOTALS FOR Recommended / NOT Recommended:

LOCAL: ***$10,566,891***

FEDERAL: ***$4,111,158***

TOTAL: ***$14,678,049***

NOT Recommended by TRC

ID#	Location	Type of Work	Fund Type	AQ Score	Local Cost	Federal Cost	Total Cost
TMPFED 07-06	University Dr: SPRR to Rural Rd	Improve bicycle and pedestrian facilities	CMAQ	554,193	$882,801	$2,059,870	$2,942,671
SCTFED 07-08	Thomas Rd: 64th St to Granite Reef Rd	Enhance sidewalks and add bicycle lanes	CMAQ	588,705	$2,992,638	$2,556,581	$5,549,219

MODE: ***Pedestrian***

NOT Recommended by TRC

ID#	Location	Type of Work	Fund Type	AQ Score	Local Cost	Federal Cost	Total Cost
SCTFED 07-09	Various locations	Upgrade traffic signals to add pedestrian countdowns and improve access to signals	CMAQ	994,266	$235,110	$408,590	$643,700

TOTALS FOR Recommended / NOT Recommended:

LOCAL: ***$4,110,549*** **FEDERAL:** ***$5,025,041*** **TOTAL:** ***$9,135,590***

TOTALS FOR ALL REQUESTS BY MODE: ***Pedestrian***

LOCAL: ***$14,677,440*** **FEDERAL:** ***$9,136,199*** **TOTAL:** ***$23,813,639***

Agenda Item #5F

MARICOPA ASSOCIATION OF GOVERNMENTS INFORMATION SUMMARY... for your review

DATE:
January 3, 2006

SUBJECT:
Approval of the Changes to the Approved June 29, 2005 Arterial Life Cycle Program (ALCP) Policies and Procedures

SUMMARY:
Since the approval of the ALCP Policies and Procedures in June 2005, the involved jurisdictions and MAG staff have been working together on key components to the ALCP: the Project Overview, Project Agreement and Project Reimbursement Requests. The approved June 29, 2005 ALCP Policies and Procedures do not incorporate these components and their requirements. The updated ALCP Policies and Procedures do reflect the intentions of these documents and also incorporates clarification on federal funding, inflation rate information, an updated appendix, and minor technical improvements.

The Transportation Review Committee has recommended approval of the Changes to the Approved June 29, 2005 Arterial Life Cycle Program (ALCP) Policies and Procedures. Since this meeting, there have been two additional changes to the ALCP Policies and Procedures: Section 400.A.1 and Section 410.A.1.a have been added for further clarification.

The Arterial Life Cycle Program is a key part of Proposition 400 and represents more than $1.5 billion of investment over the next 20-years. The updated ALCP Policies and Procedures will continue to provide guidance to MAG and to MAG members to ensure that the program is implemented in an efficient and effective manner.

PUBLIC INPUT:
There has been no public input.

PROS & CONS:
PROS: Once the changes to the ALCP Policies and Procedures are approved, involved jurisdictions and MAG will be able to move forward with Project Agreements and prepare for upcoming project reimbursement requests.

CONS: None.

TECHNICAL & POLICY IMPLICATIONS:
TECHNICAL: MAG will be able to continue implementation of the ALCP regarding Project Overviews, Project Agreements and the reimbursement process.

POLICY: A.R.S. 28-6352 (B) required that MAG performs life cycle management for the arterial street component of the RTP.

ACTION NEEDED:
Recommend approval of the proposed changes to the approved June 29, 2005 Arterial Life Cycle Program (ALCP) Policies and Procedures.

PRIOR COMMITTEE ACTIONS: On December 8, 2005, the Transportation Review Committee recommended approval of the changes to the approved June 29, 2005 Arterial Life Cycle Program (ALCP) Policies and Procedures.

Transportation Review Committee Member Attending

Maricopa County: Mike Ellegood, Chairperson
ADOT: Dan Lance
Avondale: David Fitzhugh
*Chandler: Patrice Kraus
*El Mirage: B.J. Cornwall
Fountain Hills: Randy Harrel
*Gila Bend: Lynn Farmer
*Gilbert: Tami Ryall
Glendale: Terry Johnson
*Goodyear: Cato Esquivel
*Guadalupe: Jim Ricker
*Litchfield Park: Mike Cartsonis
Mesa: Jeff Martin
*Paradise Valley: Robert M. Cicarelli
*Peoria: David Moody
Phoenix: Don Herp for Tom Callow
Queen Creek: Mark Young
RPTA: Bryan Jungwirth
Scottsdale: Mary O'Connor
Surprise: Randy Overmyer
Tempe: Carlos De Leon
*Wickenburg: Shane Dille
Valley Metro Rail: John Farry

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

CONTACT PERSON:
Eileen O'Connell, MAG, 602-254-6300.

Proposed changes to the previously approved June 29, 2005 ALCP Policies and Procedures

LOCATION	Proposed Changes	June 29, 2005 ALCP Policies and Procedures
Table of Contents – switched Section 330 & 340	CHANGED: Switched 330 & 340	
Table of Contents – Section 340	CHANGED: Project Reimbursement Requests	OLD: Invoicing for Reimbursement of Project Costs
Table of Contents – Section IV	CHANGED: Project Overview and Project Agreement	OLD: Project Agreement
Table of Contents – Section 410	NEW: Section 400 & 410	OLD: Section 400
Section 100.3.b	**CHANGED:** Provide the means within each Project Agreement, Project Overview and Project Reimbursement Request to track project implementation, performance and successful completion of individual projects and the Program.	OLD: Provide the means within each project agreement to track project implementation, performance and successful completion of individual projects and the Program
Section 110.B.1	ADDED: and the ADOT Local Government Section	
Section 110.B.2	CHANGED: The projects receiving federal funding will adhere to both the federal and the ALCP requirements.	OLD: Where conflicts occur between federal and ALCP requirements, the federal requirements will typically apply except for: a. Legal agreements and related areas. b. Risk management, liability and insurance and related areas. c. Limits on regional funding. d. Match requirements, which are established in Section 310 for all projects. e. Reporting (Annual, Certification and Other) requirements. f. Audit requirements. g. Joint requirements for projects receiving both federal and regional funds. h. Other requirements and determination on a case-by-case basis with MAG staff.
Section 120.D.1	CHANGED: All Items United States Consumer Price Index (CPI), All Urban Consumers	OLD: All Goods United States Consumer Price Index (CPI).
Section 120.D.1.a	NEW: This information can be found on the US Department of Labor, Bureau of Labor Statistics website: http://data.bls.gov. The specific series used for calculating inflation is U.S. All items, 1982-84=100 – CUUR0000SA0.	
Section 120.D.2	NEW: The inflation rate is calculated using the month of March base year 2002 and March of the current year.	
Section 120.H.3.a	**CHANGED:** All participating agencies will provide information to	**OLD:** All participating agencies will provide information to meet

LOCATION	Proposed Changes	June 29, 2005 ALCP Policies and Procedures
	meet the minimum requirements for the audit report by way of the Project Overview and Project Reimbursement Request.	the minimum requirements for the audit report.
Section 130.C.1	CHANGED: Approval of amendments to the ALCP Policies and Procedures.	OLD: Approval of amendments to the ALCP Policies and Procedures and associated documents including templates for Project Agreements.
Section 130.C.3	ADDED: and or that have a material change	
Section 200.D	DELETED: the entire section and moved it to Section 400 to go with the Project Overview description	OLD: The following information must be provided for each project: 1. Description of the scope of the project including any significant differences from the project as it is described in the RTP. 2. Alignments as appropriate for the project. 3. Major project elements between (logical) project termini for the selected alignment. 4. Cost estimates by project phase (design, right of way and construction) based on time and material-quantity estimates for use in the Project Agreement. 5. Recommendations for phasing of design, right of way acquisition and construction of the project. 6. Source of funding for the local match component and documentation that the funding is committed to the project. 7. If the project is part of a RTP project that has been divided into multiple segments, then the basis for the allocation to the segment must be documented. The sum of the regional funding for each segment must not exceed the regional budget for the original project budget as provided in the RTP.
Section 200.H	**CHANGED:** The Project Overview for each project must identify all project components for which reimbursement for the regional share is sought from the ALCP, including the components of the project that will be funded locally or by third parties.	**OLD:** The Project Agreement for each project must identify all project components for which reimbursement for the regional share is sought from the ALCP, including the components of the project that will be funded locally or by third parties.
Section 210.A.3	NEW: A Project Overview must be on file at MAG	
Section 210.B.3	ADDED: Project Overview	
Section 220.B.3.a	DELETED: and local match contributions	
Section 220.C	ADDED: if necessary	
Section 220.D.5	ADDED: fiscal "year"	OLD: fiscal _____
Section 220.D.9	CHANGED: Project Reimbursement Requests	OLD: invoices
Section 220.D.9	ADDED: Project Overview	
Section 300.A.3	DELETED: MOU	

LOCATION	Proposed Changes	June 29, 2005 ALCP Policies and Procedures
Section 300.B.1	CHANGED: The Lead Agency and MAG will be signatories to the Project Agreement	OLD: The Lead Agency and other agencies/jurisdictions listed in the Project Agreement will be signatories to the Project Agreement.
Section 300.B.3	DELETED: This is clarified in the actual Project Agreement.	OLD: The Lead Agency will be responsible for assuming all risks associated with the projects except those that are assigned to agency(ies)/jurisdiction(s) and agreed as such in the Project Agreement. **a.** The Lead Agency, and the agency(ies)/jurisdiction(s) listed in the Project Agreement, will indemnify and hold harmless MAG for all aspects of project implementation and operation.
Section 300.D.a.i	NEW: i. The agreement to this effect between the local jurisdictions and the Lead Agency must be documented in writing between the respective Town/City Managers, County/Community Administrator or designees in a Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) and/or an Intergovernmental Agreement (IGA). a. This agreement will be used to explain the multi-jurisdictional roles, responsibilities and terms of the project, which will be referenced in the Project Agreement signed by the Lead Agency. b. A copy of this agreement must be provided to MAG, who must agree to the proposed Lead Agency designation.	OLD: i. The agreement to this effect between the local jurisdictions and the Lead Agency must be documented in writing between the respective Town/City Managers, County/Community Administrator or designees. a. This agreement can be a Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) and/or an Intergovernmental Agreement (IGA).
Section 310.B.2	ADDED: and Project Overview	
Section 320.B.2	ADDED: unless there are surplus program funds, Section 120.E.	
Section 320.C	ADDED: and the Project Overview	
Section 320.D and 320.D.2	CHANGED: Project Reimbursement Request	OLD: Invoice
Section 330.A.1	ADDED: Project Overview	
Section 330.D	**CHANGED:** The Project Overview will identify as appropriate the priorities for reimbursement for prior right of way acquisition and/or work if more than one agency is requesting such reimbursement for that project.	OLD: The Project Agreement will identify as appropriate the priorities for reimbursement for prior right of way acquisition and/or work if more than one agency is requesting such reimbursement for that project.
Section 330.E	CHANGED: CIP and TIP	OLD: ...Lead Agency Capital Improvement Program or in the MAG Transportation Improvement Program approved. . .
Section 340	CHANGED: A. A Project Reimbursement Request will contain a request for	OLD: A. All project invoices shall be submitted to MAG for

LOCATION	Proposed Changes	June 29, 2005 ALCP Policies and Procedures
	payment, an invoice and a progress report. 1. The request for payment, invoice and progress report forms will be provided by MAG. 2. For a current project, the Project Reimbursement Request will be submitted by the Lead Agency to MAG as needed, or by milestone completion (Section D.4.a-k), or unless otherwise agreed to in the Project Overview. a. The Lead Agency cannot submit a Project Reimbursement Request more than once per month. b. The progress report will reflect the work that is being invoiced for. 3. If a project is advanced, progress reports will be submitted and QA/QC meetings will be held based on the milestones of the project even though a full Project Reimbursement Request will not be submitted. i. A full Project Reimbursement Request, including request for reimbursement and invoice is due at the time of project completion. 4. All Project Reimbursement Requests shall be submitted to MAG for authorization for payment. a. Participating agencies/jurisdictions may invoice the Lead Agency for any item including, but not limited to, work conducted or capital assets acquired for the project or as part of the project, subject to other terms in this agreement. 5. The work conducted and/or received must meet all the requirements of the MAG ALCP Policies and Procedures as well as any and all other applicable federal, state, regional and local requirements. 6. The Lead Agency must retain and certify all vendor receipts, invoices and any related project records as needed and that they are available for review. a. These vendor receipts or invoices must be available for five (5) years after final payment is made; auditors, MAG or its designees can make possible requests. b. Receipts and invoices for projects advanced by a jurisdiction may have a longer retention period. 7. An authorized representative of the Lead Agency will	authorization for payment. 1. As permitted in the Project Agreement, participating agencies/jurisdictions may invoice the Lead Agency for any item including, but not limited to, work conducted or capital assets acquired for the project or as part of the project, subject to other terms in this agreement. 2. The work conducted and/or received must meet all the requirements of the MAG ALCP Policies and Procedures as well as any and all other applicable federal, state, regional and local requirements. 3. The Lead Agency must retain and certify all vendor receipts, invoices and any related project records as needed and that they are available for review. a. These vendor receipts or invoices must be available for five (5) years after final payment is made; auditors, MAG or its designees can make possible requests. b. Receipts and invoices for projects advanced by a jurisdiction may have a longer retention period. 4. A duly authorized representative of the Lead Agency must sign all invoices and progress reports. 5. Matching contributions as required in the ALCP Policies and Procedures have been invoiced and/or received, and are not in arrears. 6. If a project is advanced, all invoices are due at the time of project completion. 7. Other stipulations as appropriate as determined by MAG in consultation with the Lead Agency. B. On MAG approval of invoice, it will be forwarded to ADOT for payment. 1. Checks will be distributed from ADOT. C. The signature of the duly authorized representative certifies that the invoice and progress reports are true and correct per the terms of the Project Agreement. 1. The duly authorized representative for the Lead Agency may be the respective Town/City Managers, County/Community Administrator, designee or a higher level representative of the organization that has signing authority and is designated in the Project

LOCATION	Proposed Changes	June 29, 2005 ALCP Policies and Procedures
	sign all three forms: request for payment, invoice and progress report, certifying that the request is true and correct per the terms of the Project Agreement and Project Overview. a. The duly authorized representative for the Lead Agency may be the respective Town/City Managers, County/Community Administrator, designee or a higher level representative of the organization that has signing authority and is designated in the Project Overview for that specific ALCP project. b. No electronic or scanned signature will be accepted 8. Matching contributions as required in the ALCP Policies and Procedures have been fully documented, invoiced and/or received, and are not in arrears. B. The request for payment will be approved and signed by the duly authorized representative from the Lead Agency, then it will be processed and approved at MAG and forwarded to ADOT for payment to Lead Agency. The request for payment form will include: 1. Project name, description and RTP ID 2. Estimated total project costs 3. Expenditures to date 4. Regional fund budget 5. Previous Regional fund payments 6. Amount of Regional fund requests 7. Remaining Regional funds 8. Status of project development/completion 9. Type of work for reimbursement request is for 10. Mailing address for payment 11. Signatures of authorized representatives from Lead Agency, MAG and ADOT C. The invoice will include: 1. Invoice # 2. Project name, description and RTP ID 3. Reimbursable items and related costs 4. Proper documentation of reimbursable items and reimbursable costs contained in invoice	Agreement for that specific ALCP project.

