

December 8, 2015

TO: Members of the MAG Regional Council

FROM: Mayor W.J. "Jim" Lane, Scottsdale, Chair

SUBJECT: MEETING NOTIFICATION AND TRANSMITTAL OF TENTATIVE AGENDA

Meeting - 11:30 a.m.
Wednesday, December 16, 2015
MAG Office, Suite 200 - Saguaro Room
302 North 1st Avenue, Phoenix

The next MAG Regional Council meeting will be held at the MAG offices at the time and place noted above. Members of the Regional Council may attend either in person, by videoconference or by telephone conference call. Members who wish to remove any items from the Consent Agenda are requested to contact the MAG office. Supporting information is enclosed for your review. The meeting will include a working lunch.

Please park in the garage underneath the building. Bring your ticket to the meeting, parking will be validated. For those using transit, the Regional Public Transportation Authority 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. Assisted listening devices are available from MAG staff at the meeting. If you have any questions, please call the MAG Office.

c: MAG Management Committee

**MAG REGIONAL COUNCIL
TENTATIVE AGENDA
December 16, 2015**

COMMITTEE ACTION REQUESTED

1. Call to Order

2. Pledge of Allegiance

3. Call to the Audience

An opportunity will be provided to members of the public to address the Regional Council ON ITEMS THAT ARE NOT ON THE AGENDA THAT ARE WITHIN THE JURISDICTION OF MAG, or on items on the agenda for discussion but not for action. 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 Regional Council 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 Regional Council on activities of general interest.

5. Approval of Consent Agenda

Council members may request that an item be removed from the consent agenda. Prior to action on the consent agenda, members of the audience will be provided an opportunity to comment on consent items. Consent items are marked with an asterisk (*).

3. Information.

4. Information.

5. Approval of the Consent Agenda.

ITEMS PROPOSED FOR CONSENT*

MINUTES

*5A. Approval of the October 28, 2015, Meeting Minutes

5A. Review and approval of the October 28, 2015, meeting minutes.

TRANSPORTATION ITEMS

*5B. 2015 Annual Report on the Status of the Implementation of Proposition 400

Proposition 400 was approved by the voters of Maricopa County in November 2004, and authorized the extension of a half-cent sales tax for use on transportation projects in the MAG Regional Transportation Plan. A.R.S. 28-6354 requires that MAG issue an annual report on projects included in Proposition 400, addressing factors such as project status, funding, and priorities. The 2015 Annual Report is the 11th report in the series and covers the status of the life cycle programs for freeways/highways, arterial streets, and public transit. A Summary of Findings and Issues is included in the attached material and the full report is available on the MAG website. Please refer to the enclosed material.

*5C. Update on Federal Transit Administration Section 5304 Transit Planning Funding for FY 2016 Call for Projects by the Arizona Department of Transportation

In September 2015, the Arizona Department of Transportation (ADOT) issued a Notice of Funding Availability (NOFA) for Local Rural/Small Urban Transit Planning Projects using Federal Transit Administration (FTA) Section 5304 funding. Local and regional public agencies, tribes, and operators of transit services were directed to submit their applications through their Councils of Governments (COGs) and Metropolitan Planning Organizations (MPOs) to ADOT by December 4, 2015. The 5304 grant funding would permit the COG or MPO to conduct rural transit studies. Input was coordinated and solicited from MAG member agencies, Pinal County and peer COG/MPOs to compile a listing of all of the eligible, candidate projects that meet the FTA 5304 guidelines. Upon completion of this process, only three projects met the criteria. Approval of the MAG Region 5304 planning projects list that was submitted to the Arizona Department of Transportation by December 4,

5B. Information and discussion.

5C. Approval of the MAG Region 5304 planning projects list that was submitted to the Arizona Department of Transportation by December 4, 2015.

2015, is being requested. Please refer to the enclosed material.

ENVIRONMENTAL ITEMS

*5D. Prioritized List of Proposed PM-10 Certified Street Sweeper Projects for FY 2016 CMAQ Funding

The Fiscal Year (FY) 2016 MAG Unified Planning Work Program and Annual Budget and the FY 2014-2018 MAG Transportation Improvement Program contain \$1,530,113 in FY 2016 Congestion Mitigation and Air Quality Improvement (CMAQ) funding to encourage the purchase and utilization of PM-10 Certified Street Sweepers. On October 22, 2015, the MAG Air Quality Technical Advisory Committee (AQTAC) recommended a prioritized list of proposed PM-10 Certified Street Sweeper Projects for FY 2016 CMAQ funding. Prior to the AQTAC recommendation, the MAG Street Committee reviewed the proposed street sweeper applications on October 13, 2015, in accordance with the MAG Federal Fund Programming Guidelines and Procedures. On November 18, 2015, the MAG Management Committee recommended approval of a prioritized list of proposed PM-10 Certified Street Sweeper Projects for FY 2016 CMAQ funding. Please refer to the enclosed material.

*5E. Status of Remaining MAG Approved PM-10 Certified Street Sweeper Projects That Have Not Requested Reimbursement

A status report is being provided on the remaining PM-10 certified street sweeper projects that have received approval, but have not requested reimbursement. To address new Federal Highway Administration procedures to minimize inactive obligations and to assist MAG in reducing the amount of obligated federal funds carried forward in the MAG Unified Planning Work Program and Annual Budget, we are requesting that street sweeper projects for FY 2015 CMAQ funding be purchased and reimbursement requests be submitted to MAG within one year

5D. Approval of a prioritized list of proposed PM-10 Certified Street Sweeper Projects for FY 2016 CMAQ funding and retain the prioritized list for any additional FY 2016 CMAQ funds that may become available due to closeout or additional funding received by this region.

5E. Information and discussion.

from the date of the MAG authorization letter. In addition, recently we were notified of another instance in which a street sweeper disposal occurred without prior Arizona Department of Transportation approval. Arizona Department of Transportation procedures require that member agencies obtain ADOT approval before disposal of a CMAQ-funded street sweeper. Please refer to the enclosed material.

GENERAL ITEMS

*5F. Proposed 2016 Revision to the 2015 Edition of the MAG Standard Specifications and Details for Public Works Construction

The MAG Standard Specifications and Details Committee has completed its review of proposed revisions to the MAG Standard Specifications and Details for Public Works Construction. These revisions have been recommended for approval by the committee and have been reviewed by MAG member agency Public Works Directors and/or Engineers. It is anticipated that the 2016 Revision to the 2015 Edition will be available for purchase in early January 2016. Please refer to the enclosed material.

*5G. Maricopa and Pinal County Resident Population and Employment Projections

According to Executive Order 2011-04, the Arizona Department of Administration (ADOA) is responsible for preparing an official set of population projections for Arizona and each of its counties. ADOA has prepared a set of draft resident population projections for Maricopa and Pinal Counties consistent with the 2015 Population Estimates. MAG has also developed draft employment projections which are consistent with the ADOA population projections. Because there may be changes to the State and county projections totals by ADOA, on November 10, 2015, the MAG Population Technical Advisory Committee (POPTAC) recommended approval of the draft ADOA 2015 to 2050 population projections for Maricopa County and Pinal County; and the draft 2015 to

5F. Information and discussion.

5G. Approval of the Maricopa County and Pinal County resident population and employment projections for 2015, 2020, 2025, 2030, 2035, 2040, 2045, and 2050 provided the Maricopa County and Pinal County control totals are within three percent of the final control totals.

2050 employment projections for Maricopa County and Pinal County provided the Maricopa County and Pinal County control totals are within three percent of the final control totals. The projections are for 2015, 2020, 2025, 2030, 2035, 2040, 2045, and 2050. They will be used as the control totals from which MAG will develop a set of sub-regional projections that will be brought to the Management Committee and Regional Council in 2016. The Pinal County control totals will be presented to the Central Arizona Governments Regional Council. On November 18, 2015, the MAG Management Committee recommended approval of the Maricopa and Pinal County resident population and employment projections. Subsequent to the Management Committee meeting, the State Demographer revised the draft projections. The revised Pinal County population control total is 11.05 percent lower than the previous draft, and the revised Maricopa County population control total is 0.04 percent higher than the previous draft. Previously, the Pinal County 2050 population figure was 1,164,000. In the revised draft it is 1,036,000. Previously, the Maricopa County 2050 population figure was 6,696,000. In the revised draft it is 6,698,000. Employment totals were adjusted due to population change, with the population-to-employment ratios remaining constant. Please refer to the enclosed material.

*5H. Approval of the Draft July 1, 2015 Municipality Resident Population Updates

MAG staff has prepared draft July 1, 2015 Municipality Resident Population Updates for MAG Member Agencies. The Updates, which are used to prepare budgets and set expenditure limitations, were prepared using the 2010 Census as the base and updated with housing unit data supplied and verified by MAG member agencies. Since there may be changes to the Maricopa County and Pinal County control totals by the Arizona Department of Administration, on November 10, 2015, the MAG Population Technical Advisory Committee recommended approval of these draft Updates provided that the

5H. Approval of the draft July 1, 2015 Municipality Resident Population Updates for MAG Member Agencies provided that the Maricopa County and Pinal County control totals are within one percent of the final control total.

County control totals are within one percent of the final control total. The Pinal County control total and sub-county figures will be presented to the Central Arizona Governments Regional Council. On November 18, 2015, the MAG Management Committee recommended approval of the Draft July 1, 2015 Municipality Resident Population Updates. Please refer to the enclosed material.

ITEMS PROPOSED TO BE HEARD

6. MAG 208 Water Quality Management Plan Amendment for the Central Buckeye Wastewater Treatment Plant Arizona Pollutant Discharge Elimination System Permit Discharges to the Roosevelt Canal and Buckeye Canal

The City of Buckeye has requested that the MAG 208 Water Quality Management Plan be amended to include the Central Buckeye Wastewater Treatment Plant Arizona Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (AZPDES) Permit Discharges to the Roosevelt Canal and Buckeye Canal. The facility is identified in the MAG 208 Plan with an ultimate capacity of 45.8 million gallons per day. Reclaimed water is currently disposed of through reuse and an AZPDES Permit discharge to a lateral of the Buckeye Canal located near the facility. This amendment identifies additional AZPDES Permit discharge points for the Central Buckeye Wastewater Treatment Plant to the Roosevelt Canal and the Buckeye Canal. Although this amendment includes additional AZPDES discharge points, the methods of effluent disposal currently identified in the MAG 208 Plan for the facility will continue to remain options. Unincorporated Maricopa County is located within three miles of the project. Maricopa County has submitted a letter indicating that the project is not in conflict with Maricopa County plans for the area and it is acceptable. The MAG Water Quality Advisory Committee conducted a public hearing on the Draft 208 Amendment on November 17, 2015. No comments were received. Immediately following the public hearing, the Committee recommended approval of the amendment. On

6. Approval of the MAG 208 Water Quality Management Plan Amendment for the Central Buckeye Wastewater Treatment Plant Arizona Pollutant Discharge Elimination System Permit Discharges to the Roosevelt Canal and Buckeye Canal.

November 18, 2015, the MAG Management Committee recommended approval. The amendment is posted on the MAG website at: http://www.azmag.gov/Documents/Central_Bukeye_AZPDES_Permit_Discharges.pdf. Please refer to the enclosed material.

7. Streamlining of the MAG 208 Plan Small Plant Review and Approval Process

The Maricopa Association of Governments shares the importance of economic development for the region with the Arizona Department of Environmental Quality (ADEQ) and has agreed to work cooperatively with them on streamlining options for the 208 Water Quality Management Plan Process that would not jeopardize the integrity of the process. The goal of this effort is to make the process more efficient and the region more globally competitive. On August 26, 2015, the MAG Regional Council approved the Proposal for Streamlining the 208 Water Quality Management Plan Process. The 208 Process was evaluated by a small Stakeholder Group that included representatives from cities and towns, Maricopa County, private utilities, homebuilders, and ADEQ. A representative from the Governor's Office was also invited. As part of the streamlining process, the Stakeholder Group on June 30, 2015 recommended that corresponding changes be made to the MAG 208 Plan Small Plant Review and Approval Process. This is a shortened process for wastewater treatment facilities 2.0 million gallons per day or less with no discharge. The corresponding changes have now been made that streamline the Small Plant Review and Approval Process from approximately 12 to 17 months to approximately six months. This represents a 50 to 65 percent reduction in the overall timeline for a Small Plant Review and Approval. On November 18, 2015, the MAG Management Committee recommended approval of the Draft Proposal for Streamlining the MAG 208 Water Quality Management Plan Small Plant Review and Approval Process. Please refer to the enclosed material.

7. Approval of the Proposal for Streamlining the MAG 208 Water Quality Management Plan Small Plant Review and Approval Process.

8. EPA Proposed Revisions to the Exceptional Events Rule

On November 20, 2015, the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) published a proposed rule with revisions to the 2007 Exceptional Events Rule to address issues raised by stakeholders and to provide clarity and increase the efficiency of the criteria and process. Exceptional Events include natural events such as dust storms, wildfires, stratospheric ozone intrusion and volcanic and seismic activities. In addition, EPA proposed draft guidance on preparing exceptional event demonstrations for wildfires. MAG staff is currently reviewing the proposed revisions and guidance in coordination with the MAG special Washington, D.C., legal counsel. Comments are due by January 19, 2016. U.S. Senator Jeff Flake has requested a 30-day extension of the comment period. EPA intends to finalize the rule revisions and guidance before October 1, 2016. On December 8, 2015, EPA will conduct a public hearing on these items at the Arizona Department of Environmental Quality at 10:00 a.m. Please refer to the enclosed material.

8. Information and discussion.

9. Legislative Update

An update will be provided on legislative items of interest.

9. Information, discussion and possible action.

10. Request for Future Agenda Items

Topics or issues of interest that the Regional Council would like to have considered for discussion at a future meeting will be requested.

10. Information.

11. Comments from the Council

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

11. Information.

Adjournment

**MINUTES OF THE
MARICOPA ASSOCIATION OF GOVERNMENTS
REGIONAL COUNCIL MEETING**

October 28, 2015
MAG Office
Phoenix, Arizona

MEMBERS ATTENDING

Mayor W.J. "Jim" Lane, Scottsdale, Chair	* Mayor Christian Price, City of Maricopa
Mayor Greg Stanton, Phoenix, Vice Chair	Supervisor Denny Barney, Maricopa County
Vice Mayor Robin Barker, Apache Junction	Mayor John Giles, Mesa
# Mayor Kenneth Weise, Avondale	Vice Mayor Paul Dembow for Mayor Michael Collins, Paradise Valley
Mayor Jackie Meck, Buckeye	Mayor Cathy Carlat, Peoria
# Councilmember Mike Farrar, Carefree	* Supervisor Todd House, Pinal County
Councilmember Dick Esser, Cave Creek	# Mayor Gail Barney, Queen Creek
# Mayor Jay Tibshraeny, Chandler	* President Delbert Ray, Salt River Pima-Maricopa Indian Community
* Mayor Lana Mook, El Mirage	# Mayor Sharon Wolcott, Surprise
* Mayor Tom Rankin, Florence	Mayor Mark Mitchell, Tempe
* President Ruben Balderas, Fort McDowell Yavapai Nation	* Mayor Adolfo Gamez, Tolleson
Mayor Linda Kavanagh, Fountain Hills	Mayor John Cook, Wickenburg
Mayor Chuck Turner, Gila Bend	Mayor Michael LeVault, Youngtown
* Governor Stephen Roe Lewis, Gila River Indian Community	* Mr. Roc Arnett, Citizens Transportation Oversight Committee
Mayor John Lewis, Gilbert	Mr. Joseph La Rue, State Transportation Board
Mayor Jerry Weiers, Glendale	Councilmember Jack Sellers, State Transportation Board
Mayor Georgia Lord, Goodyear	
# Mayor Rebecca Jimenez, Guadalupe	
Mayor Thomas Schoaf, Litchfield Park	

* Those members neither present nor represented by proxy.

