

**MINUTES OF THE  
MARICOPA ASSOCIATION OF GOVERNMENTS  
TRANSPORTATION POLICY COMMITTEE MEETING**

October 15, 2003  
MAG Office, Saguaro Room  
Phoenix, Arizona

MEMBERS ATTENDING

Mayor Neil Giuliano, Tempe, Chair	Mayor Boyd Dunn, Chandler
Mayor Elaine Scruggs, Glendale, Vice Chair	Rusty Gant, ADOT
Benito Almanza, Bank of America Arizona	Mayor Keno Hawker, Mesa
* F. Rockne Arnett, Citizens Transportation Oversight Committee	*Eneas Kane, DMB Associates
Mayor Steven Berman, Gilbert	Mayor Mary Manross, Scottsdale
Dave Berry, Swift Transportation	Mayor Lon McDermott, Wickenburg
Jed S. Billings, FNF Construction	Diane Scherer, Phoenix Association of Realtors
Councilmember Peggy Bilsten, Phoenix	Vice Mayor Daniel Schweiker, Paradise Valley
Mayor James Cavanaugh, Goodyear	Martin Shultz, Pinnacle West Capital Corp.
* Councilmember Pat Dennis, Peoria	Supervisor Don Stapley, Maricopa County
* Mayor Ron Drake, Avondale	Mayor J. Woodfin Thomas, Litchfield Park

\* Not present

# Participated by videoconference or telephone conference call

1. Call to Order

The meeting of the Transportation Policy Committee (TPC) was called to order by Chairman Neil Giuliano at 4:10 p.m.

2. Pledge of Allegiance

The Pledge of Allegiance was recited.

Chairman Giuliano announced that transit tickets were available for those who used transit to come to the meeting. Validation was available from MAG staff for those who parked in the parking garage. Chairman Giuliano announced that the following materials were at each place: for agenda item #4B, Approval of the Draft Special FY 2004-2007 MAG Transportation Improvement Program for an Air Quality Analysis, Errata Sheet, #04-3; for agenda item #5, Regional Transportation Plan Policy Concepts, draft possible refinements to Policy Concepts, a letter from Senator Blendu and Representative Pierce on policy concepts being discussed at the legislature; and a letter commenting on the Plan from Paradise Valley Councilmember Stephen Aron Benson.

3. Call to the Audience

Chairman Giuliano stated that an opportunity is available to members of the public to offer public comment. Citizens will be requested not to exceed a three minute time period for their comments. It was noted that no public comment cards had been turned in.

4. Approval of Consent Agenda

Chairman Giuliano stated that any member of the committee can request that an item be removed from the consent agenda and considered individually. Chairman Giuliano stated that agenda items #4A and #4B were on the consent agenda. He noted that no public comment cards had been turned in for the consent agenda items.

Mayor Dunn moved to approve consent agenda items #4A and #4B. Mayor Thomas seconded, and the motion carried unanimously.

4A. Approval of September 3, 2003 and September 17, 2003 Meeting Minutes

The Transportation Policy Committee, by consent, approved the September 3, 2003 and September 17, 2003 meeting minutes.

4B. Approval of the Draft Special FY 2004-2007 MAG Transportation Improvement Program for an Air Quality Conformity Analysis

The Transportation Policy Committee, by consent, recommended approval of the Draft Special FY 2004-2007 MAG Transportation Improvement Program for an air quality conformity analysis. The 1990 Clean Air Act Amendments require that the MAG Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) be in conformance with the applicable air quality plans. This Special TIP serves as a four-year regional guide for the preservation, management and expansion of public transportation services, including highways, ridesharing, transit facilities and various congestion mitigation and air quality improvement projects. On September 25, 2003, the Transportation Review Committee unanimously recommended approval of the Draft Special FY 2004-2007 MAG TIP for an air quality conformity analysis. Approval of an updated Special 2004-2007 TIP and the accompanying air quality conformity analysis will give the region maximum flexibility during the development of the future 2005-2009 TIP document, which will contain major elements of the Regional Transportation Plan. All MAG member agencies have been consulted regarding changes to projects in the current 2003-2007 TIP and these changes have been incorporated in the draft document, including some new locally and privately funded projects. The draft TIP contains more than one thousand transportation projects, totals more than \$3.86 billion and identifies Federally funded projects; ADOT projects; transit projects; and all regionally significant projects within the region. Members will be asked to recommend approval of the program to undergo an air quality conformity analysis process. A copy of the Draft TIP was forwarded to TPC members in their agenda packets, and included revisions made under Errata Sheets 04-1, and 04-2, which was provided at the Management Committee meeting. Since the Management Committee meeting, additional changes requested have been incorporated into Errata Sheet 04-3.