LOCATION	Proposed Changes	June 29, 2005 ALCP Policies and Procedures
	a. A copy of the invoice from the contractor is sufficient documentation for contracted work. b. An administrative breakdown chart including staff name, hours on project, hourly rate, and total costs is sufficient documentation for administrative work. D. The progress report of the Project Reimbursement Request will explain the status of the project, milestones and other necessary information. 1. It is the responsibility of the jurisdiction to document the work accomplished for each invoice or milestone during the reporting period. 2. Advanced projects prior to the approved ALCP Policies and Procedures, will have special progress report requirements. 3. For each progress report, the jurisdiction is to provide: a. Percent of work complete b. Work accomplished c. Estimate v. real cost analysis d. Work schedule analysis e. Grievance/complaints reports f. Procurement process update (when necessary) g. Documents produced 4. Milestones can be used to trigger a Project Reimbursement Request for a current project. Milestones must be used to trigger a progress report for an advanced project. The milestones are: a. Studies b. Preliminary Design - 60% c. Final Design - 100% d. Construction – 25% e. Construction – 60% f. Final Acceptance g. Project Closeout 5. Additionally to the progress report, there will be 3 Quality Assurance/Quality Control (QA/QC) meetings in the lifetime of a project. a. Each QA/QC meeting will have an agenda developed by MAG to 1)review and discuss a list of questions and measures pertaining to the	

LOCATION	Proposed Changes	June 29, 2005 ALCP Policies and Procedures
	project schedule, budget and deliverables 2)facilitate discussion and updates between MAG and jurisdictions in a team environment and plan for improvements. b. Each QA/QC meeting will consists of the project manager/other designee from the jurisdiction, a MAG representative and, if necessary and requested, other representatives from partner agencies and/or contractors. c. These meetings will generally come after the Final Design milestone, the Construction - 60% milestone, and the Final Acceptance milestone. E. On MAG approval of Project Reimbursement Request, it will be forwarded to ADOT for payment. 1. MAG will work with ADOT to expedite payment dependent on availability of funds. 2. Checks will be distributed from ADOT and sent to Lead Agency.	
Section 350.A.1 & 3	ADDED: Project Overview	
Section 400 TITLE	ADDED: Project Overview	
Section 400	NEW: A. Each ALCP Project will have a Project Overview submitted to MAG before the Project Agreement is signed. 1. For advanced projects, a Project Overview will be submitted when the project begins. B. The Project Overview can be updated throughout the project as long as it is not a material change. C. The Project Overview will provide at a minimum: 1. Lead Agency contacts and other agency(ies) jurisdiction(s) involved in the project. 2. Project scope, project alignment, project history, project considerations, ITS components, multi-modal issues, project development process including, as needed, environmental, utility and right of way clearances. 3. Map/photographs 4. Timeline 5. Management plan 6. Project data 7. Cost estimates	

LOCATION	Proposed Changes	June 29, 2005 ALCP Policies and Procedures
	8. Contingencies 9. Cost savings 10. Summary of work, including: year of work, total cost, local share, federal share, regional share, year for reimbursement 11. Project documents if needed: IGA, MOU, DCR, Corridor Study, Project Assessment, supporting document for developer contributions, project amendments, environmental overview 12. Funding sources D. A Project Overview template will be provided by MAG.	
Section 410.A	CHANGED: A Project Agreement between MAG and the designated Lead Agency will be required for every project before reimbursable expenditures may be paid.	OLD: A Project Agreement between MAG and the designated Lead Agency and other local agencies as appropriate, will be required for every project before reimbursable expenditures may be initiated.
Section 410.A.1	CHANGED: Project Reimbursement Requests	OLD: Invoice
Section 410.A.1.a	ADDED: If a project is advanced, a Project Agreement has to be in place before the completion of the project.	
Section 410.A.2.b	CHANGED **a.** A Project Agreement will not be executed for subdivided projects or projects with scopes less than that specified in the RTP, even if proposed subdivisions are already listed for preliminary programming and financial planning purposes in the TIP, unless the RTP and ALCP is amended.	OLD: a. A Project Agreement will not be executed for subdivided projects or projects with scopes less than that specified in the RTP, even if proposed subdivisions are already listed for preliminary programming and financial planning purposes in the TIP.
Section 410.B.2	CHANGED: Project Overview	OLD: Project Agreement
Section 410.C	CHANGED: B. The Project Agreement will be comprehensive. The Project Agreement will typically address at a minimum: 1. Project scope, type of work, schedule of work and reimbursement, the regional share and federal funding if applicable. 2. Lead Agency and other agency(ies) jurisdiction(s) involved in the project. 3. Applicable Design Standards. 4. Responsibilities of the Parties. 5. Risk and indemnification. 6. Records and audit rights.. 7. Term and termination. 8. Non-Availability of Funds.	OLD: E. The Project Agreement will be comprehensive. The Project Agreement will typically address at a minimum: 1. Project scope, schedule and budget including regional, local match contributions and federal funding if applicable, and cost breakdowns. 2. Lead Agency and other agency(ies) jurisdiction(s) involved in the project. 3. Applicable Design Standards. 4. Environmental Overview. 5. Overall project development process including, as needed, environmental, utility and right of way clearances. 6. Review and approval requirements; and local

LOCATION	Proposed Changes	June 29, 2005 ALCP Policies and Procedures
	9. Conflict of Interest.	jurisdiction actions. 7. Annexation (as needed), accounting, financial and legal elements including milestones or trigger points. 8. Contingencies. 9. Risk and indemnification. 10. Audits. **11.** Completion.
Section 410.F	CHANGED: F. The Lead Agency and MAG will be signatories to the Project Agreement: 1. To indicate their agreement to the Lead Agency designation and the terms of the agreement. The respective Town/City Managers, County/Community Administrator/Supervisor or designee will be the signing authority for that jurisdiction. 2. To indicate roles and responsibilities in project implementation.	OLD: F. The Lead Agency and other agency(ies)/jurisdiction(s) listed in the Project Agreement will be signatories to the Project Agreement: 1. To indicate their agreement to the Lead Agency designation and the terms of the agreement. 2. To indicate their roles and responsibilities in project implementation, if any, acting in effect as a subcontractor to the Lead Agency.
APPENDIX	DELETED: Cash Flow –not mentioned in the Policies & Procedures	
APPENDIX	DELETED: Contingency Fund –not mentioned in the Policies & Procedures	
APPENDIX	CHANGED: Material Change - …Overview	OLD: Agreement
APPENDIX	DELETED: middle sentence of Participating Agency	
APPENDIX	DELETED: last sentence in Project Agreement	
APPENDIX	DELETED: performance monitoring requirements, warranty periods in Project Completion	
APPENDIX	NEW: Project Overview	
APPENDIX	NEW: Project Reimbursement Request	
APPENDIX	DELETED: RTP Annual Report –not mentioned in the Policies & Procedures	

ARTERIAL LIFE CYCLE PROGRAM

POLICIES AND PROCEDURES

ON THE MOVE

PARTNERS IN PROGRESS

DRAFT – Proposed update to the previously approved June 29, 2005 ALCP Policies and Procedures

MARICOPA ASSOCIATION OF GOVERNMENTS

TABLE OF CONTENTS

BACKGROUND 3

I. PROGRAM MANAGEMENT AND ADMINISTRATION

Section 100: Program Objectives 4

Section 110: Applicability of Arterial Life Cycle Program Policies and Procedures 5

Section 120: Programming the Arterial Life Cycle 5

Section 130: MAG Committee Process 7

Section 140: Modifications to the Arterial Life Cycle Program Policies and Procedures 7

II. PROJECT REQUIREMENTS

Section 200: Project Eligibility 8

Section 210: Project Authorizations 9

Section 220: Project Amendments 10

III. PROJECT DETAILS

Section 300: Lead Agencies 13

Section 310: ALCP Project Budgets 14

Section 320: Eligible Costs for Reimbursement 14

Section 330: Eligible Prior Right of Way Acquisition and/or Work for Reimbursement 15

Section 340: Project Reimbursement Requests 15

Section 350: Reallocation of Surplus Project Funds 17

IV. PROJECT OVERVIEW AND PROJECT AGREEMENT

Section 400 Project Overview 19

Section 410: Project Agreement 19

APPENDIX A – GLOSSARY AND DEFINITIONS 21

BACKGROUND

In 2004, the Maricopa Association of Governments (MAG) initiated development of the Arterial Life Cycle Program (ALCP, or the "Program"), to provide management and oversight for the implementation of the arterial component of the Regional Transportation Plan (RTP, or the "Plan"). MAG is the designated Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO) for the Maricopa region. MAG serves the role designated in ARS: 28-6308 as the "regional planning agency" for this region.

The Policies and Procedures were developed in coordination with the Transportation Review Committee in workshops held in 2004 and early 2005 and are consistent with the requirements in House Bill 2456, passed in 2004 in association with the development of the Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) and Proposition 400. The Transportation Policy Committee reviewed and recommended the Policy and Procedures for approval on June 22, 2005. The Regional Council approved the Policies and Procedures on June 29, 2005.

The ALCP relies upon two main elements:

1. Policies, which provide direction to decisions and processes, in conjunction with procedures, which specify steps needed to implement specified policies.

2. Project Agreements (PA), which serve to define the roles and requirements for agencies participating in the implementation of each project.

I. PROGRAM MANAGEMENT AND ADMINISTRATION

Section 100: Program Objectives

A. The ALCP has five key objectives:

1. Effective and Efficient Implementation of the RTP: Facilitate the effective and efficient implementation of the arterial component of the RTP. In support of this objective, the Program should:
   a. Ensure projects are implemented in a manner consistent with the RTP including any updates or amendments.
   b. Include means to track project implementation against requirements established in the RTP and the ALCP.
   c. Be administratively simple.

2. Fiscal Integrity: Ensure the fiscal integrity of the regionally funded arterial component of the RTP. In support of this objective, the Program should:
   a. Establish comprehensive financial and reporting requirements for each project.
   b. Coordinate with the RTP and the other modal programs on key financial, accounting and reporting policies, procedures and practices.

3. Accountability: Provide the means to track and ensure effective and efficient project implementation. In support of this objective, the Program should:
   a. Employ comprehensive Project Agreements or other legal instruments that detail agency roles and responsibilities in the implementation of specific projects.
   b. Provide the means within each Project Agreement, Project Overview and Project Reimbursement Request to track project implementation, performance and successful completion of individual projects and the Program.

4. Transparency: Provide members of the public, elected officials, stakeholders, participating agencies and others with ready access to information on the Program and on each project. In support of this objective, the Program should:
   a. Include substantial public and stakeholder consultation as part of the implementation process for each project.
   b. Require that material changes to projects in the Program be subject to public and stakeholder consultation through the MAG Committee Process as well as any other consultation processes, including within the community or communities affected, as specified in the associated Project Agreements.

5. Compliance: Comply with all applicable federal, state and local requirements in the implementation of projects.

B. Consistency with the RTP generally means that an ALCP project meets project eligibility requirements as specified in Section 200 and the scope matches the project described in the RTP.

C. The Program must be flexible and allow adjustments as needed in support of meeting the general objectives.

Section 110: Applicability of Arterial Life Cycle Program Policies and Procedures

A. The requirements established in this document are limited to arterial street projects (including arterial intersections) as specified in the RTP that receive regional funds, including federal, state and regional (including half-cent) funds.

B. Projects receiving any federal funding in the ALCP must satisfy all federal requirements in addition to the requirements established in this document.
   1. Only select projects will have federal funding allocated to them. Those that do will be identified and the Lead Agency designated for that project will work with MAG and the ADOT Local Government Section to ensure conformity to federal and ALCP requirements.
   2. The projects receiving federal funding will adhere to both the federal and the ALCP requirements.

Section 120: Programming the Arterial Life Cycle

A. The RTP establishes regional funding limits as well as general scopes and priorities for all ALCP projects.

B. All ALCP projects must be programmed in the approved MAG Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) before they may be implemented or reimbursed.

C. Programming of projects funded by the ALCP must be consistent with the ALCP and the ALCP Policies and Procedures.
   1. Projects will initially be programmed based on the regional funding specified in the RTP plus local match contributions, as well as scopes and termini as described in the RTP.
      a. In order to support the development of Project Agreements that include a scope and schedule for each project, programming of each ALCP project shall include a separate scoping or design phase that precedes right of way acquisition and construction, unless otherwise agreed to by MAG. Environmental clearances may be funded as part of the scoping or design phase.
      b. Programming of subdivided projects will only be conducted following the completion of the process described in Section 220(C) for subdividing projects.
   2. Amendments to the TIP, RTP and/or Project Agreement for a project(s) must follow the policy set in Section 220.
   3. Federal funds will be allocated to projects, considering:
      a. A request from the Lead Agency.
      b. It is on a new alignment, has a potential impact on sensitive areas and/or populations or that it may readily accommodate the federal process given the size or schedule.

D. Inflation will occur throughout the ALCP. The original project budgets listed in the 2003 approved RTP were expressed in 2002 dollars. The annual update of the ALCP will require that the project budgets be adjusted to account for the past year's inflation.
   1. The regional funding specified in the original RTP for a project will be adjusted annually for inflation based on the All Items United States Consumer Price Index (CPI), All Urban Consumers
      a. This information can be found on the US Department of Labor, Bureau of Labor Statistics website: http://data.bls.gov. The specific series used for calculating inflation is U.S. All items, 1982-84=100 – CUUR0000SA0.

2. The inflation rate is calculated using the month of March base year 2002 and March of the current year.

E. Use of surplus and/or deficit Program funds.
   1. If there are surplus Program funds, existing projects will be accelerated in priority order of the ALCP.
      a. For projects to be accelerated, the matching local funds must be committed.
      b. If there are surplus funds available upon full completion of the ALCP, the MAG Transportation Policy Committee will discuss options regarding additional projects.
   2. If there is a deficit of Program funds to the ALCP, the ALCP projects will be delayed in priority order of the ALCP.