Attended by telephone conference call.

+ Attended by videoconference

1. Call to Order

The meeting of the MAG Regional Council was called to order by Chair W.J. "Jim" Lane, Scottsdale, at 11:35 a.m.

2. Pledge of Allegiance

The Pledge of Allegiance was recited.

Mayor Gail Barney, Councilmember Michael Farrar, Mayor Rebecca Jimenez, Mayor Jay Tibshraeny, Mayor Kenneth Weise, and Mayor Sharon Wolcott joined the meeting by teleconference.

Chair Lane noted that agenda item #5G was removed from the agenda because the candidate withdrew her name from consideration. He noted that at each member's place and on the tables on each side of the room were the addendum to the agenda, item #5H, which was previously transmitted, and a fact sheet on the Governor's proposed state education settlement for agenda item #10.

3. Call to the Audience

Chair Lane recognized public comment from Mr. Marvin Rochelle, who stated that he was proud to have worked on the Dial-a-Ride program. He said that the program lost funding and efforts have been underway to have it restored. Mr. Rochelle stated that the goal is to have regional Dial-a-Ride, so a person will be able to take transit from Surprise to Gilbert without transferring. He announced that the next public meeting on Dial-a-Ride will be at the public library on November 10, from 5:00 p.m. to 7:00 p.m. Chair Lane thanked Mr. Rochelle for his comments.

Chair Lane recognized public comment from Ms. Dianne Barker, who expressed her support for multimodal transportation. She expressed that she was excited that Ohio State University could be coming here and the visitors could increase business in Scottsdale. Ms. Barker encouraged organizations and businesses to install bicycle racks. She noted that the public voted to fund transit enhancements, and bicycles are a part of that. Ms. Barker stated that transit reform is needed because bicyclists can ride down Central Avenue faster than transit can travel. She stated that MAG is missing the point when it promotes only freeways in its materials, because in 2004, the voters approved supporting transit. Chair Lane thanked Ms. Barker for her comments.

Chair Lane recognized public comment from Mr. Pat Vint, who thanked Regional Council members who attend the meetings consistently. Mr. Vint stated that he is a terrorist, but no one notices terrorists. He said that he had a target on his back that says cop so he can take bullets meant for the police. Mr. Vint stated that there is an idiot in the White House. Mr. Vint noted that his 85th birthday was October 4. He said he has lived a long time because he is a mean SOB and only the good die young. Mr. Vint stated that the detectives at the meeting are his friends. He said that he asked if he could borrow their guns and they are so fast he has them in his pants legs. Mr. Vint stated that they can take people out fast. He spoke of an Arizona Republic article by Dustin Gardner on the benefits of a strong mayor. Mr. Vint stated that he has been at odds with Mayor Stanton over the years, but is going to meet with him and become friends. He said that he will hold Mayor Stanton to be accountable. Mr. Vint stated that his scooter can go 40 m.p.h. so you'd better hold on. Chair Lane stated that MAG is looking for comments relevant to the scope of MAG activities. Mr. Vint's time expired. Mr. Vint continued speaking. Chair Lane thanked Mr. Vint.

Mayor Stanton wished Mr. Vint a Happy Birthday.

Chair Lane recognized public comment from Mr. John Rusinek, who said that he would be speaking about dust. He read from a City of Phoenix brochure about its dust regulations, including inoperative

vehicles must not be visible beyond the property line and that parking surfaces must be dust proofed or there could be a violation. Mr. Rusinek stated that the two inspectors who came to his property said that the inoperative vehicles parked next door were okay. He said that he had been trying to get this dust problem resolved for ten years, but the City of Phoenix will do nothing. Chair Lane thanked Mr. Rusinek.

4. Executive Director's Report

Mr. Dennis Smith, MAG Executive Director, reported on items of interest to the MAG region. He announced that the Metropolitan Phoenix Export Alliance had received a \$100,000 award by JP Morgan Chase Bank to promote the Greater Phoenix Region's export position.

Mr. Smith reported on the Domestic Violence Awareness Month press conference, which was held October 16, 2015, at Banner Simulation Center in Mesa. Speakers at the "Lifesaving Lethality Assessments" press conference included MAG Chair W.J. "Jim" Lane, Vice Mayor Robin Barker (Chair of the Domestic Violence Council), Mesa Vice Mayor Dennis Kavanaugh, Glendale Police Chief Debora Black, and a woman who is a survivor of domestic violence. Mr. Smith stated that the highlight of the event was the reunion of the domestic violence survivor with the Glendale police officer she credited with saving her life.

Mr. Smith stated that MAG received the 2015 Best Intelligent Transportation Systems (ITS) Planning Project from the ITS Arizona Awards for the Emergency Vehicle Preemption Best Practices Study. The project reviewed regional emergency vehicle preemption practices and national best practices to develop recommendations for future emergency vehicle preemption deployment in the Phoenix metropolitan region. Mr. Smith stated that the idea for the project was initially brought forward by Mr. Darryl Crossman, Litchfield Park City Manager, who noted that the City of Cleveland has standardized preemption. Mr. Smith acknowledged MAG staff Mr. Sarath Joshua and Mr. Micah Henry for their work on this project. He remarked on efforts to ensure compatible systems are purchased in the region to improve traffic performance.

Mr. Smith stated that MAG staff recently met with Mr. Keiichi Koshiyama, Senior Economist with the Institute for International Economic Studies at Toyota, and staff from the Pima County economic development department and Greater Phoenix Economic Council. Mr. Smith noted that Lora Mwaniki-Lyman, MAG staff, drafted the material on Japan that was at each place. He stated that Japan is one of Arizona's largest foreign direct investment partner. Mr. Smith added that additional fact sheets will be developed for other foreign direct investment partners.

Mr. Smith stated that MAG staff members Anubhav Bagley and Amy St. Peter are presenting the Read On Arizona Early Literacy Viewer at the Race to the Top workshop in Washington, D.C. He noted that Mr. Bagley and Ms. St. Peter will be meeting with national Head Start leadership. Mr. Smith stated that the Viewer has been hailed nationally as a transformative platform.

Mr. Smith announced that a public hearing on the Draft 2015 Annual Report on the Status of the Implementation of Proposition 400 will take place on November 19, 2015, at 5:00 p.m., in the MAG Saguaro Room.

Mr. Smith stated that Phoenix was named as the Best Driving Experience in the World by Waze, the world's largest community-based traffic and navigation app. He noted that this could be utilized to promote economic development. Mr. Smith expressed that this was made possible due to efforts of the elected officials over the years and MAG's good relationship with the Arizona Department of Transportation and Federal Highway Administration.

5. Approval of Consent Agenda

Chair Lane noted that agenda items #5A, #5B, #5C, #5D, #5E, #5F, and #5H were on the Consent Agenda, agenda item #5G having been removed.

Chair Lane recognized public comment from Ms. Dianne Barker, who said that MAG's jurisdiction is multimodal transportation and project conformity in order to have better quality air for the vulnerable populations. Ms. Barker read from the minutes: "Ms. Barker stated that she tries to observe rules and when she doesn't, it is not intentional, such as performing gymnastics at meetings." She declared that she would not apologize because it was performed with skill and training. Ms. Barker stated that multimodal keeps her fit, both riding her bicycle and lifting it onto the bus. She expressed that she did cartwheels to show that multimodalism is good but she has been informed and will not do them again. Ms. Barker stated that Mr. Vint and Mr. Rusinek have spoken about particulates. She stated that Mr. Vint spoke of having a strong mayor. Ms. Barker stated that Mayor Stanton allows public comment, which helps expose mistakes at the government level. She said that she told the Phoenix City Manager that Mr. Rusinek's problem could be solved if egos were set aside and admissions made that a mistake had occurred. Ms. Barker stated that Mr. Rusinek is for the best air quality. Ms. Barker's time expired. Chair Lane thanked Ms. Barker.

Chair Lane recognized public comment from Mr. Pat Vint, who filled out a card for agenda item #5F. No comments were made.

Chair Lane asked members if they had questions or requests to hear a presentation on any of the Consent Agenda items.

Mayor John Lewis expressed appreciation to MAG and Valley Metro for the Southeast Valley Transit System Study.

Mayor Linda Kavanagh moved to approve Consent Agenda items #5A, #5B, #5C, #5D, #5E, #5F, and #5H. Councilmember Dick Esser seconded, and the motion passed unanimously.

5A. Approval of the September 30, 2015, Meeting Minutes

The MAG Regional Council, by consent, approved the September 30, 2015, meeting minutes.

5B. Project Changes - Amendment and Administrative Modification to the FY 2014-2018 MAG Transportation Improvement Program, Fiscal Year 2016 Arterial Life Cycle Program, and as Appropriate, to the 2035 Regional Transportation Plan and FY 2016 MAG Unified Planning Work Program and Annual Budget

The MAG Regional Council, by consent, approved amendments and administrative modifications to the FY 2014-2018 MAG Transportation Improvement Program, Fiscal Year 2016 Arterial Life Cycle Program, and as appropriate, to the 2035 Regional Transportation Plan and FY 2016 MAG Unified Planning Work Program and Annual Budget. The Fiscal Year (FY) 2014-2018 Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) and 2035 Regional Transportation Plan were approved by the MAG Regional Council on January 29, 2014. The new requested project additions and changes include Arterial Life Cycle Program projects; rail safety and road safety projects funded through the Highway Safety Improvement Program; Transportation Alternatives Safe Routes to School eligible activities; transit project changes related to final apportionment announcements; and general project changes. Additionally, cost savings from the procurement of FY 2014 PM-10 street sweepers were realized and the savings will be included in the FY 2016 MAG Unified Planning Work Program and Annual Budget. Project listing changes and additions included are not contingent on a new finding of conformity. The requested project changes were recommended for approval by the MAG Transportation Review Committee on October 1, 2015, and by the MAG Management Committee on October 14, 2015.

5C. Project Changes Report on September Activities - Amendment and Administrative Modification to the FY 2014-2018 MAG Transportation Improvement Program, and as Needed, to the 2035 Regional Transportation Plan Submitted to ADOT on September 3, 2015 and September 17, 2015

Due to the late announcement of Federal Transit Administration (FTA) and Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) regional allocations, on August 26, 2015, the MAG Regional Council granted approval for MAG to make modifications to work years to advance previously approved projects, to provide detailed TIP listings for prioritized projects to ensure that all FHWA obligation authority and FTA apportionments are utilized for Federal Fiscal Year 2015, and related work phase changes. Project changes and additions were submitted to the Arizona Department of Transportation (ADOT) for approval and inclusion in the State Transportation Improvement Program on September 3, 2015, that addressed FTA Section 5310 Enhanced Mobility of Seniors and Individuals with Disabilities Transportation Program and general FY 2015 needed changes. The September 17, 2015 submittal was redistributed work phase funding to save prospective financing charges estimated at \$2.9 million.

5D. 2015 Strategic Transportation Safety Plan

The MAG Regional Council, by consent, approved the 2015 Strategic Transportation Safety Plan. In July 2013, MAG initiated a study to develop a Strategic Transportation Safety Plan. The Plan establishes the regional vision, goals, objectives, strategies, countermeasures, and performance measures for making systematic improvements necessary to improve road safety in the region. The study was closely coordinated to be consistent with a similar effort that was underway to develop the state's Strategic Highway Safety Plan. The cost to implement the Draft MAG Strategic Transportation Safety Plan is estimated at \$7.8 million per year. Federal Highway Safety Improvement Program (HSIP) funds are

currently the only available funding source in the region for road safety improvements, other than local agency funds. In May 2015, the Arizona Department of Transportation (ADOT) announced a new process for programming federal HSIP funds for safety projects starting in FY 2019. The Draft Plan has been developed to be consistent with the Arizona Strategic Highway Safety Plan and the new ADOT HSIP process and related guidance. The 2015 Strategic Transportation Safety Plan was recommended for approval by the MAG Transportation Safety Committee on September 27, 2015, by the MAG Transportation Review Committee on October 1, 2015, and by the MAG Management Committee on October 14, 2015.

5E. Southeast Valley Transit System Study

The MAG Regional Council, by consent, accepted the Southeast Valley Transit System Study findings and conceptual recommendations. The Southeast Valley Transit System Study, a joint study effort between the Maricopa Association of Governments (MAG) and Valley Metro, was launched in January 2014 to analyze transit services and ridership demand in transit-established and transit-aspiring communities within a multi-jurisdictional subarea of the MAG region. The study is the third in a series of sub-regional transit studies undertaken in the region and its result is a tool to help in future system planning. The study area encompasses the cities of Apache Junction, Chandler, Mesa, and Tempe, and the towns of Gilbert, Guadalupe, and Queen Creek. The study area also includes portions of the City of Phoenix (village of Ahwatukee) and unincorporated Maricopa County. In addition, the study also includes members of the expanded MAG boundary, which are Pinal County, the City of Maricopa, the Town of Florence and the Pinal County portion of the Gila River Indian Community. This study also included input from the City of Coolidge, a transit partner that operates within the study area. The study had two purposes: To identify potential efficiencies in the current service and to identify an effective, market-defined, efficient and performance-driven transit system that meets the internal mobility needs of the subarea and ties the subarea to the overall regional transit system. The Southeast Valley Transit System Study was recommended for acceptance on September 10, 2015, by the MAG Transit Committee, and on October 1, 2015, by the MAG Transportation Review Committee and by the MAG Management Committee on October 14, 2015. This study item was also being presented to the Valley Metro Transit Management Committee and the Regional Public Transportation Authority Board in late October.

5F. Conformity Consultation

The Maricopa Association of Governments is conducting consultation on a conformity assessment for an amendment and administrative modification to the FY 2014-2018 MAG Transportation Improvement Program and 2035 Regional Transportation Plan. The amendment and administrative modification involve several projects, including Arterial Life Cycle Program, Highway Safety Improvement Program, and transit projects. The amendment includes projects that may be categorized as exempt from conformity determinations. The administrative modification includes minor project revisions that do not require a conformity determination.

5G. Appointment of MAG Elderly and Persons with Disabilities Transportation Program Ad Hoc Committee Vice Chair

This item was removed from the agenda.

5H. Appointment of the MAG Economic Development Committee Greater Phoenix Leadership Representative

The MAG Regional Council, by consent, approved the appointment of the Honorable Neil Giuliano, as the Greater Phoenix Leadership representative on the MAG Economic Development Committee. In June 2015, the MAG Regional Council approved changes to the composition of the MAG Economic Development Committee (EDC). The composition includes fifteen business member positions that have two-year terms with possible reappointment by recommendation of the Executive Committee and Regional Council. In September 2014, the EDC business member positions were approved by the Executive Committee and Regional Council. Since that time, the President and CEO of the Greater Phoenix Leadership, Tom Franz, announced his retirement. The Honorable Neil Giuliano was selected to serve as the President and CEO of Greater Phoenix Leadership, effective November 2015.