5. Regional Transportation Plan Policy Concepts

Dennis Smith stated that at the September 17, 2003 TPC meeting, seven policy concepts were approved for inclusion in the Regional Transportation Plan (RTP). He stated that the County had presented six concepts it wanted included--three of the concepts were approved, and three were not approved, pending further discussion and clarification. Mr. Smith explained that the undecided concepts related to minor and major amendments and the five-year audit requirements. Mr. Smith stated that the letter from the Senator Blendu and Representative Pierce includes a list of items that they would like to see as essential components of the extension of the sales tax. He stated that staff worked with the intergovernmental representatives and the business coalition and draft refinements to the policy concepts were faxed to the TPC. Mr. Smith noted that the intent is to have dialogue on the draft concepts at this meeting, and the TPC will make a recommendation on the concepts at the November meeting.

Mr. Smith reviewed the policy concept for the five-year audit requirements. He advised that key language includes an assurance that a national firm, experienced in evaluating multimodal transportation systems, would be selected, and that the scope for the audit would be developed through the TPC, Maricopa County, RPTA, and ADOT. Mr. Smith noted that MAG is currently under a performance audit requirement for the freeway program, which would be extended to transit.

Councilmember Bilsten asked how the performance review would affect the ability for cities to bond and accelerate projects. Mr. Smith replied that similar issues arose when MAG accelerated the regional freeway system and Grant Anticipation Notes were used. Eric Anderson stated that bonds are issued in anticipation of construction of a project. Bonds would not be issued if the agency was not 100 percent sure the project was imminent. He stated that the issuance of bonds is simultaneous with the start of the project. Mr. Anderson stated that once the bonds are issued, the project is going forward. He advised that would need to be recognized as part of the audit.

Councilmember Bilsten asked if bonds are issued or being considered, does that take that project off the table as far as determining if it should move forward, because it has already met the criteria to move forward? Mr. Anderson replied that was his understanding, because a project would already have been given the go ahead.

Mr. Shultz asked if this would mean the Auditor General would statutorily be in charge of the audit. Mr. Smith replied that the Auditor General would be in charge of hiring the consultant, and MAG would be involved in setting the scope of work. He advised that the statute would require an independent auditor who would make independent recommendations back to the TPC. The TPC would then offer comments to the Regional Council. Mr. Smith stated that the TPC and Regional Council comments would then be provided to the consulting agencies.

Mayor Hawker asked if a project was in the third or fourth phase and the project was accelerated by a city, would the project be part of the performance audit? He stated that he could envision conflicts on being able to issue bonds to accelerate those projects. Mr. Anderson stated that street projects could be subject to acceleration. He commented that he could not see why the audit would recommend that a project be deleted after it had been funded.

Mayor Hawker asked if there were any projects that could not be accelerated. Mayor Hawker gave as an example a municipality that wanted to accelerate a light rail project from ten years out to five years out, and wanted to pay the difference. Mr. Anderson replied that had not yet been discussed, but possibly could be addressed within the acceleration policy. Mayor Hawker asked if the audit further determined that light rail would not be built because of lack of performance standards, then what would

happen with the repayment to the city for funds they advanced? Mr. Smith stated that under the concepts approved on September 17th, freeway and street project accelerations would be considered with the existing freeway acceleration policy used as a model. He noted that the concept did not reference light rail.

Vice Chair Scruggs stated that the concept paper on the five-year audit process is a performance review of transportation modes funded and operational under the Plan based on how they relieve congestion and provide mobility. She noted that the current process for the MAG freeway audit looks at whether the money being spent is consistent with how it was supposed to be spent. Vice Chair Scruggs stated that issues have been raised that could cause concern about the issuance of bonds. How are we reconciling what the Legislature sees we should be doing with what we see we should be doing. She stated that she thought the review process method from Senator Blendu and Representative Pierce could halt the program and bonds could not be sold.