F. Moving ALCP Projects:
   1. A jurisdiction is allowed to advance design, acquire right of way and construct a project in the ALCP.
      a. The payment for the project will stay in the original year it is programmed in the ALCP based on the RTP.
         i. Reimbursement for a project will be the amount listed, plus inflation to the year it is programmed in the ALCP.
      b. The advancement of a project must consider the impact of the proposed change on other RTP projects and on neighboring communities.
   2. Deferring a project
      a. To defer a project, the Lead Agency must submit a written request stating the reason(s); the new schedule to MAG and the request must be approved through the MAG Committee Process.
      b. The deferral of a project must consider the impact of the proposed change on other RTP projects and on neighboring communities.
      c. If a project is deferred, other projects will be moved in priority order at that time, taking into account: project readiness, local match available and funding source preferences.
   3. Substituting Projects: If an original ALCP project has exhausted all means to develop an acceptable scope of work and/or the project is deemed not feasible given environment, public concerns, costs and other factors, a substitute project may be proposed for substitution in the same jurisdiction as the original project.
      a. The Lead Agency shall submit a written request, including the justification and the description of steps to overcome the issues related to deleting the original project from the ALCP and RTP.
      b. The substitution of a project must consider the impact of the proposed change on other RTP projects and on neighboring communities.
      c. The Lead Agency may propose a substitute project that would use the regional funds that are allocated to the original project.
         i. The substitute project should relieve congestion and improve mobility in the same general area addressed by the original planned project, if possible.
      d. The deletion of the original project and the addition of the substitute project must be approved through the MAG Committee Process and be subject to any required consultation process.
      e. If approved, the RTP and TIP shall be amended, subject to any necessary air quality conformity analysis.

G. Working with ADOT

1. ADOT maintains the arterial street fund and will be responsible for issuing bonds, through the State Transportation Board, on behalf of the street program, as designated in ARS: 28-6303.D.2.
2. MAG will work with ADOT regarding budget, invoicing process and other fiscal matters.

H. Reporting
1. At a minimum, the ALCP Certification Report will be issued annually. It will provide the status of the projects, project additions, project deletions, changes to the schedule of projects, Program and project financing and other necessary components. ARS: 28-6354.
2. All participating agencies will provide available information to MAG for needed reports, such as: GIS based information, traffic counts, travel speeds and delay data.
3. Audits – All participating agencies must cooperate and provide requested information, if available, as part of the performance audit to be conducted by the Auditor General beginning in 2010, and every fifth year thereafter. ARS: 28-6313.A.
   a. All participating agencies will provide information to meet the minimum requirements for the audit report by way of the Project Overview and Project Reimbursement Request.

Section 130: MAG Committee Process

A. The MAG Committee Process is defined in Appendix A - Definitions

B. Final decisions regarding the ALCP rest with the MAG Regional Council with recommendations from the Transportation Review Committee (TRC), MAG Management Committee and the Transportation Policy Committee (TPC). Variations to the MAG Committee Process may be applied. These include, but are not limited to:
1. Other committees, including MAG modal committees, MAG Street Committee, and the MAG ITS Committee, or bodies outside this process may consider and advise on the same item.
2. Consultation with the Citizens Transportation Oversight Committee (CTOC) will be conducted as appropriate and consistent with requirements in ARS: 28-6356(F) & (G).

C. The MAG Committee Process will apply for:
1. Approval of amendments to the ALCP Policies and Procedures.
2. Adoption of the Arterial Life Cycle Program.
3. Approval of amendments to ALCP projects in the TIP, RTP and/or that have a material change.

Section 140: Modifications to the Arterial Life Cycle Program Policies and Procedures

A. To make changes to the ALCP Policies and Procedures:
1. MAG staff will suggest new provisions, additions and revisions to the ALCP Policies and Procedures when necessary.
2. Member agencies may submit suggested changes to MAG and the chairperson of the Transportation Policy Committee.

II. PROJECT REQUIREMENTS

Section 200: Project Eligibility

A. To be funded or constructed under the Program, all projects must:
   1. Have a scope, budget (including amounts of regional funding and local match contributions) and schedule consistent with the project as included in the RTP, ALCP, as appropriate, the TIP and consistent with federal requirements where applicable.
   2. Be considered new in keeping with voter expectations, and as such:
      a. Cannot include costs for any pre-existing, programmed or planned element or improvement that is not part of the specific improvement project described or included in the RTP as of November 25, 2003 or later.
      b. Cannot have already begun design, acquired right of way or begun construction before the date specified in Section 340(A) or the date of the addition of the project to the RTP.

B. Facilities eligible for improvements under the ALCP include:
   1. Major arterials as defined in Appendix A for this document, which include:
      a. Roadway facilities on the regional arterial or mile arterial grid system.
      b. Roadway facilities that connect freeways, highways or other controlled access facilities.
      c. Other key arterial corridors.
   2. Intersections of eligible major arterials.

C. All projects must be designed to standards agreed to by the designated local jurisdictions and the Lead Agency established in the Project Agreement:
   1. The agreed standards, which may be higher than the standards in use in the local jurisdiction(s), will be specified or referenced in the Project Agreement.
   2. Standards for multiple jurisdictional projects should be consistent to the extent feasible.

D. Reimbursable items for regionally funded projects are limited to:
   1. Design, right of way and construction, as required in ARS: 28-6304(C)(5) and ARS: 28-6305(A). Design Concept Reports, planning studies and related studies, such as environmental and other studies, are also eligible.
   2. Capacity improvement projects.
   3. Safety improvement projects.
   4. Projects or components thereof directly related to capacity and safety improvements, including:
      a. Intelligent Transportation Systems (ITS).
      b. Signals.
      c. Lighting.
      d. Transit stops and pullouts, as well as queue jumper lanes, for example, for bus rapid transit.
      e. Bicycle/pedestrian facilities where integral to the roadway, including wide sidewalks separated from curbs.
      f. Utility relocations, including under grounding of utility lines where required for safety or other reasons relating to function, and not purely for aesthetic reasons, and not otherwise considered an enhancement.
      g. Drainage improvements for the project (with limitations), such as retention basins required for the project that would not normally be handled through County or other drainage funds,

within reasonable limits (and generally not exceeding typical practice for the local jurisdiction).

h. Landscaped medians and shoulders, and other improvements within reasonable limits (and generally not exceeding typical practice for the local jurisdiction).
i. Reconstruction projects, as identified in or supported by the RTP and as specified in Project Agreements, for eligible project elements.
j. Access management.
k. Rubberized asphalt and concrete paving.
l. Staff time directly attributable to project.
m. Noise, privacy and screen wall, and other buffers, if found to be necessary to meet applicable local, state or federal standards.

E. Notwithstanding findings or recommendations from the Design Concept Report or similar study, projects, project components or other costs that are not reimbursable from the ALCP include:
   1. Enhancement projects or enhancement components of projects.
      a. If a the Lead Agency and other agency (ies)/jurisdiction(s) listed in the Project Agreement requests an enhancement to a project funded in the ALCP, the local jurisdiction and/or Lead Agency shall pay all costs associated with the enhancement.
   2. Right of way that is not used by the ALCP project, with potential exceptions on a case-by-case basis for land that is identified by the Lead Agency and/or the local jurisdiction or jurisdictions as not marketable for sale.
   3. Any project or project element that exceeds reasonable limits or typical practice for the local jurisdiction in which the project or projects are located.
   4. Administrative overhead costs by the Lead Agency and other agency (ies)/ jurisdiction(s) listed in the Project Agreement that are not attributed to the project.
   5. Other expenses, such as bad debts, as determined by MAG.

F. The use of federal funds or other funding sources may involve further restrictions on the use of funds or eligible matching contributions.

G. Eligible local match contributions include:
   1. Locally funded expenditures on eligible projects or elements as listed above in this section.
   2. Third party contributions are taken at market value at the time of the donation, mutually agreed upon between the Lead Agency and other agency (ies)/jurisdiction(s) listed in the Project Agreement and MAG, and have supporting documentation.

H. The Project Overview for each project must identify all project components for which reimbursement for the regional share is sought from the ALCP, including the components of the project that will be funded locally or by third parties.

I. MAG Committee Process has the final determination on the eligibility of any project or project component for reimbursement from the Program.

Section 210: Project Authorizations

A. All projects must receive authorization to proceed with an executed Project Agreement before reimbursements are made.
   1. The project must be included in the adopted local Capital Improvement Program.

2. A Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) may be used as a bridge to a full Project Agreement.
   a. Design studies may be initiated under a MOU to determine project scope, costs and schedule, by a jurisdiction as needed for multijurisdiction projects.
   b. The MOU may address other considerations, such as roles and responsibilities for local jurisdictions in a multijurisdiction project, or early right of way acquisition, as needed in a preliminary manner prior to a full Project Agreement.
3. A Project Overview must be on file at MAG.

B. Prerequisites for project authorization and the development of a Project Agreement include:
   1. The scope, budget and schedule of the project as currently foreseen must match that specified in the RTP and/or TIP, otherwise the RTP and TIP must be amended.
   2. A Lead Agency for each project must be identified, agreed to by the local jurisdictions in which the project is located, and established in the Project Agreement.
   3. Adequate and secure funding from a local, regional and, if applicable, federal level must be identified in the Project Overview.

Section 220: Project Amendments

A. An amendment to the RTP and the TIP, if appropriate, will be needed if a scheduled project in the ALCP is: subdivided, merged with another project, advanced, deferred, exchanged, accelerated, newly funded, given reallocated money and/or altered causing a change in the scope or schedule of the project. ARS: 28-6353.
   1. Proposed amendments that in whole or in part negatively impact projects in the TIP, RTP and/or ALCP, may not be approved.
   2. Amendments are subject to approval through the MAG Committee Process on a case-by-case basis.

B. The Lead Agency and other agency (ies)/jurisdiction(s) listed in the Project Agreement, typically initiates the amendment process by making a written request to MAG.
   1. If the new or revised project resulting from the amendment is also to be regionally funded, it will be subject to all of the requirements of the ALCP.
   2. If an amendment is approved by MAG, corresponding amendments are required to the Project Agreement established for the original project(s).
   3. The request for the RTP and/or TIP amendment must be provided as part of the agenda item for review and consideration throughout the MAG Committee Process.
      a. The request must explain why it is necessary to change the project scope, schedule or budget including regional funding as described in the Project Agreement.
      b. The request must specifically address and justify the proposed changes in scope, budget or schedule relating to:
         i. Project length.
         ii. Through lane capacity.
         iii. Facility location or alignment.
         iv. All other key project features.
         v. Potential negative impacts to other RTP projects, including freeway/highway, arterial, public transportation or other mode projects.
         vi. Potential negative impacts to meeting all applicable federal, state, regional and local requirements, including but not limited to, any applicable requirements for air quality

conformity and any that may be imposed directly or indirectly following a performance audit.

vii. Funding changes identified from the original project allocation, the contingency allowance; the overall revised budget and other key aspects of the funding, reimbursement or reallocation.

C. For RTP projects that want to subdivide or merge contiguous or nearly contiguous projects, an amendment to the RTP, TIP and Project Agreement, if necessary, for the new projects must be agreed to and executed.
   1. A Design Concept Report or equivalent will be used to determine major project elements within each jurisdiction and to develop recommendations for budget allocations.
   2. The Lead Agency and other agency (ies)/jurisdiction(s) listed in the Project Agreement must agree to the proposed subdivisions, merge and/or any other associated changes.
      a. The resulting projects would together provide for the completion of the original project as specified in the RTP.

D. Projects may be advanced by the Lead Agency and other agency (ies)/jurisdiction(s) listed in the Project Agreement, who must pay the costs of advancing the project and wait for reimbursement from the Program in the fiscal year the project or projects are scheduled in the ALCP to receive regional funds. To do so, it is required that:
   1. The Lead Agency and other agency (ies)/jurisdiction(s) listed in the Project Agreement must bear all costs and risks associated with advance design, right of way acquisition, construction and related activities for ALCP projects.
   2. All parties listed in the Project Agreement must agree to the advancement.
   3. Impacts on neighboring jurisdictions must be considered.
   4. Financing costs and any other incremental costs associated with the advancement are not eligible for reimbursement.
   5. The reimbursement for the advanced project will be in the original scheduled fiscal year.
   6. If Program revenues are lower or higher than expected, then the repayment schedule is subject to Program delays or Program advancements in the same manner as any other project in the ALCP.
   7. The Lead Agency and other agency(ies)/jurisdiction(s) listed in the Project Agreement may request to revert to the original project schedule as long as all non-recoverable costs incurred or committed are paid for by the Lead Agency and/or other agency(ies)/jurisdiction(s) listed in the Project Agreement, and there are no other unacceptable adverse impacts associated with the reversion.
   8. The amount of regional reimbursement for projects advanced as segments of a larger RTP project will be determined following the completion of the process for subdividing projects as specified in Section 220(C) as will be specified in the Project Agreement to be executed for the project.
   9. Upon completion of an advanced project, all Project Reimbursement Requests will be submitted to MAG and payments will follow the schedule established in the Project Agreement and Project Overview.

E. Projects may be deferred at the request of the Lead Agency and other agency(ies)/jurisdiction(s) listed in the Project Agreement, and/or MAG.
   1. If a project is deferred, other projects will be moved in priority order for that year, taking into account: availability of Program funds, project readiness, local match available and funding source preferences.

F. Projects can be exchanged in the ALCP.
   1. Exchanging projects requires the agreement of the respective Lead Agency, MAG and all other agencies/jurisdictions listed in the Project Agreement.
   2. Funding for all projects involved in a project exchange must be documented for the Program both before and after the proposed exchange in order to demonstrate that there would be no negative fiscal impact on the ALCP.

III. PROJECT DETAILS

Section 300: Lead Agencies

A. A Lead Agency must be identified for each ALCP project in the RTP.
   1. The Lead Agency is expected to be a MAG member agency.
   2. One Lead Agency per project will be accepted. If project is subdivided, please refer to Section 300(D) (b).
   3. The designation of a Lead Agency for each project will be accomplished through the signed Project Agreement with MAG.

B. The Lead Agency will be responsible for all aspects of project implementation, including, but not limited to, project management, risk management, design, right of way acquisition and construction.
   1. The Lead Agency and MAG will be signatories to the Project Agreement.
   2. The Lead Agency and the agency(ies)/jurisdiction(s) listed in the Project Agreement are expected to use generally accepted financial and project management policies, practices and procedures in the use of funds received from the ALCP and in the implementation of the ALCP project.

C. Projects in One Jurisdiction
   1. If a project falls entirely within one jurisdiction, that jurisdiction is expected to be the Lead Agency.
      a. If there is change in jurisdictions because of an annexation that affects a project, the Lead Agency designated at the time of project implementation will continue.
   2. An alternative agency may be specified as the Lead Agency if the local jurisdiction in which the project is located agrees.
      a. An agreement between the local jurisdiction and the Lead Agency must be documented in writing between the respective Town/City Managers, County/Community Administrator or designees.
      b. A copy of that written agreement must be provided to MAG.