6. Consultant Selection for the FY 2016 Cost Risk Analysis for the MAG Regional Freeway and Highway Program On-Call List

Ms. Chaun Hill, MAG staff, reported that the FY 2016 MAG Unified Planning Work Program and Annual Budget, approved by the MAG Regional Council on May 27, 2015, included \$200,000 for the FY 2016 Cost Risk Analysis for the MAG Regional Freeway and Highway Program. On July 28, 2015, MAG issued a Request for Qualifications to create an on-call consulting list for the project. Ms. Hill stated that six firms submitted Statements of Qualifications. She noted that on September 22, 2015, a multi-agency evaluation team reviewed the Statements of Qualifications and recommended to MAG the selection of HDR and WPS/Parsons Brinckerhoff for the on-call list for the FY 2016 Cost Risk Analysis for the MAG Regional Freeway and Highway Program. On October 14, 2015, the MAG Management Committee recommended approval of the selection of HDR and WPS/Parsons Brinckerhoff.

Chair Lane thanked Ms. Hill for her report. He asked members if they had questions.

Councilmember Jack Sellers remarked that he speaks very highly to everyone of the cost risk analysis, and he is really impressed with the value obtained through the cost risk analysis process.

With no further questions, Councilmember Jack Sellers moved approval of the selection of HDR and WPS/Parsons Brinckerhoff to participate in the FY 2016 Cost Risk Analysis for the MAG Regional Freeway and Highway Program on-call list. Mr. Joseph LaRue seconded, and the motion passed unanimously.

7. New Strengthened Ozone Standard

Ms. Lindy Bauer, MAG staff, stated that ozone is a ground level pollution problem in the MAG region during the summer. It is formed by a chemical reaction that occurs between volatile organic compounds and nitrogen oxide emissions in the presence of sunlight, minimal wind, and higher temperatures.

Ms. Bauer stated that the biggest contributor of volatile organic compound emissions is natural vegetation. Other contributors are lawn and garden equipment, cars and trucks, manufacturing, dry cleaners, and industrial, manufacturing and electrical power generating facilities. Ms. Bauer stated that cars and trucks are the biggest contributors to nitrogen oxide emissions.

Ms. Bauer stated that under the Clean Air Act, the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) is required to review the national ambient air quality standards every five years in order to protect public health. On October 1, 2015, the EPA issued a tightened ozone standard from 0.075 parts per million to 0.070 parts per million. Ms. Bauer noted that this new standard might seem to be small, but it will be difficult to achieve.

Ms. Bauer noted that by October 1, 2016, states are required to submit designation recommendations for nonattainment/attainment to EPA. Ms. Bauer stated that by October 1, 2017, EPA anticipates finalizing the designations, classifications, and attainment dates based upon 2014-2016 ozone monitoring data. She noted that nonattainment areas will have until 2020 to 2037 to meet the standard.

Ms. Bauer stated that MAG has more than 80 control measures in place for ozone and has met two of the ozone standards that EPA has lowered over time. She noted that an EPA map of counties measuring above the new ozone standard in 2015 and noted that nine of ten Arizona counties do not meet the new 2015 ozone standard. Ms. Bauer stated that ADEQ indicated that perhaps after this summer, only three counties will not meet the standard: Maricopa, Gila, and Yuma.

Ms. Bauer stated that EPA has indicated that there are existing and proposed federal rules that will help regions meet the new standard. She stated that EPA analysis indicates that these rules will help the vast majority of the counties in the U.S. meet the standard by 2025 without additional actions. Ms. Bauer displayed an EPA map that showed only 14 U.S. counties are projected to measure ozone above the new ozone standard in 2025, none of them in Arizona.

Ms. Bauer stated that MAG is trying to encourage economic development and we could end up with tighter controls on industry. She addressed issues with the new standard. Ms. Bauer displayed maps from May 29, 2011, of transport from California, which combined with transport from Mexico on May 30, and moved through Arizona on May 31. Ms. Bauer stated that this region cannot control transport, which impacts the boundary and background concentrations for the Maricopa nonattainment area, and as the standard is lowered, background becomes a larger portion of the problem.

Ms. Bauer then addressed exceptional events issues. She pointed out a satellite image of a wildfire in San Bernardino on June 19, and its smoke then made its way to the Maricopa nonattainment area and the monitors went over the standard on June 20.

Ms. Bauer stated that boundary issues are very important. The MAG region has a large ozone boundary of 5,017 square miles. She stated the new standard will have impacts on conformity. Ms. Bauer stated that questions include where the boundary will be drawn.

Ms. Bauer stated that there are five classifications for ozone in the Clean Air Act: extreme, severe, serious, moderate, and marginal. She noted that the MAG region hopes to be in the marginal category, which has fewer requirements to meet than those areas with more severe air quality problems. Ms. Bauer stated that MAG will be working with the Maricopa County Air Quality Department, the Arizona Department of Environmental Quality, ADOT, and the Western Regional Alliance (a group of Intermountain West MPOs).

Ms. Bauer noted that the Management Committee recommended that MAG coordinate with the Western Regional Alliance on the impacts of the new ozone standard.

Chair Lane thanked Ms. Bauer and asked if there were questions.

Mayor Linda Kavanagh asked for clarification that natural vegetation was worse than other categories. Ms. Bauer replied that while plants and trees are beneficial for controlling PM-10 because they stabilize the soil, some of the natural vegetation produces isoprenes that are more reactive for ozone than vehicle exhaust. She pointed out the mountain haze in the eastern U.S., such as the Smoky Mountains, is naturally occurring ozone. Ms. Bauer noted that MAG is not advocating cutting down trees to control ozone emissions.

Mayor Kavanagh stated that EPA is holding the ozone plume from California and Mexico against us, but not the wildfires. Ms. Bauer stated that currently, transport is not considered an exceptional event, but wildfires are considered exceptional events. She noted that EPA will be issuing regulations to help control interstate transport, in addition to federal measures that should help with transport. Ms. Bauer remarked that the region cannot control transport. She added that there are also emissions coming to our country and our region from China, Canada, and Mexico.

Mayor Kavanagh asked about the plan for reducing emissions from cars and trucks. Ms. Bauer stated that the EPA has tightened the tailpipe standards, which includes a cleaner burning fuel that will start in 2017. She added that EPA has also proposed tightening the tailpipe standards for medium and heavy duty vehicles as well, and this will have a benefit for ozone.

Mayor Kavanagh remarked that lower cost of registration for older vehicles versus the higher cost for new vehicles does not encourage the purchase of new vehicles that pollute less.

Chair Lane asked for clarification if we are in the period where comments were being accepted by EPA or had the rule been finalized. Ms. Bauer replied that the comment period ended in March and EPA has issued the final rule.

Chair Lane asked if MAG had commented on the proposal. Ms. Bauer replied that at the time, the Arizona Legislature was in the process of passing a Senate concurrent memorial to urge the EPA to not

tighten the ozone standard. She added that Governor Ducey sent a letter to the EPA urging that the ozone standard not be tightened.

Chair Lane asked if anything other than opposition was submitted during the comment period, such as enforcement regulations that might be imposed on a state that is subjected to a plume. He asked the origin of the plume shown in the slide because it looked like it came from somewhere in the Pacific Ocean.

Ms. Bauer replied that MAG staff did the meteorological research, which showed the plume came from California. She noted that sometimes, emissions in the air do form ozone, and sometimes emissions do not form ozone. Ms. Bauer stated that staff could research the origin for further detail.

Chair Lane stated that regardless of the origin, the plume still was being transported over Arizona. He indicated that the comment period would have been the time to note the impacts to states that did not produce a plume and have no control over it. Chair Lane asked about the other considerations in federal regulations that could mitigate impacts that Ms. Bauer had mentioned.

Ms. Bauer replied that EPA indicated that some of its federal control measures that will be applied across the country should help reduce interstate transport.

Chair Lane asked if any of that had been instituted.

Ms. Bauer stated that EPA issued the Clean Power Plan, with which Arizona has some issues, reduces power plant emissions. She noted that EPA thinks they contribute to transport.

Chair Lane asked if the EPA had presented any cost/benefit analysis of what it is striving to achieve with the new ozone standard.

Ms. Bauer replied that noted on the fact sheet, EPA determined the number of deaths that would be prevented and the very high cost to implement the new ozone standard. She noted that Arizona has issues with the Clean Power Plan. One of the contentions is that EPA did not adequately research the cost burden.

Mr. Dennis Smith stated that some monitors are recording ozone standards in national parks. He said that the Western Regional Alliance wants to work with MAG on strategies, especially transport. Mr. Smith stated there are transport regulations in the eastern U.S. but not in the western states. By working together, the Intermountain West states could work on a potential legislative remedy.

Mayor Michael LeVault asked if the EPA has proof that ozone emissions from vegetation cause health problems.

Ms. Bauer stated that EPA looked at ozone concentrations. Ms. Bauer noted that the biogenics study MAG conducted a few years ago included ozone and isoprene emissions. She said that EPA has issued

emissions factors. Ms. Bauer stated that there is no guarantee that biogenics will form ozone because the ozone is not directly emitted.

Mayor LeVault remarked on the potential of the new ozone standard for destroying our economy.

Mayor John Cook noted that the one place on the map where no ozone emissions are shown is the Four Corners area, where coal is being used to generate power. He noted that this is an area EPA complains about. Mayor Cook added that another concern would be the Interstate 11 corridor that will benefit the entire nation, but will bring more traffic and more ozone and will require that Arizona meet higher standards.

Mayor Cathy Carlat moved approval that MAG work cooperatively with the Western Regional Alliance to lessen the impact of the new 2015 ozone standard. Vice Mayor Robin Barker seconded, and the motion passed unanimously.

8. City of Phoenix Resource Innovation Campus and Regional Green Organics Project

Ms. Julie Hoffman, MAG staff, reported that in 2013, the City of Phoenix announced a new sustainability initiative, Reimagine Phoenix, to divert 40 percent of waste from the landfill by 2020. She said Phoenix has been working on transforming trash into a resource. She stated that the city has provided presentations on solid waste diversion to the MAG Solid Waste Advisory Committee and the MAG Management Committee. Ms. Hoffman introduced Mr. John Trujillo, Director of Public Works from the City of Phoenix, who continued the presentation.

Mr. Trujillo stated that Mayor Greg Stanton issued a challenge for the city to be more sustainable and limit impacts to finite resources. He noted that when Reimagine Phoenix began in 2013, the City diverted 16 percent of material from its landfill and this has increased to 20 percent, which is a 25 percent increase. Mr. Trujillo noted that the national average increase since 2013 was only three percent.

Mr. Trujillo stated that the City of Phoenix is leveraging partnerships, technology, innovation, and other strategies to create a sustainable solid waste program. He stated that the City has been examining ways to enhance its solid waste program, making more efficient use of existing infrastructure, and providing a forum that connects with innovators and other organizations to create, implement and enhance sustainability solutions. Mr. Trujillo remarked that Phoenix is working to create a circular economy to divert materials from the landfills, keep resources in use as long as possible, and recover products at the end. He stated that the City wants to recover and regenerate those products here in Phoenix. Mr. Trujillo said that currently, material goes to the landfill or is shipped to China. He noted that public-private partnerships are needed to make this happen.

Mr. Trujillo stated that the Resource Innovation and Solutions Network (RISN) was launched in July 2014. It represents a \$3 million investment by the City of Phoenix and Arizona State University. Mr. Trujillo noted that its mission is to accelerate the global transition to sustainable resource management. He said that the Resource Innovation and Solutions Network focuses on new technologies and markets; connects with innovators and organizations to create, implement and enhance sustainable solutions;

provides access to research and expertise; and provides shared knowledge from like-minded organizations working to create economic value that drives a sustainable circular economy. He noted that Arizona State University is the leading sustainability and leading innovation institution in the U.S.

Mr. Trujillo gave an example of collaboration. He stated that Gilbert, Mesa, Peoria, Scottsdale, Tempe, the Salt River Pima-Maricopa Indian Community, Pima County, and Maricopa County are working with the City of Phoenix on a green organics sustainable program. Mr. Trujillo stated that 50 percent of the materials sent to the landfill are compostable products. He said that they hope the program will provide opportunities for capital development and facilities that would otherwise be beyond the reach of a single jurisdiction.

Mr. Trujillo stated that another component of the Resource Innovation and Solutions Network will be creating the Technology Solutions Incubator to help transform trash into resources. He said they are looking at start-up technologies and manufacturing processes that do that, and the Resource Innovation and Solutions Network would provide office, workshop, and/or testing research and development space, support and technical services, and access to sustainability researchers and experts.

Mr. Trujillo stated that earlier this year, the City of Phoenix issued the Reimagine Phoenix Call for Innovators. The Call for Innovators requested information that would allow the City to identify the highest and best uses for the materials deposited by Phoenix residents in their trash and recycle bins and to understand the business opportunities that would create local economic activity from those materials. The City received 118 responses from 78 organizations. Mr. Trujillo remarked that each one of these could become one or more new businesses that not only divert material from the landfill, but create new jobs.

Mr. Trujillo showed a map of the Resource Innovation Campus, which is in an industrial area located at 27th Avenue and Lower Buckeye Road, being created by the City that will include a transfer station, recycling facility, organics facility, business/manufacturers, and the Resource Innovation and Solutions Network Incubator. Mr. Trujillo pointed out that the composting operation will be in operation by 2016.

Mr. Trujillo stated that they want to ensure the facility is used for education and communication on the importance of diversion, sustainability, and a circular economy. He said that they have a Call for Artists on creating something from recycled garbage. Mr. Trujillo stated that a sustainable solid waste program can create opportunities for residents, businesses, entrepreneurs, and innovators.

Chair Lane thanked Mr. Trujillo for his presentation. He said that it sounded like a very innovative program.

Mayor Greg Stanton noted that Mr. Trujillo is a nationally recognized speaker on sustainability. He said that this program is an example of how a government department can change its culture from pick up and dumping garbage to one of sustainability. Mayor Stanton stated that for-profit private sector individuals will be located on the Resource Innovation Campus working with city employees helping the City with options for materials that would otherwise end up in a landfill and providing reuse

possibilities. He stated this is the program in which Phoenix could become nationally known as a sustainability expert because no other entity is doing this at this level.

9. Draft FY 2016 Early Phase Input Opportunity Report

Mr. Jason Stephens, MAG staff, provided a report on the FY 2016 Early Phase Input Opportunity. Mr. Stephens noted that any time the MAG Transportation Improvement Program is developed, MAG conducts a public input process. He stated that input was received on the draft listing of projects for the new FY 2017-2021 MAG Transportation Improvement Program. During the early phase, MAG received public comment at its policy committees, as well as at small and large group presentations, and via a direct mailing. Approximately 4,000 postcards were distributed to solicit input.

Mr. Stephens stated that MAG received several responses for project suggestions related to bicycles, air quality, and transit. He stated that these suggestions were forwarded to member agency staff of relevant agencies for consideration and are included in the report.

Chair Lane thanked Mr. Stephens for his report. No questions from the Council were noted.

10. Legislative Update

Mr. Nathan Pryor, MAG staff, provided a report on legislative items of interest. He stated that the City of Phoenix and the City of Maricopa were awarded Transportation Investment Generating Economic Recovery (TIGER) grants. He said that Phoenix was awarded \$10.3 million for the Grand Canal Bike and Pedestrian Improvements Project, which will complete canal trails and add lighting, neighborhood connections, bridges, and signalized crossings for bicyclists and pedestrians on approximately eight miles of the Grand Canalscape. Mr. Pryor stated that the City of Maricopa was awarded \$15 million for the State Route 347 Grade Separation Project, which includes construction of a grade-separated highway overpass on a new alignment at the intersection of State Route 347 and a double track rail line.

