MINUTES OF THE
MARICOPA ASSOCIATION OF GOVERNMENTS
MAG REGIONAL COUNCIL EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE
May 18, 2009
MAG Offices, Cholla Room
302 N. 1st Avenue, Phoenix, Arizona

MEMBERS ATTENDING

Councilwoman Peggy Neely, Chair
Mayor Thomas L. Schoaf, Litchfield Park, Vice Chair
Mayor Hugh Hallman, Tempe, Treasurer
Mayor Marie Lopez Rogers, Avondale
Mayor Steven M. Berman, Gilbert
Mayor James M. Cavanaugh, Goodyear
Mayor Scott Smith, Mesa

* Not present
# Participated by video or telephone conference call

1. Call to Order

The Executive Committee meeting was called to order by Chair Peggy Neely at 12:03 p.m. Chair Neely stated that public comment cards were available for those members of the public who wish to comment. She noted that transit tickets were available from Valley Metro for those using transit to come to the meeting. Parking validation was available from MAG staff for those who parked in the parking garage.

2. Call to the Audience

Chair Neely noted that, according to the MAG public comment process, members of the audience who wish to speak are requested to fill out the public comment cards and stated that there is a three-minute time limit. Public comment is provided at the beginning of the meeting for 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 Neely noted that no public comment cards had been received.

3. Consent Agenda

Chair Neely noted that prior to action on the consent agenda, members of the audience are 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. There were no public comment cards received.

Chair Neely requested approval of items on the consent agenda. Chair Neely noted that item #3B was recommended for approval at the May 13, 2009, MAG Management Committee.

Mayor Hallman moved to approve items #3A through #3B on the consent agenda. Mayor Berman seconded and the motion carried unanimously (4-0).

Mayor Cavanaugh arrived at 12:06 p.m. Mayor Schoaf arrived at 12:08 p.m.

3A. Approval of the April 13, 2009 Regional Council Executive Committee Meeting Minutes

The Regional Council Executive Committee, by consent, approved the April 13, 2009, Regional Council Executive Committee meeting minutes.

3B. Amendment to the Wilson and Company, Inc. Contract to Perform Additional Work for the US-60/Grand Avenue Access Management Plan Study, SR-74 to SR-303L/Estrella Freeway

The Regional Council Executive Committee, by consent, approved increasing the Wilson and Company, Inc. contract by $50,315.82 to conduct the additional work for the US-60/Grand Avenue Access Management Plan Study.

In May 2006, the Regional Council approved the MAG FY 2007 Unified Planning Work Program and Annual Budget, which included a US-60/Grand Avenue Access Management Plan Study for the segment of US-60 between SR-74 and SR-303L in the City of Surprise and Maricopa County. On October 16, 2006, the Regional Council Executive Committee selected Wilson and Company, Inc. to conduct the study for an amount of $537,502.58. The project is in the final stages of development and has established an access control system for the corridor based upon the Arizona Parkway cross-section. However, the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) and the Arizona Department of Transportation (ADOT) have provided additional concepts and have requested additional traffic corridor improvement analysis of the US-60/Grand Avenue corridor between SR-303L and Jomax Road. These additional analyses include a detailed analysis of the connection 163rd Avenue, a principal arterial, will have with US-60 approximately one-half mile from the SR-303L traffic interchange. To conduct this additional work will require an additional amount of $50,315.82. MAG federal funds would be used for this additional work. On May 13, 2009, the MAG Management Committee recommended approval of this item.

4. Approval of the Draft FY 2010 MAG Unified Planning Work Program and Annual Budget and the Member Dues and Assessments, and Approval of an Amendment to the FY 2009 MAG Unified Planning Work Program and Annual Budget to Include Additional Funding for the Maricopa County Regional Trip Reduction Program and the Regional Rideshare Program

Chair Neely introduced Rebecca Kimbrough, MAG Fiscal Services Manager, to provide an update on the FY 2010 MAG Unified Planning Work Program (UPWP) and Annual Budget.