Mayor Thomas stated that we can issue bonds by regional authority and bonds by local agencies who want to advance their projects. He noted that interest rates might be a concern.

Supervisor Stapley stated that the County reviewed the possible refinements. Its recommendation was to look at the performance of the past five years as to whether to fund a project that is underperforming, has not received federal matching funds, etc., and make recommendations for the future five years. Supervisor Stapley stated that the purpose of the audit is to make recommendations to the TPC if a change is compelling and necessary, and make an amendment. He stated that additional language is needed to make recommendations in five years on projects that come on line. Supervisor Stapley provided an example. If for some reason the entire \$1 billion for I-17 is not going to be used and \$500 million is available, a major amendment would be needed. In anticipation of that, language needs to be crafted. Supervisor Stapley stated that the audit should be independent, not controlled by MAG, with selection of the auditor by the Auditor General. He stated that clarifying language is needed on that.

Vice Chair Scruggs asked Supervisor Stapley if he felt that the recommendation would carry over to operational funds intended for a service that did not meet expectations. Supervisor Stapley replied that was correct. He stated that the recommendations of the auditor will be a practical solution. Supervisor Stapley advised that he expected the desire would be to continue funding, but the next segment might be another form of transit that might be unknown at this time. The idea is to have a check and balance system in place to do the Plan intelligently, and not be in a box in certain situations, such as revenue shortfalls or if matching funds are not granted by Congress. The goal is to have the language in place to have the ability to respond to scenarios we might not imagine.

Mayor Thomas commented that performance is similar to seeding clouds—can you actually tell if the action you took had an effect or not? Mayor Thomas stated that congestion will increase. How do we set in motion the audit criteria on a moving target?

Councilmember Bilsten stated that she had no problem with the audit of a project to determine if it is performing correctly and making recommendations to the TPC and Regional Council. However, she had concerns that the Legislature or an independent auditor, without the experience of staff familiar with the project, could pull out a project that a city feels strongly about. Councilmember Bilsten expressed concern for an auditor making the decisions that affect a community.

Chairman Giuliano noted that the auditors would not have authority over the Plan, they would make recommendations to the TPC and Regional Council. He stated that this type of situation happens many times when recommendations are made to councils to take under consideration.

Councilmember Bilsten stated that she would support a report for information that would help in the decision making, but she would not support action taken as a result of the audit without the municipalities' approval.

Mr. Smith commented that the auditors would not have the authority to make changes to the Plan. However, their comments on the document would be powerful. He added that staff was concerned that perhaps an independent auditor might come up with performance criteria that had not been imagined before and we could not meet the criteria. Mr. Smith noted that the light rail project has existing performance criteria in place in order to receive federal funding. That should receive priority over other performance criteria. Chairman Giuliano asked what possible scenarios might be considered by the auditors. Mr. Smith replied that staff believes they would have to follow federal guidelines, because that is the source of funds.

Supervisor Stapley stated his agreement with Mr. Smith. He commented that the answer is in the language that says the Auditor General will review the results of the audit and make recommendations to the TPC. Supervisor Stapley suggested adding language that the recommendation must be so compelling that a two-thirds majority vote of the TPC would be required to move an amendment to the Regional Council and on through the process. He noted that concept might be amenable to those with concerns about the audit's recommendations.

Chairman Giuliano stated that there are existing criteria for the freeway audit. If we agree we have no choice but go with federal criteria, any audit would have to do the same.

Mr. Smith stated that there are two different types of audits, as Vice Chair Scruggs mentioned earlier. The process already in place for the freeway audit is an implementation audit. The new process, the performance audit, would be a fundamental shift away from the current process and relates to project performance. Chairman Giuliano requested staff draft material clarifying the criteria for roads and freeways and other modes. Mr. Smith replied that staff could put something together on this. He added that is why the scope for the audit would be developed with the cooperating agencies, because many things will be learned as we advance, instead of locking it down in statute. Chairman Giuliano stated that the statute might refer to the scope being defined by the TPC.