D. Projects in Multiple Jurisdictions
   1. In cases where the RTP project is located in more than one jurisdiction, the project may be implemented as either:
      a. One project with a single Lead Agency as agreed to by the agency(ies)/jurisdiction(s) listed in the Project Agreement.
         i. The agreement to this effect between the local jurisdictions and the Lead Agency must be documented in writing between the respective Town/City Managers, County/Community Administrator or designees in a Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) and/or an Intergovernmental Agreement (IGA).
            a. This agreement will be used to explain the multi-jurisdictional roles, responsibilities and terms of the project, which will be referenced in the Project Agreement signed by the Lead Agency.
            b. A copy of this agreement must be provided to MAG, who must agree to the proposed Lead Agency designation.
      b. The project may be subdivided and implemented as separate projects by local jurisdictions, if agreed to by all agencies/jurisdictions listed in the Project Agreement, and following the amendment process specified in Section 220(C).

Section 310: ALCP Project Budgets

A. The regional funding for each ALCP project as specified in the RTP establishes the maximum amount payable from regional funds for that project.
   1. Every payment obligation of MAG under the RTP, ALCP and any Project Agreement or related legal agreement is conditioned upon the availability of funds appropriated or allocated for the payment of such obligation.
   2. The ALCP budget and timeline can change to account for surplus or deficit Program funds.

B. The budget for each ALCP project:
   1. The regional contribution is limited to the amount specified in the RTP for the project, or 70% of the actual project expenditures, whichever is less.
   2. Will be established in the Project Agreement and Project Overview.
   3. The Lead Agency is responsible for all of the project costs over the regional contribution and, if applicable, will need to work with the other agency(ies)/jurisdiction(s) listed in the Project Agreement to cover those costs.

C. Credits for local match requirements are not transferable between projects.

Section 320: Eligible Costs for Reimbursement

A. Reimbursable expenditures are limited to ALCP projects meeting the requirements set forth in Section 200 (Project Eligibility).

B. No reimbursements will be made:
   1. Prior to the execution of a Project Agreement.
   2. Prior to the year in which the funds for that ALCP project are programmed or would normally be received following the schedule in the TIP and RTP, unless there are surplus program funds, Section 120.E.

C. Each ALCP project will have a reimbursement timeline specified in the Project Agreement and Project Overview.

D. The Lead Agency shall send the Project Reimbursement Requests to MAG for payment from the Arizona Department of Transportation (ADOT). The Lead Agency will be responsible for:
   1. All project expenditures.
   2. Providing all Project Reimbursement Requests to MAG for reimbursement.

E. Reimbursements will be made for expenditures paid with tax or public revenue only, including development and impact fees collected by a jurisdiction.
   1. Reimbursements will not be made for project elements donated or funded via cash or cash equivalent donations, right of way donations, exactions and/or other third party or non-tax funding sources.
   2. Reimbursements from the ALCP will not be made for expenditures that have already been reimbursed from other sources, either in cash or cash equivalents or through in-kind contributions including, but not limited to, the provision of a transportation improvement project such as a design or related study, right of way acquisition or donation or construction.

F. Project elements not eligible for reimbursement under subsection 320(A) and (B) may be eligible as credit toward matching costs if the requirements specified in Sections 330 (Eligible Prior Right of Way Acquisition and/or Work for Reimbursement) and 200 (Project Eligibility) are satisfied.

G. Reimbursements, including local match contributions, will generally be commensurate with progress unless otherwise agreed to in the Project Agreement, such as for specific lump sum right of way acquisitions and/or work.

H. Right of way or other capital assets acquired included as an eligible project cost, but not used in the ALCP project, must be disposed of at market rates and the funds returned to the ALCP for reallocation following the requirements contained in Section 330.

Section 330: Eligible Prior Right of Way Acquisition and/or Work for Reimbursement

A. Prior right of way acquisitions and/or work that is part of a designated ALCP project is eligible for reimbursement if:
   1. Specified in a Project Agreement and/or Project Overview.
   2. Purchased/completed after November 1, 2002, for design, environmental and related planning studies and right of way acquisition.
   3. Completed construction and related activities after November 25, 2003.

B. Eligible prior right of way acquisition and/or work is limited to ALCP projects scheduled or programmed for completion in Phase I of the RTP (which ends June 30, 2010), including ALCP projects accelerated or advanced from later phases.

C. Reimbursements for prior right of way acquisition and/or work will be payable only to the agency that paid for the right of way acquired and/or work, unless that agency assigns the payment to another party or other terms are developed in the Project Agreement for the ALCP project.

D. The Project Overview will identify as appropriate the priorities for reimbursement for prior right of way acquisition and/or work if more than one agency is requesting such reimbursement for that project.

E. If prior right of way acquisition and/or work are not eligible for reimbursement, it may be credited toward the local match requirement if:
   1. The project or work was included in the local jurisdiction or Lead Agency CIP or in the MAG TIP approved after the start of MAG Fiscal Year 2001 (July 1, 2000).
   2. The project or work is not otherwise excluded in whole or in part elsewhere in these requirements.

Section 340: Project Reimbursement Requests

A. A Project Reimbursement Request will contain a request for payment, an invoice and a progress report.
   1. The request for payment, invoice and progress report forms will be provided by MAG.
   2. For a current ALCP project, the Project Reimbursement Request will be submitted by the Lead Agency to MAG as needed, or by milestone completion (Section D.4.a-k), or unless otherwise agreed to in the Project Overview.

a. The Lead Agency cannot submit a Project Reimbursement Request more than once per month.
b. The progress report will reflect the work that is being invoiced for.

3. If an ALCP project is advanced, progress reports will be submitted and QA/QC meetings will be held based on the milestones of the project even though a full Project Reimbursement Request will not be submitted.
   i. A full Project Reimbursement Request, including request for reimbursement and invoice is due at the time of project completion.
4. All Project Reimbursement Requests shall be submitted to MAG for authorization for payment.
   a. Participating agencies/jurisdictions may invoice the Lead Agency for any item including, but not limited to, work conducted or capital assets acquired for the project or as part of the project, subject to other terms in this agreement.
5. The work conducted and/or received must meet all the requirements of the MAG ALCP Policies and Procedures as well as any and all other applicable federal, state, regional and local requirements.
6. The Lead Agency must retain and certify all vendor receipts, invoices and any related project records as needed and that they are available for review.
   a. These vendor receipts or invoices must be available for five (5) years after final payment is made; auditors, MAG or its designees can make possible requests.
   b. Receipts and invoices for projects advanced by a jurisdiction may have a longer retention period.
7. An authorized representative of the Lead Agency will sign all three forms: request for payment, invoice and progress report, certifying that the request is true and correct per the terms of the Project Agreement and Project Overview.
   a. The duly authorized representative for the Lead Agency may be the respective Town/City Managers, County/Community Administrator, designee or a higher level representative of the organization that has signing authority and is designated in the Project Overview for that specific ALCP project.
   b. No electronic or scanned signature will be accepted
8. Matching contributions as required in the ALCP Policies and Procedures have been fully documented, invoiced and/or received, and are not in arrears.

B. The request for payment will be approved and signed by the duly authorized representative from the Lead Agency, then it will be processed and approved at MAG and forwarded to ADOT for payment to Lead Agency. The request for payment form will include:
   1. Project name, description and RTP ID
   2. Estimated total project costs
   3. Expenditures to date
   4. Regional fund budget
   5. Previous Regional fund payments
   6. Amount of Regional fund requests
   7. Remaining Regional funds
   8. Status of project development/completion
   9. Type of work for reimbursement request is for
   10. Mailing address for payment
   11. Signatures of authorized representatives from Lead Agency, MAG and ADOT

C. The invoice will include:

1. Invoice #
2. Project name, description and RTP ID
3. Reimbursable items and related costs
4. Proper documentation of reimbursable items and reimbursable costs contained in invoice
   a. A copy of the invoice from the contractor is sufficient documentation for contracted work.
   b. An administrative breakdown chart including staff name, hours on project, hourly rate, and total costs is sufficient documentation for administrative work.

D. The progress report of the Project Reimbursement Request will explain the status of the project, milestones and other necessary information.
   1. It is the responsibility of the jurisdiction to document the work accomplished for each invoice or milestone during the reporting period.
   2. Advanced projects prior to the approved ALCP Policies and Procedures, will have special progress report requirements.
   3. For each progress report, the jurisdiction is to provide:
      a. Percent of work complete
      b. Work accomplished
      c. Estimate v. real cost analysis
      d. Work schedule analysis
      e. Grievance/complaints reports
      f. Procurement process update (when necessary)
      g. Documents produced
   4. Milestones can be used to trigger a Project Reimbursement Request for a current project. Milestones must be used to trigger a progress report for an advanced project. The milestones are:
      a. Studies
      b. Preliminary Design - 60%
      c. Final Design - 100%
      d. Construction – 25%
      e. Construction – 60%
      f. Final Acceptance
      g. Project Closeout
   5. Additionally to the progress report, there will be 3 Quality Assurance/Quality Control (QA/QC) meetings in the lifetime of a project.
      a. Each QA/QC meeting will have an agenda developed by MAG to 1)review and discuss a list of questions and measures pertaining to the project schedule, budget and deliverables 2)facilitate discussion and updates between MAG and jurisdictions in a team environment and plan for improvements.
      b. Each QA/QC meeting will consists of the project manager/other designee from the jurisdiction, a MAG representative and, if necessary and requested, other representatives from partner agencies and/or contractors.
      c. These meetings will generally come after the Final Design milestone, the Construction - 60% milestone, and the Final Acceptance milestone.

E. On MAG approval of Project Reimbursement Request, it will be forwarded to ADOT for payment.
   1. MAG will work with ADOT to expedite payment dependent on availability of funds.
   2. Checks will be distributed from ADOT and sent to Lead Agency.

Section 350: Reallocation of Surplus Project Funds

A. Surplus project funds from the ALCP will not be determined by MAG to be eligible for reallocation, unless and until:
   1. Construction has been completed and the work satisfies the original intent, the scope of the project as included in the Project Agreement and Project Overview and there are remaining regional funds that were allocated to the project,
   2. If applicable, right of way, or other capital assets acquired with ALCP funds not used in the ALCP project is disposed of at market rates and the funds returned to the ALCP, OR
   3. A high degree of certainty is obtained that construction for the original ALCP project will be completed consistent with the Project Agreement and Project Overview specified scope and schedule.

B. ALCP regional funds found by MAG to be surplus to an ALCP project, and for which certain criteria as established below are met, may be reallocated in that jurisdiction depending on the availability of Program funds.
   1. To another ALCP project or projects in the jurisdiction to address a budget shortfall, not to exceed 70% of the total cost of the project.
   2. To advance a portion or entire existing ALCP project or projects in the jurisdiction up to the amount of available surplus funds.
   3. If there are surplus regional funds upon full completion of the ALCP, then new projects for that jurisdiction may be funded.
   4. Subject to approval through the MAG Committee Process of the needed amendments to the RTP and, as needed, to the TIP.

C. An amendment to the RTP and/or TIP will be required to change the amount of regional funding, local match contributions, the project budget, the schedule for the ALCP project and for any reallocation of funds to other uses.

IV. PROJECT OVERVIEW AND PROJECT AGREEMENT

Section 400: Project Overview

A. Each ALCP Project will have a Project Overview submitted to MAG before the Project Agreement is signed.
   1. For advanced projects, a Project Overview will be submitted when the project begins.
B. The Project Overview can be updated throughout the project as long as it is not a material change.
C. The Project Overview will provide at a minimum:
   1. Lead Agency contacts and other agency(ies) jurisdiction(s) involved in the project.
   2. Project scope, project alignment, project history, project considerations, ITS components, multi-modal issues, project development process including, as needed, environmental, utility and right of way clearances.
   3. Map/photographs
   4. Timeline
   5. Management plan
   6. Project data
   7. Cost estimates
   8. Contingencies
   9. Cost savings
   10. Summary of work, including: year of work, total cost, local share, federal share, regional share, year for reimbursement
   11. Project documents if needed: IGA, MOU, DCR, Corridor Study, Project Assessment, supporting document for developer contributions, project amendments, environmental overview
   12. Funding sources
D. A Project Overview template will be provided by MAG.

Section 410: Project Agreement

A. A Project Agreement between MAG and the designated Lead Agency will be required for every project before reimbursable expenditures may be initiated.
   1. If a project is completed and eligible for reimbursement following the stipulations in Section 340, a Project Agreement has to be in place before Project Reimbursement Requests are submitted for reimbursement.
      a. If a project is advanced, a Project Agreement has to be in place before the completion of the project.
   2. The scope, regional funding and schedule specified in the Project Agreement must match that specified in the RTP for the project.
      a. Project subdivisions must be approved through the MAG Committee Process as described in Section 220(C) and the RTP and, as appropriate, the TIP amended showing those subdivided projects before Project Agreements can be executed for any of the subdivided projects.
         i. The Project Agreement can be in a developmental stage while the amendment is being approved through the MAG Committee Process.
      b. A Project Agreement will not be executed for subdivided projects or projects with scopes less than that specified in the RTP, even if proposed subdivisions are already listed for preliminary programming and financial planning purposes in the TIP, unless the RTP and ALCP is amended.

B. Each Project Agreement will be based on a standard agreement provided by MAG and customized for each project.
   1. Any material changes to the standard Project Agreement or template for a specific project must be identified in a clear and concise manner in the summary section of the Project Overview for that project.

C. The Project Agreement will be comprehensive. The Project Agreement will typically address at a minimum:
   1. Project scope, type of work, schedule of work and reimbursement, the regional share and federal funding if applicable.
   2. Lead Agency and other agency(ies) jurisdiction(s) involved in the project.
   3. Applicable Design Standards.
   4. Responsibilities of the Parties.
   5. Risk and indemnification.
   6. Records and audit rights..
   7. Term and termination.
   8. Non-Availability of Funds.
   9. Conflict of Interest.

D. Upon approval of the Arterial Life Cycle Program, an update will be given to the MAG Committees regarding the status of projects, including active Project Agreements and new Project Agreements that will be executed during that fiscal year.

E. RTP and/or TIP amendments will still be required to go through the MAG Committee Process for any changes involving material cost, scope or schedule changes to the project.

F. The Lead Agency and MAG will be signatories to the Project Agreement:
   1. To indicate their agreement to the Lead Agency designation and the terms of the agreement. The respective Town/City Managers, County/Community Administrator/Supervisor or designee will be the signing authority for that jurisdiction.
   2. To indicate roles and responsibilities in project implementation.