Ms. Kimbrough stated that the draft FY 2010 MAG UPWP and Annual Budget was on the agenda for action recommending approval. She noted that MAG draft budget has been presented beginning in January through April of this year. She noted that budget dues and assessments were first presented in January and due to the uncertainty of the economy for all MAG members, MAG has recommended that dues and assessments be decreased by 50

percent for the FY 2010 budget. Ms. Kimbrough added that changes in members' amounts were due to individual member population shifts. She stated that the majority of the newly proposed consultant and pass-through projects for FY 2010, which were first presented in February, would be assisting with transportation modeling and database efforts. Ms. Kimbrough continued that for the Census 2010 project, the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) has agreed to support half of the costs for the media buys, which has reduced the cost to MAG members by $213,408. She stated that the FY 2010 MAG UPWP and Annual Budget planning areas section, located in the front section of the work program, has been updated to show the urbanized area for the next twenty (20) years. Ms. Kimbrough added that it has also been updated to illustrate the revised Eight-Hour Ozone Nonattainment Area recommended by the MAG Regional Council and by the Governor to the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) in March 2009. She reported that the Intermodal Planning Group (IPG) meeting was held on April 17, 2009. Ms. Kimbrough stated that this meeting provided a forum for MAG as the Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO), the Arizona Department of Transportation (ADOT), transit operators, and federal agencies for the region, to discuss planning issues and the information presented in the overall MAG work program. She said that at this meeting, MAG was requested to review the cooperative procedures for transit planning in the region prior to the certification review that will be scheduled for this fall. Ms. Kimbrough noted that the Federal Transit Administration (FTA) representative also commented that MAG should not delegate the responsibility for transit programming to another agency.

Ms. Kimbrough stated that the planning support projects for FY 2010 for Valley Metro Rail (METRO) and the Regional Public Transportation Authority (RPTA) are asterisked in the draft FY 2010 budget with the notation that the FY 2010 amounts are still being determined. Ms. Kimbrough continued that historically, MAG has recommended a budgeted five (5) percent increase in MAG salaries based on the results of annual performance evaluations each June. She noted that for FY 2010, MAG is recommending no increase in salaries in the draft budget. Ms. Kimbrough added that additional positions were approved during FY 2009 and in the FY 2010 budget. She stated that MAG is requesting one additional position for a Transportation Engineer to assist in the area of transportation modeling. Ms. Kimbrough noted that contingency in the budget is budgeted at fifteen (15) percent of estimated operating costs to have the flexibility in the budget to address future growth issues during the year, which could include items such as additional studies. She stated that the current estimate for contingency is approximately $1.6 million. She added that the total current budgeted expenses reflect a net decrease of about 2.4 percent which is mostly due to a decrease in budgeted capital and budgeted consultants expenditures. Ms. Kimbrough stated that the overall draft budget, including the estimated carryforward expenses, reflects a decrease from the prior budget year of about 5.4 percent. She noted that the FY 2010 draft budget is still being finalized, but that there will be no overall significant changes in operating costs compared to the FY 2009 budget. Ms. Kimbrough added that also included in the agenda item is a request for recommendation of approval to amend the Maricopa County Regional Trip Reduction program for an additional $25,588 and the Regional Rideshare program for an additional $80,000 in the FY 2009 UPWP. She stated that these projects are transportation control measures in several air quality plans. Ms. Kimbrough reported that due to budget sweeps by the state legislature earlier this year, some of the

funding for these programs was cut. She stated that in March, MAG staff met with representatives from both programs to determine the additional amounts needed to support the programs to complete the year. Ms. Kimbrough said that MAG has carryforward funding of approximately $109,000 which could be used to fund the Maricopa County Regional Trip Reduction program and the Regional Rideshare program contracts for the additional amounts.

Chair Neely asked whether money for the program came from the County.