Mr. Smith referenced Supervisor Stapley's comments about the two-thirds majority vote. He mentioned that this had been discussed with the business coalition, and they indicated they did not want to make the standard that high because it may appear that we are trying to lock in projects without much of an ability to change them.

Councilmember Bilsten requested that if this body supports the criteria in place, those guidelines could be provided to the auditor.

Vice Chair Scruggs asked Supervisor Stapley for clarification as to whether he meant in his earlier statements that a recommendation would end with the two-thirds vote, or would a change still have to go through the consultation process to the various agencies? Supervisor Stapley replied that he understood that the idea for a public vote is in the past. Under the draft concept, agencies would

comment on the amendment to the TPC, whose recommendation would then go the Regional Council. The decision made by the TPC to the Regional Council could not be stopped by the other agencies.

Ms. Scherer asked for clarification of the business coalition that Mr. Smith indicated did not support a two-thirds majority vote. She commented that she is a business representative, and she favors a two-thirds vote. Mr. Smith replied that he was referring to Maricopa 2020. Mr. Smith stated that a key provision of a major amendment is using the same process as for building the plan. The key to this language says if there is no other way to address the mobility in that corridor, you cannot take the money and walk away from the mobility issue, but must come up with ideas for solutions in that corridor.

Chairman Giuliano asked if there was further discussion on the five-year audit requirements. No comments were noted.

Mr. Smith reviewed the minor amendment refinement. He commented that this refinement is already addressed in the current MAG process.

No comments were noted on the minor amendment concept.

Mr. Smith read the major amendment refinement. "A major amendment to the RTP includes any of the following: the addition or deletion of a freeway, expressway or high capacity transit project in the RTP. A major amendment being proposed to the RTP shall be subject to the consultation process prescribed in State law (ARS 28-6308) used to develop the RTP. In addition, the proposed major amendments shall be presented to the public and subject to a public hearing. Proposed amendments that change the project identified in the RTP shall not be considered, unless no reasonable options are available to relieve congestion and improve mobility in the general area addressed by the project. Amendments that include additions or improvements to High Occupancy Vehicle facilities, park and ride lots and transit related expenditures associated with streets and highways may be considered as transit improvements and part of the Public Transportation Fund. Upon considering the written recommendations from the agencies in the consultation process and the information from the public hearing, the TPC may recommend that the proposed major amendment or a further modification to the amendment be recommended to the Regional Council for an air quality conformity analysis. If the amendment is approved by the Regional Council for an air quality conformity analysis, and the emissions from the amendment do not cause the RTP to exceed the approved air quality budget, the Regional Council may amend the RTP to include the amendment." He noted that a major amendment would only be made if there is no other way to solve a problem in a corridor.

Chairman Giuliano noted that this concept is based on the HB 2292 process. Mr. Smith added that HB 2292 did not mention the public outreach, which is important to include because it is a federal requirement.

Mayor Hawker asked how many major amendments could be possible today. He commented if major amendments could be defined on a list, that might clarify the issue now.

Chairman Giuliano asked if a change to a portion of a project might be considered a major plan amendment. Mr. Smith stated that a change to a portion of a project could be a material cost change, whereas deletion of the project would be a major amendment. Mr. Smith advised that consideration of material cost changes is a responsibility of the TPC.

No further comments were noted on major plan amendments.

Chairman Giuliano called for discussion of the issues mentioned in the letter from Senator Blendu and Representative Pierce.

Mayor Hawker referenced the Firewalls section, bullet two, that says transit and light rail include HOV lanes and park and rides lots. He stated that he thought HOV lanes were listed as freeway capacity items. Mayor Hawker noted that this would switch percentages listed as freeway and increase the amount to transit. He asked if the intent was to increase the amount to transit. Mr. Smith replied that he thought they were trying to line up their language with the language we had. For instance, if the performance audit recommended against light rail on SR 51, this is saying that HOV lanes or park and ride lots would be eligible expenses from the public transportation fund to help the corridor. Mayor Hawker asked if this would take place only when a major amendment was tripped. Mr. Smith replied that was correct.