Mr. Pryor stated that the TIGER grant is an extremely competitive pot of funding. He noted that a total of \$500 million was available in FFY 2015 and more than \$9.8 billion in project applications were received. Mr. Pryor stated that MAG did submit an application for active traffic management on Interstate 17 and a transit ramp from Interstate 10 to downtown Phoenix, but was not awarded. He stated that the good news is that more funding is coming to the region via the Phoenix and Maricopa projects.

Mr. Pryor noted that at each place was a copy of the Governor's proposed state education settlement, which has been agreed to by the school districts, governor's office and legislative leadership in settling a five year lawsuit by school districts against the Legislature. Mr. Pryor stated that MAG staff participated in an impromptu conference call on the settlement the day before that was coordinated by Ms. Sandra Watson of the Arizona Commerce Authority with Mr. Kirk Adams from the Governor's Office. He said that during the conference call, the Governor's Office requested that the Governor's plan be shared with the Regional Council. Mr. Pryor noted that there could be a special session of the Legislature this week.

Mr. Pryor explained broad details of the agreement, which increases state land distribution from the current 2.5 percent to 6.9 percent for 10 years, commits \$50 million for the first five years and then \$75 million five years after that and includes safeguards for the state budget if there is an economic downturn. Mr. Pryor stated that the proposal would require legislative approval and voter approval. Mr. Pryor remarked that a lot of details are yet to be known.

Chair Lane asked if members had questions on this portion of the report.

Mayor Cathy Carlat asked if Mr. Pryor knew if the funding referenced in Section 2, Funding, in the Governor's plan handout included funds from the state General Fund. Mr. Pryor responded that staff has not heard details on the source of the \$50 million and the \$75 million noted in Section 2.

Chair Lane noted that Mr. Pryor was passing along this new information as requested by the Governor's Office and the finer details have not been shared.

Mr. Pryor then reported on Surface Transportation Reauthorization. He said that MAP-21 is set to expire October 29, 2015. Mr. Pryor stated that the House of Representatives passed a three week extension, which could be taken up today or tomorrow, in order to beat the expiration date. He noted that if the Surface Transportation Reauthorization extension does not pass, the Federal Highway Administration could be affected as soon as October 30th.

Mr. Pryor stated that a few months ago, the DRIVE Act (Developing a Reliable, Innovative Vision for the Economy) was passed by the Senate and since then, the House passed its own surface transportation legislation, Surface Transportation Reauthorization and Reform Act (STRR), which is a six-year bill with funding yet to be identified. Mr. Pryor stated that like DRIVE, STRR does not use 2010 census numbers, but 2000 census numbers, which harms high-growth states like Arizona.

Mr. Pryor addressed the proposed Wicker-Booker amendment, which would have increased Surface Transportation Program (STP) funding to urbanized areas, including the MAG region. He noted that STP funding to the MAG region under MAP-21 totalled \$51.5 million, under DRIVE Act, \$48.5 million, and under the Wicker-Booker amendment to the DRIVE Act, \$61.1 million. Mr. Pryor stated that the Wicker-Booker amendment was not voted on.

Mr. Pryor stated that there is a similar amendment to the Wicker-Booker amendment in the House called the Davis-Titus amendment. Mr. Pryor stated that the Davis-Titus amendment would increase the Surface Transportation Program funding to urbanized areas, like the MAG region. Mr. Pryor stated that the increase would use a more phased-in approach, compared to the Wicker-Booker amendment. He pointed out that in the Wicker-Booker amendment, the \$61 million to MAG would be up-front and the funding in the Davis-Titus amendment would result in \$69 million to the MAG region.

Mr. Pryor noted that the Davis-Titus amendment was not adopted by the House Transportation and Infrastructure Committee. He said that 31 of 59 members intended to vote to adopt the amendment, however, the chairman exercised his influence and the amendment was withdrawn. The bill sponsors stated that they intend to work with the chairman to reach a compromise on the proposed amendment

so that it may be considered for adoption on the House floor. Mr. Pryor thanked the member agencies that reached out to delegation members looking for support of this amendment. He added that there will be more to come on this as the STRR is likely to come to the House floor in the next couple of weeks.

No questions from the Council were noted.

11. Request for Future Agenda Items

Topics or issues of interest that the Regional Council would like to have considered for discussion at a future meeting will be requested.

No requests were noted.

12. Comments from the Council

An opportunity will be provided for Regional Council members to present a brief summary of current events. The Regional Council 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.

Mayor John Lewis expressed support for the Cactus League team that trains in Surprise and is in the World Series.

Mayor Linda Kavanagh requested that the presentation for agenda item #7 be provided to members.

Mayor Greg Stanton announced that a job fair for youth aged 16 to 24 will be held on October 30, 2015, at the Phoenix Convention Center, 100 N. 3rd Street. The website for the job fair is posted at <http://100kopportunities.org/phoenix/>. Mayor Stanton remarked that they expect that more than 1,000 jobs will be filled at the job fair. He encouraged members to disseminate this information in their cities. Mayor Stanton added that the CEO of Starbucks and some of his friends will be at the job fair. He requested that members email him if they plan to attend so he will be able to greet them.

Adjournment

There being no further business, the meeting adjourned at 12:55 p.m.

Chair

Secretary

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

DATE:

December 8, 2015

SUBJECT:

2015 Annual Report on the Status of the Implementation of Proposition 400

SUMMARY:

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. The 2015 Annual Report is the 11th report in this series, covering progress through the fiscal year ending June 30, 2015, and reviewing the program outlook through June 30, 2026. State law also requires that MAG hold a public hearing on the report after it is issued. A public hearing on the Draft 2015 Annual Report was held November 19, 2015.

The Draft 2015 Annual Report on the Status of the Implementation of Proposition 400 addresses project status, financing, and the overall outlook for program implementation. All projects for the major transportation modes, as defined in the MAG Regional Transportation Plan, are being monitored, whether they specifically receive sales tax funding or not. The annual report process draws heavily on data from the Freeway/Highway, Arterial Street, and Transit Life Cycle Programs. A Summary of Findings and Issues from the 2015 Annual Report has been enclosed and the entire document is available on the MAG website.

PUBLIC INPUT:

No public input has been received to date regarding this agenda item.

PROS & CONS:

PROS: Preparation of the Annual Report on the Status of the Implementation of Proposition 400 is required in State statutes.

CONS: None.

TECHNICAL & POLICY IMPLICATIONS:

TECHNICAL: The information in the Annual Report represents a “snapshot” of the status of the Proposition 400 program. As new information becomes available, it will be incorporated into subsequent annual updates of the report.

POLICY: The annual report process represents a valuable tool to monitor the MAG Regional Transportation Plan and identify changing conditions that may require plan and program adjustments.

ACTION NEEDED:

Information and discussion.

PRIOR COMMITTEE ACTIONS:

Transportation Policy Committee: The Draft 2015 Annual Report is included on the December 9, 2015, Transportation Policy Committee agenda for information and discussion.

MAG Management Committee: The Draft 2015 Annual Report was included on the November 18, 2015, MAG Management Committee agenda for information and discussion.

MEMBERS ATTENDING

- Darryl H. Crossman, Litchfield Park, Chair
- Tom Remes for Ed Zuercher, Phoenix
- Matt Busby for Bryant Powell, Apache Junction
- Jessica Blazina for David Fitzhugh, Avondale
- Stephen Cleveland, Buckeye
- * Gary Neiss, Carefree
- Peter Jankowski, Cave Creek
- Marsha Reed, Chandler
- Dr. Spencer Isom, El Mirage
- # Jess Knudson for Lisa Garcia, Florence
- Alfonso Rodriguez for Phil Dorchester, Fort McDowell Yavapai Nation
- # Grady Miller, Fountain Hills
- # Ernest Rubi, Gila Bend
- * Tina Notah, Gila River Indian Community
- Patrick Banger, Gilbert
- Brent Stoddard for Dick Bowers, Glendale
- Brian Dalke, Goodyear
- * Rosemary Arellano, Guadalupe
- * Gregory Rose, City of Maricopa
- Kari Kent for Christopher Brady, Mesa
- Dawn Marie Buckland for Kevin Burke, Paradise Valley
- Carl Swenson, Peoria
- # Louis Andersen for Greg Stanley, Pinal County
- John Kross, Queen Creek
- * Bryan Meyers, Salt River Pima-Maricopa Indian Community
- Brad Lundahl for Fritz Behring, Scottsdale
- # Bob Wingenroth, Surprise
- Andrew Ching, Tempe
- Reyes Medrano, Jr., Tolleson
- Joshua Wright, Wickenburg
- Jeanne Blackman, Youngtown
- Sintra Hoffman for John Halikowski, ADOT
- Tom Manos, Maricopa County
- Wulf Grote for Steve Banta, Valley Metro/RPTA

* Those members neither present nor represented by proxy.

Participated by telephone conference call. + Participated by videoconference call.

CONTACT PERSON:

Roger Herzog, MAG, (602) 254-6300, Rherzog@azmag.gov

DRAFT 2015 ANNUAL REPORT ON THE STATUS OF THE IMPLEMENTATION OF PROPOSITION 400

Summary of Findings and Issues

The *2015 Annual Report on the Status of the Implementation of Proposition 400* has been prepared by the Maricopa Association of Governments (MAG) in response to Arizona Revised Statute (ARS) 28-6354. ARS 28-6354 requires that MAG annually issue a report on the status of projects funded through Proposition 400, addressing project construction status, project financing, changes to the MAG Regional Transportation Plan, and criteria used to develop priorities. In addition, background information is provided on the overall transportation planning, programming and financing process. The 2015 Annual Report is the 11th report in this series, covering progress through the fiscal year ending June 30, 2015, and reviewing the program outlook through June 30, 2026. The key findings and issues from the 2015 Annual Report are summarized below.

MAG REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION PLAN

The MAG Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) provides the blueprint for the implementation of Proposition 400. By Arizona state law, the revenues from the half-cent sales tax for transportation must be used on projects and programs identified in the RTP adopted by MAG. The RTP identifies specific projects and revenue allocations by transportation mode, including freeways and other routes on the State Highway System, major arterial streets, and public transportation systems.

- A major amendment to add a five-mile light rail transit (LRT) extension on South Central Avenue was approved.

On December 3, 2014, the MAG Regional Council approved a major amendment to the MAG 2035 RTP to add a five-mile light rail transit (LRT) extension on Central Avenue from downtown Phoenix (near the existing LRT turns at Washington and Jefferson Streets) to Baseline Road. The current timeframe for opening of the facility would be 2034-35. The air quality conformity analysis for this major amendment was approved by the MAG Regional Council on June 24, 2015.

- Revised alignments and cost changes to the Tempe Streetcar and the Phoenix Northwest - Phase II Light Rail Transit Extension were approved.

On March 25, 2015, the MAG Regional Council approved an amendment to the MAG 2035 RTP to reflect revised alignment and cost changes to the Tempe Streetcar, and to the Phoenix Northwest - Phase II Light Rail Transit Extension. The new Tempe Streetcar route travels on Rio Salado Parkway

from the Marina Heights development west to Mill Avenue, to the Mill/Ash avenues downtown loop and south to Apache Boulevard, then east to Dorsey Lane. The revised three-mile Tempe Streetcar project cost estimate is \$177 million. The year of opening for the three-mile Tempe Streetcar project is now 2018. The corridor alignment for Phase II of the Phoenix Northwest LRT was extended to cross I-17 near Mountain View Road, ending west of I-17. The revised project is estimated to cost \$295 million.

- The next iteration of the RTP will be a transitional update maintaining the existing Life Cycle Program structure, but incorporating federally required performance measures and targets.

Current federal transportation legislation – the Moving Ahead for Progress in the 21st Century Act (MAP-21) – establishes performance-based programs and sets forth requirements for performance goals, outcomes and targets. It is anticipated that the next iteration of the RTP will be a transitional update maintaining the existing Life Cycle Program structure, but incorporating federally required performance measures and targets. MAG staff efforts are focusing on the development of specific performance measures and targets for the transportation system in the MAG metropolitan planning area. A collaborative Performance Measures and Targets Advisory Group has been convened to gather input from MAG member agencies with respect to the requirements anticipated in the Metropolitan Planning and Asset Management Proposed Rules from the Federal Highway Administration.

HALF-CENT SALES TAX AND OTHER TRANSPORTATION REVENUES

The half-cent sales tax for transportation, approved through Proposition 400, is a key funding source for the MAG Regional Transportation Plan (RTP), representing nearly half the regional revenues for the Plan. In addition to the half-cent sales tax, there are a number of other RTP funding sources, which are primarily from state and federal agencies.

- Fiscal Year 2015 receipts from the Proposition 400 half-cent sales tax were 4.5 percent higher than receipts in FY 2014.

The receipts from the Proposition 400 half-cent sales tax in FY 2015 totaled approximately \$382 million, corresponding to a 4.4 percent increase over the total of \$366 million in FY 2014. This represents the fifth consecutive year of higher revenues since FY 2010. However, the collections for FY 2015 remain 2.2 percent lower than those in FY 2007.

- Forecasts of Proposition 400 half-cent revenues are 2.1 percent lower for the period FY 2016 through FY 2026, compared to the 2014 Annual Report estimate.

Future half-cent revenues for the period FY 2016 through FY 2026 are currently forecasted to total \$5.3 billion. This amount is \$115 million, or 2.1 percent, lower than the forecast for the same period presented in the 2014 Annual Report. This decrease reflects a slightly lower annual growth rate in revenues forecasted for this period (4.4 versus 4.6 percent). The Proposition 400 half-cent revenue forecasts will be updated again in the fall of 2015.

- Forecasts of total ADOT Funds dedicated to the MAG area for FY 2016 through FY 2026 are 3.9 percent higher than the 2014 Annual Report estimate.

The forecast for ADOT Funds for FY 2016 through FY 2026 totals \$2.7 billion, which is 3.9 percent higher than the 2014 Annual Report forecast of \$2.6 billion for the same period. This increase reflects funding allocation adjustments in the ADOT five-year construction program.

- Forecasts of total MAG federal transportation funds for FY 2016 through FY 2026 are 0.9 percent lower than the 2014 Annual Report estimate.

Total MAG federal funding for the period FY 2016 through FY 2026 is forecasted to total \$2.3 billion. This is about a 0.9 percent decrease from the slightly higher amount forecasted for the same period in the 2014 Annual Report. These forecasts are only for those MAG federal fund sources that are utilized in the Life Cycle Programs. Additional federal funds are received in the MAG region and applied to other transportation program areas, which are not covered by this report.

- Federal transportation funding levels over the long-term remain uncertain.

On July 6, 2012, President Obama signed legislation known as the 'Moving Ahead for Progress in the 21st Century Act', or 'MAP-21'. The MAG area federal transportation funding forecasts included in 2015 Annual Report correspond to the programs as structured in MAP-21. MAP-21 was originally a two-year transportation reauthorization bill through September 2014, but has been extended several times and, as of this writing, runs through November 20, 2015. A multi-year transportation funding bill is now under consideration at the federal level. The sporadic pattern of federal funding extensions has made long range forecasting of this source considerably more uncertain.

FREEWAY/HIGHWAY LIFE CYCLE PROGRAM

The Freeway/Highway Life Cycle Program extends through FY 2026 and is maintained by the Arizona Department of Transportation (ADOT) to implement freeway/highway projects listed in the MAG Regional Transportation Plan (RTP).

The program utilizes funding from the Proposition 400 half-cent sales tax extension, as well as funding from state and federal revenue sources.

- A number of major freeway/highway construction projects were completed, underway, or advertised for bids during FY 2015.