Mr. Smith responded that the legislature had swept the funds from ADEQ earlier in the year. He stated that ADEQ has provided money for both programs to the County and the RPTA. Mr. Smith noted that ADEQ is evaluating their current budget to make the necessary adjustments for the coming year. He noted that this funding request would serve as bridge money to help carry the programs forward this year.

Chair Neely asked for confirmation that ADEQ had looked for solutions to address the funding for future years.

Mr. Smith responded yes.

Chair Neely asked members of the Executive Committee if there were any questions. There were none. Chair Neely called for a motion.

Mayor Hallman moved to recommend approval of the resolution adopting the Draft FY 2010 MAG Unified Planning Work Program and Annual Budget and the member dues and assessments, and approval of an amendment to the FY 2009 MAG Unified Planning Work Program and Annual Budget to include additional funding for the Maricopa County Regional Trip Reduction Program and the Regional Rideshare Program. Mayor Cavanaugh seconded the motion and it carried unanimously (6-0).

Mayor Smith arrived at 12:11 p.m.

5. Transportation Regional Planning Roles and Responsibilities Update

Chair Neely introduced Dennis Smith, MAG Executive Director to provide an update on transportation regional planning roles and responsibilities.

Mr. Smith requested Eric Anderson, MAG Transportation Director, to join him for the presentation. Mr. Smith distributed a draft chart illustrating transit related planning roles and responsibilities among MAG, the Regional Public Transportation Authority (RPTA), and Valley Metro Rail (METRO) to assist with discussion.

Mr. Smith stated when Proposition 300 was being considered by the voters in 1985, the RPTA had enabling legislation which was contingent upon Proposition 300 being approved. He noted that there are many statutory references on the RPTA's duties and responsibilities in that legislation. Mr. Smith continued that in 1991, the Intermodal Surface Transportation Efficiency Act (ISTEA) and Clean Air Act amendments changed responsibilities for

Metropolitan Planning Organizations (MPOs). He added that in 2001, MAG received a certification review by the Federal Transit Administration (FTA) and Federal Highway Administration (FHWA). Mr. Smith noted that at that time, representatives from the FTA and FHWA requested MAG to explain how the agency would choose and consequently rank transit projects in the Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) and that MAG should make that available to the public. Mr. Smith stated that in the 2004 certification review, the FTA and FHWA returned to that same issue and asked agency staff how MAG was ranking and prioritizing transit projects. He said that in November 2008, MAG was visited by a consultant for the Transportation Research Board. Mr. Smith stated that as they were evaluating the three agencies, MAG, METRO and the RPTA, the consultant asked how the arrangement among the three transportation agencies worked in terms of planning and programming. Mr. Smith continued that as reported at previous meetings, MAG had participated in the Central Phoenix Peer Review Panel which was a collaborative effort with the Arizona Department of Transportation (ADOT), MAG, the RPTA and METRO. He said that the purpose of this panel was to evaluate freeway connections as they come into the Valley with the objective of ensuring integrated planning and multi-modal planning efforts.

Mr. Smith stated that on April 17, 2009, the Intermodal Planning Group (IPG) came to review MAG's annual work program which is recommended to the MAG Regional Council. He noted that despite explaining the relationship among the three agencies, representatives provided clear commentary stating that MAG could not delegate transit programming to another agency. Mr. Smith stated as a result, the three agencies formed an agency working group to look at responsibilities and identify if there is a better way to organize activities. He referenced that the chart which has been distributed was prepared by MAG staff and was an initial draft yet to be presented to METRO and the RPTA for further discussion. Mr. Smith noted that the working group has not made any concrete decisions and that the draft chart illustrated some of the issues the working group will need to address. He stated that the draft chart organized activities managed by the three organizations under four different options or from less consolidation to more consolidation. Mr. Smith noted that the chart only illustrated planning activities and that the other organizations also have extensive operating responsibilities that are not reflected. He added that the dollar amounts denoted in some of the boxes indicate areas where MAG is providing funding. Mr. Smith stated that the amount of funding being provided by MAG to METRO and the RPTA provided in the work program is approximately $2,192,000 which includes: $594,000 - Rideshare, $300,000 - Telework Ozone, $400,000 - Trip Reduction, $174,000 - Bicycle Safety Education, $224,000- Transit Planning, and $500,000 - Light Rail Planning Support.