APPENDIX A - GLOSSARY AND DEFINITIONS

Acceleration	Acceleration means that all of the remaining projects, including the reimbursements for advanced projects, in the Arterial Life Cycle Program are moved forward in priority order.
ADOT	Arizona Department of Transportation
Advancement	Advancement of a project means that its implementation is moved earlier in time than previously scheduled in the MAG RTP and/or TIP, with the interest and any other incremental costs associated with the earlier implementation borne by the Lead and/or local agencies requesting the advancement. Reimbursement for the project will remain in the year(s) in which the project was scheduled before the proposed advancement.
ALCP	Arterial Life Cycle Program, or the "Program"
ALCP Regional Funds	ALCP Regional Funds are generated from the Maricopa County one-half cent sales tax extension and Federal Transportation Funds, including STP and CMAQ funds.
ARS	Arizona Revised Statutes
Certification Report	Periodic report produced, at least, annually for the ALCP providing an update on the status of the Program, current revenue and cost projections. The report will provide supporting information for the RTP Annual Report.
CIP	Capital Improvement Program
CTOC	Citizens Transportation Oversight Committee as referenced in ARS 28-6356
DCR	Design Concept Report, meeting the standards established for federal aid arterial projects. Key elements of the DCR for the ALCP include (but are not limited to) the development and provision of labor and material quantity based cost estimates for the entire ALCP project as specified in the RTP, categorized by project phase, segment and jurisdiction as appropriate; projected monthly cash flow requirements, for financial planning purposes; and appropriate contingency amounts for the completion of the project.
Enhancement	"means an addition that exceeds generally accepted engineering or design standards for the specific type of facility." (From HB 2456, 28-6351(2)) For the purposes of the ALCP, the term "enhancement" is defined more specifically as: 1. Projects, project elements or project additions that are not design, right of way or construction related, including any project, project element or addition that is not a needed study, right of way acquisition or capacity or safety-related

infrastructure improvement. Examples include drainage in excess of typical needs for the roadway or intersection, "improvements" that tend to reduce through capacity, such as deletion of lanes and other traffic calming measures.
2. Project additions after a Design Concept Report has been completed, unless otherwise agreed to in the approved Project Agreement.
3. Additional limitations or requirements may apply, depending on the funding source.

EA	Environmental Assessment
EIS	Environmental Impact Statement
Federal Aid Project	Any project in which any federal aid funding is received. These projects are required to follow implementation processes established or required by the FHWA and administered through the ADOT Local Government Section.
FHWA	Federal Highway Administration
In-Kind Contribution	Contribution made to an ALCP project other than cash or cash equivalent funding, typically involving donation of right of way but may also include other aspects of project implementation such as design and construction.
ITS	Intelligent Transportation System
MAG	Maricopa Association of Governments
MAG Committee Process	Items are placed for action on the agendas of the MAG Transportation Review Committee (TRC), Management Committee, Transportation Policy Committee (TPC), as appropriate, and Regional Council
Major Arterial	"… means an interconnected thoroughfare whose primary function is to link areas in the region and to distribute traffic to and from controlled access highways, generally of region wide significance and of varying capacity depending on the travel demand for the specific direction and adjacent land uses." (ARS 28-6304(c)(5))
Material Change	In general, a material change is any change that could reasonably cause a change in decision regarding a project or an amendment to a project. It is further defined as any proposed change to a project that: 1. changes scope by: a) modifying project termini by a quarter-mile or more, b) changing a freeway- or highway–arterial interchange location by a quarter mile or more, or changing its location so as to cause increased costs for the freeway or highway program, or any change in the design and/or location of the arterial project affecting the freeway or highway not agreed by ADOT,

c) changing vertical alignment at a freeway or highway interchange between at-grade, depressed and elevated, or changing its alignment in such a way so as to cause increased costs for the freeway or highway program, or any change in vertical alignment affecting an interchange or grade separation not agreed by ADOT or light rail crossing not agreed by Valley Metro, as appropriate,
d) changing major design elements (including, but not limited to, number of lanes),
e) otherwise significantly modifying the scope of the project itself or negatively impacting a freeway, highway or light rail facility as determined in consultation with MAG staff,

2. changes costs:
   a) in excess of 5% of the project budget as specified in the Project Overview or other agreement established for the project, or in excess of one million dollars, but not less than two hundred thousand dollars, and/or
   b) to increase the regional share of the budget to an amount over the dollar amount specified in the RTP, or to an amount that represents over 70% of the project costs.
3. changes project completion by:
   a) one or more fiscal years from the year shown in the TIP or RTP, or
   b) changes project completion from one phase to another in the RTP,

and/or

4. results from a finding of a performance and/or financial audit.

Memorandum of Understanding (MOU)	A type of agreement that may used as a bridge to a Project Agreement, for example in the development of project cost estimates and allocations across multiple jurisdictions that then may be agreed and incorporated into a more formal Project Agreement to be executed before the project is further implemented.
MPO	Metropolitan Planning Organization
Participating Agency	Any agency involved in implementing an ALCP Project. All partner agencies are participating agencies.
Program	ALCP or TIP, depending on context.
Project	ALCP arterial, arterial intersection and/or ITS project as described in the RTP and project-related documents. The project description includes funding, schedule, project termini and number of lanes added and other project features. See also "Sub-divided projects".
Project Component	ALCP projects may include several project components or major elements, such as widenings, grade separations, ITS applications, bike and pedestrian facilities, etc. The components together comprise the overall ALCP project.
Project Agreement (PA)	A legally binding contract or agreement between MAG and the Lead Agency established for the ALCP project.

Project Completion	For the purposes of the material change policy, project completion means that all lanes of the roadway segment or intersection are open to traffic. For purposes of Project Agreements or other legal agreements for the project, project completion means when all requirements of the Agreements have been completed to the satisfaction of MAG (i.e. it is contract or agreement completion). A Project Agreement may establish dates for project completion considering administrative requirements or other requirements or needs as determined by MAG to be necessary.
Project Overview	A managerial document that Lead Agencies complete for each ALCP Project, before a Project Agreement is signed. The Project Overview includes the Lead Agency information, project data, summary of the project, history and background, maps/photographs, ITS components, timeline, project data, cost estimates, summary of work and local, regional, federal and total costs.
Project Reimbursement Request	The guidelines and forms: request for payment, invoice and progress reports, that a Lead Agency completes when requesting reimbursement for an ALCP Project.
Reallocation	Re-assignment or re-programming of funds unexpended or not expected to be needed from one ALCP project to another ALCP project.
Reimbursement	Payment or compensation for costs incurred.
RTP	Regional Transportation Plan found to be in conformance for air quality purposes and approved by the MAG Regional Council. The RTP may be updated or amended from time to time, and any references to the RTP mean the currently approved version unless indicated otherwise. It is also referred to as the "Plan".
STIP	State Transportation Improvement Program
Subdivided Projects	Segments of RTP projects, where the original project as specified in the RTP is subdivided or proposed for subdivision into smaller, shorter segments or components that together comprise the original RTP project in its entirety.
TIP	MAG Transportation Improvement Program found to be in conformance for air quality purposes, approved by the MAG Regional Council, and approved by the Governor for inclusion in the STIP. As the TIP may be amended from time to time, any references to the TIP mean the currently approved version unless indicated otherwise.
TPC	MAG Transportation Policy Committee
TRC	MAG Transportation Review Committee

Agenda Item #5G

MARICOPA ASSOCIATION OF GOVERNMENTS INFORMATION SUMMARY... for your review

DATE:
January 3, 2006

SUBJECT:
Draft MAG 208 Water Quality Management Plan Amendment for the Expansion of the Town of Buckeye Sundance Wastewater Treatment Plant

SUMMARY:
The Town of Buckeye has requested that MAG amend the 208 Water Quality Management Plan to include the expansion of the Sundance Wastewater Treatment Plant. The plant is identified in the current MAG 208 Plan for a capacity of 3.6 million gallons per day (mgd). The expansion would increase ultimate capacity to 8.9 mgd. Reclaimed water from the expanded facility would be disposed of through reuse, recharge, and an Arizona Pollutant Discharge Elimination System Permit discharge to the Buckeye Irrigation District Canal. The cities of Glendale and Goodyear and unincorporated Maricopa County are within three miles of the project, and all have indicated that they do not object to the facility expansion.

PUBLIC INPUT:
On December 13, 2005, the MAG Water Quality Advisory Committee conducted a public hearing on the Draft MAG 208 Plan Amendment. No public comments were received on the Draft 208 Amendment.

PROS & CONS:
PROS: Approval of the 208 Plan Amendment for the Expansion of the Town of Buckeye Sundance Wastewater Treatment Plant would make the facility consistent with the MAG 208 Plan. The MAG 208 Water Quality Management Plan is the key guiding document used by Maricopa County and the Arizona Department of Environmental Quality in granting permits for wastewater treatment systems in the MAG region.

CONS: Currently, there do not appear to be any negative impacts associated with the approval of the 208 Plan Amendment.

TECHNICAL & POLICY IMPLICATIONS:
TECHNICAL: The 208 Plan Amendment is needed to accommodate growth in the Buckeye Wastewater Planning Area.

POLICY: The MAG 208 Water Quality Management Plan is the key guiding document used by Maricopa County and the Arizona Department of Environmental Quality in granting permits for wastewater treatment systems in the MAG region. Approval of the facility expansion would enable the facility to be deemed consistent with the MAG 208 Plan. Consistency is necessary for permit approvals.

ACTION NEEDED:
Recommend approval of the Draft MAG 208 Water Quality Management Plan Amendment for the Expansion of the Town of Buckeye Sundance Wastewater Treatment Plant.

PRIOR COMMITTEE ACTIONS:
Water Quality Advisory Committee: On December 13, 2005, the MAG Water Quality Advisory Committee conducted a public hearing on the Draft 208 Plan Amendment for the Expansion of the Town of Buckeye Sundance Wastewater Treatment Plant. Following the hearing, the Committee unanimously recommended approval of the Draft 208 Plan Amendment to the MAG Management Committee.

MEMBERS ATTENDING

Roger Klingler, Scottsdale, Chair
Avondale: Greg Stack
Buckeye: Lucky Roberts
#Chandler: Jacqueline Strong
*El Mirage: Michael Salisbury
*Gilbert: Lonnie Frost
Glendale: Chris Ochs
Goodyear: David Iwanski
#Mesa: Bill Haney
*Peoria: Steven Bontrager
*Phoenix: RobertHollander
Surprise: Rich Williams Sr.
Tempe: David McNeil
Maricopa County: Dale Bodiya for John Power
Pinnacle West Capital: John Boyer
*Salt River Project: Ray Hedrick
*U of A Cooperative Extension: Patrick Clay
Citizen Representative: Eugene Jensen

*Those members neither present nor represented by proxy.
#Attended by videoconference or by telephone conference call.

CONTACT PERSON:
Julie Hoffman, MAG, 602-254-6300

Agenda Item #5H

MARICOPA ASSOCIATION OF GOVERNMENTS INFORMATION SUMMARY... for your review

DATE:
January 3, 2006

SUBJECT:
Amendment to the FY 2007 Public Safety Answering Point (PSAP) Annual Element/Funding Request and FY 2007-2011 Equipment Program for the MAG 9-1-1 System

SUMMARY:
On September 28, 2005, the MAG Regional Council approved the MAG FY 2007 Public Safety Answering Point (PSAP) Annual Element/Funding Request and FY 2007-2011 Equipment Program, to be forwarded to the Arizona Department of Administration. Equipment costs for the MAG 9-1-1 System are currently paid by the 9-1-1 state excise tax.

Since the Regional Council's approval, it has become necessary to amend the FY 2007 budget to allow for equipment upgrades. This Amendment includes a request by the MAG 9-1-1 Office to upgrade the computerized telephone 9-1-1 systems at the El Mirage Police Department for $118,300, the Glendale Police Department for $441,000, the Mesa Police Department for $804,000, and the Tempe Police Department for $441,000. The current equipment's warranties and support have expired and should be replaced. The 9-1-1 Office is also requesting a Positron MIS tool for $45,000 that will provide systemwide call reporting. This equipment was not included in the FY 2007 PSAP Annual Element/Funding Request and FY 2007-2011 Equipment Program because cost estimates were unavailable at the time the budget was drafted.

The equipment included in the Amendment specifically addresses the issues identified in the MAG 9-1-1 Five Year System Management Plan, which was approved by the Regional Council in November 2000. This Plan addressed all areas of the system including administration, budget, database maintenance, equipment and growth for the region's 9-1-1 emergency telephone system.

PUBLIC INPUT:
Opportunities for public comment on the Amendment were provided at the October PSAP Managers meeting and the November Oversight Team meeting. No comments were received. At the September 7, 2005 Management Committee meeting, a citizen commenting on the FY 2007 PSAP Annual Element/Funding Request and FY 2007-2011 Equipment Program, expressed concern that State legislation calls for a decrease in the monthly 37-cent excise tax, which will put the 9-1-1 fund into a deficit. The citizen commented that, if anything, the tax should be increased, not decreased.

PROS & CONS:
PROS: Amending the FY 2007 PSAP Annual Element/Funding Request and FY 2007-2011 Equipment Program will make it possible for the purchases of equipment to be made.

CONS: None.

TECHNICAL & POLICY IMPLICATIONS:
TECHNICAL: None.

POLICY: According to the adopted policy for making changes to the approved PSAP budget, the MAG 9-1-1 Oversight Team, the MAG Management Committee, and the MAG Regional Council are required to consider budget changes greater than 50 percent of the total equipment budget.

ACTION NEEDED:

Recommend approval of the Amendment to the FY 2007 PSAP Annual Element/Funding Request and FY 2007-2011 Equipment Program to include upgrades to the computerized telephone 9-1-1 systems at the El Mirage Police Department for $118,300, the Glendale Police Department for $441,000, the Mesa Police Department for $804,000, and the Tempe Police Department for $441,000, and a Positron MIS tool for the MAG 9-1-1 Office for $45,000.

PRIOR COMMITTEE ACTIONS:

MAG 9-1-1 Oversight Team: On November 29, 2005, the MAG 9-1-1 Oversight Team recommended approval of the Amendment.

MEMBERS ATTENDING

Harry Beck, Mesa Fire Department, Chair
* Mark Burdick, Glendale Fire Department
Steve Werner, Maricopa County Sheriff's Office
Mike Fusco, Emergency Management, Peoria
Dave Faulkner, Phoenix Police Department
Helen Gandara-Zavala, Scottsdale Police Department
Jay Spradling, Tempe Police Department
Lawrence Rodriguez, Tolleson Police Department
Liz Hunt for the Phoenix Fire Department

* Those members neither present nor represented by proxy.

MAG PSAP Managers: On October 20, 2005, the MAG PSAP Managers recommended approval of the Amendment.

