

November 4, 2008

TO: Members of the MAG Management Committee

FROM: Charlie McClendon, Avondale, Chair

SUBJECT: MEETING NOTIFICATION AND TRANSMITTAL OF TENTATIVE AGENDA

Wednesday, November 12, 2008 - 12:00 noon  
MAG Office, Suite 200 - Saguaro Room  
302 North 1<sup>st</sup> 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.

c: MAG Regional Council

**MAG MANAGEMENT COMMITTEE  
TENTATIVE AGENDA  
November 12, 2008**

**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.

4. Executive Director's Report

The MAG Executive Director will provide a report to the Management Committee on activities of general interest.

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 (\*).

3. Information.

4. Information and discussion.

5. Recommend approval of the Consent Agenda.

**ITEMS PROPOSED FOR CONSENT\***

**MINUTES**

\*5A. Approval of October 8, 2008, Meeting Minutes

5A. Review and approval of the October 8, 2008, meeting minutes.

**TRANSPORTATION ITEMS****\*5B. Arterial Life Cycle Program Status Report**

A status report on the Arterial Life Cycle Program (ALCP) is provided for the period between April 2008 and September 2008 and includes an update on Project work, the remaining FY 2009 schedule, and ALCP revenues and finances. Please refer to the enclosed material.

5B. Information.

**GENERAL ITEMS****\*5C. Approval of the Draft July 1, 2008 Maricopa County and Municipality Resident Population Updates**

MAG staff has prepared draft July 1, 2008, Maricopa County and Municipality Resident Population Updates. The Updates, which are used to allocate \$23 million in lottery funds to local jurisdictions, prepare budgets and set expenditure limitations, were prepared using the 2005 Census Survey as the base and housing unit data supplied and verified by MAG member agencies. Because there may be changes to the Maricopa County control total by the Arizona Department of Commerce, the MAG Population Technical Advisory Committee recommended approval of these Updates provided that the County control total is within one percent of the final control total. Please refer to the enclosed material.

5C. Recommend approval of the July 1, 2008 Maricopa County and Municipality Resident Population Updates provided that the Maricopa County control total is within one percent of the final control total.

**\*5D. National Hunger and Homelessness Awareness Week**

The Maricopa Association of Governments, along with several community organizations, will take part in National Hunger and Homeless Awareness Week, November 16-22, 2008. The purpose of National Hunger and Homeless Awareness Week is to bring the issues of hunger and homelessness to the forefront of the community. To promote the activities on this important issue, MAG has developed an attached calendar of events. The kickoff event, taking place on November 17, 2008,

5D. Information.

is an Awareness Walk to the Capitol and a food drive. Please refer to the enclosed material.

\*5E. Proposed 2009 Revisions to MAG Standard Specifications and Details for Public Works Construction

The MAG Standard Specifications and Details Committee has completed its review of proposed 2009 revisions to the MAG Standard Specifications and Details for Public Works Construction. These revisions are currently being reviewed by MAG member agency Public Works Directors and/or Engineers for a one month period. If no objections to any of the proposed revisions have been suggested within the month review time frame, then the proposed revisions will be regarded as approved and formal changes to the printed and electronic copies will be released. It is anticipated that the annual update packet will be available for purchase in early January 2009. Please refer to the enclosed material.

5E. Information and discussion.

### ITEMS PROPOSED TO BE HEARD

#### TRANSPORTATION ITEMS

6. METRO Light Rail Update

On December 27, 2008, the new 20-mile light rail system (METRO) will begin service. This is the culmination of many years of work by METRO and others to bring a new mode of travel to this region. Many events are being planned to celebrate this effort and important safety information is being made available to the public. A status report on the project and activities relevant to the grand opening will be provided.

6. Information and discussion.

7. Transportation Planning Update

At the October 15, 2008 Transportation Policy Committee meeting, the financial outlook for the Regional Freeway Program was discussed. Staff presented items for future discussion by the TPC to bring the 20-year costs and revenues in balance for the program. It is anticipated that these will be

7. Information and discussion.

further discussed at the November 19, 2008 TPC meeting along with a report from a peer review group regarding regional transit. An update on the items under discussion by the TPC will be provided to the members of the Management Committee.

### GENERAL ITEMS

8. Defining a Citizen's Agenda for Arizona

The Center for the Future of Arizona will be conducting a Gallup Poll for the purpose of building a citizen's agenda that reflects what Arizonans are thinking and identifies a set of clear, measurable goals that describe "The Arizona We Want" in authentic language that is meaningful to citizens. From the input received from the poll, the Center will produce a set of goals, scorecards and "how to" strategies that citizens are willing to support - and which can be addressed by future political candidates using common language. A presentation on the project will be provided by Dr. Lattie Coor, Chairman and CEO of the Center for the Future of Arizona.

9. Arizona Capitol Centennial Restoration

In 2012, Arizona will celebrate its 100<sup>th</sup> anniversary of statehood. The Arizona Historical Advisory Commission is authorized by state statute to develop a centennial plan that includes funding activities and projects that will ensure a lasting legacy of accomplishments to commemorate the centennial. One of the centennial projects being considered is upgrading the original 1901 Capitol building as legislative meeting space and offices to alleviate the crowded conditions at the current State buildings. The Commission is requesting that cities, towns, counties and tribal communities become charter centennial members and participate in this effort. The cost for a membership will be determined by the size of the entity. Please refer to the enclosed material.

8. Information and discussion.

9. Information and discussion.

10. Implementation of GovDelivery for Electronic Communication

MAG has instituted a new system to provide faster delivery of information to the MAG member agencies and the general public. The GovDelivery system will facilitate more rapid communication, promote public access to information, allow interested parties to have more control over the information they receive from MAG and facilitate a reduction in paper mailings to reduce costs and environmental impacts. An update on the implementation will be provided and members will be requested to indicate preferences regarding the delivery of electronic and hard copy mailings. Please refer to the enclosed material.

11. Legislative Update

Recently Congress has been considering a stimulus package to boost the national economy. To provide information for this effort, staff has provided funding amounts in transportation and other categories that may be possible to implement in a short period of time. Staff will provide an update on these Congressional efforts.

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.

10. Information, discussion and input on mail delivery preferences.

11. Information and discussion.

12. Information.

MINUTES OF THE  
MAG MANAGEMENT COMMITTEE MEETING  
October 8, 2008  
MAG Office Building - Saguaro Room  
Phoenix, Arizona

MEMBERS ATTENDING

|  |  |
|--|--|
| Charlie McClendon, Avondale, Chair                                     | Darryl Crossman, Litchfield Park                             |
| Mark Pentz, Chandler, Vice Chair                                       | Christopher Brady, Mesa                                      |
| # Matt Busby for George Hoffman,<br>Apache Junction                    | Jim Bacon, Paradise Valley                                   |
| David Johnson for Jeanine Guy, Buckeye                                 | Carl Swenson, Peoria   |
| Jon Pearson, Carefree  | Frank Fairbanks, Phoenix                                     |
| * Usama Abujbarah, Cave Creek  | * John Kross, Queen Creek                                    |
| Spencer Isom for B.J. Cornwall, El Mirage                              | * Bryan Meyers, Salt River Pima-Maricopa<br>Indian Community |
| Alfonso Rodriguez for Phil Dorchester,<br>Fort McDowell Yavapai Nation | Brad Lundahl for John Little, Scottsdale                     |
| * Rick Davis, Fountain Hills   | Randy Oliver, Surprise                                       |
| * Gila Bend  | Jeff Kulaga for Charlie Meyer, Tempe                         |
| * Joseph Manuel, Gila River Indian<br>Community                        | Chris Hagen for Reyes Medrano, Tolleson                      |
| George Pettit, Gilbert   | + Gary Edwards, Wickenburg                                   |
| Jenna Goad for Ed Beasley, Glendale                                    | * Lloyce Robinson, Youngtown                                 |
| Romina Korke for John Fischbach,<br>Goodyear                           | * Victor Mendez, ADOT  |
| * RoseMary Arellano, Guadalupe   | Kenny Harris for David Smith,<br>Maricopa County             |
|  | Bryan Jungwirth for David Boggs, Valley<br>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 Charlie McClendon at 12:02 p.m.

2. Pledge of Allegiance

The Pledge of Allegiance was recited. It was noted that Gary Edwards joined the meeting by videoconference and Matt Busby joined the meeting by teleconference.

Chair McClendon introduced Randy Oliver, the new City Manager for Surprise, and welcomed him to the Committee.

Chair McClendon stated that the revised agenda and supporting materials for agenda items #5B and #5D and the revised 2008 Annual Report on the Status of Proposition 400 for agenda item #7 were at each place. The report was revised to make a correction on page S-2.

Chair McClendon announced that parking garage validation and transit tickets were available from Valley Metro/RPTA for those using transit to come to the meeting.

3. Call to the Audience

Chair McClendon 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 McClendon 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 McClendon noted that no public comment cards had been turned in.

4. Executive Director's Report

Dennis Smith, MAG Executive Director, reported the Don't Trash Arizona! anti-litter campaign had won the Public Relations Society of America 2008 Copper Anvil Award. Mr. Smith congratulated MAG's Communications Division and its manager, Kelly Taft, for their work on the campaign.

Mr. Smith stated that MAG was informed that the visualization techniques used for the Regional Transportation Plan and the Transportation Improvement Program in the MAG Public Participation Plan were listed as a notable practice by the Federal Highway Administration. He acknowledged the MAG Communications and Transportation Divisions for their efforts on this.

Mr. Smith announced that MAG will be utilizing a new service called GovDelivery, where interested stakeholders can sign up to receive updates to news and events, publications, and meeting minutes and agendas that are published on the MAG Web site. He noted that GovDelivery will provide more access to MAG information to the public and member agencies. Mr. Smith said that rollout is expected by October 31, 2008.

Mr. Smith stated that the Institute of Transportation Engineers awarded James Witowski its Best Paper Award for the Maricopa County Enhanced Parkway. He noted that this parkway concept, a diagram of which was displayed onscreen, is planned extensively in the MAG Interstate 10 - Hassayampa Valley Transportation Framework Study. Mr. Smith extended his appreciation to Dr. Robert Maki, City Engineer from the City of Surprise, who introduced MAG to this concept and added that the State of Michigan has used this type of parkway for the past 40 years. Chair McClendon thanked Mr. Smith for his report. No questions for Mr. Smith were noted.

5. Approval of Consent Agenda

Chair McClendon stated that agenda items #5A, #5B, #5C, #5D, and #5E were on the consent agenda. Chair McClendon reviewed the public comment guidelines for the consent agenda. He noted that no public comment cards had been received.

Chair McClendon asked if any member of the Committee had questions or a request to have a presentation on any consent agenda item. None were noted.

Mr. Crossman moved to recommend approval of consent agenda items #5A, #5B, #5C, #5D, and #5E. Mr. Swenson seconded, and the motion carried unanimously.

5A. Approval of September 10, 2008, Meeting Minutes

The Management Committee, by consent, approved the September 10, 2008, meeting minutes.

5B. Project Changes: Amendments and Administrative Modifications to the FY 2008-2012 MAG Transportation Improvement Program and the FY 2009 Arterial Life Cycle Program

The Management Committee, by consent, recommended approval of amendments and administrative modifications to the FY 2008-2012 Transportation Improvement Program, the FY 2009 Arterial Life Cycle Program, and as appropriate, to the Regional Transportation Plan 2007 Update, as shown in the attached table. The FY 2008-2012 MAG Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) was approved by the MAG Regional Council on July 25, 2007 and the FY 2009 Arterial Life Cycle Program (ALCP) was approved by the MAG Regional Council on June 25, 2008. Since that time, there have been requests from member agencies to modify projects in the programs. The proposed amendment includes three projects funded by the Federal Safe Routes to School Program in Avondale, Gilbert, and Phoenix and a Federal High Priority Project in Scottsdale. The requested project changes include funding and schedule changes to Arizona Department of Transportation projects on Loop 303. The amendment includes projects that may be categorized as exempt from a conformity determination and the administrative modification includes minor project revisions that do not require a conformity determination. The Transportation Review Committee recommended approval of the project changes on September 25, 2008. Since the mailout of the Management Committee agenda, three Scottsdale ALCP projects, SCT04-009, SCT08-928 and SCT09-924, were identified to modify the regional costs for project work. These changes do not cause a negative fiscal impact to the ALCP.

5C. ADOT Red Letter Process

The Regional Council approved the Red Letter Process in 1996 to provide early notification of potential development in planned freeway alignments. Development activities include actions on plans, zoning, and permits. Key elements of the process include: (1) Notifications; ADOT will periodically forward Red Letter notifications to MAG. Notifications will be placed on the consent agenda for information and discussion at the Transportation Review Committee, Management Committee, and Regional Council meetings. If a member wishes to take action on a notification, the item can be removed from the consent agenda for further discussion. The item could then be placed on the agenda of a subsequent meeting for action. (2) Advance

acquisitions; ADOT is authorized to proceed with advance right-of-way acquisitions up to \$2 million per year in funded corridors. Any change in the budgets for advance right-of-way acquisitions constitutes a material cost change as well as a change in freeway priorities and therefore, would have to be reviewed by MAG and would require Regional Council action. With the passage of Proposition 400 on November 2, 2004, the Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) includes funding for right-of-way acquisition as part of the funding for individual highway projects. This funding is spread over the four phases of the Plan. Funding for advance acquisitions may be made available on a case-by-case basis.

For information, the ADOT Advance Acquisition policy allows the expenditure of funds to obtain right-of-way where needed to address hardship cases (residential only), forestall development (typical Red Letter case), respond to advantageous offers or, with remaining funds, acquire properties in the construction sequence for which right-of-way acquisition has not already been funded. In addition to forestalling development within freeway corridors, ADOT, under the Red Letter Process, works with developers on projects adjacent to or close to existing and proposed routes that may have a potential impact on drainage, noise mitigation, and/or access. For this purpose, ADOT needs to be informed of all zoning and development activity within one-half mile of any existing and planned facility. Without ADOT input on development plans adjacent to or near existing and planned facilities, there is a potential for increased costs to the local jurisdiction, the region and/or ADOT. ADOT has forwarded a list of notifications from January 1, 2008, to June 30, 2008. Of the 435 notices received, 106 had an impact to the State Highway System. This item was on the agenda for information and discussion.

5D. Conformity Consultation

The Maricopa Association of Governments is conducting consultation on a conformity assessment for an amendment and administrative modification to the FY 2008-2012 MAG Transportation Improvement Program. The proposed amendment includes three projects funded by the Federal Safe Routes to School Program in Avondale, Gilbert, and Phoenix and a Federal High Priority Project in Scottsdale. The proposed administrative modification includes funding and schedule changes to Arizona Department of Transportation projects on Loop 303. The amendment includes projects that may be categorized as exempt from a conformity determination and the administrative modification includes minor project revisions that do not require a conformity determination. Comments on the conformity assessment were requested by October 17, 2008. This item was on the agenda for consultation.

5E. Vendor Selection for Digital Aerial Photography

The Management Committee, by consent, recommended approval that Landiscor Aerial Information be selected to provide digital aerial photography in an amount of \$26,533.50. In May 2008, the MAG Regional Council approved the FY 2009 Unified Planning Work Program and Annual Budget, which included \$80,000 for digital aerial photography for use in planning activities by both MAG and its member agencies. As in past years, this photography has been made available at no charge to MAG member agencies. MAG issued an Invitation for Bids and received four bids. A multi jurisdictional evaluation team reviewed the bids, and recommended to MAG that the low bid of \$26,533.50 from Landiscor Aerial Information be selected. The

sample imagery and bid package submitted by Landiscor Aerial Information demonstrated the highest quality imagery product for the price.

8. Outdoor Light Pollution

This agenda item was taken out of order.

Buell Jannuzi, Director of Kitt Peak Observatory, reported on the importance of the astronomy community to the State of Arizona and on issues related to outdoor light pollution in Maricopa County and how it impacts astronomy. Mr. Jannuzi stated that Kitt Peak was selected as an astronomical site after an extensive search for sites in the late 1950s because of the clear and dark skies, good visibility, nearby necessary support from major universities and industry, and proximity to a major airport.

Mr. Jannuzi spoke about the new \$20 million Veritas observatory, and noted that a new telescope is being built in Happy Jack, Arizona. He advised that a recent study found that astronomy nets approximately \$250 million per year for the Arizona economy, which is not counting the secondary resources to entities. Mr. Jannuzi stated that the Gamma-Ray space telescope, which is operated by the Goddard Space Center, was assembled in Gilbert, Arizona. He added that Arizona State University was recently awarded a \$700 million grant by NASA to guide the study of the search for life.

Mr. Jannuzi stated that one of the recommendations of the aforementioned study is how the Arizona Legislature, counties, municipalities and Tribal Nations can keep astronomy sound in Arizona by reviewing their existing statutes and ordinances in an effort to reduce light pollution.

Mr. Jannuzi displayed a photo of North America taken from the international space station that showed light pollution at night. He then showed various pictures of nighttime light pollution affecting Kitt Peak Observatory and Mount Graham, even though the light sources could be more than 200 miles distant. Mr. Jannuzi commented that the light shining upward to space is not doing any good, but is just wasting energy.

Mr. Jannuzi encouraged incorporating lighting designs that make lighting more efficient. He commented that it is easier to be proactive on new installations than to go back and retrofit existing lighting. Mr. Jannuzi displayed photos of lit areas that showed light was directed where it was not needed. He commented that a lot of light did not necessarily make areas safer, it was more important to direct the light downward to provide the most efficient and effective coverage. Mr. Jannuzi stated that new technologies provide new opportunities and new challenges. He showed an example of a full cutoff lighting fixture with no direct uplight and essentially no glare, where all light is used, not wasted.

Mr. Jannuzi also showed examples of top lit billboards that are more effective than bottom lit billboards. He urged that those who write codes be provided with information about quality lighting, in order to provide better visibility, save money, and protect dark skies. Mr. Jannuzi also noted that education is an important component in conveying the impacts of inefficient lighting and the value of dark skies. He said that the astronomy community is ready to assist jurisdictions, including speaking to the public. Mr. Jannuzi noted that a recent study showed the

energy cost savings that might be realized. He stated that the National Park Services is also active in promoting dark skies. Chair McClendon thanked Mr. Jannuzi for his report.

6. Transportation Planning Update

Eric Anderson, MAG Transportation Director, shared perspectives with the Management Committee on the economy, the half-cent sales tax for transportation, and cost challenges being experienced in regard to projects in Proposition 400. He commented that the economy is in a downturn and cities are dealing with budget issues.

Mr. Anderson displayed a chart that showed Proposition 400 sales tax revenues and noted that 11 of the last 12 months have seen negative growth. He reported that transportation sales tax revenues fell by 3.2 percent in fiscal year 2008. Mr. Anderson said that ADOT researched the sales tax base back to 1960 and indicated it had never declined in 47 years. He added that in the first two months of fiscal year 2009 the revenue from the transportation sales tax decreased 10.2 percent.