Projects completed during FY 2015:

- I-10/Perryville Road: Construct new interchange.
- US-60 (71st Avenue to McDowell Road): Roadway improvements.
- Loop 303 (Camelback Road to Glendale Avenue): Construct new freeway.
- Loop 303/I-10: Construct new system interchange (Phase I).

Projects advertised for bids or under construction during FY 2015:

- US-60 Meridian Road Half-diamond Traffic Interchange: Construct new interchange.
- Loop 101 (Shea Blvd. to Loop 202): Construct General Purpose lanes.
- Loop 202 (Loop 101 to Broadway Road): Add General Purpose and High Occupancy Vehicle lanes.
- Loop 303/US-60: Construct new interchange.
- Loop 303 (US-60 to Happy Valley Road): Construct new freeway.
- Loop 303 El Mirage Road Traffic Interchange: Construct new interchange.

- Major progress was made toward construction of the South Mountain Freeway.

The final Environmental Impact Statement for the South Mountain Freeway Corridor was released to the public on September 26, 2014. A Record of Decision by the Federal Highway Administration was published to the public through the Federal Register on March 13, 2015, selecting a build alternative. The Record of Decision is currently in litigation in the U.S. District Court for the District of Arizona. At this time, no stays or injunctions regarding the project have been issued by the court. At the time of this document, the project litigation is under schedule for a judicial decision before project construction commences in May 2016.

In July 31, 2014, it was announced that the South Mountain Freeway would be delivered as a single Public-Private-Partnership Design-Build-Maintain project. A Request for Qualifications was released on October 15, 2014 and a shortlist of three developers was announced on March 19, 2015. A final Request for Proposals (RFP) was released on June 12, 2015 and proposals were due to ADOT on November 2, 2015. Following an evaluation period, ADOT will announce a winning proposal and corresponding developer in January 2016. Assuming successful contract negotiation, the developer will begin design and construction activities in May 2016 with a completion target

of late 2019. This completion date is three-years ahead of previous schedules for the Loop 202/South Mountain Freeway facility.

- Cash flow analysis indicates that there is a positive balance of approximately \$30 million for the Regional Freeway/Highway Life Cycle Program through FY 2026.

During FY 2015, cash flow modeling based on revised revenue forecasts and updated project cost estimates was conducted. This analysis indicated that except for FY 2025 there is a positive ending cash balance for all years through FY 2026, and that there is a positive balance of approximately \$30 million (2015 \$'s) for the total program through FY 2026. This is an improvement compared to a negative ending balance of \$162 million reported in the FY 2014 Annual Report and is due largely to reduced costs associated with preliminary engineering and right-of-way activities.

As in the past, the Freeway/Highway Life Cycle Program will be subjected to continuing analysis, addressing future revenue forecasts and project cost trends. Revised long-range revenue forecasts will be prepared and updated cash flow assessments will be conducted. Based on this analysis, the need for additional program adjustments will be considered during FY 2016.

ARTERIAL STREET LIFE CYCLE PROGRAM

The Arterial Street Life Cycle Program (ALCP) extends through FY 2026 and is maintained by the Maricopa Association of Governments (MAG) to implement arterial street projects in the MAG Regional Transportation Plan (RTP). The Program receives significant funding both from the Proposition 400 half-cent sales tax and federal highway programs, as well as a local match component. Although MAG is charged with the responsibility of administering the overall program, the actual construction of projects is accomplished by local government agencies. MAG distributes the regional share of the funding on a reimbursement basis.

- During FY 2015, a total of \$63 million in ALCP project expenses was reimbursed to the implementing agencies.

During FY 2015, a total of \$63 million in ALCP project expenses was reimbursed to implementing agencies. This included reimbursements to nine individual agencies, as well as funding for projects in the MAG Intelligent Transportation System program. Since the beginning of the program, a total of \$582 million has been disbursed and 54 projects have been completed.

- Continuing progress on projects in the Arterial Street Life Cycle Program has been maintained.

During FY 2015, project overview reports were prepared by the lead agencies for 12 projects in the ALCP. Since the inception of the program, 92 project overviews have been submitted to MAG. Thirteen project agreements were executed in FY 2015. In all, 91 project agreements have been executed to date. Lead agencies deferred approximately \$32 million in federal and regional reimbursements from FY 2015 to later years due to project implementation and local funding issues.

- Projected Arterial Life Cycle Program (ALCP) reimbursements are slightly above estimated future revenues for the period FY 2016 - FY 2026.

Projected Arterial Life Cycle Program reimbursements are slightly above (\$36 million in 2015 \$'s or 3.5 percent) estimated future revenues. This difference is considered to be within the variance of revenue projections and cost estimates, and specific remedial action is not anticipated at this time. On June 24, 2015, the MAG Regional Council approved the FY 2016 ALCP. The temporary elimination of the program bonding and project inflation remained in place. These two actions, combined with adjustments to project schedules, meant that no involuntary funding deferrals were needed.

TRANSIT LIFE CYCLE PROGRAM

The Transit Life Cycle Program (TLCP) is maintained by the Regional Public Transportation Authority (RPTA)/Valley Metro and implements transit projects identified in the MAG Regional Transportation Plan. The RPTA maintains responsibility for administering half-cent sales tax revenues deposited in the Public Transportation Fund for use on transit projects, including light rail transit (LRT) projects. Although RPTA maintains responsibility for the distribution of half-cent funds for light rail projects, the nonprofit corporation of Valley Metro Rail, Inc. was created to oversee the design, construction and operation of the light rail starter segment, as well as future corridor extensions planned for the system.

- One bus route extension was implemented in FY 2015 and additional routes will be funded during the next five years.

Routes Implemented During FY 2015:

- Waddell/Thunderbird (T71): Extended to the City of Peoria.

Routes Planned for Implementation during FY 2016 through FY 2020:

- Van Buren Street (T70): Scheduled Improvement in FY 2016.
- Alma School Road (T43): Scheduled Improvement in FY 2018.
- University Drive (T69); Funding Start in FY 2020.

- Estimated future costs for the Transit Life Cycle Program are in balance with project future funds for the period of FY 2016 through FY 2026.

Estimated future costs for the period of FY 2016 through FY 2026 are in balance with project future funds available with a remainder of approximately \$6.0 million (2015 \$'s). Valley Metro continually works with its members to find the optimal mix of local, regional and federal funds for the projects in the TLCP. The life cycle process requires a balance to be maintained through effective financing and cash flow management, value engineering of projects, and Plan and Program adjustments as necessary.

- Federal discretionary funding for transit continues to be an important issue.

A significant portion of the funding for the Light Rail Transit/High Capacity Transit system is awarded by the US Department of Transportation through the discretionary "New Starts Program". The MAG area is subject to a highly competitive process with other regions for this federal funding, resulting in uncertain timing and amounts of New Starts monies over the long term. Therefore, prospective New Starts awards require careful monitoring. Beyond the "New Starts Program" for the Light Rail Transit/High Capacity Transit system, other revenues from the Federal Transit Administration are a key source of funding for the bus capital program. At the federal level, continued pressure to reduce spending could result in decreased federal revenues for the TLCP. In the future, this could put additional projects in jeopardy.

PERFORMANCE MONITORING PROGRAM

The MAG Transportation System Performance Monitoring and Assessment Program has been established to provide a framework for reporting performance at the system and project levels, and serve as a repository of historical, simulated and observed data for the transportation system in the MAG region.

- Freeway vehicle miles of travel (VMT) in the region have increased recently.

Freeway Vehicle Miles of Travel (VMT) per day in the Phoenix-Mesa urbanized area reflects the overall vehicle travel trends for the region. In 2014, there was an increase of 4.8 percent in VMT in the region. This compares with an increase of 1.1 percent in 2013.

- Annual boardings on light rail transit and fixed route bus declined somewhat during FY 2015.

Light rail transit boardings decreased slightly by 0.4 percent, and boardings on bus service (local bus, express, RAPID, circulators, and a rural route) also decreased somewhat by 2.3 percent, during FY 2015 compared to FY 2014.

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

DATE:

December 8, 2015

SUBJECT:

Update on Federal Transit Administration Section 5304 Transit Planning Funding for FY 2016 Call for Projects by the Arizona Department of Transportation

SUMMARY:

In September 2015, the Arizona Department of Transportation (ADOT) issued a Notice of Funding Availability (NOFA) for Local Rural/Small Urban Transit Planning Projects using Federal Transit Administration (FTA) Section 5304 funding. Local and regional public agencies, tribes, and operators of transit services were directed to submit their applications through their Councils of Governments (COGs) and Metropolitan Planning Organizations (MPOs) to ADOT by December 4, 2015. The 5304 grant funding would permit the COG or MPO to conduct rural transit studies.

COGs and MPOs are required to be the lead applicant for this funding application. (Rural providers of transit including public, tribal, non-profit agencies may apply directly to ADOT for the funding through the 5311 application process.)

MAG staff was directed by the MAG Transit Committee in September to coordinate and solicit input from MAG member agencies, Pinal County and peer COG/MPOs, such as Central Arizona Governments (CAG) and the Sun Corridor MPO (SCMPO). The task was to compile a listing of all of the eligible, candidate projects that meet the FTA 5304 guidelines. The projects were identified from previous MAG and Valley Metro studies, with guidance, discussion and input from the MAG Transit Committee and regional member agencies. Upon completion of this process, only three projects met the criteria. Separately, two transit operations projects will be reevaluated by Valley Metro for possible further study and four projects will be submitted by other entities as their own candidate submittals to ADOT.

The list of the three candidate projects that met the FTA 5304 criteria is enclosed for review by the Regional Council. Please refer to the enclosed material for additional information.

PUBLIC INPUT:

None.

PROS & CONS:

PROS: The study will inform the public of the costs, market demand and feasibility associated with implementing rural paratransit services in the MAG Region and rural transit services in the areas of City of Apache Junction and the area of the City of Maricopa.

CONS: This is a grant application submittal. There is no guarantee that the region will receive funding due to the competitive nature of the process. In a result of being a grant recipient and completing studies, recommendations and findings would have no guarantee of local, regional, state or federal funding for project implementation.

TECHNICAL & POLICY IMPLICATIONS:

TECHNICAL: The studies will inform the public of the costs, market demand and feasibility associated with implementing rural paratransit services in the MAG Region and rural transit services in the area of City of Apache Junction and the area of the City of Maricopa.

POLICY: None.

ACTION NEEDED:

Approval of the MAG Region 5304 planning projects list that was submitted to the Arizona Department of Transportation by December 4, 2015.

PRIOR COMMITTEE ACTIONS:

The item was heard by the MAG Transit Committee on October 8, 2015.

MEMBERS ATTENDING

- * ADOT: Jaclyn Meli
- Avondale: Kristen Sexton, Vice Chair
- Buckeye: Sean Banda for Andrea Marquez
- Chandler: Jason Crampton for RJ Zeder
- El Mirage: Jose Macias
- Gilbert: Kristin Myers
- Glendale: Debbie Albert
- Goodyear: Cato Esquivel
- # Maricopa: David Maestas
- * Maricopa County DOT: Denise Lacey
- Mesa: Jodi Sorrell
- * Paradise Valley: Jeremy Knapp
- Peoria: Bill Mattingly for Stuart Kent
- Phoenix: Maria Hyatt, Chair
- Queen Creek: Mohamed Youssef
- Scottsdale: Gregory P. Davies for Madeline Clemann
- Surprise: Martín Lucero
- # Tempe: Robert Yabes
- * Tolleson: Jason Earp
- Valley Metro: Abhi Dayal
- # Youngtown: Grant Anderson

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

CONTACT PERSON:

Marc Pearsall, MAG, (602) 254-6300.

MAG REGION - Rural - Urban

Transit Planning Needs

1-Oct-15

100%

80%

20%

Current notes	Project Name	General Description of Planning Study	Identified in What Plan or during what meeting?	Date of Plan/meeting/ Link	Lead region	Notes	Estimated Total Cost	Federal Request	Local Match
MAG - RPTA	Rural Paratransit Needs Assessment in the MAG Planning Area	MAG was notified that the State of Arizona may cut AHCCCS non-emergency medical transportation by Sept 2016. In lieu of possibility that AHCCCS non-emergency medical transportation cuts will be in affect by Sept 2016, there was a request to study regional paratransit needs within the MAG Study Area. This study may lead to future opportunities to secure 5310 and 5311 funding.	Needs identified in Fall 2015 when notified that the State may cut AHCCCS non-emergency medical transportation by Sept 2016	2016	MAG Region; RPTA Coordination, in coordination with Pinal County	Currently, recipients or qualified consumers of AHCCCS non-emergency medical transportation receive a waiver that permits them to use either a taxi, shuttle of other service for non-emergency. These waivers may be cut by Sept 2016, therefore, the services will be reduced to older persons and disabilities population.	\$ 75,000	X	In kind staff labor
MAG - RPTA -City of Maricopa	City of Maricopa Transit Demand Study (Recommended by David Maestas of Maricopa)	connect Maricopa with Phx/Tempe/Chandler. Also enhance intra-Maricopa transit service for local demand. City is trying to transition from Demand Response to fixed service. History: An express known as Maricopa MAX previously operated between Maricopa and Phoenix/ Tempe. Service was offered from April 2008 to September 2009, and was suspended during Great Recession.	New service outlined in Southeast Valley Transit System Study (SEV) - Recommend using vanpool until 2020-30 as per SEV, then migration to express bus service.	Spring 2016 - Fall 2016	MAG Region; RPTA Coordination, in coordination with Pinal County	Currently, Valley Metro allocated fleet of nine vans operates between Maricopa and Tempe, Chandler. Passengers pay directly to VM. Previous Origin + Destination Survey determined that a strong travel market exists between Maricopa and the technology areas of South Chandler, West Chandler and South Tempe.	\$ 75,000	X	In kind staff labor
MAG - RPTA - City of Apache Junction	Apache Junction Area Transit Demand Study (Recommended by Gao Pham of Apache Jct.)	Study the potential to introduce new transit service between Apache Junction, Mesa, Gateway airport area and Gold Canyon. Use van pool, shuttle, neighborhood circulator or fixed route bus to serve new markets and to connect with existing Mesa transit system.	Southeast Valley Local Transit System Study (SEV)	Spring 2016 - Fall 2016	MAG Region; RPTA Coordination, in coordination with Pinal County	This study would determine the market for new service that would link Maricopa County and Pinal County communities.	\$ 75,000	X	In kind staff labor
RPTA-MAG	Wickenburg Rural Connector (Rte 660)	This line was operated by Valley Metro from 2005-2011 between Wickenburg and Glendale. Service ceased during the Great Recession due to low ridership and funding cuts. If service were reinstated, previous agreements between agencies would need to be revisited and funding identified and committed.	Ongoing dialogue	Ongoing through 2015-2016	MAG UZA & Rural	Valley Metro and Wickenburg to continue dialogue on this item.	X	X	X
RPTA-MAG	Anthem - New River Rural Connector	Expand Valley Metro service to serve new markets near unincorporated Maricopa County / City of Phoenix area. Van pool, shuttle or express from Anthem Outlet to North Phoenix / Deer Valley / Desert Ridge	Public Outreach by RPTA	2015-2016	MAG UZA & Rural	Any recommended service would be new transit Anthem area.	X	X	X
SCMPO - MAG - CAG - Coolidge	Florence / San Tan Valley / Queen Creek / East Valley - Vanpool or Rural Connector Service	Expand Van Pools, CART or Valley Metro service	Southeast Valley Transit System Study (SEV) Pinal County Transit Studies Spring 2014 - Summer 2015	N/A	Rural - coordination with CART, SCMPO, MAG, CAG, Pinal County,	This would be new service linking the far Southeast Valley with Florence and the CART system. Possible coordinatation with SCMPO, Coolidge, Pinal County?	X	X	X
SCMPO-MAG - CART - Coolidge	Coolidge / San Tan Valley / Queen Creek / East Valley - Vanpool or Rural Connector Service	Expand CART / Cotton Express service to serve markets	Southeast Valley Transit System Study (SEV) Pinal County Transit Studies Spring 2014 - Summer 2015	N/A	Rural - coordination with CART, SCMPO, MAG, CAG, Pinal County, Casa Grande	This would be new service linking the far Southeast Valley with Coolidge and the CART system. Possible coordinatation with SCMPO, Coolidge, Pinal County?	X	X	X
SCMPO - Casa Grande - Maricopa Coolidge	Casa Grande / Maricopa service; enhance existing service between Casa Grande / Coolidge / Florence	Expand Cotton Express / CART to serve new markets	Pinal County Transit Studies	N/A	Rural - coordination with CART, SCMPO, MAG, CAG, Pinal County, Casa Grande	This new service would link two large Pinal County cities. Enhancing the service of existing CART system.	X	X	X
CAG	Cobre Valley (Copper country east of the MAG Region)	Expand San Carlos or other to service markets	N/A	N/A	CAG	CAG is the lead agency on this request.	X	X	X
Total							\$225,000	\$0	\$0