Mr. Shultz referenced the Tax Extension Basics, bullet two, that said, "The tax will continue to be assessed in same amounts and on same items as currently assessed." He stated that the language needed clarification because if changes to categories are not allowed, that could cause an administrative problem. Mr. Shultz suggested that phrase be eliminated unless there is a reason to include it. Mr. Smith stated that he had not spoken to the authors of the letter, and recalled when the Plan appeared to be \$700 million short because we were not sure we could have the lease tax. He stated that he thought they were trying to write the statute so the \$700 million could be captured.

Vice Chair Scruggs stated that one matter being discussed by many outside groups is the statewide taxation of professional services. She commented that the way this draft concept is worded, the tax would not apply to professional services, which could impact funding that may come forward.

Councilmember Bilsten asked if there was a sunset on the terms for business representatives on the TPC. She commented that she was happy with the current representatives, and thought it would be a mistake to replace them.

Chairman Giuliano stated that another question is whether they intend this to be codified.

Mr. Smith stated that the composition of the TPC was hammered out by the Regional Council Transportation Subcommittee. One of the components was that the business representatives would represent regional business interests. He noted that the draft concept in the legislative attachment included trade associations, which was not the intent of the original TPC composition. Mr. Smith stated that some of the TPC members have terms and others are appointed by cities. He commented that another consideration could be staggering the terms of the business representatives. Mr. Smith stated that the business coalition wants to codify this issue to have certainty as to who is on the TPC.

Councilmember Bilsten expressed concern for changing the business representatives. The TPC business representatives have put in a lot of effort and much has been learned from them. She stated that she wanted to ensure that the Legislature cannot arbitrarily pull off the business representatives. from the TPC Councilmember Bilsten suggested that if they feel strongly about this, they could attend meetings and see that the TPC business representatives do not rubber stamp everything the elected officials ask for. She stated that it would be acceptable for the Governor, Senate President, and Speaker of the House to appoint a representative, but she did not support them taking anyone off the TPC.

Chairman Giuliano asked the effective date. Mr. Smith replied that we are requesting an emergency clause in the bill, so it would be effective in January. Chairman Giuliano noted that this could affect the TPC business representatives even before the sales tax election.

Vice Chair Scruggs stated that the issue is the appointment of members to a Maricopa County regional board. This is not a state board or commission. She noted that at the current time, the entities listed, the Governor, President and Speaker, have ten percent of the TPC, by virtue of the CTOC and State Board representatives. Vice Chair Scruggs stated that if this goes into action, the Governor, President, and Speaker will be responsible for the appointment of 36 percent of the TPC. She stated that we are talking about a group who is making decisions for one county in the state who has decided to tax themselves to build projects within their jurisdiction. Vice Chair Scruggs commented that a past Speaker was from Lake Havasu City. She questioned how someone from outside Maricopa County could make meaningful appointments to the TPC except to listen to those particular constituents with whom that person is close. Vice Chair Scruggs stated that the current Senate President and House Speaker are great leaders and contribute much to the state, but this is a regional function. We are asking Maricopa County taxpayers to tax themselves.

Mayor Manross stated her agreement with Vice Chair Scruggs. It is unknown who will be the Governor, President, or Speaker, and they may not be elected from Maricopa County. It is not right to have State elected officials selecting who will be on a MAG Board. Mayor Manross stated that the TPC is not broken, it does not need to be fixed. The TPC has done a wonderful job bringing diverse interests together. Mayor Manross stated that she did not support change when all have come together.

Mr. Berry expressed his appreciation for the support. He stated that he thought it would be an advantage to have terms for the business representatives to show they cannot be arbitrarily removed from the TPC. Mr. Berry stated that staggered terms would ensure continuity, so not all are freshmen at once. Mr. Berry commented that politics are the reality. The authority to tax flows from the state, so credence needs to be given to their concerns. Mr. Berry stated that perhaps a subgroup could get together and flesh out the draft concepts before the next meeting.

Mayor Manross stated that she was not so much concerned about terms and staggered terms, but who would be selecting the members. Why would that authority not stay within the region? The TPC is a diverse group and are stakeholders. If this is political, is MAG going to have to make changes to get this through the Legislature?