Mr. Anderson stated that three factors were affecting the sales tax revenue situation. (1) The energy crisis, which is taking money out of people's pockets to pay for gasoline and as a result, they cannot spend money on other things. He added that this represents a negative impact of about \$350 million on the state sales tax. (2) The implementation of E-verify has affected the population base, although the exact impact on the sales tax revenue is unknown. (3) The housing market, which is the largest impact.

Mr. Anderson displayed a map that showed homes with negative equity in the metro area. He said that 51 percent of the housing bought in the last five years has a negative equity. Mr. Anderson noted that housing equity is a source of personal and household wealth and has a direct correlation to household spending, especially big ticket items. He commented that currently, consumer confidence is low. Mr. Anderson said that when he participated in an expert panel at ADOT in August 2008, there was a sense that relief in the housing market may occur in 2010, but no one really knows for sure.

Mr. Anderson stated that the impact of the housing market on sales tax revenue and the ability to obtain financing is a serious concern. Mr. Anderson commented that the ability of cities to issue bonds is highly problematic right now. He advised that \$12 billion in municipal bonds since September 15, 2008, were not issued because there is no market. He reported that the interest rate for a recent bond issued in Long Island for the power authority was about two percentage points higher than it would have been in August 2008. Mr. Anderson stated that there are serious financial issues and that is even if you can find someone to buy the bonds. He noted that the State of California needs short-term financing to get the state through to Spring when the tax revenue will begin to flow.

Mr. Anderson displayed a chart that showed that in the second quarter of 2008, about 52 percent of homes sold in the metro area were sold at a loss, and 38 percent of homes sold were foreclosures. He commented that foreclosures will increase. Mr. Anderson stated that this is an unprecedented time, and what will happen with the bailout plan is unknown. He added that the international credit markets are essentially shut down right now. Mr. Anderson displayed a map,

which showed that home values experienced an unprecedented decrease of an average of 22 percent in one year.

Mr. Anderson stated that the FY 2007 transportation sales tax revenue came in under projections, and the fiscal year 2008 collection came in just under \$380 million, about \$30 million under projection. He said that ADOT is in the process of revising the revenue forecast to 2025. Mr. Anderson indicated that the revised revenue projections from ADOT could be between \$500 million and \$1 billion lower than previous forecasts and noted that the impact to the highway program could be \$570 million and to transit could be \$300 million.

Mr. Anderson said that he had spoken to a person who had looked at a portfolio of shopping centers in Phoenix, Flagstaff, and Tucson. The person reported that for calendar year 2007, retail sales were down 11 percent to 12 percent, and so far this year were down another 10 percent, for a combined loss of about 23 percent over the past one and one-half years.

Mr. Anderson stated that the ADOT forecast is expected to be released in one week or thereabouts. He indicated that lower revenue means there is less ability to issue bonds to keep the freeway program on track. Mr. Anderson noted that the transit program is examining the transit life cycle program aspect. He noted that setting priorities in the freeway program is MAG's responsibility, and a serious discussion on managing the program is needed.

Mr. Anderson stated that over the past five years, since the Regional Transportation Plan was adopted in late 2003, the cost of highway and street construction has increased 77 percent, which is about four times the rate of general inflation. He said that the prices for concrete, steel, and asphalt have risen significantly, but the biggest impact resulted from the increase in oil prices, which affects all aspects of construction. Mr. Anderson indicated that the ADOT expert panel saw some moderation, especially in concrete prices, but commodity prices are still at the mercy of the global oil market. He noted that the price of asphalt already has increased eight-fold and is expected to increase another 50 percent to 75 percent. Mr. Anderson stated that availability will continue to be an issue because manufacturers are choosing to make higher value products from the same material that is used to make asphalt. Mr. Anderson pointed out that in the past year, diesel fuel, which is important in highway construction, increased 78 percent.

Mr. Anderson stated that the program includes about \$15 billion in freeway projects and has about \$11 billion in resources. He remarked that due to the downturn in the economy, this is a good opportunity to take advantage and get projects out the door, assuming the bonds can be sold. Mr. Anderson stated that the freeway program in the 1990s had issues in one aspect or another, but today's program has issues across the board – revenue, financing and cost.

Mr. Anderson then reviewed the next steps. He said that ADOT is expected to revise the revenue projections by mid-October; the bond program in light of revised revenues and financial markets will need to be studied; future right-of-way and construction cost inflation will continue to be analyzed; project options such as interim, staging, or reducing scopes to provide basic mobility and preserve right-of-way within the budget will be analyzed; and policy discussion and guidance will continue. Mr. Anderson stated that the TPC will begin policy discussion at the October and November 2008 meetings and provide guidance on what options they want to look

at in terms of balancing the program. Mr. Anderson stated that staff will take the guidance and develop some options for the TPC's consideration after the first of the year.

Mr. Anderson explained that when Proposition 400 was put together, they took the strategy to preserve the full footprint of a corridor even though the freeway would not be built immediately to capacity. He stated that one policy discussion is do we want to purchase right-of-way for the full footprint or just purchase right-of-way for what we are able to build? The implication is that we will never go back and buy the right-of-way for the full footprint because development will have occurred and the land will be too expensive. Mr. Anderson stated that another option is to protect the long range right-of-way to add capacity in the future. He noted that in some cases, the cost of right-of-way protection is a billion dollars. Mr. Anderson stated that another policy discussion is whether to continue to build freeways or go with a strategy of interim parkways until we have more money to build a full freeway. He said that each has short- and long-term costs and benefits, and we need to take care of what we have today, but also not preempt future options. Mr. Anderson stated that we have confidence in our elected officials to give good direction and guidance and staff will take that direction and guidance and develop options for solutions.

Chair McClendon asked the timeframe for action on policies. Mr. Anderson replied that the TPC will begin discussion at the October 15, 2008, meeting. He added that updates will be given to the Management Committee on a regular basis. Mr. Anderson commented that overall, they would like to have a revised plan in March or April to incorporate into the annual update of the RTP. He noted that Arizona state law requires that program costs and revenue be in balance. In addition, the performance audit is due in 2010 and the auditors will ask the Legislature to ask MAG if there is enough money to finish Proposition 400. Mr. Anderson commented that it is incumbent upon MAG to deal with this issue promptly. He noted that some other options might preserve the intent of the program, for example, extending the schedule. Mr. Anderson said that in addition, other revenue sources might become available, including a possible reauthorization of the federal transportation act or from setting up a freight trust fund, which is being considered. He commented that I-10 is a highway of national importance, and there could be a joint effort regionally and statewide to improve I-10 with federal funds and take the pressure off regional funds. Mr. Anderson stated that a federal strategy needs to be a part and ensure Arizona gets its fair share of federal transportation funds.

Mr. Fairbanks stated that the same factors that impact the freeway program have also impacted building and maintaining streets in Phoenix. He asked if the situation was common in the region and the state. Mr. Anderson replied that the situation was prevalent across all jurisdictions, even nationally. He mentioned that the last gas tax increase in Arizona was in 1991. This tax represents about one-half of the Highway User Revenue Fund (HURF), which is the source for street needs at the local level. Mr. Anderson stated that the HURF issue needs to be addressed from the state perspective. Mr. Anderson commented that because arterial and local streets carry 60 percent to two-thirds of the traffic, it is important to have a good system that is well maintained.

Mr. Fairbanks indicated that he keeps hearing rumors that there is some intent of doing state funding for highways and roads. He said that from his perspective, if there is a new initiative to fund highways and roads across the state, he did not know how it would be successful without

addressing the cities' obligation for streets and roads, and without addressing the huge shortfall in Proposition 400. Mr. Fairbanks asked if we are going to look at new funding, should we not make good on the promises made to voters in Proposition 400?

Mr. Anderson stated that because of the high fuel prices, a decline in vehicle miles traveled has shown up dramatically. He said that one half of the HURF is the fuel tax and one-quarter is the vehicle license tax. Mr. Anderson commented that car sales have decreased, so the tax base is declining. Mr. Anderson stated that cities are under stress on the state program already. When ADOT releases the HURF projections, he thought the amount would be down because of the declines in driving and in the vehicle license tax.

Mr. Bacon expressed his concern about the consequences to the tourism industry. Mr. Bacon said that he had seen a report on the significant impact to Sky Harbor Airport of perhaps 800,000 to one million passengers. He commented that if the trend continues, it will affect resort properties and soften the commercial market quickly. Mr. Bacon expressed appreciation for the points about financing becoming more difficult to obtain, but he has heard from colleagues that they think they will be unable to obtain financing at all. He said that he hoped the discussion deals with getting financing at any cost rather than discussion about a higher rate. Mr. Bacon commented that the experiences on projects in his community going to bid are different than the numbers in the presentation. He reported that the day before the Management Committee meeting, the low bidder on a utility project was less than 50 percent of the engineer's estimate. Mr. Bacon said that this is in addition to two significant public facility bids that were also under the bid estimate.

Mr. Smith stated that this might be the time to pursue one of the recommendations from the 1991 performance audit that was not approved. He asked Mr. Anderson to explain the recommendation to the Committee. Mr. Anderson stated that the first performance audit was done in 1991 in response to many of the cost and revenue issues being faced today. He said that all of the recommendations from the audit were implemented, with the exception of before and after appraisals. Mr. Anderson explained that before and after appraisals means that the appraisal process on a piece of land can recognize the enhanced value of the balance of the parcel once the freeway is completed. He said that the Arizona appraisal process cannot recognize that enhanced value is basically double-dipping; a seller gets fair market value and if it is not a total take, the value of the leftover property also is enhanced by the facility. Mr. Anderson commented that it may be time to revisit that concept, and there could be substantial cost savings on right-of-way to the program. He added that this does not apply to residential, but to large, vacant or partially developed parcels.

7. 2008 Annual Report on the Status of the Implementation of Proposition 400

Roger Herzog, MAG Senior Project Manager, stated that Arizona Revised Statute 28-6354 requires that MAG issue an annual report on the status of projects funded by the half-cent sales tax authorized by Proposition 400. He said that the 2008 Annual Report is the fourth report in this series. Mr. Herzog stated that a public hearing on the report is scheduled for November 2008. He added that the summary of findings was included in the agenda packet and the complete report is posted on the MAG Web site.

Mr. Herzog addressed the key findings of the Annual Report. For the category of regional revenues, he noted that fiscal year 2008 half-cent sales tax receipts were three percent lower than the receipts from FY 2007. He advised that this is the first decline in the half-cent sales tax since it began in 1985. Mr. Herzog stated that for July and August 2008, receipts were down 11.2 percent and 9.1 percent, respectively, and revenue from the gas tax was down about 2.9 percent.

Mr. Herzog stated that revenue projections are being updated, and will likely result in lower long-range forecasts. He noted that the federal transportation funding act expires in FY 2009, and its structure represents a major uncertainty.

Mr. Herzog stated that for FY 2009-2026, the estimated future costs of \$6.312 billion for the Transit Life Cycle Program are currently in balance with projected revenues of approximately \$6.315 billion. Mr. Herzog noted that these figures are through 2008, but will be changing. He stated that costs are continuing to rise faster than anticipated, especially in the bus program, and revenues are not expected to keep pace, at least in the short term. Mr. Herzog stated that if revenues continue to decline, new bus service implementation included in the RTP may be impacted in the future. He added that bus services that have been implemented previously will be reviewed to ensure that productivity goals are met.

Mr. Herzog stated that during FY 2009, RPTA will be examining closely the assumptions used in estimating both revenues and expenditures for the Transit Life Cycle Program, and making adjustments as may be necessary.

Mr. Herzog stated that for FY 2009-2026, the total estimated future regional reimbursements of \$1.703 billion for projects in the Arterial Street Life Cycle Program are in balance with projected revenues of \$1.864 billion. He said that project costs are increasing and local governments have had to make up the difference. Mr. Herzog stated that the inability to provide matching funds, and other scheduling and resource issues, have resulted in the deferral of a number of arterial projects by implementing agencies. Due to this, lead agencies have deferred the use of \$46 million in federal and regional funding from FY 2008 to later years. Mr. Herzog stated that it is anticipated that project scope changes and rescheduling may continue to occur in the future, as local jurisdictions continue to face a variety of fiscal issues.

Mr. Herzog stated that for FY 2009-2026, the unadjusted future costs of \$10.008 billion for the Freeway/Highway Life Cycle Program are currently in balance with projected revenues of \$10.273 billion. He advised that the impacts of construction cost increases and project scope changes on the Freeway/Highway Life Cycle Program are being evaluated, and noted that the new preliminary estimated program cost totals \$14.9 billion, significantly more than past estimates.

Mr. Herzog provided a breakdown of the \$14.9 billion cost estimate. He stated that the 2003 base planning estimate was \$8.5 billion. Mr. Herzog stated that he original inflation allowance was \$1.4 billion, and there is an additional \$2.3 billion price inflation, for a total of \$3.7 billion. He said that scope changes total \$2.7 billion and include \$1.3 billion of original contingency allowance and \$1.4 billion in additional scope changes.

Mr. Herzog stated that there is a gap of approximately \$3.3 billion between the updated cost estimate of \$14.9 billion and available funding of \$11.6 billion. He commented that this difference could be subject to future increases, depending on the outlook for inflation, facility design contingencies, further cost estimate refinements, and updated revenue forecasts. Mr. Herzog stated that given the potential deficit of approximately \$3.3 billion, a major effort to achieve a balance between future program costs and available revenues will be required. Potential approaches to achieving a program balance could include enhanced financing methods, project phasing, extension of the programming period, and adjustment of project schedules.

Chair McClendon asked for clarification of scope changes. Mr. Herzog replied that scope changes include various components, such as additional traffic interchanges, upgraded system level interchanges to provide local access, additional through-lanes, and funding for the renewal of the quiet pavement program. He stated that some local governments are working with ADOT on the design factor process, and noted that looking at the design features and possible tradeoffs will be part of the process to be undertaken to keep the program balanced.

Chair McClendon asked how the decisions for scope changes are made if they do not come back through the MAG process. Mr. Herzog replied that one process for adding the scope changes is through the review of the update of the TIP and through the life cycle program, which is part of the RTP. He said that a lot of the scope changes have not shown up directly in the project cost to this point, but there is the potential for them to be included in future TIP and life cycle program updates.

Mr. Smith stated that MAG develops and approves the RTP, which is then sent to ADOT for implementation. He explained that ADOT engineers then draft a design concept report (DCR), where they analyze current traffic forecasts and do projections of the number of lanes that would be required for future needs. For example, the RTP includes six lanes for a freeway but the DCR indicates ten lanes would be required to accommodate future traffic. Mr. Smith stated that this might be called scope creep, but it could also be called good engineering because we are planning a freeway for the future. He stated that this DCR information has not been brought back through the MAG process.

Mr. Anderson provided some examples of scope changes. He said that two lanes are planned to be added to Loop 101 – one lane in the median and one lane on the outside. However, ADOT has adopted a strategy to build the original six lanes on the outside and new lanes in the median because then certain structures will not have to be moved. Mr. Anderson noted that this option is more expensive because more concrete is used. He said that another example is utility relocation. Mr. Anderson noted that when a plan estimate is done, they realize there may be miscellaneous items requiring changes, which show up as a result of the DCR and, in some cases, may be significant, such as moving transmission lines. Mr. Anderson commented that there are some changes that save money down the road, and there are some changes that might be nice to do, but we would be unable to pursue due to financial constraints. He stated that currently MAG staff track scope changes, but the DCRs go forward without a policy review. Mr. Anderson commented that he thought the DCRs should come back through the MAG process and the policymakers would know and understand what the engineering side in the process recommended. Mr. Anderson stated that once the DCR is completed, the direction of the scope and the final design process are set.

Mr. Smith stated that another component to be looked at to keep costs in line is value engineering, which ADOT currently utilizes.

9. 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.

No comments from the Committee were noted.

There being no further business, the meeting adjourned at 1:10 p.m.

---

Secretary

---

Chairman



# ARTERIAL LIFE CYCLE PROGRAM

## Status Report

April 2008 – September 2008

### CONTENTS

|  |   |
|--|---|
| ALCP Revenue and Finance .....                     | 1 |
| RARF Collection and the Economy .....              | 2 |
| ALCP Programming and Reimbursements.....           | 3 |
| FY2008 RARF Closeout.....                          | 3 |
| ALCP FAQs.....                                     | 4 |
| ALCP Project Status.....                           | 4 |
| Fiscal Year 2007-2008 ALCP Schedule.....           | 5 |
| ALCP Project Status Tables for FY2008/FY2009 ..... | 6 |

July 1<sup>st</sup> marked the end of fiscal year (FY) 2008 and the start of a FY2009. Beginning in December, MAG Staff and Member Agencies worked diligently to update information on projects programmed in the Arterial Life Cycle Program. The MAG Regional Council approved the FY2009 Arterial Life Cycle Program (ALCP) on June 25, 2008. MAG Staff distributed print versions of the ALCP to each Lead Agency and posted an electronic version to the program’s website at <http://www.mag.maricopa.gov/project.cms?item=5034>.

Minor changes were made to the FY2009 ALCP, which were not previously included in published versions. First, the Regional Remaining Budget for each project was published to the dollar. In the past, MAG Staff had rounded this number to the thousands of dollars.

Second, the layout of the ALCP Book was streamlined for projects with multiple Lead Agencies associated with one RTP identification number. This change occurred at the request of member agencies and had a minimal impact on many of the Lead Agencies programmed in the ALCP. Finally, the FY2009 clearly marked any completed projects or project segments. MAG Staff added “CO” for closed out/completed in the project status column of the ALCP.

MAG Staff would like to thank the efforts of everyone involved with updating the ALCP! We acknowledge the detailed nature of the task and appreciate each agency’s efforts to provided current and accurate information.

**ALCP REVENUE AND FINANCE**

The ALCP receives dedicated sales tax revenues (RARF) for transportation improvements to the arterial road network in Maricopa County. RARF revenues are deposited into the arterial account on a monthly basis.

In FY 2008, \$379 million was collected for all modes. Almost \$40 million was allocated to the Arterial Life Cycle Program in FY2008. Table 1 details the revenue collected by mode during FY 2008. The RARF Account balance was \$59.1 million as of September 30<sup>th</sup>. During the month, one PRR for \$13.6 million was submitted to ADOT for reimbursement, which would bring the account balance to \$45.5 million.

A spike in RARF revenues stemming from Super Bowl XLII held at the University of Phoenix Arena in Glendale, Arizona was anticipated in March 2008. However, the month’s revenues were 8.2% lower than forecasted. The March 2008 revenues also were down 1.6% compared to March 2007 revenues.