Mr. Smith noted that the agencies are managing a lot of activities and at times those activities may be incongruent. He said it may be confusing why one agency is doing safety planning and another is doing bicycle planning. Mr. Smith stated that MAG is having more difficulty explaining to external agencies, such as consultants, how these activities are managed. He noted that with an impending certification review scheduled for this October, he believes that at a minimum, the agencies need to address the transit programming challenge. Mr. Smith stated that staff wanted to provide the Executive Committee a document that identified all areas of responsibility for the agencies to provide context to address transit programming.

He invited Mr. Anderson, who is participating in the agency working group with Kevin Wallace, MAG Transit Project Manager, to provide some additional comments.

Mr. Anderson stated that he had a couple additional comments. He said that when discussing transportation planning, it is about integrated multi-modal transportation planning. Mr. Anderson noted that it is difficult to do integrated multi-modal transportation planning if MAG has delegated major pieces of transit planning to other agencies. He stated that Mr. Smith had mentioned the Bicycle Safety Education Program. Mr. Anderson said that MAG has its safety committee and safety is one of the agency's Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) objectives. He added that MAG is also developing performance measures to measure how the agency is performing relative to safety. Mr. Anderson said that the questions he has been asking are why is this particular function where it is today and should it stay there or not. He noted that the exercise will be useful even if there is no change other than cleaning up some of the programming aspects. Mr. Anderson stated that it is important, that an organization, whether a private business or a public sector agency, steps back to make sure it understands all the areas for which it is responsible as well as makes sure it has sufficient resources to carry out those responsibilities. He said that the agencies encountered confusing roles when METRO was presenting an alternatives analysis recommendation for the I-10 West light rail corridor. Mr. Anderson stated that this further stressed the issue of how to go West from that station location. He noted that METRO was doing different analyses and its staff have been requested by cities to evaluate how to get light rail into communities in terms of system planning. Mr. Anderson said that he did not know what the working group would decide, but that as they review each of the boxes it will be important to understand each one and what should remain long term.

Mr. Smith noted that after discussing the draft chart internally, it was noted that some boxes are not depicted. He stated that for example, although the other two agencies are building their own modeling capacities, MAG has the most extensive modeling group of the three. Mr. Smith added that MAG has been discussing with ADOT that it would not be necessary for ADOT to also build its own modeling capacity. He stated that if these activities are not further evaluated and organized there will be further fragmentation and it would not be what is best for the region. Mr. Smith noted that it is important to identify who needs to be doing what. He said that the transition could occur over a period of time, but that transit programming needs to be analyzed seriously in next two to three months. Mr. Smith said that MAG could choose to form a transit committee or put transit programming functions under the Transportation Review Committee which currently exists. He stated that he did not think MAG would not complete another certification review without satisfactorily explaining how MAG does transit programming.

Chair Neely asked how much of the activity among the three agencies is duplication or what is the percentage of the activity being duplicated.

Mr. Anderson responded that many things are not necessarily being duplicated, but could be that they are being done in the wrong agency. He noted that for example with respect to the development of the Transportation Improvement Program (TIP), the RPTA produces a list and prioritizes projects for the TIP which MAG then takes and inserts into the program. Mr.