MEMBERS ATTENDING

Chris Nadeau, Goodyear, Chair
Erika Wilson, Mesa, Vice Chair
Kathy Jeter, Apache Junction
Janne Stringer, Avondale
Velma Washington, Buckeye
* Vicki Szczepkowski, Chandler
* Michelle Busch, El Mirage
* Mary Schlosser, Ft. McDowell Yavapai Nation
* Janet Laird, Gilbert
Denny Bennett, Glendale
Mary Millard, Maricopa County
Larry Scott, Paradise Valley
Vicky Scott, Peoria
Tami deRuiter, Phoenix
Darren Shortey for Curtis Thomas, Salt River Pima-Maricopa Indian Community
Tom Melton, Scottsdale
* Jack Aguilar, Surprise
Diane Campbell for Karen Allen, Tempe
Toni Rogers, Tolleson
Ed Syzponik, Wickenburg
+ Brian Tobin, ASU
+ Barbara Jaeger, ADOA
*+Gina Weiers, Capitol Police
+ Debbie Henry, DPS
+ Paul Phillips, Luke AFB
+ Doug Mummert, Phoenix
*+Joe Gibson, Rural Metro/Southwest Ambulance

* Those members neither present nor represented by proxy.
+ Ex-Officio member

CONTACT PERSON:

Liz Hunt, 602-534-9775 or Mary D. Franklin 602-262-6260, Phoenix Fire Department.

Agenda Item #5I

MARICOPA ASSOCIATION OF GOVERNMENTS INFORMATION SUMMARY... for your review

DATE:
January 3, 2006

SUBJECT:
Approval of the Report on the Need for Increased Domestic Violence Shelter in the MAG Region

SUMMARY:
The MAG Regional Domestic Violence Council, through the Victim Services Subcommittee, has produced a report on the unduplicated need for shelter beds to serve current domestic violence victims in the MAG Region. The Council determined that 325 more beds are needed by researching data from local service providers and conducting a statistically reliable study in all nine domestic violence shelters in the MAG Region. The report and supporting data can be used by domestic violence advocates to clearly demonstrate the current level of need and to support the case for increased funding to provide more domestic violence shelter beds. This effort was undertaken in partnership with Arizona State University's Partnership for Community Development.

PUBLIC INPUT:
This report was reviewed by the MAG Regional Domestic Violence Council on November 1, 2005. Public comment was part of that discussion and included the suggestion to indicate that some of the needs identified by the domestic violence victims are common to many other people as well, such as affordable housing and transportation. This has been revised in the document.

PROS & CONS:
PROS: The benefits of meeting the current demand for domestic violence shelter are important. This research indicates that 23 percent of victims remain with their abuser when they cannot access shelter. Another 49 percent stay with families and friends, most often known to the abuser. These unsafe situations can result in serious injury or even death to the victim. Calls for emergency services also have a significant financial impact on municipalities. By meeting the current need for shelter, municipalities can save lives and money.

CONS: There are no cons to providing additional shelter beds.

TECHNICAL & POLICY IMPLICATIONS:
TECHNICAL: This report establishes the number of additional beds that are needed, but it does not indicate where the beds should be placed. Additional research will be needed to site new shelters based on the need, availability of services and the infrastructure needed to support the clients such as transportation and access to employment centers.

POLICY: Providing additional shelter beds will require increased funding, political will and community support. The Governor's FY2006 budget added new beds statewide but more are needed to meet the current demand. This report does not endeavor to project the future demand, but the need may increase with time. This will require ongoing attention and possibly the addition of more beds in the future.

ACTION NEEDED:
Recommend acceptance of the Report on the Need for Domestic Violence Shelter in the MAG Region.

PRIOR COMMITTEE ACTIONS:
The MAG Regional Domestic Violence Council recommended approval of this report on November 1, 2005.

MEMBERS ATTENDING:

Phillip Westbrooks, Vice Mayor of Chandler, Chairman
Cmdr. Kim Humphrey, City of Phoenix, Public Affairs Bureau, Vice Chair
Judge Carey Hyatt for Mark Armstrong, Maricopa Co. Superior Court
* Tracy Bame, Phelps Dodge Corp.
* John A. Blackburn, Jr., AZ Criminal Justice Commission
Jerry Boone, Maricopa County Department of Public Health
Dena Salter for Jennifer Casaletto, Maricopa Medical Center
* Chris Christy, Salt River Pima-Maricopa Indian Community
* Gene D'Adamo, The Arizona Republic
Linda Dickerson for Dept. Of Public Safety
* Susan Glawe, Blue Cross Blue Shield
Gina Grappone for the Governor's Office
Laura Guild, DES
Shannon Cotton for Cindy Hallman, Marley House
Sherri Lauritano for Vicki Hill, City of Phoenix Law Department
Lt. Scott Connelly for Dan Hughes, City of Surprise
* Mary Lynn Kasunic, Area Agency on Aging
Wallace Kemp, Phoenix Police Department
Patricia Klahr, Chrysalis Shelter
* Phil Lieberman, Councilmember of Glendale
JoEllen Lynn, American Express
Carolyn McBurney, Envision Project Management
Marna McClendon, Office of the Attorney General
Lisa Melton, Community Legal Services
* Craig Mills, APS
* Michael Parascandola, City of Goodyear
Celeste Adams for Janice Parker, Save the Family Foundation
* Keith Perkins, Never Again Foundation
* Don Peyton, City of Phoenix Fire Dept.
Connie Phillips, Sojourner Center
John Pombier, City of Mesa
* Lynn Potts, City of Mesa
* Fred Scott, Councilmember of Goodyear
Libby Bissa for Ginger Spencer, Phoenix Family Advocacy Center
* Mike Stedman, City of El Mirage
* Patricia Stevens, Maricopa County Attorney's Office
Kris Scharlau for Judy Tapscott, City of Tempe
* Kerry G. Wangberg, City of Phoenix Prosecutor's Office
Dale Wiebusch, Arizona Coalition Against Domestic Violence
Rick Ybarra, Value Options

+ Those attending by video/audio conference
* Those not present or represented by proxy

CONTACT PERSON:
Amy St. Peter, MAG, 602-254-6300

Agenda Item #5J

MARICOPA ASSOCIATION OF GOVERNMENTS INFORMATION SUMMARY... for your review

DATE:
January 3, 2006

SUBJECT:
MAG Continuum of Care Regional Committee on Homelessness Guidelines

SUMMARY:
In December, 1999, MAG became the responsible entity for the Continuum of Care Regional Committee on Homelessness. The Committee represents a partnership between MAG and a diverse coalition of individuals and agencies who participate in planning and coordinating services to populations who are homeless. A principal activity of the Committee is to complete and submit the Stuart B. McKinney application for homeless assistance funding for Maricopa County to the Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD). This partnership has been very successful in receiving homeless assistance for this region. In 2002 guidelines were created by the Committee to assist in guiding its activities. Clarifications are now being proposed to the guidelines.

The primary area of the guidelines under discussion by the Committee has been advocating for policy positions that would assist in ending homelessness. Within the MAG policy process, major advocacy positions are brought through the appropriate MAG committees and to the Regional Council for approval. This clarification has been made to the advocacy desired by the Continuum when it is on behalf of the Committee and MAG. This clarification would not impact individual committee members when they are acting on behalf of themselves or their agency. It would only apply to regional positions on behalf of MAG through the Continuum. The guidelines also clarify that the Chair and Vice Chair of the Continuum will be appointed by the Chair of the MAG Regional Council, as is the current practice with other MAG committees.

PUBLIC INPUT:
None

PROS & CONS:
PROS: The guidelines add structure to the MAG Continuum of Care Regional Committee on Homelessness and is a formal document for new and current members.

CONS: Some of the issues that members want to address on behalf of the Continuum of Care Regional Committee on Homelessness are time sensitive.

TECHNICAL & POLICY IMPLICATIONS:
TECHNICAL: The benefit of the Maricopa Association of Governments process is to build regional support on public policy issues.

POLICY: The guidelines will add structure to the Continuum of Care Regional Committee on Homelessness. Anytime anyone takes a stand on an issue on behalf of the MAG Continuum of Care Regional Committee on Homelessness, that position needs to be reviewed and approved through the appropriate Maricopa Association of Governments process.

ACTION NEEDED:
Recommend approval of the MAG Continuum of Care Regional Committee on Homelessness Guidelines.

PRIOR COMMITTEE ACTIONS:
MAG Continuum of Care Regional Committee on Homelessness: On November 17, 2005, The Committee reached consensus on the guidelines for approval by the MAG Regional Council.

MEMBERS ATTENDING:

Greg Stanton, Councilmember of Phoenix, Chair
Tom Canasi, City of Tempe, Co-Vice Chair
Don Keuth, Phoenix Community Alliance, Co-Vice Chair
* Lorenzo Aguirre, City of El Mirage
Roberto Armijo, Community Information & Referral Services
* Maryann Beerling Thomas, New Arizona Family
Allie Bones, DES/CPM
* Judy Bowden, Mesa United Way
Brad Bridwell, US Vets
Kendra Cea, APS
* Kelly Dalton, City of Goodyear
Trinity Donovan, Valley of the Sun United Way
* Ken Einbinder, US HUD
Steve Frate, City of Glendale, Councilmember
Fred Karnas, Governor' Office, C Y & F
* Dan Lundberg, City of Surprise
* Marvin Martin, Berean Baptist Church
Carrie Mascaro, Catholic Social Services
Mike McQuaid, HSC
Meggan Medina, Arizona Coalition to End Homelessness
* Guy Mikkelsen, Foundation for Senior Living
Darlene Newsom, United Methodist Outreach Ministries
* Crucita Nuñez-Ochoa, Chicanos Por La Causa
* Frank Scarpati, Community Bridges
Laura Skotnicki, Save the Family
Brenda Robbins for Vicki Staples, AZ Dept. of Health Services
Annette Stein, Maricopa County HS
Jeff Taylor, Phoenix Rescue Mission
Margaret Trujillo, Trial Court of Arizona
* Mike Whalen, Councilmember of Mesa
*Mary Rose Wilcox, Maricopa County, Supervisor
Elizabeth Morales for Ted Williams, AZ Behavioral Health Corporation
* Kit Wood, Maricopa County Schools
Margot Cordova for Diana Yazzie Devine, Native American Connections

*Those members neither present nor represented by proxy.
+Those members present by audio or video conference.

CONTACT PERSON:
Brande Mead, MAG Human Services Planner I, (602) 452-5060.

Guidelines for
The Maricopa Association of Governments
Continuum of Care
Regional Committee on Homelessness

Name

This committee is named the Maricopa Association of Governments Continuum of Care Regional Committee on Homelessness (hereafter referred to as the Continuum).

Office

The principal office of the Maricopa Association of Governments Continuum of Care Regional Committee on Homelessness will be located at the Maricopa Association of Governments' offices located at 302 North First Avenue, Suite 300 in Phoenix, Arizona.

Purpose

The purpose of the Continuum is to develop a diverse coalition of people to provide participation in the planning and coordination of services to populations who are homeless. Toward this goal, the Continuum will:

1. Develop a consolidated application for Stuart B. McKinney funds through the Department of Housing and Urban Development to support homeless assistance programs.

2. Support a year-round planning and coordinating process to end homelessness.

3. Develop a year-round plan to end homelessness for chronically homeless people and monitor progress.

Membership

Meetings

It is the intention of the full membership of the Continuum to meet no fewer than four times annually with the potential of meeting up to eight times within a calendar year. The Steering Subcommittee will meet at least six times annually. Each subcommittee will determine meeting frequency.

Membership Categories

The Continuum will be composed of up to 42 people in three different membership categories. Potential categories include:

1. Private sector/general public.

2. Public sector: 25 cities, three Indian communities and one county (attempt to keep geographically diverse).

3. Provider agencies.

Representatives from a small number of key organizations will be standing members and will not count as representatives within the categories. Such organizations will include the Department of Housing and Urban Development, Arizona Department of Corrections, the Arizona Department of Health, and the Ranking and Rating Committee of Valley of the Sun United Way. Any representative will excuse themselves from votes in which they have a conflict of interest, such as in the approval of the application to HUD for McKinney funds. The remaining number of membership slots will be filled evenly across the three categories. At least one person will have been formerly homeless.

Those members who rotate off the Continuum, especially former Chairs, may continue to be associated with the Continuum as emeritus members. Honorary members or honorary chairs of the Continuum may be selected by the Steering Subcommittee and approved by the full membership.

All current members will be grandfathered in and will rotate off the Continuum as members finish their staggered term limits. (See *Term Limits* section)

The three membership categories shall be as follows:

1. Private sector: For-profit entities are encouraged to become members of the Continuum. This includes businesses that have a stake, interest or expertise regarding the homeless population, as well as individuals whose background is in the corporate sector.

2. Public sector: Government employees and elected officials are encouraged to join the Continuum as members. This category includes representatives from the state, county, municipal and federal levels.

3. Provider agencies: Non-profit agencies, funders, homeless advocates and formerly homeless people will be encouraged to become members of the Continuum through this category. Faith based organizations and community based grass roots organizations are also included.

Membership List

The Chair of the Membership Subcommittee, in combination with MAG staff, will maintain a list of all members in good standing and will monitor this information to ensure the proper balance among the three categories is maintained at all times. It will be the duty of the Membership Subcommittee to recruit new members as appropriate and to recommend new

officers when needed. "Members in good standing" will consist of those members who are currently within their terms as members.

Termination of Membership

1. An individual membership will be terminated upon written resignation of the member or upon failure to attend three Continuum meetings within a year without approval from the Chair. If a member leaves the organization from which they were appointed to the Continuum, their membership will be terminated. Membership applies to the organization and not the person. In the case of the general public category, however, the membership applies to the person and not the organization. Therefore, if a person is appointed to the Continuum in the general public category, their membership will not be terminated if they leave their organization.

2. An Organizational or Business membership will be terminated upon the dissolution of the member organization or business or upon written resignation of the member organization or business.

3. The Membership Subcommittee will review attendance of all appointed members. If a member sends a proxy to the majority of the meetings and rarely comes personally to the meetings, the Membership Subcommittee may decide to ask the Continuum Chair to meet with that member to determine the appropriateness of continued membership.

Term Limits

Term limits are necessary to encourage innovation and to create vitality and momentum within the membership and give an opportunity for renewal for members who are interested in rotating on and off the Continuum. All terms are based on a calendar year. Members of the Continuum and related committees shall adhere to the following standards:

1. Members will have a three-year term limit. One-third of the members will rotate off at a time. The rotation is evenly divided so that an even proportion between public and private sectors and providers remain on the Continuum at any given time. Initially, current members will be given the opportunity to self select into the three groups rotating off in one, two and three years. The Membership Subcommittee will then finalize the three groups and implement the assigned term limits. After a one-year absence from the Continuum, a member may be reappointed.

2. The Chair of the Continuum will be appointed by the MAG Regional Council and have a two-year term limit. Vice Chairs may serve for two years. If an officer's membership term finishes before his/her term as officer, the officer may finish out their term as an officer before having to leave the Continuum.

3. Members of ad hoc committees shall serve for the tenure of the committee because the committee is temporary in nature and it needs the focus of all members during the life of the committee.