Although, \$379 million was collected in FY 2008, RARF revenues were \$30 million

| Table 1. FY2008 RARF Collections (July 2007 - June 2008) |                |                  |                |                   |
|--|----------------|------------------|----------------|-------------------|
|  | Freeways       | Arterial Streets | Transit        | Prop. 400 (total) |
| <b>July</b>  | \$ 18,885,497  | \$ 3,528,429     | \$ 11,190,161  | \$ 33,604,087     |
| <b>August</b>  | \$ 17,440,380  | \$ 3,258,434     | \$ 10,333,891  | \$ 31,032,705     |
| <b>September</b>   | \$ 17,351,147  | \$ 3,241,762     | \$ 10,281,018  | \$ 30,873,927     |
| <b>October</b>   | \$ 18,118,625  | \$ 3,385,152     | \$ 10,735,769  | \$ 32,239,546     |
| <b>November</b>  | \$ 17,588,010  | \$ 3,286,016     | \$ 10,421,365  | \$ 31,295,391     |
| <b>December</b>  | \$ 17,525,852  | \$ 3,274,403     | \$ 10,384,535  | \$ 31,184,790     |
| <b>January</b>   | \$ 20,360,361  | \$ 3,803,982     | \$ 12,064,057  | \$ 36,228,400     |
| <b>February</b>  | \$ 16,425,349  | \$ 3,068,793     | \$ 9,732,458   | \$ 29,226,600     |
| <b>March</b>   | \$ 17,089,315  | \$ 3,192,844     | \$ 10,125,875  | \$ 30,408,034     |
| <b>April</b>   | \$ 18,243,897  | \$ 3,408,557     | \$ 10,809,996  | \$ 32,462,450     |
| <b>May</b>   | \$ 16,915,606  | \$ 3,160,389     | \$ 10,022,948  | \$ 30,098,944     |
| <b>June</b>  | \$ 17,250,763  | \$ 3,223,007     | \$ 10,221,537  | \$ 30,695,308     |
| <b>Total</b>   | \$ 213,194,803 | \$ 39,831,769    | \$ 126,323,611 | \$ 379,350,183    |



lower than the \$408 million forecasted. During the first two months of FY2009, \$58 million in RARF revenues were collected for all modes, with \$6 million being allocated to Arterial improvements. The \$58 million collected was 5.8 percent lower than the \$61.6 estimated revenues for July and August 2008. Table 2 compares actual RARF revenues to estimated revenues for FY 2008.

The Arizona Department of Transportation (ADOT) publishes reports pertaining to the Regional Area Road Fund (RARF) on their website at [http://www.azdot.gov/inside\\_adot/fms/rarflink.asp](http://www.azdot.gov/inside_adot/fms/rarflink.asp). Several reports are available for download, such as the:

- Monthly Revenue Trend Report;
- FY 2008 Actual Distribution Flow Chart;
- FY 2008 Year End Report; and,
- RARF Revenue Forecasts.

The current revenue forecast posted on the ADOT RARF website was published in September 2007.

ADOT is in the process of updating the forecasts, which should be published in the Fall of 2008.

| Table 2. RARF Collections<br>Estimate v. Actual FY2008 (July 2007 - June 2008) |                         |                       |                          |
|--|-------------------------|-----------------------|--------------------------|
|  | Estimated<br>Total RARF | Actual<br>Total RARF  | Percentage<br>Difference |
| July   | \$ 33,541,000           | \$ 33,604,087         | 0.2%                     |
| August   | \$ 31,331,000           | \$ 31,032,705         | -1.0%                    |
| September  | \$ 32,518,000           | \$ 30,873,927         | -5.1%                    |
| October  | \$ 33,108,000           | \$ 32,239,546         | -2.6%                    |
| November   | \$ 32,786,000           | \$ 31,295,391         | -4.5%                    |
| December   | \$ 32,853,000           | \$ 31,184,790         | -5.1%                    |
| January  | \$ 40,623,000           | \$ 36,228,400         | -10.8%                   |
| February   | \$ 32,990,000           | \$ 29,226,600         | -11.4%                   |
| March  | \$ 33,118,000           | \$ 30,408,034         | -8.2%                    |
| April  | \$ 36,740,000           | \$ 32,462,450         | -11.6%                   |
| May  | \$ 34,271,000           | \$ 30,098,944         | -12.2%                   |
| June   | \$ 34,821,000           | \$ 30,695,308         | -11.8%                   |
| <b>Total</b>   | <b>\$ 408,700,000</b>   | <b>\$ 379,350,183</b> | <b>-7.2%</b>             |

### RARF COLLECTION AND THE ECONOMY

In November 2004, the voters of Maricopa County approved Proposition 400, which extended the ½ cent sales tax for transportation through 2025. The tax extension was divided among freeways (56.2%), transit (33.3%) and arterial streets (10.5%). The extension became effective on January 1, 2006. During FY 2008, the sales tax raised about \$379 million compared to \$390 million for FY 2007, a decline of about three percent. This is the first year-over-year decrease that the region has experienced since the tax was first imposed in 1986. The poor performance of the transportation sales tax is consistent with the other sales tax collections at the state level and among many of the MAG member agencies. The significant downturn in the economy was due to the substantial financial crisis in the housing industry that has resulted in significant financial distress among both homeowners and the financial industry.

New housing construction has fallen to levels similar to those experienced in 1991 in metropolitan Phoenix. Falling values combined with adjustable rate mortgages being reset to higher rates, has resulted in substantial loss of homeowner equity, and in many cases, houses with more debt than current values. The loss of home equity, the freezing of many home equity loans, and foreclosures has had a significant impact on sales tax collections.



In addition to the turmoil in the housing market, higher fuel costs have had a negative impact on sales tax collections. As fuel prices have continued to escalate, and as economic conditions and housing values have deteriorated, consumers have made significant changes in personal spending. The impact of higher fuel prices alone may have resulted in a shift of \$6.0 billion of expenditures to fuel purchases in Arizona. If this entire shift was from sales that are subject to sales taxes, the shift would represent a \$340 million loss in state sales tax collections and about a \$14.5 million loss in the Maricopa County transportation sales tax.

---

### **ALCP PROGRAMMING AND REIMBURSEMENTS**

To date, almost \$954 million has been generated through the RARF tax collection as a result of Proposition 400. Of that, \$100 million in RARF revenues collected was dedicated to the Arterial Life Cycle Program for capacity and safety improvements. At the start of FY 2008, six Lead Agencies were programmed to receive \$74.8 million in reimbursements through the Arterial Life Cycle Program. Throughout the fiscal year, MAG reimbursed \$28.3 million to Lead Agencies for work conducted on ITS, arterial capacity and intersection improvements. RARF Closeout Projects received over \$14 million of the \$28.3 million reimbursed in FY08. ALCP Project receiving reimbursements in FY 2008 included:

- Chandler Blvd at Dobson Rd Intersection Improvements
- Ray Rd at Alma School Rd Intersection Improvements
- Greenfield Rd from Baseline Rd to Southern Ave
- McKellips Rd at Lindsay Rd Intersection Improvements
- Southern Ave at Stapley Dr Intersection Improvements
- SR101 Loop North Frontage Rd from Hayden Rd to Scottsdale Rd

During the annual update, several Lead Agencies deferred \$46.5 million in funding from FY 2008 to later fiscal years. More than \$26.5 million in RARF and \$19.5 million in STP-MAG were deferred in FY 2008. The total amount deferred represented 62% of the programmed reimbursements for Fiscal Year 2008.

---

### **FY2008 RARF CLOSEOUT**

Fiscal Year 2008 represented the first RARF Closeout Process for the Arterial Life Cycle Program. On December 19, 2007, the MAG Regional Council approved the ALCP Policies and Procedures, which established the RARF Closeout Process (Section 260). According to the Policies, Lead Agencies with completed projects/segments that have submitted all ALCP Project Requirements to MAG Staff by June 1<sup>st</sup> are eligible for RARF Closeout. The allocation of eligible RARF Closeout funds will be made (in sequential order) to projects scheduled for reimbursement in the next fiscal year and then to all other projects in the chronological order of the programmed reimbursements. Table 3 lists the ALCP Projects eligible for RARF Closeout in 2008.

At the start of the process, nine projects programmed for \$28.7 million in reimbursements throughout the life of the ALCP for consideration. After a detailed financial analysis, MAG



Staff determined that \$14.98 million should be used during the Closeout Process. Three of the five Lead Agencies that submitted projects received advanced funding through the RARF Closeout Process.

**Table 3. FY08 RARF Closeout Eligible Projects**

| Eligible projects are in consecutive order based on the fiscal year the project is programmed for reimbursement |                 |             |  |                      |                          |
|---|-----------------|-------------|--|----------------------|--------------------------|
| Fiscal Year for Reimb.  | RTP ID          | Lead Agency | Project Name   | Fiscal Year for Work | Amount 2007\$ (millions) |
| 2012  | ACI-LKP-10-03-B | Peoria      | Lake Pleasant Pkwy: Union Hills to Dynamite Rd       | 2006                 | 4.022                    |
| 2013  | ACI-LKP-10-03-B | Peoria      | Lake Pleasant Pkwy: Union Hills to Dynamite Rd       | 2006                 | 4.022                    |
| 2014  | All-ARZ-30-03   | Chandler    | Arizona Ave/Chandler Blvd: Intersection Improvements | 2006                 | 3.582                    |
| 2014  | ACI-VAL-20-03   | Gilbert     | Val Vista Dr: Warner Rd to Pecos Rd                  | 2006                 | 3.352                    |
| 2021  | All-ARZ-10-03   | Chandler    | Arizona Ave/Elliot Rd Intersection Improvements      | 2006                 | 3.582                    |
| 2021  | ACI-SHA-20-03-C | Scottsdale  | Shea Blvd at Via Linda (Phase1)                      | 2006                 | 0.945                    |
| 2021  | ACI-SHA-20-03-F | Scottsdale  | Shea Blvd at Mayo/134th St                           | 2006                 | 0.280                    |
| 2021  | ACI-SHA-20-03-A | Scottsdale  | Shea Blvd at 90th/92nd/96th Streets                  | 2007                 | 3.500                    |
| 2022  | ACI-HPV-20-03-A | Phoenix     | Happy Valley: I-17 to 35th Ave                       | 2005                 | 5.439                    |
| <b>Total</b>  |                 |             |  |                      | <b>28.724</b>            |

All of the projects slated to receive RARF Closeout Funds were reimbursed. Without the RARF Closeout Process reimbursements, 56% of programmed reimbursements (\$41.8 million) would have been deferred from FY2008 to later fiscal years.

**ALCP FAQs**

Will my project be deleted from the ALCP if the decrease in revenues negatively impacts the program? What if I defer a project?

ALCP Project Reimbursements may be delayed if there is a deficit of Program funds. Reimbursements will be delayed in priority order of the ALCP (Policies Section 270B). Projects may also be advanced if a surplus of funds occurs (Policies Section 270A). This means, that project reimbursements may be delayed in one fiscal year and then advanced the following year contingent on the program’s revenue stream.

When should I submit a Project Overview?

Technically, a Project Overview must be accepted by MAG before a project may be reimbursed and/or a Project Agreement may be initiated by MAG. In addition, a Project Overview must be submitted prior to the purchase of right-of-way for advanced projects (Policies Section 400).

**ALCP PROJECT STATUS**

The fourth quarter of fiscal year 2008 and the first quarter of 2009 were extremely productive for member agencies with projects programmed in the ALCP. Over the last 6



months, MAG Staff received 9 Project Overviews from 5 Lead Agencies and initiated 9 Project Agreements with 6 Lead Agencies. In addition, MAG Staff received 7 Project Reimbursement Requests in the amount of \$16.3 million. Tables 4 and 5 provide detailed information on the status of projects programmed for work and/or reimbursement in FY08 and FY09, respectively.

**Arterial Life Cycle Program - Fiscal Year 2009**

| 2008             |  |
|------------------|--|
| <b>September</b> | <b>25th:</b> Transportation Review Committee (TRC) Project changes to amend/administratively modify the current Transportation Improvement Program (TIP), Regional Transportation Plan (RTP), and Arterial Life Cycle Program (ALCP)*  |
| <b>October</b>   | Managers, Transportation Policy Committee (TPC), and Regional Council (RC) review/recommend/approve project changes to amend/administratively modify the current TIP, RTP, and ALCP*   |
| <b>November</b>  | <b>17th:</b> TIP/ALCP Data Entry System available to member agencies for 2009-2014 project updates   |
| <b>December</b>  | <b>4th:</b> TRC review/recommend/approve project changes to amend/administratively modify the current TIP, RTP, and ALCP*  |
| 2009             |  |
| <b>January</b>   | Managers, TPC, and RC review/recommend/approve project changes to amend/administratively modify the current TIP, RTP, and ALCP*<br><b>9th: Due Date,</b> Member Agencies submit 2009-2014 ALCP project updates for inclusion in the 2010-2014 TIP via the TIP/ALCP Data Entry System                             |
| <b>February</b>  | <b>6th: Due Date,</b> Member agencies submit 2015-2026 ALCP project updates for the Draft FY10 ALCP via the TIP/ALCP Data Entry System<br><b>20th:</b> MAG Staff will provide Member Agencies with the first draft of the FY2010 ALCP for review and comment   |
| <b>March</b>     | <b>20th: Due Date,</b> Member agencies submit comments for Draft FY2010 ALCP<br><b>26th:</b> TRC review/recommend/approve project changes to amend/administratively modify the current TIP, RTP, and ALCP*   |
| <b>April</b>     | Managers, TPC and RC review/recommend/approve project changes to amend/administratively modify the current TIP, RTP, and ALCP*<br><b>15th:</b> MAG Staff will determine the availability of RARF Closeout Funds and Eligible Projects<br><b>23rd:</b> TRC review/recommend ALCP projects for RARF Closeout Funds |
| <b>May</b>       | Managers, TPC and RC review/recommend/approve ALCP projects for RARF Closeout Funds<br><b>28th:</b> TRC review/recommend/approve Draft FY2010 ALCP   |
| <b>June</b>      | <b>1st: Due Date,</b> Member Agencies submit final Project Reimbursement Requests for FY2009<br><b>1st: Due Date,</b> Member Agencies recommended to receive RARF Closeout Funds submit final versions of all ALCP project requirements<br>Managers, TPC and RC review/recommend/approve Draft FY2010 ALCP       |

*\*If necessary*

This is the ninth Status Report for the Arterial Life Cycle Program (ALCP). Semi-annually, MAG staff will provide member agencies with an update on the projects in the ALCP. This report and all other ALCP information are available online at <http://www.mag.maricopa.gov/project.cms?item=5034>.



**Transportation Division**



## Arterial Life Cycle Program Status Report

**TABLE 5**

**ARTERIAL STREET LIFE CYCLE PROGRAM**

**April 2008 - September 2008, Project Status of Projects Underway**

**(2008 and Year of Expenditure, Dollars in Millions, Consistent with the FY09 - June 25, 2008 ALCP)**

**(2007 and Year of Expenditure, Dollars in Millions, Consistent with the FY08 - May 28, 2008 ALCP)**

| Lead Agency & Facility                             | Project Requirement Completed<br>PO = Project Overview<br>PA = Project Agreement | Status<br>S=Study<br>P=Pre-Design<br>D=Design R=ROW<br>C=CONST<br>C/O=Closed out | Regional Funding Reimbursements |   |                | Total Expenditures (Exp.)    |   | FY(s) for Reimb. | FY for Final Constr. | Other Project Information  |
|--|--|--|---------------------------------|---|----------------|------------------------------|---|------------------|----------------------|--|
|  |  |  | Programmed Reimb. FY09          | Estimated Future Reimb. FY 2010 - 2026 (2008\$) | Reimb. To Date | Exp. through FY 2009 (YOE\$) | Estimated Future Exp. FY 2010 - 2026 (2008\$) |                  |                      |  |
| <b>CHANDLER</b>                                    |  |  |                                 |   |                |                              |   |                  |                      |  |
| Chandler Blvd at Alma School Rd                    | PO, PA   | D, R   | 1.304                           | 2.411   |                |                              | 9.633   | 2009-2011        | 2011                 |  |
| Chandler Blvd at Dobson Rd                         | PO, PA   | D, R, C  | 3.627                           |   | 0.084          | 0.774                        | 7.686   | 2007-2009        | 2009                 | Study 100% complete; Design is 92% complete                              |
| Gilbert Rd: Chandler Heights Rd to Hunt Hwy        |  | D  |                                 | 5.895   |                |                              |   | 2024             | 2011                 |  |
| Gilbert Rd: Queen Creek Rd to Chandler Heights Rd  |  | D  |                                 | 7.940   |                |                              |   | 2023             | 2011                 |  |
| Gilbert Rd: SR202L/Germann Rd to Queen Creek Rd    | PO, PA   | D, R, C  |                                 | 6.773   |                |                              | 11.874  | 2021             | 2009                 |  |
| Queen Creek Rd: Arizona Ave to McQueen             | PO, PA   | D, R, C  |                                 | 4.318   |                |                              | 9.597   | 2012             | 2009                 |  |
| Queen Creek Rd: McQueen Rd to Lindsay              |  | D  |                                 | 11.967  |                |                              |   | 2011-2012        | 2011                 |  |
| Ray Rd at Alma School Rd                           | PO, PA   | D, R   | 2.080                           | 1.492   | 0.137          | 0.196                        | 9.709   | 2008-2010        | 2010                 | Design 30% Complete  |
| Ray Rd at McClintock Dr                            | PO   | D  |                                 | 3.714   |                |                              | 8.102   | 2011             | 2011                 |  |
| <b>FOUNTAIN HILLS</b>                              |  |  |                                 |   |                |                              |   |                  |                      |  |
| Shea Blvd: Palisades Blvd. to Fountain Hills Blvd. | PO   | D  | 0.288                           |   |                |                              | 0.411   | 2009             | ---                  | Project programmed for Design only                                       |
| Shea Blvd: Technology Dr to Cereus Wash            | PO   | D, R   | 1.089                           | 4.614   |                |                              | 8.147   | 2009-2010        | 2010                 |  |
| <b>GILBERT</b>                                     |  |  |                                 |   |                |                              |   |                  |                      |  |
| Guadalupe Rd/Cooper Rd: Intersection Improvements  |  | D, R, C  | 3.714                           |   |                |                              |   | 2009             | 2009                 |  |
| Guadalupe/Power: Intersection Improvements         |  | D  |                                 | 3.582   |                |                              |   | 2010             | 2010                 | Exchanged with Guadalupe/Cooper during annual update. Moved the Phase IV |
| Power Rd at Pecos: Intersection Improvement        | PO   | D, R, C  | 5.327                           | 4.666   |                |                              | 8.700   | 2009-2010        | 2009                 |  |
| Power Rd: Santan Fwy to Pecos Rd                   |  | D, R, C  | 4.060                           | 6.316   |                |                              |   | 2009-2010        | 2010                 |  |
| Val Vista Rd: Warner Rd. to Pecos Rd.              | PO, PA   | C/O  | 6.934                           | 0   | 10.398         | 15.271                       |   | 2007-2008, 2014  | 2006                 | Project Complete; RARF Closeout Project                                  |
| Warner Rd. at Cooper Rd.                           | PO, PA   | R, C   | 3.714                           |   |                |                              |   | 2007-2008        | 2008                 |  |