Anderson stated that MAG, however, cannot explain how that list of RPTA projects was developed and prioritized. He said that when discussing the programming of projects, MAG has the Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) which sets forth the projects and funding allocations. Mr. Anderson added that MAG would be looking at investment positions across all modes not just transit. He noted that whether bike and pedestrian or highway, it is important to ask what is the appropriate investment in a given project that improves the mobility of a region. Mr. Anderson said that by having a prioritization process occurring in separate silos, the region will never get a true look at an integrated prioritization process which really is an important aspect of a plan. He discussed park and rides as an example of ancillary facilities that are extremely critical in regard to transit and its success in the future. Mr. Anderson noted that where park and rides are located is relevant to highways and transit service, noting that planning for park and rides are a good example of some really good missed opportunities. He stated that addressing park and ride accessibility is difficult when planning for highway, transit and bike and pedestrian projects is conducted in silos. Mr. Anderson added that MAG was taking another step forward during the process and looking at its internal organization to make sure the agency is not recreating silos around the different modes. He stated that it was important to advocate for the different modes, but also make sure that all the options are on the table for discussion.

Mr. Smith said that it was not only transit where areas of responsibility were being discussed. He noted that a meeting has been scheduled for May 22, 2009 including all the Councils of Governments (COGs) and Metropolitan Planning Organizations (MPOs) in Arizona, and ADOT. Mr. Smith said the purpose of the meeting was to discuss ADOT's responsibilities versus regional responsibilities. He stated that it was anticipated there would be discussion regarding that as many decisions as possible should be driven at the regional level and not at the state level when it comes to transportation planning. Mr. Smith noted that there is a lot on the table to be discussed, but that staff wanted to provide information early for input.

Chair Neely requested how MAG was addressing the RPTA and METRO line items in the budget.

Mr. Smith replied that an asterisk has been placed next to those line items and approximately $2.1 million is to be determined.

Chair Neely asked if there were any comments.

Mayor Hallman stated that this effort addresses Mayor Cavanaugh's concern regarding light rail planning west of the I-10 to a certain location and where commuter rail may become another option. He said that it was necessary to get these planning efforts connected holistically. Mayor Hallman noted that the City of Tempe has used the economic downturn as an opportunity to reorganize and has merged planning for all the city's transportation into a single group. He said that it is very difficult to plan properly for efforts such as bike paths when there are silos and the objective is to connect people to a multi-modal system. Mayor Hallman stated that it is necessary to prioritize across silos not just within them. He thanked staff for preparing the information and beginning the dialogue among the agencies.

Mayor Cavanaugh asked who was on the committee representing each of the organizations.

Mr. Anderson responded that he and Kevin Wallace from MAG, Carol Ketcherside and Bryan Jungwirth from the RPTA and John Farry and Wulf Grote from METRO have been participating in the working group. He stated that the agencies have been focusing on policy discussion but will move into implementation following further guidance from the Executive Committee.

Mayor Smith stated that he heard two things including a certification process and evaluation of what would be best and most efficient for the agencies. He asked which issue was driving the discussion or was it both. He requested what would a lack of certification mean to MAG.

Mr. Smith responded that the issue of transit programming was brought to MAG's attention in the last two certification reviews with the last one noting that they were carrying forward corrective action from the previous one because MAG had still not addressed the issue. He stated that not addressing transit programming would not be an option this time. Mr. Smith said that in 1991, ISTEA changed the responsibilities of MPOs, especially Transportation Management Areas (TMAs) because TMAs have more than 200,000 in population. He said as a result, ISTEA provided that TMAs would be given project selection authority but that every three (3) years, the federal government would monitor to make sure agencies are following federal elements of the legislation.

Mayor Smith asked whether it was project selection authority or responsibility or are they one in the same.

Mr. Smith responded that they are one in the same.

Mayor Smith said that he thought there was a big difference.

Mr. Smith replied that an MPO like the Central Yavapai Metropolitan Planning Organization (CYMPO) is able to provide input to ADOT, but does not have the latitude MAG has as a TMA.

Mayor Smith said that he was trying to differentiate between MAG's responsibility versus ADOT's responsibility and who has the final say.

Mr. Smith said that MAG has the final say because it is MAG's TIP.

Mayor Smith stated that it was in fact really MAG's responsibility and that MAG is in charge. He noted that this makes a difference in how MAG approaches the situation. Mayor Smith said that it really is not an option and that MAG needs to find a way to provide the information requested and at what level.