4. Members of the Planning, Membership and Outreach Subcommittees will serve for three-year terms. One-third shall rotate off at a time. Chairs of these subcommittees shall serve for one year.

5. Members of the Steering Subcommittee (the Chair, one Vice Chair and the Chair of each subcommittee) will follow their respective term limits in their positions.

Conflict of Interest

A member of the Continuum shall declare a conflict of interest to the Chair of the Continuum of any item that would relate to the private financial or otherwise personal interests of the member or of the agency/organization for which they are associated.

Committee Structure

Number of Officers

Officers of the Continuum will include a Chair, one Vice Chair and one Chair for each of the subcommittees. The Chair of the MAG Regional Council will appoint the Chair and Vice Chair of the Continuum.

Removal

Any officer or member may be removed from office by a majority vote of the Steering Subcommittee whenever in its judgment the best interest of the Continuum will be served. Such removal will be included on the agenda of a Steering Subcommittee meeting and the reason(s) for the proposed removal will be given at the Steering Subcommittee meeting. The officer/member whose removal is proposed will be afforded an opportunity to respond to stated reason(s).

Succession Planning

The Chair will serve a two-year term with one Vice Chair. When the Chair's term expires or if the Chair leaves their position prematurely, the Chair of the MAG Regional Council will appoint a new Chair to the Committee. The former Chair may then exit the Continuum or become an emeritus member.

Duties of Officers

1. Chair: The Chair of the Continuum will preside at all Continuum meetings, establish ad hoc committees, appoint members to committees, give reports to the MAG Regional Council, and direct and advise staff within the framework of the policies. The Chair will have other responsibilities normally associated with this Office as required by these guidelines or as may be assigned by the Continuum.

2. Vice Chair: The Vice Chair will possess the powers and discharge the duties of the Chair in the Chair's absence and perform other such duties as the Chair or Continuum may request. The Continuum Vice Chair may also assume the powers and duties of subcommittee Chairs in their absence.

3. Subcommittee Chair: The Chair for each subcommittee will preside at all subcommittee meetings, appoint members to work on tasks, give reports at all Continuum meetings and advise and direct staff within the framework of the policies. The Subcommittee Chair will have other responsibilities normally associated with this Office as required by these guidelines or as may be assigned by the Continuum Chair.

Standing Subcommittees

Steering Subcommittee

1. The Steering Subcommittee will consist of the Continuum Chair, the Continuum Vice Chair and the Chair from each standing subcommittee.

2. The Steering Subcommittee will act on behalf of the Continuum between meetings of the Continuum. Such actions shall be reported at the next Continuum meeting and are subject to Continuum ratification. The Steering Subcommittee will only take such action when a meeting of the full membership is not possible. All actions will be reported to the full membership and comments will be solicited to preserve broad input from all members.

3. The Continuum Chair, working in concert with MAG staff, will be responsible for calling all meetings of the Steering Subcommittee, setting agenda items, providing reasonable notice and scheduling of meetings at times and places reasonably convenient to the members.

It is within the purview of the Steering Subcommittee to review issues and decide the most appropriate course of action.

Planning Subcommittee

1. Membership to the Planning Subcommittee will be open to both members and non-members of the Continuum.

2. The Chair of the Continuum will appoint a Chair for this subcommittee that is a member of the Continuum.

3. This group is responsible for providing input on issues that will steer the activities and momentum of the Continuum. This group is also responsible for analysis and project review with potential recommendation for action in the Continuum.

Outreach Subcommittee

1. The Outreach Subcommittee will be composed of members and non-members of the Continuum.

2. The Chair of the Continuum will appoint a Chair to this subcommittee that is a member of the Continuum.

3. This subcommittee is responsible for educating the public and Continuum members about the challenges the homeless population faces in the community. In terms of educating the public about homeless issues, the Outreach Subcommittee will plan and recommend appropriate marketing strategies such as newsletters, brochures, press releases and publications, about trends in homelessness to the Continuum for implementation. In terms of educating the Continuum, members of the Outreach Subcommittee will inform Continuum members about initiatives they have planned and recommended for approval by the Continuum.

Membership Subcommittee

1. The Membership Subcommittee will be composed of five Continuum members. Members may volunteer or be appointed by the Chair of the Continuum.

2. The Chair of the Continuum will appoint a Chair of this subcommittee that is a member of the Continuum.

3. The Membership Subcommittee is responsible for monitoring appointments to the Continuum to ensure the proper proportions are maintained and for recruiting new members to keep this balance.

Ad hoc Committees and Work Groups

1. Ad hoc committees will be composed of Continuum members as well as interested community members appointed at large by the Continuum Chair. The Chair will also appoint experts from the community.

2. The Continuum Chair will appoint the Ad hoc Committee Chair. This position will be time limited.

3. Ad hoc committees will meet for a limited amount of time for a specified purpose. This flexibility is necessary in order to resolve short-term issues and not have an excessive amount of committees and meetings.

4. The Finance Ad hoc Committee will continue to operate as an ad hoc committee and will convene when funding needs to be secured for the Continuum.

Decision Making

Quorum

A quorum is achieved when fifty percent of the appointed members plus one more are present. Proxies sent by Continuum members count for quorum.

Voting

When a quorum is present, the members or their approved proxies may vote only on items listed for action on the agenda. A simple majority vote will rule, defined as fifty percent plus one.

Rules of Order

Robert's Rules of Order Newly Revised will govern Continuum meetings and all committee meetings unless otherwise provided for in these Guidelines or other applicable documents.

Education and Outreach

The Continuum will strive toward engaging and informing the public on important issues that impact the Region's homeless population. Anytime anyone takes a stand on an issue on behalf of the MAG Continuum of Care Regional Committee on Homelessness, that position needs to be reviewed and approved through the appropriate Maricopa Association of Governments process. The benefit of the Maricopa Association of Governments process is to build Regional support on public policy issues.

Agenda Item #5K

MARICOPA ASSOCIATION of GOVERNMENTS

302 North 1st Avenue, Suite 300 ▲ Phoenix, Arizona 85003
Phone (602) 254-6300 ▲ Fax (602) 254-6490
E-mail: mag@mag.maricopa.gov ▲ Web site: www.mag.maricopa.gov

January 3, 2006

TO: Members of the MAG Management Committee

FROM: Heidi Pahl, 2005 Census Survey Coordinator

SUBJECT: STATUS REPORT ON 2005 CENSUS SURVEY

The data collection phase of the 2005 Census Survey is now complete and the local census office is closed. The Census Bureau is now in the data capture and processing phase and results will be received in Spring 2006. These results will be used to distribute billions of dollars in state-shared revenues to cities and towns, Maricopa County, and Indian communities within the MAG region from 2006 to 2011.

At the November 9, 2005 Management Committee meeting, staff gave an update on the status of 2005 Census Survey activities, return rates of the census questionnaire and a review of costs of the survey. An update on the 2005 Census Survey is provided below.

Status of 2005 Census Survey Activities

All field work for the 2005 Census Survey is complete. The data capturing and processing phase includes completing the check-in and keying of paper questionnaires, performing quality control and assurance checks, matching the data against the master sample file, and making adjustments for nonresponse in the weighting and estimation process. Processing also includes applying factors to each enumerated housing unit to account for addresses not enumerated. The Census Bureau will have preliminary numbers for each member agency to review in Spring 2006.

Costs

The cost for the 2005 Census Survey and count of population in group quarters has been estimated at $7.7 million. The Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) has authorized the use of FHWA funds to cover a portion of the estimated cost, while the remaining estimated cost will be incurred by MAG member agencies. The Census Bureau final costs will be based upon total expenses incurred by the Census Bureau and will be determined in 2006. In addition to costs paid to the Census Bureau, other costs have been incurred, including the regionwide media campaign (estimated at $230,000) and the setup and maintenance of the local census office (estimated at $170,000). MAG will be working with FHWA regarding sharing the total cost of the census, estimated at $8.1 million.

If you have any questions or need additional information, please contact me at (602) 254-6300.

Agenda Item #5L

MARICOPA ASSOCIATION OF GOVERNMENTS INFORMATION SUMMARY... for your review

DATE:
January 3, 2006

SUBJECT:
Discussion of the Development of the FY 2007 MAG Unified Planning Work Program and Annual Budget

SUMMARY:

Each year, the Unified Planning Work Program and Annual Budget is developed in conjunction with member agency and public input. The Work Program is reviewed each year by the federal agencies in the spring and approved by the Regional Council in May. This overview of MAG's draft Dues and Assessments and the proposed budget production timeline provides an opportunity for early input into the develop of the Work Program and Budget. The draft Dues and Assessments document is footnoted for your information.

- The population numbers used in the draft Dues and Assessments calculation are described in footnote (a). The most current approved population numbers are for FY 2004. We anticipate that the census for 2005 will be ready in May or June 2006 and that these population numbers will be used for the final draft Dues and Assessments calculation.

- The Solid Waste Planning Assessment discussed in footnote (b) remains unchanged from FY 2006 at $10,000 with no anticipated additional program activity for Solid Waste Planning during FY 2007.

- The information in footnotes (c), (d) and (f) remains the same from prior years and describes the calculations for the 9-1-1 Planning Assessment, the Homeless Prevention Assessment and the Maricopa County portion of the population calculation, respectively.

- Last year an option to establish a minimum level for the draft Dues and Assessments of $350 was presented and approved, and this is described in footnote (e). The same minimum level of $350 was used in the calculations and affects one entity for FY 2007.

The Dues and Assessments reflect the standard increase, which is based on the inflationary factor used by the Arizona Department of Transportation. The inflationary adjustment is estimated to be seven percent for FY 2007. This percentage will be finalized at the end of January.

PUBLIC INPUT:
No public comments have been received.

PROS & CONS:
PROS: MAG is proposing a budget time line that provides explicit information, an incremental review of key budget details and a draft review of the budget and work program. Additionally, we are providing draft Dues and Assessments.

CONS: None.

TECHNICAL & POLICY IMPLICATIONS:
TECHNICAL: None.

POLICY: None.

ACTION NEEDED:
Input on the development of the FY 2007 MAG Unified Planning Work Program and Annual Budget.

PRIOR COMMITTEE ACTIONS:
None.

CONTACT PERSON:
Rebecca Kimbrough, MAG Fiscal Services Manager, (602) 452-5051

Maricopa Association of Governments
Fiscal Year 2007
January 3, 2006
Draft Dues And Assessments

Jurisdiction	July 1, 2004 (a) Population Totals	MAG Member Dues	Solid Waste (b) Planning Assessment	Water Quality Planning Assessment	9-1-1 (c) Planning Assessment	Human Services Planning Assessment	Homeless (d) Prevention Assessment	Total (e) FY 2007 Estimated Dues & Assessments
Apache Junction	34,400	$1,961	$97	$1,137	$2,315	$700		$6,210
Avondale	60,255	$3,435	$169	$1,992	$4,055	$1,226		$10,877
Buckeye	14,505	$827	$41	$480	$976	$295		$2,619
Carefree	3,310	$189	$9	$109	$223	$67		$597
Cave Creek	4,370	$249	$12	$144	$294	$89		$788
Chandler	220,705	$12,582	$620	$7,298	$14,854	$4,491	$4,126	$43,971
El Mirage	28,310	$1,614	$80	$936	$1,905	$576		$5,111
Fort McDowell Yavapai Nation	824	$249	$2	$27	$55	$17		$350
Fountain Hills	22,475	$1,281	$63	$743	$1,513	$457		$4,057
Gila Bend	2,030	$116	$6	$67	$137	$41		$367
Gila River Indian Community	2,740	$156	$8	$91	$184	$56		$495
Gilbert	164,685	$9,389	$463	$5,446	$11,084	$3,351	$3,079	$32,812
Glendale	233,330	$13,302	$655	$7,715	$15,704	$4,748	$4,362	$46,486
Goodyear	35,810	$2,041	$101	$1,184	$2,410	$729		$6,465
Guadalupe	5,380	$307	$15	$178	$362	$109		$971
Litchfield Park	3,920	$223	$11	$130	$264	$80		$708
Maricopa County (f)	232,860	$13,275	$654	$7,700	$15,672	$4,738	$4,354	$46,393
Mesa	447,130	$25,491	$1,256	$14,785	$30,093	$9,098	$8,360	$89,083
Paradise Valley	14,410	$822	$40	$476	$970	$293		$2,601
Peoria	132,300	$7,542	$372	$4,375	$8,904	$2,692	$2,474	$26,359
Phoenix	1,416,055	$80,728	$3,978	$46,824		$28,814	$26,475	$186,819
Queen Creek	11,645	$664	$33	$385	$784	$237		$2,103
Salt River Pima-Maricopa	6,780	$387	$19	$224	$456	$138		$1,224
Scottsdale	221,130	$12,606	$621	$7,312	$14,883	$4,500	$4,134	$44,056
Surprise	63,960	$3,646	$180	$2,115	$4,305	$1,301		$11,547
Tempe	160,820	$9,168	$452	$5,318	$10,824	$3,272	$3,007	$32,041
Tolleson	5,445	$310	$15	$180	$366	$111		$982
Wickenburg	5,970	$340	$17	$197	$402	$121		$1,077
Youngtown	3,970	$226	$11	$131	$267	$81		$716
TOTALS	3,559,524	$203,126	$10,000	$117,699	$144,261	$72,428	$60,371	$607,885

FY 2006 Total Costs		$189,650	$10,000	$110,000	$134,823	$67,691	$56,422
Based on Population		$13,476	$0	$7,699	$9,438	$4,737	$3,949
		7.11%	0.00%	7.00%	7.00%	7.00%	7.00%
Per Capita Cost		$0.05707	$0.00281	$0.03307	$0.04053	$0.02035	$0.01696

The annual dues and assessments are apportioned according to per capita populations and are increased using the inflation factor for the MAG Regional Freeway System for FY 2007 (7 percent).

(a) The official census numbers for 2005 are anticipated to be ready in May 2006. The final population numbers approved by Regional Council will be used for this calculation.

(b) The Solid Waste Planning Assessment remains at the fiscal year 2006 amount of $10,000. There is no anticipated increased activity in fiscal year 2007 for this program.

(c) The 9-1-1 assessment is apportioned according to per capita populations excluding the City of Phoenix.

(d) The Homeless Prevention assessment is only charged to cities who are CDBG recipients and have populations over 50,000 and to Maricopa County.

(e) Total Dues and Assessments are based on a minimum of $350 per member.

(f) The Maricopa County portion of the dues and assessments includes the balance of the county, excluding Gila River Indian Community, the Fort McDowell Yavapai Nation, and the Salt River Pima-Maricopa Indian Community (except when calculating the Homeless Prevention assessment).