## Arterial Life Cycle Program Status Report

**TABLE 5**

**ARTERIAL STREET LIFE CYCLE PROGRAM**

**April 2008 - September 2008, Project Status of Projects Underway**

**(2008 and Year of Expenditure, Dollars in Millions, Consistent with the FY09 - June 25, 2008 ALCP)**

**(2007 and Year of Expenditure, Dollars in Millions, Consistent with the FY08 - May 28, 2008 ALCP)**

| Lead Agency & Facility                                      | Project Requirement Completed<br>PO = Project Overview<br>PA = Project Agreement | Status<br>S=Study<br>P=Pre-Design<br>D=Design R=ROW<br>C=CONST<br>C/O=Closed out | Regional Funding Reimbursements |   |                | Total Expenditures (Exp.)    |   | FY(s) for Reimb. | FY for Final Constr. | Other Project Information  |
|---|--|--|---------------------------------|---|----------------|------------------------------|---|------------------|----------------------|--|
|   |  |  | Programmed Reimb. FY09          | Estimated Future Reimb. FY 2010 - 2026 (2008\$) | Reimb. To Date | Exp. through FY 2009 (YOE\$) | Estimated Future Exp. FY 2010 - 2026 (2008\$) |                  |                      |  |
| <b>MARICOPA COUNTY</b>                                      |  |  |                                 |   |                |                              |   |                  |                      |  |
| Dobson Rd, Gilbert Rd, McKellips Rd: Bridge over Salt River |  | S  |                                 | 44.261  |                |                              |   | 2010-2011, 2015  | 2012                 | Three ALCP Bridge Projects are being studied together. Projects Deferred to Phase II |
| El Mirage Rd: Bell Rd to South of Beardsley                 |  | D, R   |                                 | 9.568   |                |                              |   | 2016-2018        | 2010                 |  |
| El Mirage Rd: Deer Valley Drive to L303                     |  | D, C   |                                 | 9.722   |                |                              |   | 2016-2018        | 2009                 | Project resegmented in annual update   |
| El Mirage Rd: Thunderbird Rd to Bell Rd                     | PO   | P, R   | 0.680                           | 19.978  |                |                              | 71.539  | 2006, 2008-2015  | 2015                 |  |
| El Mirage Rd: Thunderbird to Northern Ave.                  | PO   | P  |                                 | 16.535  |                |                              | 24.020  | 2016-2018        | 2018                 |  |
| McKellips Rd: Loop 101 (Pima Fwy) to SRP-MIC/Alma School Rd |  | P  |                                 | 38.820  |                |                              |   | 2009, 2013-2015  | 2015                 |  |
| Northern Parkway: Corridorwide ROW Protection               |  | R  | 1.810                           | 3.338   |                |                              |   | 2009-2011        |                      |  |
| Northern Parkway: Sarival to Dysart                         |  | P, D, R  | 19.699                          | 35.060  |                |                              |   | 2009-2011        | 2011                 |  |
| Power Rd: Baseline Rd to East Maricopa Floodway             | PO, PA   | D, R, C  | 4.882                           |   | 2.820          | 8.948                        | 6.264   | 2008-2009        | 2009                 |  |
| <b>MESA</b>   |  |  |                                 |   |                |                              |   |                  |                      |  |
| Broadway Rd: Dobson Rd to Country Club Dr                   | PO, PA   | P, D, R  | 1.920                           | 5.305   | 0.080          | 0.115                        | 14.962  | 2008-2010        | 2010                 | Studies 100% Complete; DES/ROW/CONST to be deferred in the FY2010 ALCP annual update |
| Country Club at University                                  | PO, PA   | D, R   |                                 | 2.756   |                |                              | 6.995   | 2017             | 2010                 |  |
| Dobson Rd at Guadalupe Rd                                   | PO, PA   | P, D, R  | 0.514                           | 2.092   | 0.106          | 0.152                        | 5.760   | 2008-2010        | 2010                 | Design 60% Complete  |
| Dobson Rd at University Dr                                  |  | D  |                                 | 2.756   |                |                              |   | 2020             | 2011                 |  |
| Gilbert Rd at University Dr                                 | PO, PA   | D, R, C  |                                 | 2.756   |                |                              | 8.100   | 2022             | 2009                 |  |
| Greenfield Rd: Baseline Rd to Southern Ave                  | PO, PA   | D, R   | 0.751                           | 4.086   | 0.455          | 0.650                        | 7.165   | 2008-2010        | 2010                 | Design 90% Complete; ROW 30% Complete  |
| Hawes Rd: Santan Fwy to Ray Rd                              |  | D  |                                 | 2.329   |                |                              |   | 2021             | 2010                 |  |

## Arterial Life Cycle Program Status Report

**TABLE 5**

**ARTERIAL STREET LIFE CYCLE PROGRAM**

**April 2008 - September 2008, Project Status of Projects Underway**

**(2008 and Year of Expenditure, Dollars in Millions, Consistent with the FY09 - June 25, 2008 ALCP)**

**(2007 and Year of Expenditure, Dollars in Millions, Consistent with the FY08 - May 28, 2008 ALCP)**

| Lead Agency & Facility  | Project Requirement Completed<br>PO = Project Overview<br>PA = Project Agreement | Status<br>S=Study<br>P=Pre-Design<br>D=Design R=ROW<br>C=CONST<br>C/O=Closed out | Regional Funding Reimbursements |   |                | Total Expenditures (Exp.)   |   | FY(s) for Reimb. | FY for Final Constr. | Other Project Information   |
|---|--|--|---------------------------------|---|----------------|-----------------------------|---|------------------|----------------------|---|
|   |  |  | Programmed Reimb. FY09          | Estimated Future Reimb. FY 2010 - 2026 (2008\$) | Reimb. To Date | Exp. through FY 2009 (YOES) | Estimated Future Exp. FY 2010 - 2026 (2008\$) |                  |                      |   |
| <b>MESA</b>   |  |  |                                 |   |                |                             |   |                  |                      |   |
| McKellips/Greenfield, McKellips/Higley, and McKellips/Val Vista Intersection Improvements | PO, PA   | P  | 0.119                           | 8.215   | 0.119          | 0.170                       | 11.347  | 2008, 2011-2013  | 2013                 | Studies 100% Complete; Design 10% Complete; Projects Deferred to Phase II |
| McKellips Rd at Lindsay Rd  | PO, PA   | D, R   | 1.956                           | 4.278   | 0.043          | 0.060                       | 8.385   | 2008-2010        | 2010                 | Design 15% Complete; ROW to be deferred in the FY2010 ALCP annual update  |
| Mesa Dr at Broadway Rd  | PO   | P  | 0.150                           | 0.701   |                |                             | 18.700  | 2009-2012        | 2012                 |   |
| Mesa Dr: US-60 (Superstition Fwy) to Southern   | PO, PA   | P, D, R  | 2.324                           | 4.879   | 0.044          | 0.063                       | 21.650  | 2008-2010        | 2010                 | Studies 75% Complete; ROW to be deferred in the FY2010 ALCP annual update |
| Power Rd: East Maricopa Floodway to Santan Fwy/Loop 202                                   |  | D, R, C  | 10.092                          |   |                |                             |   | 2009             | 2009                 |   |
| Ray Rd: Sossaman Rd to Ellsworth Rd   |  | D, R   |                                 | 3.759   |                |                             |   | 2022             | 2010                 |   |
| Southern Ave at Country Club Dr   | PO   | D  | 0.307                           | 4.504   |                |                             | 6.400   | 2009-2011        | 2011                 |   |
| Southern Ave at Lindsay Rd  | PO   | D  | 0.315                           | 4.415   |                |                             | 6.303   | 2009-2011        | 2011                 | DES to be deferred in the FY2010 ALCP annual update                       |
| Southern Ave at Stapley Dr  | PO, PA   | P, D   | 1.221                           | 11.259  |                |                             | 16.800  | 2008-2011        | 2011                 |   |
| Thomas Rd: Gilbert Rd to Val Vista Dr   |  | D, R   | 1.746                           | 3.766   |                |                             |   | 2009-2010        | 2010                 | DES and ROW to be deferred in the FY2010 ALCP annual update               |
| <b>PEORIA</b>   |  |  |                                 |   |                |                             |   |                  |                      |   |
| Beardsley Rd Connection: Loop 101 to Beardsley Rd at 83rd Av/Lake Pleasant Pkwy           | PO, PA   | D, R, C  |                                 | 22.885  |                |                             | 30.700  | 2011-2012        | 2009                 |   |
| Happy Valley Rd: Lake Pleasant Pkwy to 67th Ave   |  | D, R, C  |                                 | 20.369  |                |                             |   | 2021-2023        | 2009                 |   |
| Lake Pleasant Pkwy: Dynamite Blvd to L303   | PO   | D  |                                 | 26.407  |                |                             |   | 2011-2014        | 2011                 |   |
| <b>PHOENIX</b>  |  |  |                                 |   |                |                             |   |                  |                      |   |
| Happy Valley Rd: I-17 to 35th Avenue  | PO, PA   | C/O  |                                 | 5.439   |                | 7.648                       |   | 2022             | 2005                 | Project Complete  |
| Happy Valley Rd: 35th Avenue to 43rd  |  | D  |                                 | 4.045   |                |                             | 2.738   | 2022             | 2011                 |   |
| Happy Valley Rd: 43rd Ave to 55th Ave   |  | D  |                                 | 4.138   |                |                             |   | 2024             | 2012                 |   |

## Arterial Life Cycle Program Status Report

| TABLE 5  |  |  |                                 |   |                |                              |   |                  |                      |  |
|--|--|--|---------------------------------|---|----------------|------------------------------|---|------------------|----------------------|--|
| ARTERIAL STREET LIFE CYCLE PROGRAM   |  |  |                                 |   |                |                              |   |                  |                      |  |
| April 2008 - September 2008, Project Status of Projects Underway                                   |  |  |                                 |   |                |                              |   |                  |                      |  |
| (2008 and Year of Expenditure, Dollars in Millions, Consistent with the FY09 - June 25, 2008 ALCP) |  |  |                                 |   |                |                              |   |                  |                      |  |
| (2007 and Year of Expenditure, Dollars in Millions, Consistent with the FY08 - May 28, 2008 ALCP)  |  |  |                                 |   |                |                              |   |                  |                      |  |
| Lead Agency & Facility   | Project Requirement Completed<br><br>PO = Project Overview<br>PA = Project Agreement | Status<br><br>S=Study<br>P=Pre-Design<br>D=Design R=ROW<br>C=CONST<br>C/O=Closed out | Regional Funding Reimbursements |   |                | Total Expenditures (Exp.)    |   | FY(s) for Reimb. | FY for Final Constr. | Other Project Information  |
|  |  |  | Programmed Reimb. FY09          | Estimated Future Reimb. FY 2010 - 2026 (2008\$) | Reimb. To Date | Exp. through FY 2009 (YOE\$) | Estimated Future Exp. FY 2010 - 2026 (2008\$) |                  |                      |  |
| <b>PHOENIX</b>   |  |  |                                 |   |                |                              |   |                  |                      |  |
| Sonoran Blvd: Central Ave to 32nd St   | PO   | D  |                                 | 32.111  |                |                              | 44.244  | 2011-2014        | 2013                 |  |
| <b>SCOTTSDALE</b>  |  |  |                                 |   |                |                              |   |                  |                      |  |
| Pima Rd at Happy Valley Rd   |  | C/O  |                                 |   |                |                              |   | 2009             | 2008                 |  |
| Pima Rd: McKellips Rd to Via Linda   |  | P, D, R  | 5.592                           | 24.602  |                |                              |   | 2008-2011        | 2011                 |  |
| Pima Rd: SR101L to Thompson Peak Parkway   | PO, PA   | C/O  | 13.659                          |   | 13.639         | 19.485                       |   | 2009             | 2008                 |  |
| Pima Rd: Thompson Peak Pkwy to Pinnacle Peak Rd  | PO, PA   | D, R, C  | 7.994                           | 5.442   |                |                              | 19.194  | 2009-2010        | 2010                 |  |
| Scottsdale Rd: Thompson Peak Pkwy to Pinnacle Peak Rd  |  | P, D   |                                 | 11.409  |                |                              |   | 2011             | 2011                 |  |
| Shea at 120/124th Streets  |  | D, R, C  |                                 | 0.377   |                |                              |   | 2022             | 2009                 |  |
| Shea Auxiliary Lane from 90th St to Loop 101   |  | D  |                                 | 3.411   |                |                              |   | 2023-2024        | 2010                 |  |
| Shea Blvd - 96th St to 144th St ITS Improvements   |  | D, R   |                                 | 2.322   |                |                              |   | 2024             | 2010                 |  |
| Shea Blvd - SR-101L to 96th St, ITS Improvements   |  | D, C   |                                 | 0.377   |                |                              |   | 2022             | 2009                 |  |
| Shea at 90th/92nd/96th Intersection Improvements   | PO, PA   | C/O  |                                 | 3.500   |                |                              | 3.347   | 2021             | 2006                 | Project Complete; Project consolidated to include 3 previous intersection improvement projects |
| Shea Blvd at 114th Street  |  | D, R   |                                 | 0.261   |                |                              |   | 2022-2023        | 2010                 |  |
| Shea Blvd at 115th Street  |  | D  |                                 | 0.109   |                |                              |   | 2024             | 2010                 |  |
| Shea Blvd at 136th Street  |  | D  |                                 | 0.174   |                |                              |   | 2024             | 2011                 |  |
| Shea Blvd at Frank Lloyd Wright Blvd   |  | D, R   |                                 | 0.653   |                |                              |   | 2022             | 2010                 |  |
| Shea at Mayo Blvd/134th St   | PO   | C/O  |                                 | 0.280   |                |                              | 0.312   | 2021             | 2007                 | Project Complete   |
| Shea at Via Linda (Phase I)  | PO   | C/O  |                                 | 0.945   |                |                              | 0.912   | 2021-2022        | 2006                 | Project Complete   |

## Arterial Life Cycle Program Status Report

| TABLE 5  |  |  |                                 |   |                |                              |   |                  |                      |   |
|--|--|--|---------------------------------|---|----------------|------------------------------|---|------------------|----------------------|---|
| ARTERIAL STREET LIFE CYCLE PROGRAM   |  |  |                                 |   |                |                              |   |                  |                      |   |
| April 2008 - September 2008, Project Status of Projects Underway                                   |  |  |                                 |   |                |                              |   |                  |                      |   |
| (2008 and Year of Expenditure, Dollars in Millions, Consistent with the FY09 - June 25, 2008 ALCP) |  |  |                                 |   |                |                              |   |                  |                      |   |
| (2007 and Year of Expenditure, Dollars in Millions, Consistent with the FY08 - May 28, 2008 ALCP)  |  |  |                                 |   |                |                              |   |                  |                      |   |
| Lead Agency & Facility   | Project Requirement Completed<br><br>PO = Project Overview<br>PA = Project Agreement | Status<br><br>S=Study<br>P=Pre-Design<br>D=Design R=ROW<br>C=CONST<br>C/O=Closed out | Regional Funding Reimbursements |   |                | Total Expenditures (Exp.)    |   | FY(s) for Reimb. | FY for Final Constr. | Other Project Information                       |
|  |  |  | Programmed Reimb. FY09          | Estimated Future Reimb. FY 2010 - 2026 (2008\$) | Reimb. To Date | Exp. through FY 2009 (YOE\$) | Estimated Future Exp. FY 2010 - 2026 (2008\$) |                  |                      |   |
| <b>SCOTTSDALE</b>  |  |  |                                 |   |                |                              |   |                  |                      |   |
| SR-101L North Frontage Rd: Hayden to Scottsdale Rd   | PO, PA   | C  | 3.805                           |   | 3.037          | 4.338                        | 4.391   | 2009             | 2008                 | Design 100% Complete; Construction 99% Complete |
| SR-101L North Frontage Rd: Pima Rd/Princess Dr to Hayden   |  | P, D, R  | 1.233                           | 14.135  |                |                              |   | 2008-2009        | 2009                 |   |
| SR-101L South Frontage Rd: Hayden to Pima  |  | P, D   | 0.705                           | 12.470  |                |                              |   | 2008-2010        | 2010                 | Project Deleted in the annual update            |

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

**DATE:**

November 4, 2008

**SUBJECT:**

Approval of the Draft July 1, 2008 Maricopa County and Municipality Resident Population Updates

**SUMMARY:**

MAG staff has prepared draft July 1, 2008 Maricopa County and Municipality Resident Population Updates. The Updates were prepared using the 2005 Census Survey for Maricopa County as the base and housing unit data supplied and verified by MAG member agencies. The method used to calculate the updates was approved by the MAG Population Technical Advisory Committee (POPTAC). Because there may be changes to the Maricopa County control total by the Arizona Department of Commerce (ADOC), the MAG POPTAC recommended approval of these Updates provided that the Maricopa County control total is within one percent of the final control total. The Updates are used to allocate \$23 million in lottery funds to local jurisdictions, prepare local budgets and set expenditure limitations.

The State Population Technical Advisory Committee will be considering these updates along with those for the remainder of the State on December 5, 2008. The Director of the Department of Economic Security (DES) is required to forward the Updates to the Economic Estimates Commission by December 15th of each year.

**PUBLIC INPUT:**

None.

**PROS & CONS:**

PROS: The July 1, 2008 Maricopa County and Municipality Resident Population Updates are needed to gauge growth in the region, distribute \$23 million in lottery funds to cities and towns, prepare budgets and set expenditure limitations.

CONS: None.

**TECHNICAL & POLICY IMPLICATIONS:**

TECHNICAL: The July 1, 2008 Maricopa County and Municipality Resident Population Updates have been prepared using a methodology that is consistent for all counties and municipalities in the State of Arizona.

POLICY: The July 1, 2008 Maricopa County and Municipality Resident Population Updates are needed by local officials to accommodate and budget for growth.

**ACTION NEEDED:**

Recommend approval of the July 1, 2008 Maricopa County and Municipality Resident Population Updates provided that the Maricopa County control total is within one percent of the final control total.

## **PRIOR COMMITTEE ACTIONS:**

MAG POPTAC: On October 28, 2008, the MAG Population Technical Advisory Committee unanimously recommended approval of the July 1, 2008 Maricopa County and Municipality Resident Population Updates provided that the Maricopa County control total is within one percent of the final control total.