MARICOPA ASSOCIATION OF GOVERNMENTS

INFORMATION SUMMARY... for your review

DATE:

December 8, 2015

SUBJECT:

Prioritized List of Proposed PM-10 Certified Street Sweeper Projects for FY 2016 CMAQ Funding

SUMMARY:

The purchase of PM-10 Certified Street Sweepers supports a committed control measure made in regional air quality plans to reduce particulate matter that becomes airborne from vehicle travel on paved roads. The Fiscal Year (FY) 2016 MAG Unified Planning Work Program and Annual Budget and the FY 2014-2018 MAG Transportation Improvement Program contain \$1,530,113 in FY 2016 Congestion Mitigation and Air Quality Improvement (CMAQ) funding to encourage the purchase and utilization of PM-10 Certified Street Sweepers. On October 22, 2015, the MAG Air Quality Technical Advisory Committee recommended a prioritized list of proposed PM-10 Certified Street Sweeper Projects for FY 2016 CMAQ funding and to retain the prioritized list for any additional FY 2016 CMAQ funds that may become available due to closeout or additional funding received by this region. On November 18, 2015, the MAG Management Committee recommended approval of the prioritized list.

Consistent with federal CMAQ guidance, MAG staff evaluated the sweeper projects for estimated emission reductions and cost-effectiveness based on federal funds requested. In addition, the Committee considered other data such as emission reductions, proximity to PM-10 monitors, frequency of sweeping, geographical area to be swept, expansion of areas to be swept, and number of certified street sweepers already purchased.

According to the MAG Federal Fund Programming Guidelines and Procedures, project applications are to be reviewed by the MAG Street Committee. On October 13, 2015, the MAG Street Committee made a recommendation to forward the summary of the discussion from the meeting on the PM-10 Certified Street Sweeper applications evaluated by the Street Committee to the MAG Air Quality Technical Advisory Committee.

PUBLIC INPUT:

An opportunity for public comment was provided at the November 18, 2015, MAG Management Committee meeting and the October 22, 2015, MAG Air Quality Technical Advisory Committee meeting. No public comments were received.

PROS & CONS:

PROS: The purchase of PM-10 certified street sweeper projects supports the measure "PM-10 Efficient Street Sweepers" in the Revised MAG 1999 Serious Area Particulate Plan for PM-10. In addition, the MAG 2012 Five Percent Plan for PM-10 includes PM-10 Certified Street Sweepers.

CONS: None.

TECHNICAL & POLICY IMPLICATIONS:

TECHNICAL: The Serious Area PM-10 Plan contains the committed measure “PM-10 Efficient Street Sweepers”.

POLICY: Using CMAQ funding for the member agency purchase of PM-10 Certified Street Sweepers will assist in the reduction of PM-10 emissions in the Maricopa County PM-10 Nonattainment Area.

ACTION NEEDED:

Approval of a prioritized list of proposed PM-10 Certified Street Sweeper Projects for FY 2016 CMAQ funding and retain the prioritized list for any additional FY 2016 CMAQ funds that may become available due to closeout or additional funding received by this region.

PRIOR COMMITTEE ACTIONS:

Management Committee: On November 18, 2015, the MAG Management Committee recommended approval of a prioritized list of proposed PM-10 Certified Street Sweeper Projects for FY 2016 CMAQ funding and to retain the prioritized list for any additional FY 2016 CMAQ funds that may become available due to closeout or additional funding received by this region.

MEMBERS ATTENDING

- Darryl H. Crossman, Litchfield Park, Chair
- Tom Remes for Ed Zuercher, Phoenix
- Matt Busby for Bryant Powell,
Apache Junction
- Jessica Blazina for David Fitzhugh,
Avondale
- Stephen Cleveland, Buckeye
- * Gary Neiss, Carefree
- Peter Jankowski, Cave Creek
- Marsha Reed, Chandler
- Dr. Spencer Isom, El Mirage
- # Jess Knudson for Lisa Garcia, Florence
- Alfonso Rodriguez for Phil Dorchester,
Fort McDowell Yavapai Nation
- # Grady Miller, Fountain Hills
- # Ernest Rubi, Gila Bend
- * Tina Notah, Gila River Indian Community
- Patrick Banger, Gilbert
- Brent Stoddard for Dick Bowers,
Glendale
- Brian Dalke, Goodyear
- * Rosemary Arellano, Guadalupe

- * Gregory Rose, City of Maricopa
- Kari Kent for Christopher Brady, Mesa
- Dawn Marie Buckland for Kevin Burke,
Paradise Valley
- Carl Swenson, Peoria
- # Louis Andersen for Greg Stanley, Pinal
County
- John Kross, Queen Creek
- * Bryan Meyers, Salt River Pima-Maricopa
Indian Community
- Brad Lundahl for Fritz Behring,
Scottsdale
- # Bob Wingenroth, Surprise
- Andrew Ching, Tempe
- Reyes Medrano, Jr., Tolleson
- Joshua Wright, Wickenburg
- Jeanne Blackman, Youngtown
- Sintra Hoffman for John Halikowski,
ADOT
- Tom Manos, Maricopa County
- Wulf Grote for Steve Banta, Valley
Metro/RPTA

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

Air Quality Technical Advisory Committee: On October 22, 2015, the MAG Air Quality Technical Advisory Committee recommended a prioritized list of proposed PM-10 Certified Street Sweeper Projects for FY 2016 CMAQ funding and to retain the prioritized list for any additional FY 2016 CMAQ funds that may become available due to closeout or additional funding received by this region.

MEMBERS ATTENDING

- Tim Conner, Scottsdale, Chairman
- Jamie McCullough, El Mirage, Vice Chair
- Drew Bryck, Avondale
- Susan Avans for Robert van den Akker, Buckeye
- * Jim Weiss, Chandler
- Jessica Koberna, Gilbert
- Megan Sheldon, Glendale
- * Cato Esquivel, Goodyear
- # Kazi Haque, Maricopa
- Greg Edwards, Mesa
- William Mattingly, Peoria
- Joe Gibbs for Joe Giudice, Phoenix
- # Antonio DeLaCruz, Surprise
- Oddvar Tveit, Tempe
- * Youngtown
- Ramona Simpson, Queen Creek
- # Walter Bouchard, American Lung Association of Arizona
- Kristin Watt, Salt River Project
- * Rebecca Hudson-Nunez, Southwest Gas Corporation
- * Michael Denby, Arizona Public Service Company
- * Gina Grey, Western States Petroleum Association
- * Robert Forrest, Valley Metro/RPTA
- * Dave Berry, Arizona Motor Transport Association
- * Jeanette Fish, Maricopa County Farm Bureau
- Steve Trussell, Arizona Rock Products Association
- * Claudia Whitehead, Greater Phoenix Chamber of Commerce
- Amanda McGennis, Associated General Contractors
- * Spencer Kamps, Homebuilders Association of Central Arizona
- * Mannie Carpenter, Valley Forward
- Kai Umeda, University of Arizona Cooperative Extension
- Beverly Chenausky, Arizona Department of Transportation
- # Eric Massey for Arizona Department of Environmental Quality
- * Environmental Protection Agency
- Hether Krause, Maricopa County Air Quality Department
- Scott DiBiase, Pinal County
- * Michelle Wilson, Arizona Department of Weights and Measures
- @ Ed Stillings, Federal Highway Administration
- * Judi Nelson, Arizona State University
- Stan Belone, Salt River Pima-Maricopa Indian Community

- * Members neither present nor represented by proxy.
- # Participated via telephone conference call.
- + Participated via video conference call.
- @ Ex-Officio member, non-voting member.

Street Committee: On October 13, 2015, the MAG Street Committee made a recommendation to forward the summary of the discussion from the meeting on the PM-10 Certified Street Sweeper applications evaluated by the Street Committee to the MAG Air Quality Technical Advisory Committee.

MEMBERS ATTENDING

- Maria Angelica Deeb, Mesa, Chair
- Chris Hauser, El Mirage, Vice Chair
- Eric Boyles for Susan Anderson, ADOT
- Emile Schmid, Apache Junction
- David Janover, Avondale
- * Jose Heredia, Buckeye
- Kevin Lair, Chandler
- @Aryan Lirange, FHWA
- Morris Taylor for Wayne Costa, Florence
- Tim Oliver, Gila River Indian Community
- * Greg Smith, Gilbert
- Patrick Sage, Glendale
- # Luke Albert for Hugh Bigalk, Goodyear
- Bill Fay, City of Maricopa

- Lee Jimenez, Maricopa County
- Mike Gillespie, Litchfield Park
- * James Shano, Paradise Valley
- Jenny Grote, Phoenix
- Scott Bender, Pinal County
- Ben Wilson, Peoria
- * Janet Martin, Queen Creek
- Jennifer Jack, Salt River Pima-Maricopa Indian Community
- * Phil Kercher, Scottsdale
- Dana Owsiany, Surprise
- German Piedrahita, Tempe
- * Jason Earp, Tolleson
- Grant Anderson, Youngtown

* Members neither present nor represented by proxy.

Members attending by phone.

@ Ex-Officio member, non-voting member.

CONTACT PERSON:

Dean Giles, Air Quality Planning Program Specialist, (602) 254-6300.

MAG Air Quality Technical Advisory Committee Recommendation

Prioritized List of Proposed PM-10 Certified Street Sweeper Projects for FY 2016 CMAQ Funding

\$1,530,113 in CMAQ Funding is Available for Sweeper Projects

										Supplemental Information			
Agency	Federal Cost	Local Cost	Total Cost*	Daily Emission Reduction (Kilograms/day)	Cost-Effectiveness (CMAQ dollar cost per annual metric ton reduced)	The requested certified street sweeper will:				Have local resources been committed for staff or equipment to support the sweeper project?		Please indicate in what geographical area(s) the requested certified street sweeper will operate	Number of certified street sweepers owned and operated by your agency. +
						Replace non-certified sweeper	Expand	Increase Frequency	Replace older certified sweeper	Yes	No		
Peoria #1	\$259,845	\$15,706	\$275,551	552	\$184				✓	✓		Peoria City Limits: Northern Ave. to SR74 and 67 th Ave. to El Mirage Rd.	5
Phoenix #1	\$232,850	\$14,075	\$246,925	158	\$574				✓	✓		Area from 111 th Ave. to 1 st Ave., W. Bethany Home Rd. to W. Pecos Rd.	35
Phoenix #2	\$232,850	\$14,075	\$246,925	158	\$574				✓	✓		Area from 51 st Ave. to 32 nd St., Bell Rd. to Camelback Rd.	35
Mesa	\$166,756	\$10,080	\$176,836	66	\$981		✓				✓	Citywide.	9
Scottsdale	\$214,853	\$12,987	\$227,840	67	\$1,260				✓	✓		Scottsdale Rd. to Pima Rd. and Chaparral Rd. to Thunderbird Rd.	7
Apache Junction	\$270,636	\$16,359	\$286,995	81	\$1,306				✓		✓	Citywide.	3
Peoria #2 ++	\$259,845	\$15,706	\$275,551	53	\$1,915			✓		✓		Peoria City Limits: Northern Ave. to SR74 and 67 th Ave. to El Mirage Rd.	5
Subtotal	\$1,637,635												
Amount Available	\$1,530,113												
Balance	\$-107,522												
Chandler	\$228,749	\$13,827	\$242,576	28	\$3,150				✓	✓		Alma School to Germann, Germann to Gilbert, Gilbert north along city boundary to Elliot, Elliot to Alma School. Also throughout the city.	10
Glendale	\$241,043	\$14,570	\$255,613	5	\$19,497			✓		✓		Citywide.	3
Total	\$2,107,427												

All street sweeper project applications indicate sweeping within four miles of a PM-10 monitor.

* Total cost for the CMAQ eligible portion of the project, excludes ineligible equipment.

+ The total number of certified street sweepers owned and operated by the agency, regardless of funding source.

++ For Peoria #2 sweeper project, initial funding of \$152,323 is available in FY 2016 CMAQ. The remaining \$107,522 of the \$259,845 requested for the project may become available due to year-end closeout including any additional funding received by the region.



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

December 8, 2015

TO: Members of the MAG Regional Council

FROM: Dean Giles, Air Quality Planning Program Specialist

SUBJECT: STATUS OF REMAINING MAG APPROVED PM-10 CERTIFIED STREET SWEEPER PROJECTS THAT HAVE NOT REQUESTED REIMBURSEMENT

A status report is being provided on the remaining PM-10 certified street sweeper projects that have received approval, but have not requested reimbursement (see attached table). To address new Federal Highway Administration procedures to minimize inactive obligations and to assist MAG in reducing the amount of obligated federal funds carried forward in the MAG Unified Planning Work Program and Annual Budget, we are requesting that street sweeper projects for FY 2015 CMAQ funding be purchased and reimbursement requests be submitted to MAG within one year from the date of the MAG authorization letter. In addition, recently MAG was notified of another instance in which a street sweeper disposal occurred without Arizona Department of Transportation (ADOT) approval. ADOT procedures require that member agencies obtain ADOT approval prior to the disposal of a CMAQ-funded street sweeper. The process for requesting ADOT approval is provided in the ADOT Policies and Procedures, Section 8.07 (attached).

At the June 10, 2009 MAG Management Committee meeting, discussion took place on the implications of delaying the expenditure of MAG Federal Funds. In addition to projects listed in the Transportation Improvement Program, street sweepers were given as an example.

In some cases approved sweeper projects have taken up to three years to request reimbursement. The delay in requesting reimbursement for street sweepers results in obligated federal funds being carried forward in the MAG Unified Planning Work Program and Annual Budget. The Federal Highway Administration has expressed concern regarding the amount of obligated funds being carried forward in the Work Program. To assist MAG member agencies in tracking the purchase of approved sweepers, periodic updates will be provided on the status of the reimbursement requests.

The purchase of PM-10 certified street sweeper projects supports the measure "PM-10 Efficient Street Sweepers" in the Revised MAG 1999 Serious Area Particulate Plan for PM-10. In addition, the MAG 2012 Five Percent Plan for PM-10 includes PM-10 Certified Street Sweepers. Also, it is important to note that for the conformity analysis for the Transportation Improvement Program and Regional Transportation Plan, MAG only takes emission reduction credit for approved street sweeper projects that have received reimbursement.