Maricopa Association of Governments
Fiscal Year 2007
DRAFT January 3, 2006
Work Program and Annual Budget Proposed Timeline

01/05/06	*Thurs*	*Intergovernmental Meeting*
01/09/06	*Mon*	*Regional Council Executive Committee Meeting-dues/assessments; timeline*
01/11/06	*Wed*	*Regional Council Management Committee Meeting-dues/assessments; timeline*
01/25/06	*Wed*	*Regional Council-dues/assessments; timeline*
02/02/06	*Thurs*	*Intergovernmental Meeting*
02/08/06	*Wed*	*Management Committee Meeting- present new projects; presentation of summary budget documents*
02/13/06	*Mon*	*Regional Council Executive Committee Meeting- present new projects; presentation of summary budget documents*
02/16/06	*Thurs*	*Budget Workshop-videoconference (TBD)*
02/22/06	*Wed*	*Regional Council Meeting- present new projects; presentation of summary budget documents*
03/02/06	*Thurs*	*Intergovernmental Meeting*
03/08/06	*Wed*	*Management Committee Meeting- information and review of draft budget documents*
03/20/06	*Mon*	*Regional Council Executive Committee Meeting- information and review of draft budget documents*
03/29/06	*Wed*	*Regional Council Meeting- information and review of draft budget documents*
03/30/06	*Thurs*	*Intergovernmental Meeting*
04/05/06	*Wed*	*Management Committee Meeting- information and review of draft budget documents*
04/17/06	*Mon*	*Regional Council Executive Committee Meeting- information and review of draft budget documents*
04/26/06	*Wed*	*Regional Council Meeting- information and review of draft budget documents*
April		*Changes in draft budget projects and/or any changes in budgeted staff will be brought to the Executive Committee, Management Committee and Regional Council in their April meetings if needed (TBD)*
April		*IPG meeting with FHWA, FTA, ADOT and others (TBD)*
05/04/06	*Thurs*	*Intergovernmental Meeting*
05/10/06	*Wed*	*Management Committee meeting - present draft Budget for recommendation of approval*
05/15/06	*Mon*	*Regional Council Executive Committee meeting - present draft Budget for recommendation of approval*
05/24/06	*Wed*	*Regional Council meeting - present draft Budget for approval*

Agenda Item #7

MARICOPA ASSOCIATION OF GOVERNMENTS INFORMATION SUMMARY... for your review

DATE:
January 3, 2006

SUBJECT:
Particulate Pollution Update

SUMMARY:
In November and December 2005, this region experienced high readings at two of the PM-10 monitor sites. Although these readings will need to be checked by Maricopa County air quality personnel, it appears that MAG will need to initiate the preparation of a Five Percent Plan for submission to EPA by December 31, 2007. The Plan must show a reduction in PM-10 emissions of five percent per year until the standard is attained. It is important that the region attain the 24-hour PM-10 standard as quickly as possible. Every monitor in the nonattainment area must be clean in 2006, 2007 and 2008 in order for the region to attain by 2008.

At the December MAG Regional Council meeting, Maricopa County Supervisor Don Stapley requested assistance from the MAG member agencies in reporting dust control violations to Maricopa County for enforcement. Specifically, Supervisor Stapley requested that MAG member agencies: (1) allow building inspectors to be cross-trained by the County to be able to observe dust control violations and report them to the Air Quality Department, (2) impose more stringent requirements on unpaved parking lots, (3) replace outdated sweeping equipment with PM-10 efficient sweepers, and (4) support legislation to prohibit open burning of trash on high pollution days.

During the discussion, interest was expressed in the approach used by the City of Peoria for dust control. Peoria requires that a copy of the Maricopa County Rule 310 permit be submitted and incorporated into the grading and drainage permits issued by the city. Local inspectors are then able to monitor the contractor's compliance with the earthmoving permit and dust control plan. MAG staff has forwarded the applicable Peoria City Code, included in the attachment, to the MAG member agencies.

On December 21, 2005, EPA proposed two new 24-hour standards for particulate pollution: a stricter fine particulate standard and a new coarse particulate standard. EPA is proposing to revoke the existing 24-hour PM-10 standard, except in areas that have violating monitors and a population of 100,000 or more. In these areas, such as Maricopa County, the current 24-hour PM-10 standard will remain in place until EPA has completed nonattainment designations for the new coarse standard in July 2013. The EPA has indicated that there may be legal challenges of the new coarse particulate standard. In the case of eight-hour ozone, the implementation of the new federal standards was delayed by seven years due to litigation.

PUBLIC INPUT:
At many MAG committee meetings, a citizen has expressed concern for the effects of PM-10 on residents of the region. Another citizen commented that the PM-10 problem is hard to get around in a desert and that everyone is a part of the solution and can help with this problem by encouraging trip reduction.

PROS & CONS:
PROS: Public health is protected when the federal particulate standards are attained and maintained.

CONS: Showing five percent per year reductions in particulate emissions will be a major challenge for a rapidly growing region.

TECHNICAL & POLICY IMPLICATIONS:
TECHNICAL: The Five Percent Plan will require a major PM-10 modeling and plan development effort on the part of MAG.

POLICY: New control measures may be required to reduce particulate emissions by five percent per year and lower PM-10 readings at the monitors.

ACTION NEEDED:
Information and discussion.

PRIOR COMMITTEE ACTIONS:
None.

CONTACT PERSON:
Cathy Arthur or Lindy Bauer, MAG, (602) 254-6300.

Sec 20-255. Grading and drainage regulations; permits required and exceptions.

(a) Drainage. No person shall obtain a building permit, required by the Building Code of the City of Peoria, for work in or over any natural water course, drainage way, canyon, ravine, arroyo or other potential flood hazard are without first having obtained a grading permit from the City. Where a 404/401 permit is required from the Corps of Engineers, a copy of the application/findings as a result of the application, and a letter of approval shall be submitted to the City Engineer for review, prior to the issuance of a grading permit.

(b) Flood hazard area. No person shall obtain a building permit, required by the Building Code of the City of Peoria, in an area of special flood hazard without first obtaining a grading permit from the City.

(c) Mining, quarrying, excavating, processing, stockpiling of rock, sand, gravel, aggregate, or clay where established and provided by law.

(d) Filling, excavating, stockpiling and storing. No person shall do any grading without first obtained a grading permit from the City except for the following:

(1) A fill less than one foot (1') in depth and placed on natural terrain with a slope flatter than five horizontal to one vertical and which does not exceed 100 cubic yards on any one site and does not obstruct a drainage course.

(2) An excavation of one thousand (1,000) cubic yards or less or eight feet (8') or less below finished grade for basements and footings of a building, retaining wall, or other structure authorized by a valid building permit. This shall not exempt any fill made with the material from such excavation nor exempt any excavation having an unsupported height greater than five feet (5') after the completion of such structure.

(3) Excavation or deposition of earth materials within a property which is dedicated or used, or to be used for cemetery purposes not obstructing a water course except where such grading is within one hundred feet (100') of the property line or intended to support structures.

(4) Grading in an isolated, self-contained area if the Engineering Director or his designee finds that no apparent danger to private or public property can now or thereafter result from the grading operations.

(5) Grading in public right-of-way and easements done under a permit issued by the City Engineer.

(6) Grading by a public utility company in private easements which do not obstruct a natural water course.

(e) Notwithstanding Section 20-255(d) (2), no person shall commence or conduct any clearing, grubbing, and/or grading of land which is designated as hillside under the Zoning Ordinance of the City of Peoria, or which land has specific zoning or development stipulations attached to it which prohibits or controls grading, clearing or grubbing on said sand, or which land is in a zoning district which prohibits or controls clearing, grubbing and/or grading of said land, without first having obtained a permit from the City.

(f) Notwithstanding the provisions of (d) above, the NPDES program may require a Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan and impose additional requirements and prohibitions.

(g) Notwithstanding the provisions of (d) above, a copy of the Maricopa County Rule 310 permit shall be submitted and incorporated into the grading and drainage permit issued by the city.

(h) Wall Permits. For any property located north of Deer Valley Road, the Building Official shall require the issuance of a Wall Permit prior to the approval of any minor land division, site plan, subdivision plat, or individual plot plan. A Wall Permit shall require any fence or wall to be constructed in compliance with the drainage requirements contained in this Chapter and shall include such conditions as may be reasonably necessary to protect the life, limb, health, welfare, and property of others from damage of any kind. Upon a property owner's submittal of a written request to waive the requirement for a Wall Permit, the Engineering Director shall review the property owner's justification for such a waiver. The Engineering Director may waive in writing the Wall Permit requirement if in the opinion of the Director the fence or wall will have no drainage impacts

(Ord. No. 98-95, enacted, 8/26/98)
(Ord. No. 01-173, 11/6/01, Amended) SUPP 2001-4
(Ord. No. 02-41, 6/7/02, Amended) SUPP 2002-2

Agenda Item #9

Maricopa County

County Manager's Office

Justice System Coordination

101 West Jefferson Street
Law Library – 3rd Floor
Phoenix, AZ 85003-2243

County Manager's Office
301 West Jefferson
Tenth Floor
Phoenix, AZ 85003-2143

Phone: 602.506.1310
Fax: 602.506.2313
rexa@mail.maricopa.gov

Maricopa County completed a large jail building project last year, financed through 1998's Proposition 400 which authorized a 1/5 cent sales tax to be collected for nine years or until $900 million was raised (voters later approved a twenty year extension of this tax). The funds were primarily to be used for the capital building project; however, voters also agreed that the funds should be used to support various initiatives "for the purpose of reducing the expense of adult and juvenile jail facilities."

With the completion of the building project, Maricopa County is now focusing on crime prevention with the understanding and belief that we cannot build our way out of the crime problem. The County is challenged by an ever-growing general population, a political environment that often questions alternative programming, and the ever-present limited resources. As a result, we are very interested in exploring crime prevention, diversion, demand reduction, and alternative to incarceration options, along with partnering with community agencies to ensure public safety while also being accountable to the County's fiscal health and need to serve its citizens in the most responsible and effective way possible.

Following are some efforts and programs the County has underway that will form the foundation of a more dedicated Crime Prevention Plan:

- **Citizens Jail Oversight Committee** – The group of nine citizens has been meeting regularly since 1999 to oversee the County's use of Proposition 400 funds and ensure that the voters' intentions are met. They were instrumental during the building project and now are willingly embracing the chance to explore crime prevention alternatives.
- **Update of 1997 Jail Master Plan** – This master plan led to Proposition 400 in 1998. Acknowledging that many things have changed in the past eight years, a consulting group led by Andrew Cupples of DMJM Design has been hired to explore the County's efforts in implementing all Proposition 400 initiatives. They will also explore current case processing practices and what other jurisdictions are doing that may be able to be implemented in Maricopa County, both from a case processing and crime prevention perspective. DMJM understands that the County is not looking for facility recommendations, but rather program recommendations. The consulting team has just begun their work; a final report is expected approximately December 2006.
- **Maricopa County Commission of Justice System Intervention for the Seriously Mentally Ill** – This group, chaired by Supervisor Don Stapley, has been meeting since March 2005. They recently assigned six working groups to explore potential diversion points, from the time of first contact with law enforcement to the time of release from jail. Ideas that have been suggested include Mobile Crisis Teams modeled after a successful City of Los Angeles program; increased communication with providers when their clients enter the criminal justice system; continued coordination with Mental Health Court;

Justice System Coordination

101 West Jefferson Street
Law Library – 3rd Floor
Phoenix, AZ 85003-2243

County Manager's Office
301 West Jefferson
Tenth Floor
Phoenix, AZ 85003-2143

Phone: 602.506.1310
Fax: 602.506.2313
rexa@mail.maricopa.gov

exploring options for more treatment beds and housing; and a more structured release.

- **Five Year Strategic Plan** – The County Board of Supervisors reworked the Strategic Plan in Spring 2005, setting the County's priorities for the next five years. Priority One is to "Ensure safe communities and a streamlined, integrated justice system." Goals were established to help accomplish this priority, including "By June 2007, reduce property crime rates and violent crime rates in Maricopa County by establishing and implementing a crime-prevention strategy that encompasses evidence-based practices" and "By July 2007, develop a plan to meet the demands placed upon law enforcement and detention operations due to population and business growth in Maricopa County." Working groups have been assigned to establish action plans in order to fulfill the goals and priority.
- **Reconvene the Regional Crime Prevention Council** – This group, organized by Maricopa County and comprised of community and government leaders, met in December 2003 to begin to focus on crime prevention issues. Unfortunately, due to staffing changes, the group never met again. One idea adopted under the Strategic Plan is to bring a similar group together.
- **Evidence based programming** – When doing research into alternatives, Maricopa County is cognizant of the fact that we must use the public's tax dollars responsibly. When examining any crime prevention, diversion, demand reduction, and/or alternatives to incarceration, agencies are requiring that only programs that are evidence-based be offered. This is also reflected in the Strategic Plan. We must be able to prove to the taxpayers and to the Office of Management and Budget that money is being used effectively.
- **Provide for more substance abuse treatment** – Maricopa County is using Drug Courts, the ALPHA Program through the Sheriff's Office, and partnerships with various community providers to treat those with substance abuse problems. The County recognizes the continuing need for more beds and housing, together with more effective utilization of alternatives to incarceration, in being able to combat this problem. More community partnerships are always being explored. The County is also interested in the most effective ways to fight the methamphetamine epidemic and treat those who are addicted.
- **Housing alternatives to jail** – Maricopa County is just beginning to explore what "step down" facilities might be in use in other parts of the country that would provide an alternative to the traditional jail bed.
- **Juvenile Probation efforts** – Juvenile Detention and Probation are involved in many crime prevention programs, including the Zip Code Project, the Youth Recovery Academy, the Court Unified Truancy Suppression Program, Families in Need of Services, and Teen Courts.
- **Las Artes** – This is a Workforce Development program targeting youth who have not graduated high school. It provides opportunities for at-risk youth to partake in community projects coupled with addressing the academic, social and emotional needs of youth as they pursue a high school diploma, GED, and/or

Justice System Coordination

101 West Jefferson Street
Law Library – 3rd Floor
Phoenix, AZ 85003-2243

County Manager's Office
301 West Jefferson
Tenth Floor
Phoenix, AZ 85003-2143

Phone: 602.506.1310
Fax: 602.506.2313
rexa@mail.maricopa.gov

employment. Students receive equal amounts of time in the classroom as well as developing their artistic talents through mosaic arts.

- **Homeless Court –** Discussions began in Fall 2004 to implement a Homeless Court at the Human Services Campus. Unresolved charges can ultimately preclude homeless people, including a substantial number of veterans, from achieving self sufficiency and ending homelessness via employment, housing, public assistance, treatment programs and drivers' licenses.
- **Miscellaneous efforts** – There are several working groups established within and between agencies that are in discussions about effective crime prevention and alternative programming. Many agencies also have implemented programs to achieve these goals which are not noted here, as this is not intended as a comprehensive list but as an example of the largest efforts underway.