### MEMBERS ATTENDING:

|  |  |
|--|--|
| George Pettit, Gilbert, Chairman               | Mesa: Wahid Alam   |
| * Apache Junction: Bryant Powell               | # Paradise Valley: Molly Hood  |
| Avondale: Scott Wilken                         | Peoria: Ed Boik  |
| Buckeye: Brian Rose                            | Phoenix: Tim Tilton  |
| * Carefree: Gary Neiss                         | Queen Creek: Dave Williams   |
| # Cave Creek: Ian Cordwell for Usama Abujbarah | * Salt River Pima-Maricopa Indian Community: Ruben Guerrero for Bryan Meyers |
| * Chandler: Jason Crampton                     | Scottsdale: Harry Higgins  |
| # El Mirage: Mark Smith                        | * Surprise: Janice See   |
| # Fountain Hills: Eugene Schlecta              | # Tempe: Sherri Lesser for Lisa Collins                                      |
| * Gila River Indian Community: Terry Yergan    | * Valley Metro: Ann McCracken  |
| Glendale: Thomas Ritz                          | * Wickenburg: Steve Boyle  |
| # Goodyear: Katie Wilken                       | * Youngtown: Lloyce Robinson   |
| Guadalupe: Mark Johnson                        | * Maricopa County: Matt Holm   |
| Litchfield Park: Sonny Culbreth                |  |

\*Those not present

# Participated via audioconference

MAG POPTAC Ad Hoc Subcommittee: On October 28, 2008, the MAG Population Technical Advisory Committee Ad Hoc Subcommittee unanimously recommended approval of the Maricopa County and Municipality July 1, 2008 Resident Population Updates provided that the final update is within one percent of 3,990,000 people.

### MEMBERS ATTENDING:

|                               |                              |
|-------------------------------|------------------------------|
| Tim Tilton, Chairman, Phoenix | Mesa: Wahid Alam             |
| Scottsdale: Harry Higgins     | * Tempe: Lisa Collins        |
| * Chandler: Jason Crampton    | * Maricopa County: Matt Holm |
| Glendale: Thomas Ritz         |                              |

\*Those not present

## **CONTACT PERSON:**

Anubhav Bagley or Rita Walton, MAG, (602) 254-6300.

# DRAFT

## JURISDICTION POPULATION UPDATE 2005 CENSUS SURVEY and JULY 1, 2008

| Jurisdiction          | Total Population                     |                  |                | Percent Growth |             | Share              |                    |
|-----------------------|--------------------------------------|------------------|----------------|----------------|-------------|--------------------|--------------------|
|                       | September 1, 2005<br>(Census Survey) | July 1, 2008     | Change         | Overall        | Annual      | Share of<br>Growth | Share of<br>County |
| Apache Junction *1 *2 | 275                                  | 276              | 1              | 0.4%           | 0.1%        | 0.0%               | 0.0%               |
| Avondale              | 69,356                               | 76,701           | 7,345          | 10.6%          | 3.6%        | 2.5%               | 1.9%               |
| Buckeye               | 25,406                               | 50,323           | 24,917         | 98.1%          | 27.3%       | 8.6%               | 1.3%               |
| Carefree              | 3,684                                | 3,950            | 266            | 7.2%           | 2.5%        | 0.1%               | 0.1%               |
| Cave Creek            | 4,766                                | 5,134            | 368            | 7.7%           | 2.7%        | 0.1%               | 0.1%               |
| Chandler              | 230,845                              | 244,473          | 13,628         | 5.9%           | 2.0%        | 4.7%               | 6.1%               |
| El Mirage             | 32,061                               | 33,659           | 1,598          | 5.0%           | 1.7%        | 0.6%               | 0.8%               |
| Fort McDowell *1      | 824                                  | 824              | 0              | 0.0%           | 0.0%        | 0.0%               | 0.0%               |
| Fountain Hills        | 24,492                               | 26,006           | 1,514          | 6.2%           | 2.1%        | 0.5%               | 0.7%               |
| Gila Bend             | 1,808                                | 1,900            | 92             | 5.1%           | 1.8%        | 0.0%               | 0.0%               |
| Gila River *1 *2      | 2,742                                | 2,742            | 0              | 0.0%           | 0.0%        | 0.0%               | 0.1%               |
| Gilbert               | 173,072                              | 215,117          | 42,045         | 24.3%          | 8.0%        | 14.5%              | 5.4%               |
| Glendale              | 242,369                              | 248,479          | 6,110          | 2.5%           | 0.9%        | 2.1%               | 6.2%               |
| Goodyear              | 46,213                               | 59,526           | 13,313         | 28.8%          | 9.3%        | 4.6%               | 1.5%               |
| Guadalupe             | 5,555                                | 5,993            | 438            | 7.9%           | 2.7%        | 0.2%               | 0.2%               |
| Litchfield Park       | 4,528                                | 5,097            | 569            | 12.6%          | 4.3%        | 0.2%               | 0.1%               |
| Mesa                  | 448,096                              | 459,765          | 11,669         | 2.6%           | 0.9%        | 4.0%               | 11.5%              |
| Paradise Valley       | 13,863                               | 14,449           | 586            | 4.2%           | 1.5%        | 0.2%               | 0.4%               |
| Peoria *2             | 138,109                              | 155,684          | 17,575         | 12.7%          | 4.3%        | 6.1%               | 3.9%               |
| Phoenix               | 1,475,834                            | 1,562,108        | 86,274         | 5.8%           | 2.0%        | 29.8%              | 39.2%              |
| Queen Creek *2        | 15,916                               | 23,382           | 7,466          | 46.9%          | 14.5%       | 2.6%               | 0.6%               |
| Salt River *1         | 6,796                                | 6,880            | 84             | 1.2%           | 0.4%        | 0.0%               | 0.2%               |
| Scottsdale            | 234,752                              | 242,392          | 7,640          | 3.3%           | 1.1%        | 2.6%               | 6.1%               |
| Surprise              | 88,265                               | 108,910          | 20,645         | 23.4%          | 7.7%        | 7.1%               | 2.7%               |
| Tempe                 | 165,796                              | 172,675          | 6,879          | 4.1%           | 1.4%        | 2.4%               | 4.3%               |
| Tolleson              | 6,498                                | 6,836            | 338            | 5.2%           | 1.8%        | 0.1%               | 0.2%               |
| Wickenburg            | 6,077                                | 6,445            | 368            | 6.1%           | 2.1%        | 0.1%               | 0.2%               |
| Youngtown             | 6,163                                | 6,523            | 360            | 5.8%           | 2.0%        | 0.1%               | 0.2%               |
| Balance of County     | 226,355                              | 243,749          | 17,394         | 7.7%           | 2.6%        | 6.0%               | 6.1%               |
| <b>Total</b>          | <b>3,700,516</b>                     | <b>3,990,000</b> | <b>289,484</b> | <b>7.8%</b>    | <b>2.7%</b> | <b>100.0%</b>      | <b>100.0%</b>      |

**Note: These figures are preliminary and are subject to change. Totals may not add due to rounding.**

\*1 Included in "Balance of County" in 2005 Census Survey.

\*2 Maricopa County portion only.

Sources: U.S. Bureau of the Census Year 2005 Census Survey, Arizona Department of Commerce, Maricopa Association of Governments

Prepared by the Maricopa Association of Governments, October 2008.

# DRAFT

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

**DATE:**

November 4, 2008

**SUBJECT:**

National Hunger and Homeless Awareness Week

**SUMMARY:**

On December 8, 1999, the MAG Regional Council approved MAG becoming the responsible entity for year-round homeless planning for the MAG region. The MAG Continuum of Care Regional Committee on Homelessness was established and takes a leadership role in developing recommendations on regional homeless issues for review and approval by the MAG Regional Council.

Members of the Continuum of Care Committee are taking part in regional efforts to promote National Hunger and Homelessness Awareness Week, November 16-22, 2008. Activities are taking place across the region this week and through the month of November. MAG has developed a calendar of events as a way to inform and engage members of the community on the issues and impact of homelessness and hunger in the MAG region. The calendar will be provided at the meeting.

**PUBLIC INPUT:**

Members of the MAG Continuum of Care Regional Committee on Homelessness as well as other community stakeholders have been meeting monthly since August 2008 to develop community awareness strategies. The strategies were presented at the October 6, 2008 MAG Continuum of Care Regional Committee on Homelessness meeting for information and discussion. There were no comments from the public at the meeting. The awareness activities taking place during Hunger and Homeless Awareness Week are all open to the public.

**PROS & CONS:**

**PROS:** As more people become aware of the issues facing people who are homeless and hungry, support for efforts to end homelessness and hunger in the region will increase. The awareness events will inform community members on the causes of hunger and homelessness as well as the solutions. As more people become involved in these issues, the community will see greater results toward ending homelessness and hunger in the region.

**CONS:** There are no anticipated cons.

**TECHNICAL & POLICY IMPLICATIONS:**

**TECHNICAL:** According to the January 2008 point-in-time count, there are over 7,000 homeless men, women, and children on the streets and in shelters in the MAG region. There was an overall 15 percent decrease in the number of homeless people on the streets in Maricopa County from 2007 to 2008. There was an eight percent increase in the number of people in emergency and transitional shelters in the same time period. Recently, providers are reporting significant increases in the number of people seeking assistance for the first time. The number of people in need of resources and shelter is increasing yet the capacity to provide resources in many cases is decreasing. It is critical that the community is aware of the resources in place and solutions to address the issues of hunger and homelessness in the MAG region.

POLICY: Raising the awareness of hunger and homelessness in the MAG region will engage community members in the solutions to end homelessness and hunger in the community. The issues facing people who are hungry and homeless are as complex as the solutions. There is not one strategy that is right for every community. The Committee has been an effective method to discuss and move forward with regional solutions addressing homelessness that are responsive to local needs and priorities.

**ACTION NEEDED:**

Information.

**PRIOR COMMITTEE ACTIONS:**

The MAG Continuum of Care Regional Committee on Homelessness discussed the awareness activities at the October 6, 2008, meeting.

**MEMBERS ATTENDING:**

- Greg Stanton, Councilmember, City of Phoenix, Chair
- \* Roberto Armijo, Community Information & Referral Services
- David Barnhouse, Governor's Office
- Brad Bridwell, US Vets
- \* Kathryn Brown, AZ Dept of Corrections
- \* Kendra Cea, APS
- Amy Schwabenlender for Trinity Donovan, Valley of the Sun United Way
- Steve Frate, City of Glendale, Councilmember
- \* Joyce Gross, Town of Buckeye
- \* Dina Higgins, City of Mesa
- Theresa James, City of Tempe
- Tim Cole for Deanna Jonovich, City of Phoenix
- Don Keuth, Phoenix Community Alliance, Co-Vice Chair
- \* Stephanie Knox, Magellan Health
- \* Mark Ludwig, AZ Department of Housing
- \* Dan Lundberg, City of Surprise
- Nick Margiotta, Phoenix Police Department
- \* Carrie Mascaro, Catholic Charities
- Michael McQuaid, Human Services Campus
- Linda Mushkatel, Maricopa County
- Gary Zeck for Darlene Newsom, UMOM New Day Centers
- \* Joanne Osborne, Councilmember of Goodyear
- \* Gina Ramos-Montes, City of Avondale
- Brenda Robbins, AZ Dept of Health Services
- Laura Skotnicki, Save the Family
- Jacki Taylor, Arizona Coalition to End Homelessness
- \* Margaret Trujillo, MG Trujillo Associates
- \* Mary Rose Wilcox, Maricopa County, Supervisor
- Ted Williams, Arizona Behavioral Health Corporation
- Diana Yazzie Devine, Native American Connections

\*Those members neither present nor represented by proxy.

+Those members present by audio or videoconference.

**CONTACT PERSON:**

Brandee Mead, MAG Human Services Planner III, (602) 254-6300

# **MARICOPA ASSOCIATION OF GOVERNMENTS**

## **INFORMATION SUMMARY... for your review**

**DATE:**

November 4, 2008

**SUBJECT:**

Proposed 2009 Revisions to MAG Standard Specifications and Details for Public Works Construction

**SUMMARY:**

The MAG Standard Specifications and Details for Public Works Construction represent the best professional thinking of representatives of several Public Works Departments and are reviewed and refined by members of the construction industry. They were written to fulfill the need for uniform rules for public works construction performed for Maricopa County and the various cities and public agencies in the county. It further fulfills the need for adequate standards by the smaller communities and agencies who could not afford to promulgate such standards for themselves. The MAG Standard Specifications and Details Committee has completed its 2008 review of proposed revisions to the MAG Publication. A summary of cases is shown in Attachment One. A voting summary is shown in Attachment Two.

A summary of these recommendations has also been sent to MAG Public Works Directors for review for a period of one month. The complete package sent to the MAG Public Works Directors, including the proposed update packets to the MAG Standard Specifications and Details for Public Works Construction book is also available online for review at the following internet address:

<http://www.mag.maricopa.gov/event.cms?item=9331>

If no objections to any of the proposed revisions have been suggested within the month review time frame, then the proposed revisions will be regarded as approved and formal changes to the printed and electronic copies will be released. It is anticipated that the annual update packet will be available for purchase in early January 2009.

**PUBLIC INPUT:**

Development of these revisions has been achieved during open meetings of the MAG Specifications and Details Committee and has included input from several professional contractor and utility groups, private companies and private citizens.

**PROS & CONS:**

**PROS:** Approval of the latest revisions will ensure that the MAG Specifications and Details reflect the latest and best practices in public works construction appropriate for MAG agencies.

**CONS:** Due to the constant evolutionary change inherent in the Specifications and Details process, annual updates to the printed and electronic versions are necessary.

**TECHNICAL & POLICY IMPLICATIONS:**

**TECHNICAL:** The MAG Specifications and Details are a series of recommendations developed over many years, principally by senior inspectors and their supervisors from many MAG agencies. These

recommendations are not prescriptive, but are often adopted entirely, or in part, by MAG agencies in developing public works projects.

POLICY: In prior years, action by the MAG Public Works Committee was the only review needed prior to publication of the revisions. The MAG Public Works Committee has now been discontinued so formal review by the Management Committee is requested.

**ACTION NEEDED:**

Information and discussion.

**PRIOR COMMITTEE ACTIONS:**

MAG Specifications and Details Committee. Reviewed and provided recommendations for the cases submitted for consideration throughout 2008.

The MAG Public Works Directors are currently reviewing the proposed updates.

VOTING MEMBERS

Robert Herz, P.E., RLS, Maricopa County DOT,  
Chairman  
Jim Badowich, Avondale  
Steven Borst, P.E., Buckeye  
Warren White, P.E., Chandler  
Dennis Teller, El Mirage  
Kelli Kurtz, Gilbert  
Tom Kaczmarowski, P.E., Glendale  
Troy Tobiasson, Goodyear

Gordon Haws, Mesa  
Jesse Gonzales, Peoria  
Jeff Van Skike, P.E., Phoenix (Street Trans.)  
Jami Erickson, Phoenix (Water)  
Mark Palichuk, Queen Creek  
Rodney Ramos, P.E., Scottsdale  
Loren Kelly, Surprise  
James E. Bond, P.E., Tempe

ADVISORY MEMBERS

John Ashley, ACA  
Brian Gallimore, AGC  
Jeff Benedict, AGC  
Adrian Green, ARPA  
James Carusone, ARPA

Paul Nebeker, Independent  
Bill Davis, NUCA  
William Ast, NUCA  
Peter Kandaris, SRP Engineering

**CONTACT PERSON:**

Gordon Tyus, MAG, (602) 254-6300

Twenty-two cases were considered in 2008, including five cases carried over from 2007. Of these, six cases were later withdrawn, fifteen were approved, and one case was deferred to continue work in 2009. It is anticipated that the annual update package will be available for purchase in early January, 2009.

Please contact Gordon Tyus at (602) 254-6300 or by e-mail at [qtyus@mag.maricopa.gov](mailto:qtyus@mag.maricopa.gov) if you have questions regarding the Proposed 2009 Revisions to MAG Standard Specifications and Details for Public Works Construction.

The following table lists the cases submitted and the recommendations as shown:

**MARICOPA ASSOCIATION OF GOVERNMENTS  
SPECIFICATIONS AND DETAILS COMMITTEE  
SUMMARY OF RECOMMENDATIONS FOR 2008 CASES FOR CONSIDERATION**

| <b>Case</b>    | <b>Description</b>   | <b>Recommended Action</b> |
|----------------|--|---------------------------|
| 07-02          | Revision/Rewrite of Asphalt Paving and Materials, Section 710 and Section 321                      | Approval                  |
| 07-03<br>A & B | PVC Catch Basins – New Details 535-2, 535-3, 537-2, 539-2, 542-1 through 4 and 543-1 through 5     | Withdrawn                 |
| 07-08          | Revision to Section 615 Sewer Line Construction – Clarify tolerances for pipe versus trench bottom | Withdrawn                 |
| 07-11          | Revision to Detail 370, Vertical Realignment of Water Mains  | Withdrawn                 |
| 07-12          | Revision to Detail 404-2, Water & Sanitary Sewer Separation/Protection                             | Withdrawn                 |
| 08-01          | Revision to Section 210 Borrow Excavation  | Approval                  |
| 08-02          | New Section 317, Asphalt Milling   | Approval                  |
| 08-03          | New Section 325, Asphalt – Rubber Concrete Overlay, Gap Graded                                     | Approval                  |
| 08-04          | New Details 180-1 and 180-2, Portable Water Tank Fill Pipe and Backflow Prevent Details            | Withdrawn                 |
| 08-05          | Revisions to Safety Post Detail 140 and add Detail 141   | Approval                  |
| 08-06          | Insert new section 618.5 Video Inspection of New Mainline Storm Drains.                            | Approval                  |

| <b>Case</b> | <b>Description</b>  | <b>Recommended Action</b> |
|-------------|---|---------------------------|
| 08-07       | Revisions to Section 109 Measurements and Payments  | Approval                  |
| 08-08       | Revisions to Section 301 Subgrade Preparation and Section 601.4 Foundation, Bedding, Backfilling and Compaction concerning optimum moisture and percent compaction. | Approval                  |
| 08-09       | Revisions to Section 625.3.1 Modification to Sewer Manhole Construction   | Withdrawn                 |
| 08-10       | Detail 200 and Sections 336 and 601 – Trench backfill and pavement Replacement  | Carry Forward             |
| 08-11       | Revisions to Detail 250 DRIVEWAY ENTRANCES and specification Section 340  | Approval                  |
| 08-12       | New Section 331, Microsurfacing<br>New Section 714, Microsurfacing Materials  | Approval                  |
| 08-13       | Revision to Section 345 Adjusting Frames, Covers, Valve Boxes and Water Meter Boxes   | Approval                  |
| 08-14       | Revision to Detail 212 UTILITY POTHOLE REPAIR   | Approval                  |
| 08-15       | Revision to Detail 535 CATCH BASIN TYPE 'F' – Grate modification  | Approval                  |
| 08-16       | Revision to Detail 552 CONCRETE CUT-OFF WALLS – Revise concrete pavement note   | Approval                  |
| 08-17       | Revision to Detail 210 RESIDENTIAL SPEED HUMP – Delete conflicting note.  | Approval                  |

RECOMMENDATION SUMMARY  
OF THE  
MARICOPA ASSOCIATION OF GOVERNMENTS  
STANDARD SPECIFICATIONS AND DETAILS COMMITTEE

October 9, 2008

**GENERAL INFORMATION:**

Case Number: 07-02  
Section/Detail: Section 321 and Section 710  
Title: Revisions/Rewrite of Asphalt Concrete Pavement and Materials  
Sponsor: Arizona Rock Products Association (ARPA)  
Advisor: Don Green, Jeff Benedict

**DISCUSSION:**

In 2007, the Asphalt Paving Technical Committee (APTC) proposed major revisions to Sections 321 and 710 concerning asphalt pavement and related materials. Numerous changes were proposed in terms of section formatting, making the specifications more consistent with national and regional standards, use of design mixes; revisions to aggregate and anti-stripping requirements; more consistent terminology; and modifications to mix design criteria. This case also moves language currently in Section 710 (Materials) to Section 321 where appropriate.