If you have any questions, please call me at (602) 254-6300.

**STATUS OF REMAINING PM-10 CERTIFIED STREET SWEEPER PROJECTS
THAT HAVE RECEIVED APPROVAL**

December 8, 2015

	Remaining Projects	CMAQ Allocated	Status
FY 2015 CMAQ			
Approved January 28, 2015			
To address new Federal Highway Administration procedures to minimize inactive obligations, we are requesting that the street sweepers be purchased and reimbursement requests be submitted to MAG by January 28, 2016.	Phoenix (2)	\$441,872	The new sweepers should arrive around the third week of December 2015.
	Peoria	\$231,215	The city anticipates delivery by the end of December 2015.
	Surprise (1)	\$214,750	The city anticipates delivery before the end of November or first week of December.
Approved February 25, 2015			
To address new Federal Highway Administration procedures to minimize inactive obligations, we are requesting that the street sweepers be purchased and reimbursement requests be submitted to MAG by February 26, 2016.	Surprise (1)	\$214,750	The city anticipates delivery before the end of November or first week of December.
	Pinal County	\$223,473	Pinal County expects delivery of these in January 2016.
Contingency Funds Available June 1, 2015			
To address new Federal Highway Administration procedures to minimize inactive obligations, we are requesting that the street sweepers be purchased and reimbursement requests be submitted to MAG by June 6, 2016.	Maricopa (2)	\$477,374	Order was placed on September 1, 2015 and anticipate delivery in early February for the first sweeper and early March for the second.
	Chandler (2)	\$473,644	Purchase agreement is set to go to City Council for final approval on December 10, 2015.
	Scottsdale	\$201,444	We are expecting delivery of the new sweeper last week of November or first week of December, 2015.
	Pinal County (2)	\$446,946	Pinal County expects delivery of these in January 2016.
Total Remaining Project Costs		\$2,925,468	

MAG staff contact: Lindy Bauer or Dean Giles, (602) 254-6300



ARIZONA DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION POLICIES AND PROCEDURES

FIN-11.08 FEDERAL PROPERTY MANAGEMENT STANDARDS

Effective: October 18, 2010
Supersedes: FIN-11.08 (1/28/2010)
Responsible Office: Fixed Assets
Phone: (602) 712-8028

Review: October 18, 2012
Transmittal: 2010 - October
Page 1 of 9

8.01 PURPOSE

To establish uniform standards governing the use and disposition of property acquired, in whole or in part, with federal funds or whose cost was charged to a project supported by a federal grant.

8.02 SCOPE

This policy applies to all recipients or subrecipients of federal funds through a pass-through entity. The policy is limited to those items whose acquisition cost is at least \$5,000 per unit.

8.03 DEFINITIONS

Acquisition Cost	Net invoice unit price of the property including the cost of modifications, attachments, accessories, or auxiliary apparatus necessary to make the property usable for the purpose for which it was acquired. Other charges, such as the cost of installation, transportation, taxes, professional services, duty, or protective in-transit insurance can be included or excluded from the cost in accordance with generally accepted accounting principles.
Common Rule	<u>49 CFR 18</u> , Uniform Administrative Requirements for Grants and Cooperative Agreements to State and Local Governments, the federal regulation which governs all grants subject to this policy.
Federal Awarding Agency	Agency of the federal government that awards the grants. These agencies include, but are not limited to: A. United States Department of Transportation (DOT) <ol style="list-style-type: none">1. Federal Highway Administration (FHWA)2. Federal Transit Authority (FTA)3. Federal Aviation Administration (FAA)4. Federal Motor Carrier Safety Administration (FMCSA)5. National Highway Transportation Safety Administration (NHTSA)6. Federal Railroad Administration (FRA) B. United States Department of the Interior (DOI) <ol style="list-style-type: none">1. Bureau of Indian Affairs (BIA)2. Bureau of Land Management (BLM)

FIN-11.08 FEDERAL PROPERTY MANAGEMENT STANDARDS

Effective: October 18, 2010

Transmittal: 2010 - October

Supersedes: FIN-11.08 (1/28/10)

Page 2 of 9

Grant	A sum of money given by one governmental entity to some other entity for the purpose of achieving some goal or supporting some program.
Pass-through Entity	A non-federal entity that provides a federal grant to a subrecipient to carry out a federal program.
Personal Property	Property which is non-financial in nature, which has a useful life of at least one year, and which is used in operations, except real property. Personal property is further classified as one of the following: A. Tangible—having physical existence. B. Intangible—having no physical existence, such as patents, software, inventions, and copyrights.
Real Property	Land, Buildings, Improvements, and related property rights, which are used in operations.
Recipient	A non-federal entity, such as ADOT, that expends federal awards received directly from a federal awarding agency to carry out a federal program.
Subrecipient	A non-federal entity that expends funds from a federal grant received from a pass-through entity to carry out a federal program. Examples would be Pima Association of Governments (PAG), Maricopa Association of Governments (MAG), as well as cities and towns, Metropolitan Planning Organizations (MPO's), and Councils of Government (COG's). An entity that receives funding from a subrecipient is also a subrecipient. (Note: The terms and conditions of the federal award are carried forward from the recipient to the subrecipient.)

8.04 PROCEDURES FOR ALL FEDERALLY-FUNDED PERSONAL PROPERTY

- A. When statutory authority exists, title to property purchased in whole or part with federal funds shall be vested in the recipient or subrecipient upon acquisition. The recipient or subrecipient is, however, responsible for adherence to any applicable federal program compliance requirements (49 CFR 18 Section 32).
- B. Use of Personal Property—federally-funded personal property may be used under the following conditions:
 - 1. Property shall be used by the recipient or subrecipient in the program or project for which it was acquired as long as needed, whether or not the project or program continues to be supported by federal funds.
 - 2. When no longer needed for the original program or project, the property may be used in other activities currently or previously supported by a federal agency.
 - 3. The recipient or subrecipient shall make property available for use on other projects or programs currently or previously supported by the federal government, providing such use will not interfere with the work on the projects or programs for which it was originally acquired.

FIN-11.08 FEDERAL PROPERTY MANAGEMENT STANDARDS

Effective: October 18, 2010

Transmittal: 2010 - October

Supersedes: FIN-11.08 (1/28/10)

Page 3 of 9

4. The recipient or subrecipient shall not use property acquired with grant funds to compete unfairly with private companies that provide equivalent services, unless specifically permitted or contemplated by federal statute.
 5. When acquiring replacement property, the recipient or subrecipient may use the property to be replaced as a trade-in or sell the property and use the proceeds to offset the cost of the replacement property, subject to the approval of the awarding agency, as well as ADOT.

(Note: The federal awarding agency may be entitled to a share of the trade-in amount. Sections 8.04.1.1 and 8.04.1.2 show how this amount is calculated.)
 6. For ADOT-owned property, any such transactions are subject to the rules for disposal of ADOT property described in ADOT Policy FIN-11.02, 'Control and Inventory of ADOT Property.'
- C. Property obtained under a federal grant may be titled to, be in the physical custody of, and be carried on the financial statements of, a recipient or subrecipient. However, from the perspective of the federal awarding agency, ADOT is the agency to whom the federal agency has granted funds; as such, the federal awarding agency expects ADOT to ensure that federal regulations are followed.
- D. Federal regulations permit states to impose their own requirements on their subrecipients. The State of Arizona does have more strict requirements, which apply to ADOT's subrecipients, as they apply to ADOT. Therefore, transactions, as described herein, may be subject to approval by ADOT.
- E. In the normal course of business, ADOT may grant funds to a subrecipient (e.g. Maricopa Association of Governments, or MAG), which in turn grants them to its own subrecipient (e.g. a city or town). When this additional granting occurs, ADOT expects that ADOT's subrecipient will ensure compliance with all federal and state requirements, and further expects that ADOT's subrecipient (MAG, in this example) will handle all communications with its subrecipient, including, but not limited to:
1. The gathering of information to complete the annual inventory, as described in Section 8.06 of this policy, 'Inventorying Federally-Funded Property Owned by Subrecipients.'
 2. All rules governing the disposition of federally-funded property, as described in Section 8.07 of this policy, 'Disposition of Federally-Funded Property Owned by Subrecipients.'
- F. All federally-funded property, regardless of whether title is held by ADOT or by a subrecipient, is subject to the provisions of 49 CFR 18, also known as the Common Rule.
- G. Property management requirements for federally-funded personal property include:
1. Maintain property records that contain:
 - a. description of property
 - b. vendor
 - c. model
 - d. manufacturer
 - e. serial number

FIN-11.08 FEDERAL PROPERTY MANAGEMENT STANDARDS

Effective: October 18, 2010

Transmittal: 2010 - October

Supersedes: FIN-11.08 (1/28/10)

Page 4 of 9

- f. name of title holder
 - g. acquisition date
 - h. cost of property
 - i. accumulated depreciation
 - j. net book value
 - k. federal awarding agency
 - l. percentage of federal participation
 - m. percentage of recipient or subrecipient participation
 - n. location, use, and condition of property
 - o. date of disposal and sale price or trade-in value
 - p. contact person, with phone number
2. An annual physical inventory, which includes a report of all assets purchased in whole, or in part, with funds from the federal awarding agency when required by that agency. For property owned by ADOT, the inventory must reconcile to the financial statements as of the end of ADOT's fiscal year (June 30). Guidelines for inventorying property owned by subrecipients are discussed in Section 8.06, 'Inventorying Federally-Funded Property Owned by Subrecipients.' In either case, the inventory is to be submitted to the federal awarding agency by October 31.
 3. A control system to prevent loss, damage, or theft.
 4. Adequate maintenance procedures.
 5. Sales procedures (if authorized or required to sell property) which ensure the highest possible return.
- H. Disposition of Personal Property—When original or replacement equipment is no longer needed for the original program or project, or for other activities currently or previously supported by a federal agency, the property may be sold, with the federal awarding agency having the right to a share of the proceeds. Examples of how this share is calculated are shown in Sections 8.04.I.1 and 8.04.I.2 of this policy.
- I. Federal Awarding Agency's Share of Sale Proceeds: When a recipient or subrecipient sells, by any means (e.g. trade-in, auction, etc.), property purchased with federal funds, the federal awarding agency is entitled to a share of the proceeds, calculated using one of the following methods:
1. The federal awarding agency has the right to a calculated amount:

Current market value		Awarding agency's share
Or	X	(federal participation %)
proceeds from sale (including trade-in)		of the equipment

If the grant agreement calls for the recipient or subrecipient to fund a percentage of the purchase price, that purchase price is calculated net of the trade-in amount, regardless of how much, if any, of the trade-in amount the federal awarding agency is entitled to.

Example: The following facts are assumed:

FIN-11.08 FEDERAL PROPERTY MANAGEMENT STANDARDS

Effective: October 18, 2010

Transmittal: 2010 - October

Supersedes: FIN-11.08 (1/28/10)

Page 5 of 9

- Purchase price of replacement property—\$200,000
- Trade-in allowance provided by vendor—\$20,000
- Net invoice price—\$180,000
- Percent of new property to be funded by subrecipient—20%
- Percent of traded-in property which was funded by federal awarding agency—85%

In this example:

- Amount of trade-in allowance to federal awarding agency—\$17,000 ($\$20,000 \times 85\%$ federal share on traded-in property)
 - Amount of trade-in allowance to subrecipient—\$3,000 ($\$20,000$ less $\$17,000$)
 - Amount of purchase of new property funded by subrecipient—\$36,000 ($\$180,000 \times 20\%$ local share)
 - Amount of cash outlay by recipient or subrecipient—\$33,000 ($\$36,000$ less $\$3,000$)
2. Should the property include an attachment not eligible for federal participation, the trade-in allowance will be pro-rated between the original purchase and the attachment based on their relative costs. It is the responsibility of the recipient or subrecipient to provide documentation of these costs.

Example: The following facts are assumed:

- Purchase price of replacement property—\$200,000
- Trade-in allowance provided by vendor—\$20,000
- Net invoice price—\$180,000
- Percent of new property to be funded by subrecipient—20%
- Purchase price of federally-funded traded-in property—\$90,000
- Purchase price of subrecipient-funded attachment, not eligible for federal participation—\$10,000
- Total cost of traded-in property—\$100,000
- Percent of traded-in property allocated to subrecipient-funded attachment—10% ($\$10,000 / \$100,000$)
- Percent of traded-in property which was funded by federal awarding agency (before accounting for attachment)—85%

In this example:

- Amount of trade-in allowance directly allocated to subrecipient—\$2,000 ($\$20,000 \times 10\%$ not eligible for federal participation)
- Amount of trade-in allowance allocated to original purchase—\$18,000 ($\$20,000$ less $\$2,000$)
- Amount of remaining trade-in allowance to federal awarding agency—\$15,300 ($\$18,000 \times 85\%$ federal share on traded-in property)
- Amount of regaining trade-in allowance to subrecipient—\$2,700 ($\$18,000$ less $\$15,300$)
- Total trade-in allowance to subrecipient—\$4,700 ($\$2,000$ plus $\$2,700$)

FIN-11.08 FEDERAL PROPERTY MANAGEMENT STANDARDS

Effective: October 18, 2010

Transmittal: 2010 - October

Supersedes: FIN-11.08 (1/28/10)

Page 6 of 9

- Amount of purchase of new property funded by subrecipient—\$36,000 (\$180,000*20% local participation on new property)
- Amount of cash outlay by subrecipient—\$31,300 (\$36,000 less \$4,700)

3. If appropriate disposition action is not taken by the recipient/subrecipient of the equipment, the federal awarding agency may direct the action to be taken.

J. Salvage Credits—Any proceeds received from the sale of salvage or scrap material are to be credited to the project to which the material was originally charged, or to a similar project.

8.05 PROCEDURES FOR ALL FEDERALLY-FUNDED REAL PROPERTY

A. Title to real property under a grant will vest, upon acquisition, in the recipient or subrecipient, as applicable. The recipient or subrecipient is, however, responsible for adherence to any applicable federal program compliance requirements under the Code of Federal Regulations (CFR) 49 CFR 18 Section 31.

B. Real property will be used for the originally-authorized purposes for as long as is needed for those purposes, and the recipient or subrecipient shall not dispose of or encumber its title or other interests.

C. When real property is no longer needed for the originally-authorized purpose, the subrecipient will notify ADOT, in writing, of its intentions regarding the property. One of the following options is to be selected:

1. Retention of title, after compensating the awarding agency an amount computed by multiplying the awarding agency's percentage of participation by the fair market value of the property. If real property acquired with federal funds is disposed of and replaced with real property under the same program, the net proceeds from the disposition may be used as an offset to the cost of the replacement property.
2. Sale of property, with the awarding agency being compensated in an amount equal to the awarding agency's percentage of participation by the sales price, after reducing said price by actual and reasonable selling and fix-up expenses. Procedures shall be in place to provide for as competitive a sales process as practicable, with the intent of realizing the highest possible return.

(Note: Examples of how to calculate the federal awarding agency's share of the sales proceeds are found in Sections 8.04.I.1 and 8.04.I.2 of this policy.)

3. Transfer of title to the awarding agency, with the recipient or subrecipient being compensated in an amount calculated by multiplying the recipient's or subrecipient's percentage of participation by the fair market value of the property.