Mayor Berman stated his agreement with Vice Chair Scruggs and Mayor Manross. He stated his agreement with Mr. Berry regarding terms.

Mayor McDermott stated his agreement with Vice Chair Scruggs and Mayor Manross. He stated that during the TPC selection process, a number of qualified candidates were considered. They had to go through a process—their appointments were not automatic. Mayor McDermott stated that the TPC is lucky to have ended up with the best and the brightest representatives.

Mr. Shultz commented that it would be appropriate to have conversations with members of the Legislature. Their motive could be a desire for involvement in the process. Mr Shultz stated that MAG made a good faith effort to have the ranking Maricopa Senate and House representatives on the TPC, although it was later discovered that they were precluded from membership by law.

Mayor Thomas stated that six legislatively-assigned members would be too many. Having the two legislative members, as in the original composition, would be effective.

Vice Chair Scruggs stated that each municipality and the county contribute substantial amounts of their own funds to the Plan; therefore, they should be making the decisions on how those funds are spent. Vice Chair Scruggs stated that the formula for the business representatives was that they would represent a business that is regional in nature, and not represent an organization or body of which we are members. This was done so as to not be in conflict as dues payers. Vice Chair Scruggs stated there were safeguards built in to the composition. It is important those criteria stay in place.

Mayor Manross expressed concern for including members from trade organizations.

Chairman Giuliano stated that dialogue will take place with legislative leaders, the business coalition, and others to refine the draft concepts and have an update for the November meeting.

Councilmember Bilsten requested a review of what was decided by the TPC on the draft concepts. She stated that members are out meeting with people and she wanted to ensure everyone is on the same page.

Mr. Smith noted that there did not appear to be support for the business representatives item. He added that there appeared to be an acknowledgment about setting terms and staggering terms. For the five-year audit requirements, clarify the language to protect projects that are underway and that evaluation will go forward and look at those proposed projects. Any project that is bonded is locked in and will not be changed.

Chairman Giuliano stated that the criteria in the scope of the five-year audit would be clarified.

Mr. Anderson stated that the tax base issue will need clarification, as Mr. Shultz mentioned.

Supervisor Stapley commented on a two-thirds vote of the TPC to authorize major and minor amendments. Mr. Smith stated that the TPC is still at a majority vote unless guidance is given by the TPC. He noted that this is a change that could be accomplished simply, and could be discussed at the November meeting.

Mayor Hawker suggested discussion of the concept that the ranking Maricopa members could serve on the TPC. If it is in the bill language, and are Maricopa representatives, we would not disagree with that. Mr. Smith reminded members that there was a constitutional provision that legislators cannot hold two offices. The only exception is serving on a school board. Chairman Giuliano asked if they could serve as ex-officio or non-voting representatives. Mr. Smith replied that had been brought up, but did not go anywhere. He added that the question could be asked again.

Councilmember Bilsten stated that she would like clarifying language if the final approval is at MAG.

## 6. Maintenance Resolution

Tom Remes addressed the TPC on the maintenance resolution. Mr. Remes stated that maintenance funding for landscaping, litter pickup and sweeping has been discussed by the TPC since March. A Maintenance Stakeholders Group, including representatives from the TPC, ADOT, the State Transportation Board, the Governor's office, legislative staff, and the Joint Legislative Budget

Committee was formed to discuss the issue. Mr. Remes explained that the resolution recognizes the need to address the shortfall in maintenance funding. He reviewed the provisions of the resolution: 1) Designate that \$279 million of the half-cent sales tax to be dedicated for landscaping, litter control and sweeping maintenance for freeways designated in the Regional Transportation Plan for Maricopa County. 2) MAG and ADOT to work together to create a long-term funding strategy and process that provides a dedicated funding stream for maintenance. 3) Track maintenance expenditures through the Annual Report for the MAG Regional Freeway Program. 4) Partnering between ADOT and cities to encourage Adopt-a-Highway sponsors. 5) Develop a long-term litter prevention program. Chairman Giuliano thanked Mr. Remes for his report and asked if there were any questions.