An Asphalt Working Group comprised of agency representatives and technical experts met monthly during 2008 to refine the language in the rewritten specifications, and incorporate feedback and concerns of MAG member agencies, including updating penalty tables, quality control testing and the addition of coring methods.

The full committee also reviewed drafts of the revisions throughout the year. Written comments were provided by Maricopa County and the City of Mesa.

The final approved document addressed comments from member agencies and suggestions made during the Working Group meetings and final review meetings.

**RECOMMENDATION:**

Based on the following data, the MAG Standard Specifications and Details Committee recommends approval of this case.

|                 |                  |               |              |   |
|-----------------|------------------|---------------|--------------|---|
| Submittal Date: | February 7, 2007 | Vote Summary: | Affirmative: | 9 |
| Vote Date:      | October 10, 2008 |               | Negative:    | 3 |
|                 |                  |               | Abstention:  | 0 |

RECOMMENDATION SUMMARY  
OF THE  
MARICOPA ASSOCIATION OF GOVERNMENTS  
STANDARD SPECIFICATIONS AND DETAILS COMMITTEE

October 9, 2008

**GENERAL INFORMATION:**

Case Number: 07-03 A and B  
Section/Detail: Details 535-2, 535-3, 537-2, 539-2, 542-1 through 4, and 543-1 through 5. Section 601.4.10  
Title: A. PVC Catch Basins – Proposed New Details  
B. PVC Inlet Structures  
Sponsor: National Utility Contractors Association of Arizona (NUCA)  
Advisor: Dale Phelan/Bill Davis

**DISCUSSION:**

Currently MAG includes several details for catch basins constructed from concrete and their matching grates. Catch basins constructed using PVC pipe and other related materials have come into common use in private industry, yet the MAG specifications provide no option for their use. Case 07-03 proposed to add a series of catch basin details constructed from PVC pipe for use in the MAG region. The sponsor provided information and technical specifications on the strength, materials and installation practices for the PVC catch basins and inlets. The case was broken into 07-03A for the Catch Basins and 07-03B for the Inlet Structures.

Throughout 2008, the sponsor updated the proposed details, including additional dimensions, annotations and material requirements. The sponsor also provided isometric assembly views and noted changes needed to Section 601.4.10.

It was suggested by members that the drawings needed more revisions in order to be constructed without any reference to a specific manufacturer, in a manner consistent with the existing MAG concrete catch basin details. Additional changes suggested by the committee included providing full dimensions for the base plate and other revisions to notes and details. The committee also had discussions and concerns about the use of PVC catch basins within the public right-of-way. Suggestions included whether their applications should be limited, or the necessity of including them in the MAG specifications without further testing and evaluation by agencies.

Since this case cannot be carried forward another year, there remained concerns about the use of PVC catch basins in the public right-of-way, as well as additional work needed to update the technical requirements of the detail drawings, the sponsor withdrew the case on October 8, 2008.

**RECOMMENDATION:**

The case was withdrawn by the sponsor on October 8, 2008.

|                 |                  |               |              |   |
|-----------------|------------------|---------------|--------------|---|
| Submittal Date: | February 7, 2007 | Vote Summary: | Affirmative: | 0 |
| Vote Date:      | No vote taken.   |               | Negative:    | 0 |
|                 |                  |               | Abstention:  | 0 |

RECOMMENDATION SUMMARY  
OF THE  
MARICOPA ASSOCIATION OF GOVERNMENTS  
STANDARD SPECIFICATIONS AND DETAILS COMMITTEE

October 9, 2008

**GENERAL INFORMATION:**

Case Number: 07-08  
Section/Detail: Section 615  
Title: Revision to Section 615 Sewer Line Construction – Clarify tolerances for pipe versus trench bottom.  
Sponsor: Town of Queen Creek  
Advisor: Gerald Wright/Mark Palichuk

**DISCUSSION:**

Case 07-08 proposed to clarify language for pipe and grade tolerances. Presently, Section 615 gives trench bottom grade tolerances, but does not specify pipe flow line tolerances. With the use of closed circuit T.V. inspection it is possible to make direct measurements inside the pipe. Use of trench grade tolerances could result in pipe flow problems if pipe is set to the same grade ranges.

The proposed addition included a paragraph describing water ponding tolerances inside sewer pipe as measured by video inspection. The committee agreed that there is a need since there is no standard for present field practices using video inspection of pipes. Advisory members explained the necessity for more work on the proposed changes since they do not address equipment calibration or technician qualifications, nor is there uniform agreement on the proposed tolerance limits. There was general agreement that video-based tolerances were also needed for manholes and pipe inverts.

Since the case cannot be carried forward another year, to address these outstanding issues, the sponsor withdrew the case, with the possibility of submitting it as a new case in the future when calibration, technician qualifications and tolerance limits had been studied.

**RECOMMENDATION:**

The case was withdrawn by the sponsor on July 2, 2008.

|                 |                |               |              |   |
|-----------------|----------------|---------------|--------------|---|
| Submittal Date: | May 2, 2007    | Vote Summary: | Affirmative: | 0 |
| Vote Date:      | No vote taken. |               | Negative:    | 0 |
|                 |                |               | Abstention:  | 0 |

RECOMMENDATION SUMMARY  
OF THE  
MARICOPA ASSOCIATION OF GOVERNMENTS  
STANDARD SPECIFICATIONS AND DETAILS COMMITTEE

October 9, 2008

**GENERAL INFORMATION:**

Case Number: 07-11  
Section/Detail: Detail 370  
Title: Vertical Realignment of Water Mains  
Sponsor: City of Peoria  
Advisor: Jesse Gonzales

**DISCUSSION:**

Case 07-11 proposed including an option for realignment of a ductile iron mechanical joint in MAG Detail 370 by adding notes: *One continuous joint of pipe 20' (18' nominal) with bell cut off or equivalent pipe to be used at undercrossing between 45s; and Joints shall be restrained back from 45s per MAG 303-1 and 303-2 or sealed restraint calculations will be required.*

Members commented that additional work was needed to address differences for retrofit projects, to avoid disturbing large areas of existing pavement.

Since the case cannot be carried forward another year, and the sponsor was unable to work on the case for an extended period due to health issues, it was withdrawn on July 2, 2008.

**RECOMMENDATION:**

The case was withdrawn by the sponsor on July 2, 2008.

|                 |               |               |              |   |
|-----------------|---------------|---------------|--------------|---|
| Submittal Date: | June 6, 2007  | Vote Summary: | Affirmative: | 0 |
| Vote Date:      | No vote taken |               | Negative:    | 0 |
|                 |               |               | Abstention:  | 0 |

RECOMMENDATION SUMMARY  
OF THE  
MARICOPA ASSOCIATION OF GOVERNMENTS  
STANDARD SPECIFICATIONS AND DETAILS COMMITTEE

October 9, 2008

**GENERAL INFORMATION:**

Case Number: 07-12  
Section/Detail: Detail 404-2  
Title: Revision to Water and Sanitary Sewer Separation/Protection  
Sponsor: City of Peoria  
Advisor: Jesse Gonzales

**DISCUSSION:**

Case 07-12 proposed adding language to clarify the location of pipe and joint restraints to insure that fittings/couplings do not fail and create cross-contamination between sewer and water line crossing.

It was proposed to revise Detail 404-2: Water and Sanitary Sewer Separation/Protection to more accurately show and note that pipe joints are 20' (18' nominal) apart, and that the pipes are shown properly restrained outside of the restricted zone.

The committee noted that both new and retrofit work still need to be addressed.

Since the case cannot be carried forward another year, and the sponsor was unable to work on the case for an extended period due to health issues, it was withdrawn on July 2, 2008.

**RECOMMENDATION:**

The case was withdrawn by the sponsor on July 2, 2008.

|                 |               |               |              |   |
|-----------------|---------------|---------------|--------------|---|
| Submittal Date: | June 6, 2007  | Vote Summary: | Affirmative: | 0 |
| Vote Date:      | No vote taken |               | Negative:    | 0 |
|                 |               |               | Abstention:  | 0 |

RECOMMENDATION SUMMARY  
OF THE  
MARICOPA ASSOCIATION OF GOVERNMENTS  
STANDARD SPECIFICATIONS AND DETAILS COMMITTEE

October 9, 2008

**GENERAL INFORMATION:**

Case Number: 08-01  
Section/Detail: Section 210  
Title: Borrow Excavation  
Sponsor: Maricopa County  
Advisor: Bob Herz

**DISCUSSION:**

The purpose of the case was to define acceptance criteria for borrow material with an updated formula used by MCDOT. The first paragraphs of Section 210.2 would now read:

**210.2 IMPORTED BORROW:**

Imported borrow shall consist of material required for construction and unless otherwise designated in the special provisions, the Contractor shall make arrangements for obtaining imported borrow and shall pay all costs involved. When designated sources for imported borrow are indicated on the plans or in the special provisions, the material shall be assumed approved by the Engineer.

Borrow material for fill within the roadway prism shall meet the following requirements:

The Plasticity Index (PI) (AASHTO T90) and the percent passing the number 200 sieve (Minus 200) (ASTM C136) when used in the equation below, shall give a value of X that does not exceed 62.

$$X = (\text{Minus 200}) + 2.83 (\text{PI})$$

When the percentage of the Minus 200 material is greater than 30, the PI for the soil shall be at least 5 and at the same time in compliance with the X value requirement.

**RECOMMENDATION:**

Based on the following data, the MAG Standard Specifications and Details Committee recommends approval of this case.

|                 |                 |               |              |    |
|-----------------|-----------------|---------------|--------------|----|
| Submittal Date: | January 1, 2008 | Vote Summary: | Affirmative: | 11 |
| Vote Date:      | June 5, 2008    |               | Negative:    | 0  |
|                 |                 |               | Abstention:  | 0  |

RECOMMENDATION SUMMARY  
OF THE  
MARICOPA ASSOCIATION OF GOVERNMENTS  
STANDARD SPECIFICATIONS AND DETAILS COMMITTEE

October 9, 2008

**GENERAL INFORMATION:**

Case Number: 08-02  
Section/Detail: Section 317  
Title: Asphalt Milling  
Sponsor: Maricopa County  
Advisor: Bob Herz

**DISCUSSION:**

The purpose of this case was to incorporate specifications from MCDOT's supplement into the MAG specifications as requested by the MAG Specifications & Details Supplements Working Group.

The case adds Section 317 Asphalt Milling to the MAG Specifications book.

The committee provided suggestions that included equipment type, dust control compliance, milling operation requirements, clean up and debris removal, and construction time frames. Other comments included how to deal with delamination, repair methods and making the specification performance-based.

Questions were raised about how contractors are to locate below grade milling hazards and how to prevent tearing and breakout of underlying or adjacent materials. Written comments were provided by Salt River Project.

In response to committee comments, noting that the milling machine shall have electronic grade controls was added. Also revisions were made to clarify the contractor's duties in notifying the engineer when the existing pavement thickness is found to be less than anticipated, and when breaking or delamination of underlying material occurs.

**RECOMMENDATION:**

Based on the following data, the MAG Standard Specifications and Details Committee recommends approval of this case.

|                 |                 |               |              |    |
|-----------------|-----------------|---------------|--------------|----|
| Submittal Date: | January 1, 2008 | Vote Summary: | Affirmative: | 11 |
| Vote Date:      | May 8, 2008     |               | Negative:    | 0  |
|                 |                 |               | Abstention:  | 0  |

RECOMMENDATION SUMMARY  
OF THE  
MARICOPA ASSOCIATION OF GOVERNMENTS  
STANDARD SPECIFICATIONS AND DETAILS COMMITTEE

October 9, 2008

**GENERAL INFORMATION:**

Case Number: 08-03  
Section/Detail: Section 325  
Title: Asphalt – Rubber Concrete Overlay, Gap Graded  
Sponsor: Maricopa County  
Advisor: Bob Herz

**DISCUSSION:**

The purpose of this case was to incorporate specifications from MCDOT's supplement into the MAG specifications as requested by the MAG Specifications & Details Supplements Working Group.

The case adds Section 325, Asphalt – Rubber Concrete Overlay, Gap Graded to the MAG Specifications book.

This new section provides material and construction requirements for asphalt-rubber concrete used as an asphalt pavement overlay.

Written comments were provided by the Associated General Contractors of Arizona including a comparative table of asphalt-rubber pavement mix design requirements from ADOT, MCDOT, and the cities of Glendale, Mesa and Phoenix. The committee provided additional comments including eliminating the 2-inch overlay mix.

Maricopa County incorporated comments from the committee in the final version which was approved on September 3, 2008.

**RECOMMENDATION:**

Based on the following data, the MAG Standard Specifications and Details Committee recommends approval of this case.

|                 |                   |               |              |    |
|-----------------|-------------------|---------------|--------------|----|
| Submittal Date: | January 1, 2008   | Vote Summary: | Affirmative: | 12 |
| Vote Date:      | September 3, 2008 |               | Negative:    | 0  |
|                 |                   |               | Abstention:  | 0  |

RECOMMENDATION SUMMARY  
OF THE  
MARICOPA ASSOCIATION OF GOVERNMENTS  
STANDARD SPECIFICATIONS AND DETAILS COMMITTEE

October 9, 2008

**GENERAL INFORMATION:**

Case Number: 08-04  
Section/Detail: Details 180-1 and 180-2  
Title: Portable Water Tank Fill Pipe and Backflow Prevention Details  
Sponsor: Chandler  
Advisor: David Fern/Warren White

**DISCUSSION:**

The purpose of this case was to add new details as requested by the MAG Specifications & Details Supplements Working Group to reduce the number of agency supplements to MAG standards. Similar details are currently part of the supplements for the cities of Chandler, Goodyear, Mesa and Scottsdale to show approved methods for filling portable water tanks and trucks.

Discussions included whether these methods should be included in the MAG standards since they are not construction or material requirements. It was also noted that the details need to state that the methods referenced apply only to potable water sources. Some members stressed the need to reduce agency supplements.

Questions were raised as to whether these details should be used in agency supplements since they are already covered by Arizona Administrative Code. A number of members explained that these types of details are needed by their agencies, and that a single reference code would provide the best approach. After further discussion, members recommended that agencies should not include these details within their supplements, but have their water departments provided them to contractors when supplying hydrant meters.

Since the consensus of the members was not to include these details as MAG standards, the case was withdrawn by the sponsor.

**RECOMMENDATION:**

The case was withdrawn by the sponsor on June 6, 2008.

|                 |                 |               |              |   |
|-----------------|-----------------|---------------|--------------|---|
| Submittal Date: | January 1, 2008 | Vote Summary: | Affirmative: | 0 |
| Vote Date:      | No vote taken.  |               | Negative:    | 0 |
|                 |                 |               | Abstention:  | 0 |

RECOMMENDATION SUMMARY  
OF THE  
MARICOPA ASSOCIATION OF GOVERNMENTS  
STANDARD SPECIFICATIONS AND DETAILS COMMITTEE

October 9, 2008

**GENERAL INFORMATION:**

Case Number: 08-05  
Section/Detail: Detail 140, New Detail 141  
Title: Revisions to Safety Post Details  
Sponsor: Chandler  
Advisor: David Fern/Warren White

**DISCUSSION:**

The purpose of this case was to consolidate safety post details as requested by the MAG Specifications & Details Supplements Working Group to reduce the number of agency supplements to MAG standards. The sponsor provided a revised Detail 140 to incorporate differences in the details used in Chandler and Mesa supplements and to incorporate a hazard marker.

It was suggested that rather than to include both drawings on Detail 140, to add Detail 141 Hazard Marker, and rename Detail 140 with a more accurate description of Bollards. Other members provided feedback including making the post heights more uniform, and excluding marker placement requirements since use and application are usually agency and job specific.

Additional details were added for removable bollards, and different methods of mounting hazard markers.

Notes were updated regarding the type of reflective materials used on the markers, and the function of the through drill hole on removable bollards to assist in lifting.

Comments were incorporated in the final details 140 and 141.

**RECOMMENDATION:**

Based on the following data, the MAG Standard Specifications and Details Committee recommends approval of this case.

|                 |                 |               |              |    |
|-----------------|-----------------|---------------|--------------|----|
| Submittal Date: | January 1, 2008 | Vote Summary: | Affirmative: | 12 |
| Vote Date:      | August 6, 2008  |               | Negative:    | 0  |
|                 |                 |               | Abstention:  | 0  |

RECOMMENDATION SUMMARY  
OF THE  
MARICOPA ASSOCIATION OF GOVERNMENTS  
STANDARD SPECIFICATIONS AND DETAILS COMMITTEE

October 9, 2008

**GENERAL INFORMATION:**

Case Number: 08-06  
Section/Detail: New Section 618.5  
Title: Video Inspection of New Mainline Storm Drains  
Sponsor: Phoenix  
Advisor: Jeff Van Skike

**DISCUSSION:**

To incorporate a City of Phoenix supplement it was proposed to add new Section 618.5, which will require a video inspection of the mainline pipe before final paving is allowed. Discussion included not restricting the video inspection to HDPE storm drains, and changes in the language to clarify where video inspection is needed.

The new section was approved as the following text:

**618.5 VIDEO INSPECTION OF NEW MAINLINE STORM DRAINS:**

The Contractor shall provide the Engineer with an annotated video inspection record (either VHS or DVD format) of the new mainline storm drain pipeline. The video shall clearly show all joints, seals, connecting pipes, and manholes. This video shall be provided to the Engineer, and reviewed and approved by the Engineer prior to the Contractor being allowed to place the final pavement over the storm drain line. No separate payment will be made for this inspection; the cost of the video inspection shall be included in the cost of the pipe.