Mr. Smith stated that the federal law says that the MPO develops the TIP in cooperation with the transit operators. He noted that MAG has been talking with the RPTA and METRO and inserting their projects, but is being told more directly that is not going to work.

Mayor Smith said that MAG has abdicated the responsibility of transit programming and processes it through the organization noting that the federal agencies are saying they do not like how that works and that if MAG is going to process transit, MAG should also be involved in managing the decision and prioritization of transit projects.

Mr. Smith said that MAG would have to document it and also explain the process to the public.

Mayor Schoaf stated that from the comments he was hearing, MAG itself has the authority to make this decision.

Mr. Smith replied yes. He said that in the work program MAG is already providing the funding to the RPTA and METRO. Mr. Smith stated that MAG can decide if it wants to continue to fund the agencies to do other activities and take this responsibility back into the organization or MAG can take back both the activity and funding because it is an MPO responsibility.

Mayor Schoaf said that there are a lot more boxes in the draft chart that do not have money distributed from MAG than do. He asked what the additional cost of bringing those activities back into MAG would be.

Mr. Smith replied that MAG still has some questions on some of the boxes as to whether to put dollar signs in them. He noted that the agency was conservative in its approach and that some boxes not denoting funding may have MAG funding in them.

Mayor Schoaf said that he was trying to understand the cost impact to MAG by bringing those activities back into the organization. He stated that he did not know whether it was minor dollars or big dollars and whether doing so will negatively impact MAG's budget.

Mr. Smith responded that he did not believe that it would negatively impact MAG's budget. He stated that current funding, including $500,000 of FTA money, is going to METRO, $224,000 is going to the RPTA for transit planning and approximately $1 million of CMAQ funding is going to the RPTA for the Rideshare program. Mr. Smith said the impact depends on how extensive MAG would like to shift responsibilities back to MAG noting that approaching the Rideshare program involves getting into more of an operational type of function than planning function.

Mayor Schoaf asked if MAG could pull back the activities without adding much in overhead costs and if money would be saved if MAG did not need to have as much overhead as what is currently being utilized at the other agencies.

Mr. Smith replied that from MAG's perspective the agency would save on the overhead costs. He said that currently MAG is supervising the contracts, but that if it brought the activities back into the organization, it would not supervise, but would implement and therefore save time processing invoices. He noted that the agency has struggled with how many activities for which it should be responsible, but that the first priority is to address option one because that is transit related.

Mayor Smith asked how supervising versus implementing activities would impact MAG, for example, noting would that be a change in title and responsibility or impact positions. He requested whether MAG envisioned that work described in the draft chart under options three and four would eventually be done at MAG.

Mr. Smith responded yes. He added that another variation of the draft options reflected on the chart could include MAG retaining a subcontract with the RPTA and METRO and note that the positions would be reporting to MAG. Mr. Smith noted that it depended on how extensive MAG wanted to absorb responsibilities.

Mayor Smith stated that if MAG is responsible for executing the program, it is going to be held accountable. He added that it would depend on what level of responsibility MAG would want to assume.

Mr. Smith stated that with respect to highway responsibilities, MAG in the past had staff located at ADOT who were reporting to MAG and ADOT. He noted that following an audit, MAG was asked to either keep its employees at ADOT and relinquish doing policy or remove them. Mr. Smith said that MAG elected to remove them because it became confusing to the public who those employees represented.

Chair Neely noted that the certification is scheduled for October. She asked the timetable for the agencies to address this matter.

Mr. Smith replied that staff could present a recommendation for consideration in September.

Chair Neely requested staff to continue reporting to the Executive Committee regarding progress and outcomes of the working group. She requested an update on this item on the Executive Committee agenda until the working group developed its final recommendations.

Mr. Smith requested Mr. Anderson to provide further information regarding how long it may take the working group to develop its recommendations.