Mr. Shultz asked the amount to sponsor one mile in the Adopt-A-Highway program. Dan Lance, ADOT State Engineer, replied that the cost for sponsoring one mile is \$6,000 per year, or \$500 per month.

Councilmember Bilsten asked for assurance that there is enough money in the budget to keep freeways and proposed freeways clean, beyond the Adopt-A-Highway program. She noted that it is important to the public that the freeways will be kept clean and they will have walls, regardless of noise decibels. Councilmember Bilsten commented that ADOT has to request money from the Legislature for landscape maintenance and litter control. If funds are not forthcoming from the Legislature, the freeways become a blight for neighborhoods. She indicated her support for the resolution if it means all freeways will have regular cleaning. Mr. Anderson stated that as we see the landscape maintenance and litter control today, the staff has been assured by ADOT that budget is sufficient to keep freeways looking good even if no organization adopts the segment. Mr. Anderson clarified that the resolution dedicates a revenue source for landscape maintenance and litter control only. Mr. Anderson stated that ADOT's priority is safety, so they have to divert funds during tough budget times. Councilmember Bilsten asked for assurance that there was enough money to keep all freeways clean. Mr. Anderson replied that there was.

Mayor Cavanaugh asked if the maintenance program would start with day one of the 20-year program. Mr. Smith stated that maintenance money is included in year one of the program. He further explained that there currently is a maintenance program, but ADOT recently had to cut this back. When choices must be made, safety is their priority. Mr. Smith stated that what the TPC is trying to accomplish with the resolution is to dedicate funding for landscape maintenance and litter control, and manage the fund. He added that a non-supplanting clause is needed so funding cannot be used by the Legislature for something else.

Mayor Hawker noted that at a freeway opening, the cost for maintaining a freeway mile was given as \$123,000 per year. He noted that the \$6,000 from Adopt-A-Highway does not make much of an impact on the total; therefore, another source of money is needed.

Mayor Manross moved to recommend approving the maintenance resolution. Mayor Cavanaugh seconded, and the motion carried unanimously.

## 7. Review and Discussion of Draft Preliminary Regional Transportation Plan Document

Chairman Giuliano stated that Mr. Anderson would give a presentation on the Regional Transportation Plan document that has been prepared. He noted that it was an excellent document, and the fact sheet on the Plan would be very useful.

Mr. Anderson reviewed approvals by the TPC that include East Valley street projects, right-of-way protection for Jomax Road, SR 74, and Loop 303, full funding of new interchanges, and a reduction of the overall contingency to 9.3 percent of the plan. Mr. Anderson stated that the draft plan includes about 57 percent to freeways/highways, about 31 percent to transit, and about nine percent to streets/arterials. He noted that some elements, such as bicycle or pedestrian projects, were included in the Plan and were based on plans adopted by the Regional Council. Mr. Anderson reviewed the policy concepts adopted by the TPC: Establish firewalls; implement a Life Cycle Program for freeways, transit, and streets; continue material cost change and enhancement policies; expand highway acceleration policy to streets; and review the Plan every five years. Mr. Anderson reviewed the next steps for the Plan. After the air quality conformity analysis is done, the plan needs to be certified to the Governor and Legislature by November 30th. To accommodate this, a special Regional Council meeting has been scheduled for November 25th. The next step is that the Legislature needs to take action in January 2004 to authorize an election on May 18, 2004.

Mr. Anderson stated that a 20-30 page Plan document would also be produced for wider distribution, in addition to a CD and posting on the MAG Web site.

Mayor Thomas asked how the maps would be distilled into the ballot language. Chairman Giuliano stated that would be one of the tasks the campaign consultant would work on.

Mayor Thomas referred to map 3-4. He commented that this was one of the most pertinent maps in the Plan, because it shows the alignment of job centers with rail lines. Mayor Thomas stated that he believed this would be the next challenge, to work toward a regional rail plan.

Mr. Smith mentioned to members that the document would undergo revision when the air quality material is included.

Chairman Giuliano noted that the next TPC meeting is scheduled for November 12th at 4:00 p.m. He added that a notice may be forthcoming announcing a change in the December 10th meeting date to December 17th.

There being no further business, the meeting adjourned at 5:30 p.m.

---

Chairman

---

Secretary