**RECOMMENDATION:**

Based on the following data, the MAG Standard Specifications and Details Committee recommends approval of this case.

|                 |                   |               |              |    |
|-----------------|-------------------|---------------|--------------|----|
| Submittal Date: | February 2, 2008  | Vote Summary: | Affirmative: | 12 |
| Vote Date:      | September 3, 2008 |               | Negative:    | 0  |
|                 |                   |               | Abstention:  | 0  |

RECOMMENDATION SUMMARY  
OF THE  
MARICOPA ASSOCIATION OF GOVERNMENTS  
STANDARD SPECIFICATIONS AND DETAILS COMMITTEE

October 9, 2008

**GENERAL INFORMATION:**

Case Number: 08-07  
Section/Detail: Section 109  
Title: Revisions to Section 109 Measurements and Payments  
Sponsor: Mesa  
Advisor: Gordon Haws

**DISCUSSION:**

To incorporate a City of Mesa supplement, it was proposed to make revisions to Section 109 that would better define compensation with change orders.

Maricopa County provided written comments and changes that would incorporate their supplement into Section 109 as well.

Discussion included removing references to the term bid, since some contracts are not bid.

The final approved version included revisions/additions to Subsections 109.1, 109.2, and 109.4, and added a new subsection:

109.10 PAYMENT FOR MOBILIZATION/DEMOBILIZATION

**RECOMMENDATION:**

Based on the following data, the MAG Standard Specifications and Details Committee recommends approval of this case.

|                 |                   |               |              |    |
|-----------------|-------------------|---------------|--------------|----|
| Submittal Date: | February 2, 2008  | Vote Summary: | Affirmative: | 12 |
| Vote Date:      | September 3, 2008 |               | Negative:    | 0  |
|                 |                   |               | Abstention:  | 0  |

RECOMMENDATION SUMMARY  
OF THE  
MARICOPA ASSOCIATION OF GOVERNMENTS  
STANDARD SPECIFICATIONS AND DETAILS COMMITTEE

October 9, 2008

**GENERAL INFORMATION:**

Case Number: 08-08  
Section/Detail: Section 301 and Section 601.4  
Title: Revisions to Section 301 Subgrade Preparation and Section 601.4 Foundation, Bedding, Backfilling and Compaction concerning optimum moisture and percent compaction.  
Sponsor: Mesa  
Advisor: Gordon Haws

**DISCUSSION:**

To eliminate a City of Mesa supplement, it was proposed to make revisions to Sections 301.3 and 601.4 to modify subgrade compaction requirements and to include tolerances for optimum moisture.

Discussion included concerns that the optimum moisture range may not be adequate for difficult soils, and it was suggested to broaden the optimum moisture content tolerance to include a wider variety of soils types as a default value.

The SRP representative suggested wording for compaction under various conditions. It was also recommended that the term "Other traffic ways" in Section 301.3(B) be better defined.

Maricopa County submitted additional revisions that incorporated their supplements to Sections 301, and also noted that a reference to a detail drawing should be specified as MAG Detail 190.

The final approved version included revisions/additions to Subsections 302.2, 302.3, 302.7, 302.8 and 601.4.

**RECOMMENDATION:**

Based on the following data, the MAG Standard Specifications and Details Committee recommends approval of this case.

|                 |                   |               |              |    |
|-----------------|-------------------|---------------|--------------|----|
| Submittal Date: | February 2, 2008  | Vote Summary: | Affirmative: | 11 |
| Vote Date:      | September 3, 2008 |               | Negative:    | 0  |
|                 |                   |               | Abstention:  | 0  |

RECOMMENDATION SUMMARY  
OF THE  
MARICOPA ASSOCIATION OF GOVERNMENTS  
STANDARD SPECIFICATIONS AND DETAILS COMMITTEE

October 9, 2008

**GENERAL INFORMATION:**

Case Number: 08-09  
Section/Detail: Section 625.3.1  
Title: Modification to Sewer Manhole Construction  
Sponsor: Mesa  
Advisor: Gordon Haws

**DISCUSSION:**

The purpose of this case was to incorporate the City of Mesa supplement to Section 625.3.1 as requested by the MAG Specifications & Details Supplements Working Group. The sponsor provided the following proposed revisions to Subsection 625.3.1:

Add the following additional verbiage before the paragraph that starts with “Frame and Cover...”

- All manholes shall have a minimum of 6-inches and a maximum of 16-inches of approved adjusting rings.
- All joints between shaft sections, cones and adjusting rings shall be sealed with “RAM-NEK” flexible gasket, mortar, or approved equal.
- When a manhole is called out in the plans or in the specifications to be lined with a PVC line, all exposed concrete surfaces including the shelf and opening shall be lined.
- When manholes are placed within asphalt paved areas, the rings and covers shall be installed per MAG Standard Detail 422.

Discussion included members noting that the proposed minimum and maximum manhole adjustments may be in conflict with existing MAG Detail 420.

Upon further review of the present MAG requirements, the sponsor determined that the changes proposed were already adequately addressed in the MAG Specifications and Details, so the case was withdrawn.

**RECOMMENDATION:**

The case was withdrawn by the sponsor on April 2, 2008.

|                 |                  |               |              |   |
|-----------------|------------------|---------------|--------------|---|
| Submittal Date: | February 2, 2008 | Vote Summary: | Affirmative: | 0 |
| Vote Date:      | No vote taken.   |               | Negative:    | 0 |
|                 |                  |               | Abstention:  | 0 |

RECOMMENDATION SUMMARY  
OF THE  
MARICOPA ASSOCIATION OF GOVERNMENTS  
STANDARD SPECIFICATIONS AND DETAILS COMMITTEE

October 9, 2008

**GENERAL INFORMATION:**

Case Number: 08-10  
Section/Detail: Detail 200 and Sections 336 and 601  
Title: Trench Backfill and Pavement Replacement  
Sponsor: Salt River Project  
Advisor: Peter Kandararis

**DISCUSSION:**

The purpose of this case was to make revisions necessary to eliminate numerous agency trench backfill and pavement replacement supplemental details by combining the most common practices. The sponsor provided an updated Detail 200 and proposed revisions to Sections 336 and 601 to incorporate the most common agency supplements and exceptions. The sponsor also provided member agency representatives a summary of what would need to change in their agency supplements if the revisions to the MAG Specifications and Details were adopted.

Committee members requested that revised Detail 200 include a default option of 1-sack cement CSLM, and also discussed the use of ½-sack cement versus 1-sack cement for controlled low strength material backfill.

Members also reviewed changes proposed for “T-Top” pavement repairs and noted that trench foundation requirements should be in accordance with Section 601.

Additional written comments were provided by Tempe and Maricopa County.

Due to the large number of changes and high number of agency supplements the case effects, it is recommended that this case be carried over to 2009.

**RECOMMENDATION:**

The MAG Standard Specifications and Details Committee recommends carrying forward this case for further discussion in 2009.

|                 |                  |               |              |   |
|-----------------|------------------|---------------|--------------|---|
| Submittal Date: | February 2, 2008 | Vote Summary: | Affirmative: | 0 |
| Vote Date:      | No vote taken.   |               | Negative:    | 0 |
|                 |                  |               | Abstention:  | 0 |

RECOMMENDATION SUMMARY  
OF THE  
MARICOPA ASSOCIATION OF GOVERNMENTS  
STANDARD SPECIFICATIONS AND DETAILS COMMITTEE

October 9, 2008

**GENERAL INFORMATION:**

Case Number: 08-11  
Section/Detail: Details 250-1, 250-2, Section 340  
Title: Revisions to Detail 250 DRIVEWAY ENTRANCES and Specification Section 340  
Sponsor: Maricopa County  
Advisor: Bob Herz

**DISCUSSION:**

The purpose of Case 08-11 was to revise MAG Driveway Entrance details to obtain ADA compliant sidewalk installations and reduce supplemental details. Revisions included creating separate installation details for driveways when the sidewalk is detached, and when attached to the back of the curb.

MAG Detail 250 is replaced with Detail 250-1 Driveway Entrance with Detached Sidewalk, and Detail 250-2 Driveway Entrance with Sidewalk attached to Curb. Also revisions were made to Section 340 in the Description, Materials, and Construction Methods subsections including revisions to notes about detectable warnings and expansion joint placement.

Discussion by the committee included squaring driveway wing areas and redrawing Section A-A to have the gutter and drive thicknesses match. There were also comments on the class of concrete and thickness used for commercial driveways.

Other discussion included showing a minimum 3-foot sidewalk width dimension behind the driveways ramps in the plan view of Detail 250-2 and the potential need for additional right-of-way to accommodate the change.

Committee feedback was included in the final revised case and new detail drawings.

**RECOMMENDATION:**

Based on the following data, the MAG Standard Specifications and Details Committee recommends approval of this case.

|                 |                |               |              |    |
|-----------------|----------------|---------------|--------------|----|
| Submittal Date: | May 5, 2008    | Vote Summary: | Affirmative: | 12 |
| Vote Date:      | August 6, 2008 |               | Negative:    | 0  |
|                 |                |               | Abstention:  | 0  |

RECOMMENDATION SUMMARY  
OF THE  
MARICOPA ASSOCIATION OF GOVERNMENTS  
STANDARD SPECIFICATIONS AND DETAILS COMMITTEE

October 9, 2008

**GENERAL INFORMATION:**

Case Number: 08-12  
Section/Detail: New Sections 331 and 714  
Title: Microsurfacing and Microsurfacing Materials  
Sponsor: Phoenix  
Advisor: Jeff Van Skike

**DISCUSSION:**

New Sections 331 Microsurfacing and 714 Microsurfacing Materials were proposed by the City of Phoenix to incorporate their supplement into the MAG Specifications, which provides options for pavement microsurfacing materials.

As the City of Phoenix specifications group reviewed their supplements to MAG, revisions to Sections 331 and 714 were presented to the MAG committee.

Maricopa County provided written comments recommending adding test methods to the specification table in Section 331, including performance requirements in Section 331, and modifying the language in the aggregate requirements of Section 714. It was also suggested to reformat the document using the standard MAG format and numbering system.

The sponsor made revisions to the case based on the comments provided.

**RECOMMENDATION:**

Based on the following data, the MAG Standard Specifications and Details Committee recommends approval of this case.

|                 |                 |               |              |           |
|-----------------|-----------------|---------------|--------------|-----------|
| Submittal Date: | May 5, 2008     | Vote Summary: | Affirmative: | <b>12</b> |
| Vote Date:      | October 8, 2008 |               | Negative:    | <b>0</b>  |
|                 |                 |               | Abstention:  | <b>0</b>  |

RECOMMENDATION SUMMARY  
OF THE  
MARICOPA ASSOCIATION OF GOVERNMENTS  
STANDARD SPECIFICATIONS AND DETAILS COMMITTEE

October 9, 2008

**GENERAL INFORMATION:**

Case Number: 08-13  
Section/Detail: Section 345  
Title: Revision to Section 345 Adjusting Frames, Covers, Valve Boxes  
and Water Meter Boxes  
Sponsor: Phoenix  
Advisor: Jeff Van Skike

**DISCUSSION:**

The purpose of the case is to make revisions to Section 345 to require contractors be responsible for locating utilities during surface improvement projects to ensure adjustments are performed.

Maricopa County recommended changing the wording in the first sentence as follows “The contractor ~~responsible for the surface improvement, i.e., concrete and/or asphalt paving,~~ shall also be responsible for the careful identification and location of all utility devices requiring ~~future~~ adjustment within the new pavement section, including manholes, water valves, sewer clean-outs, vaults, etc.”

Discussion followed pertaining to problems encountered with utility identification and marking for developer/permit work when various contractors are working independently for developers. The members discussed other items including clarifying or defining the term “surface improvement” and broadening the wording for described locating devices to include allow any appropriate method.

The sponsor updated the case based on the comments received. Additional minor language changes as discussed and suggested by members were also made for the final revision that was approved by the committee.

**RECOMMENDATION:**

Based on the following data, the MAG Standard Specifications and Details Committee recommends approval of this case.

|                 |               |               |              |    |
|-----------------|---------------|---------------|--------------|----|
| Submittal Date: | March 5, 2008 | Vote Summary: | Affirmative: | 11 |
| Vote Date:      | July 2, 2008  |               | Negative:    | 0  |
|                 |               |               | Abstention:  | 0  |

RECOMMENDATION SUMMARY  
OF THE  
MARICOPA ASSOCIATION OF GOVERNMENTS  
STANDARD SPECIFICATIONS AND DETAILS COMMITTEE

October 9, 2008

**GENERAL INFORMATION:**

Case Number: 08-14  
Section/Detail: Detail 212  
Title: Revision to Detail 212 UTILITY POTHOLE REPAIR  
Sponsor: Phoenix  
Advisor: Jeff Van Skike

**DISCUSSION:**

The purpose of the case was to revise MAG Detail 212 to allow multiple backfill and asphalt concrete materials for repair of utility potholes.

At present only ½-sack cement CLSM backfill and 12.5 mm asphalt concrete are allowed for repairs, with asphalt concrete placed within 4 hours of CLSM backfill. The proposed change allows agencies more flexibility to insure that more backfill and asphalt concrete products are available and eliminates the time restriction.

The sponsor modified Detail 212 to note ½-sack controlled low-strength material *or other agency approved material* could be used as pothole backfill, and removed the time restriction.

Additional revisions included a note to insure that “Edges shall be cut to a neat vertical face” and a note to tack edges when making the repair.

**RECOMMENDATION:**

Based on the following data, the MAG Standard Specifications and Details Committee recommends approval of this case.

|                 |                |               |              |           |
|-----------------|----------------|---------------|--------------|-----------|
| Submittal Date: | April 2, 2008  | Vote Summary: | Affirmative: | <b>12</b> |
| Vote Date:      | August 6, 2008 |               | Negative:    | <b>0</b>  |
|                 |                |               | Abstention:  | <b>0</b>  |

RECOMMENDATION SUMMARY  
OF THE  
MARICOPA ASSOCIATION OF GOVERNMENTS  
STANDARD SPECIFICATIONS AND DETAILS COMMITTEE

October 9, 2008

**GENERAL INFORMATION:**

Case Number: 08-15  
Section/Detail: Detail 535  
Title: Revision to Detail 535 CATCH BASIN TYPE 'F' – Grate modification  
Sponsor: Maricopa County  
Advisor: Bob Herz

**DISCUSSION:**

As part of the review of Case 07-03, a committee representative discovered that end bars on catch basin grates are being centered on grate bars, resulting in an unnecessarily wide space between frames and grates at the pavement surface.

The purpose was to reduce the maximum potential gap between the grate and frame to prevent the entrapment of bicycle tires.

To correct this, it was proposed that the end bars be made flush with the top of grates. Revisions to Detail 535 Catch Basin Type 'F' was to adjust the size and location of the grate end bars and revise the end bar note to read:

(2) 2 ½" x ¼" x 3'-4 ½" END BAR FLUSH WITH TOP SURFACE OF GRATE

Other updates to the detail included clarifying some dimension and welding symbol annotations.

**RECOMMENDATION:**

Based on the following data, the MAG Standard Specifications and Details Committee recommends approval of this case.

|                 |              |               |              |    |
|-----------------|--------------|---------------|--------------|----|
| Submittal Date: | June 4, 2008 | Vote Summary: | Affirmative: | 10 |
| Vote Date:      | July 2, 2008 |               | Negative:    | 1  |
|                 |              |               | Abstention:  | 0  |

RECOMMENDATION SUMMARY  
OF THE  
MARICOPA ASSOCIATION OF GOVERNMENTS  
STANDARD SPECIFICATIONS AND DETAILS COMMITTEE

October 9, 2008

**GENERAL INFORMATION:**

Case Number: 08-16  
Section/Detail: Detail 552  
Title: Revisions to Concrete Cut-Off Wall Detail 552  
Sponsor: Maricopa County  
Advisor: Bob Herz

**DISCUSSION:**

The purpose of this case was to clarify requirements for concrete surfaced ford crossings. The concrete surfaced ford requirements shown in Detail 552 conflict with requirements of Section 324 Portland Cement Concrete Street Pavement. Detail 552 requires Class A Concrete, the third paragraph of Section 324.5 PROTECTION OF PAVEMENT states. "No traffic or Contractor's equipment, except as hereinafter provided, will be permitted on the pavement until the concrete has developed a compressive strength of 3500 psi." The 28-day strength required of Class A concrete is 3000 psi. Maricopa County uses concrete ford crossings as a hard non-erodible surface for local roads, the requirements of Section 324 are not needed with Detail 552.

The suggested revision was:

Revise the concrete surfacing note in the typical section titled CONCRETE SURFACE FORD CONCRETE WALLS as follows:  
8" CLASS 'A' CONCRETE PER SECTIONS 505 AND 725, SECTION 324 DOES NOT APPLY.

The committee gave no objections to the proposed change.

**RECOMMENDATION:**

Based on the following data, the MAG Standard Specifications and Details Committee recommends approval of this case.

|                 |                |               |              |    |
|-----------------|----------------|---------------|--------------|----|
| Submittal Date: | June 4, 2008   | Vote Summary: | Affirmative: | 11 |
| Vote Date:      | August 5, 2008 |               | Negative:    | 0  |
|                 |                |               | Abstention:  | 0  |

RECOMMENDATION SUMMARY  
OF THE  
MARICOPA ASSOCIATION OF GOVERNMENTS  
STANDARD SPECIFICATIONS AND DETAILS COMMITTEE

October 9, 2008

**GENERAL INFORMATION:**

Case Number: 08-17  
Section/Detail: Detail 210  
Title: Revision to Detail 210 RESIDENTIAL SPEED HUMP – Delete conflicting note.  
Sponsor: Maricopa County  
Advisor: Bob Herz

**DISCUSSION:**

**PURPOSE:** Clarify requirements for maximum height of speed hump. Notes 1 and 2 indicate a maximum height of 3.25” while a note under Section A-A indicates a maximum height of 3”.

**REVISION:** Delete the note located under Section A-A

After discussion, members were in general agreement that the detail only required one set of tolerances. There was some discussion about raising the maximum height to 3.5 inches, and on the ability to accurately measure the dimensions of the hump slope as noted in Section A-A.

Other revisions included changing note 2 to read:  
HUMPS CONSTRUCTED OVER 3.25” OR LESS THAN 3.00” SHALL BE REMOVED AND REPLACED AT THE CONTRACTOR’S EXPENSE.

Also the width dimension in note 7B was corrected from 18” to 24”, and a symmetrical centerline annotation was added to clarify the dimensioning on Section A-A.