Mr. Anderson stated that the working group could begin addressing programming shortly, but that it would be useful to wait and see what other activities may develop. He noted that as an example, MAG has been discussing establishing a transit modal committee and that staff would want to make sure the responsibilities of that committee were developed first. Mr. Anderson said that September was a good timeframe to present recommendations, allowing the working group to discuss which options may be best for a long term solution. He stated that there were a lot of details yet to be addressed by the three agencies noting that some employees may remain in their current positions, but reporting relationships will be important to discuss. Mr. Anderson added that staff could provide further information next month on what may be recommended as a short term solution. He said that once a decision is made from a policy perspective, MAG will prepare information to be presented during the certification review in October.

Chair Neely said that she was hearing several comments including trying to merge agencies into a system that works for everyone, proceeding cautiously as options are reviewed, and

analyzing the extent to which MAG's budget may be impacted by bringing activities back into MAG. She recommended moving forward with what may be the most efficient way that provides member agencies with the best service. Chair Neely stated that there is increasing dialogue in the West Valley concerning future planning west of the I-10. She noted that it would be nice to have more regional planning and organization. Chair Neely said that she would agree with Mayor Hallman's perspective that this is something MAG should explore, but cautiously.

Mayor Hallman said that he wanted to make sure he understood the discussion regarding MAG's authority versus obligation. He wanted to clarify whether MAG has the right to do it or that the agency has to do it. Mayor Hallman said that from the discussion, he understood that MAG is ultimately fundamentally responsible for transit programming and that if this is not done it is MAG's problem. He asked what would be the consequence if MAG has not figured out how to determine those priorities with the other agencies.

Mr. Smith responded that he would need to look further into what those consequences might be, but that he assumed MAG has to fix it.

Mayor Hallman said that with respect to the draft chart, he would recommend not using the word drastic to describe the extent of consolidating particular activities. He stated that MAG ought to examine this issue to make sure it is efficient, but must also consider what will be most effective. Mayor Hallman added that cost could be incurred because the agency is trying to effect a result and that it may cost more to get a greater result that will be of more value. He recommended staff consider a cost benefit analysis to examine how a consolidation of these functions could achieve greater results although there may be a marginal increase in cost to do so. Mayor Hallman said that the goal is to get the most value out of member agencies' expenditures and that currently there are three agencies doing many things. He said that the location of employees is not particularly important as it relates to reporting authority noting that the RPTA hires all employees for METRO who are then leased to METRO. Mayor Hallman stated that this leads to calling into question why policymakers are not proceeding to the next step. He said that it was important to identify those appropriate boxes in option one to address and clarify the legal issue of who should be doing what, but that he hoped MAG would also consider a long term plan to reorganize the agencies which would provide the most benefit to constituents for the least cost. Mayor Hallman stated that he did not know to what extent MAG wanted to assume responsibilities identified to the right of the draft chart, but that what is depicted moves closer to the idea of what would be valuable to the constituencies of MAG's policymakers. He said that he believed this meant merging MAG, METRO, and the RPTA into an ultimate transit authority, noting that the divisions of METRO and the RPTA could remain operational entities. Mayor Hallman continued that if the agencies are not brought together, the scenario of employees in one set of offices will be calling employees in another set of office to discuss where a light rail station and bus stop should be located instead of a single entity managing that function. He said that he hoped the agencies could move beyond addressing programming and discuss operational issues as well noting that if member agencies want to attain regionalism this would be the direction to pursue.

Chair Neely asked if there were any further comments.

Mayor Lopez Rogers stated that she was not able to understand the context of the discussion without looking at the draft chart. She noted that as MAG and the other agencies proceeded discussing this issue, they should move forward with an understanding of developing and planning an integrated multi modal system.

Chair Neely noted that she believed staff has received some direction to continue moving forward.

6. Adjournment

Mayor Hallman moved to adjourn the Executive Committee meeting. Mayor Schoaf seconded the motion and carried unanimously (7-0). There being no further business, the Executive Committee adjourned at 12:45 p.m.

_____
Chair

_____
Secretary