**RECOMMENDATION:**

Based on the following data, the MAG Standard Specifications and Details Committee recommends approval of this case.

|                 |                |               |              |    |
|-----------------|----------------|---------------|--------------|----|
| Submittal Date: | June 4, 2008   | Vote Summary: | Affirmative: | 11 |
| Vote Date:      | August 6, 2008 |               | Negative:    | 0  |
|                 |                |               | Abstention:  | 0  |

## MAG Specification & Detail Committee VOTING SUMMARY for 2008

| Case No. | Title – Section/Detail   | Vote Date | Avondale | Buckeye | Chandler | El Mirage | Gilbert | Glendale | Goodyear | MariCopa County | Mesa | Peoria | Phoenix | Queen Creek | Scottsdale | Surprise | Tempe | Voting Summary Y-N-A-NP |
|----------|--|-----------|----------|---------|----------|-----------|---------|----------|----------|-----------------|------|--------|---------|-------------|------------|----------|-------|-------------------------|
| 07-02    | Revision/ Re-Write Section 321 and Section 710                           | 10/8/2008 | Y        | —       | Y        | Y         | —       | Y        | Y        | Y               | N    | Y      | Y       | N           | N          | —        | Y     | 9-3-0-3                 |
| 07-03 A  | CASE WITHDRAWN   |           |          |         |          |           |         |          |          |                 |      |        |         |             |            |          |       |                         |
| 07-03 B  | CASE WITHDRAWN   |           |          |         |          |           |         |          |          |                 |      |        |         |             |            |          |       |                         |
| 07-08    | CASE WITHDRAWN   |           |          |         |          |           |         |          |          |                 |      |        |         |             |            |          |       |                         |
| 07-11    | CASE WITHDRAWN   |           |          |         |          |           |         |          |          |                 |      |        |         |             |            |          |       |                         |
| 07-12    | CASE WITHDRAWN   |           |          |         |          |           |         |          |          |                 |      |        |         |             |            |          |       |                         |
| 08-01    | Revision to Section 210 Borrow Excavation                                | 7/02/2008 | Y        | —       | —        | Y         | —       | Y        | Y        | Y               | Y    | Y      | Y       | Y           | —          | Y        | Y     | 11-0-0-4                |
| 08-02    | New Section 317, Asphalt Milling   | 7/02/2008 | Y        | —       | —        | Y         | —       | Y        | Y        | Y               | Y    | Y      | Y       | Y           | —          | Y        | Y     | 11-0-0-4                |
| 08-03    | New Section 325, Asphalt – Rubber Concrete Overlay, Gap Graded           | 9/03/2008 | Y        | Y       | Y        | —         | —       | —        | Y        | Y               | Y    | Y      | Y       | Y           | Y          | Y        | Y     | 12-0-0-3                |
| 08-04    | CASE WITHDRAWN   |           |          |         |          |           |         |          |          |                 |      |        |         |             |            |          |       |                         |
| 08-05    | *Revisions to Safety Post Detail 140                                     | 8/06/2008 | Y        | Y       | Y        | —         | —       | Y        | Y        | Y               | Y    | Y      | Y       | Y           | Y          | —        | Y     | 12-0-0-3                |
| 08-06    | *Insert new section 618.5 Video Inspection of New Mainline Storm Drains. | 9/03/2008 | Y        | Y       | Y        | —         | —       | —        | Y        | Y               | Y    | Y      | Y       | Y           | Y          | Y        | Y     | 12-0-0-3                |
| 08-07    | Revisions to Section 109 Measurements and Payments                       | 9/03/2008 | Y        | Y       | Y        | —         | —       | —        | Y        | Y               | Y    | Y      | Y       | Y           | Y          | Y        | Y     | 12-0-0-3                |

Voting Abbreviations: Y: Yes N: No A: Abstain — : Not Present (NP)

\*: Indicates changes made to proposal prior to vot

| Case No. | Title – Section/Detail   | Vote Date | Avondale | Buckeye | Chandler | El Mirage | Gilbert | Glendale | Goodyear | Maricopa County | Mesa | Peoria | Phoenix | Queen Creek | Scottsdale | Surprise | Tempe | Voting Summary Y-N-A-NP |
|----------|--|-----------|----------|---------|----------|-----------|---------|----------|----------|-----------------|------|--------|---------|-------------|------------|----------|-------|-------------------------|
| 08-08    | *Revisions to Section 301 Subgrade Preparation and Section 601.4 Foundation, Bedding, Backfilling and Compaction concerning optimum moisture and percent compaction. | 9/03/2008 | Y        | Y       | Y        | —         | —       | —        | Y        | Y               | Y    | Y      | Y       | —           | Y          | Y        | Y     | 11-0-0-4                |
| 08-09    | CASE WITHDRAWN   |           |          |         |          |           |         |          |          |                 |      |        |         |             |            |          |       |                         |
| 08-10    | Detail 200 and Sections 336 and 601 – Trench backfill and pavement Replacement   |           | C        | A       | R        | R         | Y       |          | O        | V               | E    | R      |         | 2           | 0          | 0        | 9     |                         |
| 08-11    | Revisions to Detail 250 DRIVEWAY ENTRANCES and specification Section 340   | 9/03/2008 | Y        | Y       | Y        | —         | —       | —        | Y        | Y               | Y    | Y      | Y       | Y           | Y          | Y        | Y     | 12-0-0-3                |
| 08-12    | New Section 331, Microsurfacing Specifications<br>New Section 714, Microsurfacing Materials  | 10/8/2008 | Y        | —       | Y        | Y         | —       | Y        | Y        | Y               | A    | Y      | Y       | Y           | Y          | —        | Y     | 11-0-1-3                |
| 08-13    | *Revision to Section 345 Adjusting Frames, Covers, Valve Boxes and Water Meter Boxes   | 7/02/2008 | Y        | —       | —        | Y         | —       | Y        | Y        | Y               | Y    | Y      | Y       | Y           | —          | Y        | Y     | 11-0-0-4                |
| 08-14    | *Revision to Detail 212 UTILITY POTHOLE REPAIR   | 8/06/2008 | Y        | Y       | Y        | —         | —       | Y        | Y        | Y               | Y    | Y      | Y       | Y           | Y          | —        | Y     | 12-0-0-3                |
| 08-15    | Revision to Detail 535 CATCH BASIN TYPE 'F' – Grate modification   | 7/02/2008 | Y        | —       | —        | Y         | —       | Y        | N        | Y               | Y    | Y      | Y       | Y           | —          | Y        | Y     | 10-1-0-4                |
| 08-16    | Revision to Detail 552 CONCRETE CUT-OFF WALLS – Revise concrete pavement note  | 8/06/2008 | Y        | —       | Y        | —         | —       | Y        | Y        | Y               | Y    | Y      | Y       | Y           | —          | —        | Y     | 11-0-0-4                |
| 08-17    | Revision to Detail 210 RESIDENTIAL SPEED HUMP – Delete conflicting note.   | 8/06/2008 | Y        | —       | Y        | —         | —       | Y        | Y        | Y               | Y    | A      | Y       | Y           | —          | —        | Y     | 10-0-1-4                |

Voting Abbreviations: Y: Yes N: No A: Abstain —: Not Present (NP)

\*: Indicates changes made to proposal prior to voi



ARIZONA CAPITOL CENTENNIAL COMMITTEE

JOHN D. DRIGGS, *Chairman*  
 MARTIN L. SHULTZ, *Vice Chairman*

**MEMORANDUM**

**TO:           MAG Regional Council**

**FROM:       John Driggs, Chairman, Arizona Capitol Centennial Commission**

**DATE:       November 3, 2008**

Renovation of the historic 1900 State Capitol has been designated the signature project for Arizona’s Centennial in 2012 by the Arizona Centennial Commission and the Arizona Historical Advisory Commission. It will be the first step of a broader master plan for the Capitol Complex, including the governmental mall.

An appropriation of \$450,000 to start the project was passed by the legislature this year. A feasibility report by an ad hoc Capitol Task Force recommends the project and estimates a cost of 1.5 million dollars. To make up the difference, House Speaker Jim Weiers and Senate President Tim bee have asked that \$900,00 be raised from non-state sources (see attached letter). A committee has been formed to accomplish this unprecedented public/private sector effort.

The participation of local government will be requested in the form of a sponsor membership in the Capitol project. It is designed to not only help raise the necessary additional funds, but also to provide cities and towns with some awareness tools and communication resources that can help in developing centennial projects and activities in each community.

Requested Participation  
 Cities and Towns

|                   |                  |         |
|-------------------|------------------|---------|
| <u>Population</u> | 50,000 and above | \$5,000 |
|                   | 10,000 and above | \$3,000 |
|                   | All others       | \$2,000 |

In each category, \$1,000 will cover the cost of membership benefits in the centennial program. These are designed to provide a high level of communication about the centennial designed to help local government in their projects.

## Membership Benefits, 2009-2012

- Four years membership in the Arizona Historical Society, a state agency
- Four years membership in the Sharlot Hall Museum, a state agency
- Four years subscription to *Arizona Highways*, which has been designated the official centennial magazine
- A subscription to the anticipated monthly bulletin of the Arizona Centennial Commission.

An “Arizona Centennial” account has been opened at the Arizona Community Foundation. All checks will be placed in that account and will not be deposited in the state treasurer’s office or become a part of the state general fund.

Please call me with any questions. We would appreciate a response as soon as possible. The Legislative Council is expected to meet before the end of the year to approve a budget for the \$450,000. We would like to raise that much from local government, tribes, and the private sector before December 31.

Checks should be made payable to the Arizona Community Foundation with a notation: Arizona Centennial Fund and mailed to:

John Driggs  
4448 E. Camelback Rd., #11  
Phoenix, AZ 85018  
(602) 840-8729  
gddriggs@cox.net

SPEAKER JAMES P. WEIERS  
1700 WEST WASHINGTON, SUITE H  
PHOENIX, ARIZONA 85007-2844

PHONE: (602) 926-4173  
FAX (602) 417-3153  
TOLL-FREE: 1-800-352-8404  
jweiers@azleg.gov



LEGISLATIVE DISTRICT 10

-----  
RULES  
-----

LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL, VICE-CHAIRMAN

-----  
JOINT LEGISLATIVE AUDIT COMMITTEE

Arizona House of Representatives  
Phoenix, Arizona 85007

September 11, 2008

Dear Mr. John Driggs:

In our discussion which led to the creation of the ad hoc Capitol Task Force, you have been very encouraging about the potential for significant private sector financial support for the renovation and further development of the state capitol complex. With the enactment of S.B. 1337, \$450,000 will be available upon the effective date to the Legislative Council for design work on the Capitol.

You have also indicated to us your willingness to lead a fundraising effort to match and supplement the state funds that will now be available. We also understand that the Capitol program has been designated as the signature centennial statewide legacy project by both the Arizona Historical Advisory Commission and the newly formed Arizona Centennial Commission created by executive order of the Governor. We are also aware that the local chapters of the American Institute of Architects and the American Society of Landscape Architects, together with the ASU College of Design, have collaborated to produce an Arizona State Capitol Centennial 2012 plan as the first step in the process.

Therefore, we are asking you to commence a fundraising program to test the feasibility and provide an early indicator of private sector support of the Capitol Centennial project. We suggest you set a first phase goal of raising \$900,000 which would be a 2:1 match from the private sector. This would conform to the requirement and emulate the legislative intent that was embodied in the prior appropriation bill for the Centennial.

We suggest that you work with Mike Braun, Executive Director of the Legislative Council, to develop a plan for raising and coordinating expenditure of private sector funds for the Capitol with the state funds under the control of the council.

The plan should include, along with your fundraising, the formation of a committee of recognizable experts in the field of architecture and planning, and engineering and development. This will add credibility to the program and meet any public scrutiny. The Legislative Council will review your plan for comment and endorsement.

Sincerely,

Handwritten signature of James P. Weiers in black ink.

JAMES P. WEIERS  
Speaker of the House  
Chairman, Legislative Council

Handwritten signature of Timothy S. Bee in black ink.

TIMOTHY S. BEE  
Senate President

CC: Legislative Council members

## ARIZONA CAPITOL CENTENNIAL COMMITTEE

John Driggs – Chairman

Marty Shultz – APS, Vice Chairman

Jim Garrison -- State Historic Preservation Officer

Bob Frankeberger – Architect, State Historic Preservation Office

Tina Litteral – Executive Vice President, American Institute of Architects – Arizona

Steve Gervais – Pinnacle West

Don Keuth – President, Phoenix Community Alliance

Janice Burnett – American Council of Engineering Companies of Arizona

Dave Roderique – President, Downtown Phoenix Partnership

Mike Johnson – Councilman – City of Phoenix

Shannon Dubasik – Executive Director Capitol Mall Assn.

Patrick Pinetta – American Institute of Architects – Arizona

Michael Dollin – American Society of Landscape Architects

Rick Naimark – Deputy City Manager, Phoenix

Jason Franz – Phoenix Urban Research Laboratory, ASU

Mark Minter – Arizona Builders Alliance

Jim Ballinger – Director, Phoenix Art Museum

Arlene Pfeiff-Maraj – Managing Director, Human Services Campus

Lynn Favour – Maricopa County

### Resource Information Advisors:

Mike Braun – Executive Director, Legislative Council

GladysAnn Wells – Arizona State Library, Archives & Public Records

Jim Apperson – Governor's Staff

Lynne Smith – Assistant Director, Department of Administration

Richard Stavneak – Director, Joint Legislative Budget Committee

Bill Boyd – Staff, Senate Government Committee

David Hooper – State Capitol Museum Director

| City/Town            | July 1, 2007<br>Population * |
|----------------------|------------------------------|
| All Cities and Towns | 5,155,814                    |
| Apache Junction      | 37,539                       |
| Avondale             | 75,256                       |
| Benson               | 4,992                        |
| Bisbee               | 6,310                        |
| Buckeye              | 40,467                       |
| Bullhead City        | 41,000                       |
| Camp Verde           | 11,519                       |
| Carefree             | 3,871                        |
| Casa Grande          | 42,422                       |
| Cave Creek           | 5,028                        |
| Chandler             | 241,205                      |
| Chino Valley         | 13,098                       |
| Clarkdale            | 3,986                        |
| Clifton              | 2,497                        |
| Colorado City        | 4,053                        |
| Coolidge             | 11,721                       |
| Cottonwood           | 11,130                       |
| Dewey-Humboldt       | 4,434                        |
| Douglas              | 18,152                       |
| Duncan               | 818                          |
| Eagar                | 4,702                        |
| El Mirage            | 33,583                       |
| Eloy                 | 13,953                       |
| Flagstaff            | 64,200                       |
| Florence             | 21,913                       |
| Fountain Hills       | 25,540                       |
| Fredonia             | 1,135                        |
| Gila Bend            | 1,891                        |
| Gilbert              | 203,656                      |
| Glendale             | 246,076                      |
| Globe                | 7,897                        |
| Goodyear             | 55,954                       |
| Guadalupe            | 5,606                        |
| Hayden               | 843                          |
| Holbrook             | 5,599                        |
| Huachuca City        | 1,832                        |
| Jerome               | 329                          |
| Kearny               | 2,282                        |
| Kingman              | 28,635                       |
| Lake Havasu City     | 55,263                       |
| Litchfield Park      | 5,055                        |
| Mammoth              | 1,783                        |
| Marana               | 32,274                       |
| Maricopa             | 32,157                       |
| Mesa                 | 456,344                      |

| City/Town        | July 1, 2007<br>Population * |
|------------------|------------------------------|
| Miami            | 1,904                        |
| Nogales          | 21,746                       |
| Oro Valley       | 42,551                       |
| Page             | 7,307                        |
| Paradise Valley  | 14,215                       |
| Parker           | 3,401                        |
| Patagonia        | 926                          |
| Payson           | 16,742                       |
| Peoria           | 151,544                      |
| Phoenix          | 1,538,568                    |
| Pima             | 2,233                        |
| Pinetop-Lakeside | 4,769                        |
| Prescott         | 43,217                       |
| Prescott Valley  | 38,357                       |
| Quartzsite       | 3,671                        |
| Queen Creek      | 21,729                       |
| Safford          | 9,460                        |
| Sahuarita        | 21,110                       |
| St. Johns        | 3,973                        |
| San Luis         | 25,658                       |
| Scottsdale       | 240,126                      |
| Sedona           | 11,134                       |
| Show Low         | 11,473                       |
| Sierra Vista     | 44,736                       |
| Snowflake        | 5,221                        |
| Somerton         | 10,879                       |
| South Tucson     | 5,803                        |
| Springerville    | 2,164                        |
| Star Valley      | 2,157                        |
| Superior         | 3,369                        |
| Surprise         | 104,895                      |
| Taylor           | 4,325                        |
| Tempe            | 167,871                      |
| Thatcher         | 5,235                        |
| Tolleson         | 6,680                        |
| Tombstone        | 1,682                        |
| Tucson           | 541,132                      |
| Wellton          | 2,303                        |
| Wickenburg       | 6,380                        |
| Willcox          | 3,913                        |
| Williams         | 3,146                        |
| Winkelman        | 430                          |
| Winslow          | 10,135                       |
| Youngtown        | 6,332                        |
| Yuma             | 93,212                       |

# **MARICOPA ASSOCIATION OF GOVERNMENTS**

## **INFORMATION SUMMARY... for your review**

**DATE:**

November 4, 2008

**SUBJECT:**

Implementation of GovDelivery for Electronic Communication

**SUMMARY:**

MAG is expanding the options for electronic communication through the implementation of the GovDelivery service. This service provides free subscriptions to key areas of the MAG Web site and incorporate the electronic notice of minutes and agendas currently provided by an internal system. This service is free to everyone and will make it easier for member agencies and the public to stay informed of MAG meetings, events and projects. Subscribers will have control over what information they receive and how often that information arrives. For example, subscribers can opt to receive a single daily e-mail that summarizes new information from MAG. Time sensitive information will still go out immediately. Subscribers can also contact MAG to request Green Delivery only. By opting out of paper mailings, subscribers can reduce paper waste and mailing costs.

Members of the Management Committee will be requested to indicate preferences regarding the delivery of electronic and hard copy mailings. This service will become effective November 1, 2008 with a welcome e-mail notifying subscribers of the change in service. Members and the public are encouraged to notify MAG staff if they wish to discontinue paper mailings.

**PUBLIC INPUT:**

No public input has been received.

**PROS & CONS:**

PROS: GovDelivery will reduce the environmental impact of MAG mailings and give subscribers more control over the information they receive from MAG. Additionally, MAG will spend less staff time maintaining extended lists and processing paper mailings. Finally, the system will facilitate public involvement in the MAG process by making it easier to stay informed of meetings and events.

CONS: None.

**TECHNICAL & POLICY IMPLICATIONS:**

TECHNICAL: GovDelivery is an annual service and requires minimal administration by and training of MAG staff.

POLICY: None.

**ACTION NEEDED:**

Information, discussion and input on mail delivery preferences.

**PRIOR COMMITTEE ACTIONS:**

None.

**CONTACT PERSON:**

Audrey Skidmore, MAG, (602) 254-6300