8.06 INVENTORYING FEDERALLY-FUNDED PROPERTY OWNED BY SUBRECIPIENTS

When required by the federal awarding agency, an annual inventory is submitted of all assets purchased, in whole or in part, with federal funds, regardless of whether or not the property is in ADOT's physical custody or is carried on ADOT's financial statements. For property owned either by ADOT's subrecipients (e.g. MAG), or a subrecipient's subrecipients (e.g. a city or town), the following rules must be followed.

A. The inventory from all subrecipients must include all information described in 8.04.G.1 of this policy.

FIN-11.08 FEDERAL PROPERTY MANAGEMENT STANDARDS

Effective: October 18, 2010

Transmittal: 2010 - October

Supersedes: FIN-11.08 (1/28/10)

Page 7 of 9

- B. The inventory must reconcile to the financial statements as of the end of the entity's fiscal year (generally June 30).
- C. The inventory must be submitted by ADOT's subrecipient (e.g. MAG) to the ADOT Fixed Assets Manager by October 31.

8.07 DISPOSITION OF FEDERALLY-FUNDED PROPERTY OWNED BY SUBRECIPIENTS

- A. When federally-funded property is removed from service, voluntarily or otherwise, all parties involved must adhere to both federal and State of Arizona requirements. While federal requirements apply primarily to capital assets, those assets costing at least \$5,000 per unit, the State of Arizona has more strict requirements, both in terms of the processes to be followed and the fact that the State's requirements apply to all property, not just property costing at least \$5,000 per unit.
- B. No property is to be transferred to another entity, removed from the physical custody of the subrecipient, or deleted from the subrecipient's financial records without written approval from the ADOT Fixed Assets Manager. This approval will be communicated through ADOT's subrecipient (e.g. MAG).
- C. When property has been disposed of, it is the responsibility of the subrecipient to make sure the property is not included in the next inventory forwarded to ADOT, as described in Section 8.06 of this policy.
- D. When the subrecipient has received its funding from ADOT's subrecipient (e.g. a city receiving funding from MAG), the flow of communication, and any required documentation, is as follows. All of this communication must be in writing.
 - 1. The subrecipient (e.g. city) will inform MAG.
 - 2. MAG will inform the ADOT Fixed Assets Manager.
 - 3. The ADOT Fixed Assets Manager will inform MAG of the approval and of any additional required steps.
 - 4. MAG will inform the subrecipient (e.g. city).
- E. The following are requirements which are unique to the various categories of disposition:
 - 1. **MISSING/STOLEN**—The subrecipient must obtain a police report from a local law enforcement agency.
 - 2. **ACCIDENTAL DESTRUCTION**—The subrecipient must provide details about the destroyed property.
 - 3. **DONATION**—Approval of both the federal awarding agency and ADOT are required prior to any donation.
 - 4. **SURPLUS**—When property obtained under a federal grant is no longer needed for the purpose for which it was obtained, the property may be used in other activities currently or previously supported by a federal agency. When the subrecipient has determined that no such use is available, the property may be removed from service ('surplused'). Approval of both the federal awarding agency and ADOT are required.
 - 5. **CANNIBALIZATION/ON-SITE DESTRUCTION**—When it is determined that federally-funded property has value as a component of other property ('cannibalization') or if it is

determined that the most effective way to dispose of such property is to destroy it on-site, an email, letter, or memorandum must be submitted and forwarded to the ADOT Fixed Assets Manager. This email, letter, or memorandum must contain the property's description, pictures of the property, and the reason for the request.

6. **TRADE-IN/SELLING WITH REPLACEMENT**—Trading in federally-funded property as partial payment on replacement property, or selling, may be done with approval of both the federal awarding agency and ADOT. The subrecipient must send an email, letter, or memorandum; this email or memorandum must include a complete description of the item(s) to be traded, a complete description of the item(s) to be purchased, a copy of the vendor quote which specifies price, trade-in amount, and net cost, and the reason for the request. No purchase order should be placed for replacement equipment without affirmative approval of the ADOT Fixed Assets Manager. For selling, the subrecipient must prepare an email, letter, or memorandum including the same information as for a trade-in, except that the manner of the sale is to be specified. The federal awarding agency is entitled to a share of the proceeds per the examples shown in Sections 8.04.I.1 and 8.04.I.2 of this policy, as applicable.

7. **TRADE-IN/SELLING WITHOUT REPLACEMENT**—If a subrecipient wants to sell federally-funded property without intending to obtain replacement within the next funding cycle, the subrecipient may do so. However, the federal awarding agency is still entitled to its share of the proceeds, per the examples shown in Sections 8.04.I.1 and 8.04.I.2 of this policy, as applicable. The forwarding of this share is administered using either of the following methods:

- a. The subrecipient forwards the funds to the entity from which it received funds for the original purchase. If a city or town is selling the property, the funds would be forwarded to the subrecipient (in this example, MAG, although it would apply equally to any subrecipient). In this example, or if MAG sells the property, MAG will account for the funds internally and make adjustments to the current or future year distribution from the federal awarding agency.
- b. The subrecipient notifies the entity from which it received funds for the original purchase (again, either MAG or ADOT, as applicable). Both the subrecipient and (in this example) MAG will track the funds, with the intent of properly applying the funds to a purchase of replacement property made at some future date.

F. **SALVAGE CREDITS**—If any proceeds are received from the sale of salvage or scrap material, the federal awarding agency is entitled to a share of these proceeds, as calculated in the examples shown in Sections 8.04.I.1 and 8.04.I.2 of this policy.

8.08 SUPPLIES

Title to supplies acquired under a grant will vest, upon acquisition, in the recipient or subrecipient as applicable. If, after termination or completion of the award, there is a residual inventory of unused supplies whose fair market value exceeds \$5,000, and if the supplies are not needed for any other federally-sponsored programs or projects, the recipient or subrecipient shall compensate the awarding agency for its share.

8.09 COPYRIGHTS

The awarding agency reserves a royalty-free, non-exclusive, and irrevocable license to reproduce, publish, or otherwise use, and to authorize others to use, for federal government purposes:

- A. The copyright in any work, such as a book, publication, or other copyrightable material developed under a grant, or contract under a grant.
- B. Any rights of copyright to which a recipient, subrecipient, or a contractor purchases ownership with grant support.

8.10 PATENTS

The inventor of a patentable invention developed under a federally-funded grant retains rights to the invention. All contracts initiated by any pass-through entity or subrecipient must include the following clause, suitably modified to identify the parties, 'The subrecipient or contractor will retain all rights provided for the State in this clause, and the State will not, as part of the consideration for awarding the subrecipient or contract, obtain rights in the subrecipient's or contractor's subject inventions (37 CFR Part 401).

8.11 CONTACT INFORMATION

The ADOT Fixed Assets unit may be contacted at:

206 S. 17th Avenue, Mail Drop 203B
Phoenix, AZ 85007
(602) 712-8028 (manager)
(602) 712-6592
Email: Fixedassets@azdot.gov

8.12 CORRESPONDING POLICIES

FIN-11.02 Control and Inventory of ADOT Property

8.13 CORRESPONDING FEDERAL REGULATIONS

37 CFR 401 Rights to Inventions Made by Nonprofit Organizations and Small Business Firms under Government Grants, Contracts, and Cooperative Agreements.

49 CFR 18 Uniform Administrative Requirements for Grants and Cooperative Agreements to State and Local Governments (also known as the Common Rule).

MARICOPA ASSOCIATION OF GOVERNMENTS

INFORMATION SUMMARY... for your review

DATE:

December 8, 2015

SUBJECT:

Proposed 2016 Revision to the 2015 Edition of the 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 from many agency Public Works/Engineering 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 2015 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 was also sent to MAG Public Works Directors for review for a period of one month. The package sent to the MAG Public Works Directors included links to the Draft 2016 Revision Packet for the Specifications and Details. This information is available online for review at the following internet address: <https://www.azmag.gov/Events/Event.asp?CMSID=8225>. This item was also reviewed by the MAG Management Committee at the November 18, 2015 meeting.

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 2016 Revision to the 2015 Edition of the Standard Specifications and Details for Public Works Construction will be available for purchase in early January 2016.

PUBLIC INPUT:

Development of these revisions has been achieved during open meetings of the MAG Specifications and Details Committee and has included input from working groups (that helped develop cases for the committee) as well as 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: A formal review by the Regional Council is requested.

ACTION NEEDED:

Information and discussion.

PRIOR COMMITTEE ACTIONS:

MAG Management Committee. This item was on the November 18, 2015, agenda. No comments were received.

MEMBERS ATTENDING

- Darryl H. Crossman, Litchfield Park, Chair
- Tom Remes for Ed Zuercher, Phoenix
- Matt Busby for Bryant Powell, Apache Junction
- Jessica Blazina for David Fitzhugh, Avondale
- Stephen Cleveland, Buckeye
- * Gary Neiss, Carefree
- Peter Jankowski, Cave Creek
- Marsha Reed, Chandler
- Dr. Spencer Isom, El Mirage
- # Jess Knudson for Lisa Garcia, Florence
- Alfonso Rodriguez for Phil Dorchester, Fort McDowell Yavapai Nation
- # Grady Miller, Fountain Hills
- # Ernest Rubi, Gila Bend
- * Tina Notah, Gila River Indian Community
- Patrick Banger, Gilbert
- Brent Stoddard for Dick Bowers, Glendale
- Brian Dalke, Goodyear
- * Rosemary Arellano, Guadalupe
- * Gregory Rose, City of Maricopa

- Kari Kent for Christopher Brady, Mesa
- Dawn Marie Buckland for Kevin Burke, Paradise Valley
- Carl Swenson, Peoria
- # Louis Andersen for Greg Stanley, Pinal County
- John Kross, Queen Creek
- * Bryan Meyers, Salt River Pima-Maricopa Indian Community
- Brad Lundahl for Fritz Behring, Scottsdale
- # Bob Wingenroth, Surprise
- Andrew Ching, Tempe
- Reyes Medrano, Jr., Tolleson
- Joshua Wright, Wickenburg
- Jeanne Blackman, Youngtown
- Sintra Hoffman for John Halikowski, ADOT
- Tom Manos, Maricopa County
- Wulf Grote for Steve Banta, Valley Metro/RPTA

* Those members neither present nor represented by proxy.

Participated by telephone conference call. + Participated by videoconference call.

MAG Specifications and Details Committee. Reviewed and provided recommendations for the cases submitted for consideration throughout 2015.

VOTING MEMBERS

- Tom Wilhite, P.E., Tempe, *Chair*
- Jim Badowich, Avondale, *Vice Chair*
- Craig Sharp, Buckeye
- Warren White, P.E., Chandler

- Ruben Aguilar, El Mirage
- Wayne Costa, Florence
- Tom Condit, Gilbert
- Mark Ivanich, P.E., Glendale

Tom Vassalo, Goodyear
Robert Herz, P.E., Maricopa County DOT Lance
Webb, Mesa
Dan Nissen, Peoria
Melody Moss, Phoenix (Street Trans.)

Jami Erickson, Phoenix (Water)
Rodney Ramos, P.E., Scottsdale
Kristin Tytler, Surprise
Jonathan Sorrell, Valley Metro
Gregory Arrington, Youngtown

ADVISORY MEMBERS

Jeff Benedict, ARPA
Arvid Veidmark, AZUCA
Mike Sanders, AZUCA
Adrian Green, AGC
Brian Gallimore, AGC

Jeff Hearne, ARPA
Peter Kandaris, Independent
Paul R. Nebeker, Independent
Jacob Rodriguez, SRP

The MAG Public Works Directors have reviewed the proposed updates. Minor typographic corrections were noted and updated in the draft revision. The City of Phoenix proposed a minor revision to be reviewed in 2016.

CONTACT PERSON:

Gordon Tyus, MAG, (602) 452-5035

2015 PROPOSED REVISIONS TO MAG SPECIFICATIONS AND DETAILS

(Updated information can be found on the website: <http://www.azmag.gov/Projects/Project.asp?CMSID=1055&CMSID2=7154>)

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

September 24, 2015

Detailed information about each case is provided on the 2015 Specs and Details Cases Under Consideration page on the MAG website.

<http://www.azmag.gov/Projects/Project.asp?CMSID=1055&CMSID2=7154>

Most case files include a cover memo listing the purpose of each case and proposed changes. The final version of the working cases are posted, which often include the strike-through changes and other discussion points.

Further discussion on the cases is available in the committee meeting minutes which are posted separately for each meeting. Links can be found on the Standard Specifications & Details Committee page.

<http://www.azmag.gov/Committees/Committee.asp?CMSID=1055>

Final summary materials for review of the 2016 Revision to the 2015 Edition of the MAG Specifications and Details for Public Works Construction manual including detailed attendance and voting records are posted on the Specifications & Details Public Works Directors Review Deadline page.

<http://www.azmag.gov/Events/Event.asp?CMSID=8225>



2015 PROPOSED REVISIONS TO MAG SPECIFICATIONS AND DETAILS

(Updated information can be found on the website: <http://www.azmag.gov/Projects/Project.asp?CMSID=1055&CMSID2=7154>)

CASE	DESCRIPTION	PROPOSED BY	MEMBER	SUBMITTAL DATE Last Revision	VOTE DATE	VOTE	
	CARRY FORWARD CASES FROM 2014						
14-03	Case 14-03: Updates to Guardrail Details. Revisions to Section 415 and/or inclusion of MCDOT guardrail details.	MCDOT	Bob Herz	01/08/2014	Withdrawn	0 0 0	Yes No Abstain
Summary	<p>Maricopa County is planning to change to 31” high (instead of 28”) guardrails, based on a recommendation from FHWA. This Midwest Guardrail System has splice points located between posts. It is still a strong post system, but with the splice points located between the posts the W-beam is less prone to tearing. The new 31” high guardrail system will be used for new installations. Existing 28” high guardrail will remain in place and be maintained; no retrofitting is needed or planned.</p> <p>Since MAG currently refers to the County details, once the County adopts new details, MAG would need to either update the specifications to match the County details, or add the existing County details into the MAG details. At this time, the County has not completed the specifications and details for this new system of guardrails, so the case was withdrawn in 2015.</p>						
14-06	Case 14-06: Revisions to Section 718 Preservative Seal for Asphalt Concrete, and Section 334.	Asphalt WG	Jeff Benedict	02/05/2014 09/01/2015	Approved 09/02/2015	11 0 0	Yes No Abstain
Summary	<p>This case updates Section 718 PRESERVATIVE SEAL FOR ASPHALT CONCRETE to include the most common type of sealants currently in use, and updates the specifications and testing requirements for them as appropriate. This case was reviewed by the Asphalt Working Group and received input from industry experts and manufacturers.</p> <p>Table 718-1 was thoroughly updated with current ASTM testing procedures. A new “Type E” polymer modified rejuvenating emulsion (PMRE) was added to the list of allowable products. There was discussion about adding a new subsection for seal coating, but it was decided to address this in a later revision. The case also added the “Type E” option in Section 334, as well as fixing a reference back to Section 718.</p>						

2015 PROPOSED REVISIONS TO MAG SPECIFICATIONS AND DETAILS

(Updated information can be found on the website: <http://www.azmag.gov/Projects/Project.asp?CMSID=1055&CMSID2=7154>)

CASE	DESCRIPTION	PROPOSED BY	MEMBER	SUBMITTAL DATE Last Revision	VOTE DATE	VOTE	
14-12	Case 14-12: Proposed revisions to Sections 336, 321.10.3, 601.2.7 and Detail 200-1 and 200-2. Add pavement removal criteria to prevent full depth pavement cuts from being located within a lane wheel path and to prevent creation of narrow pavement edge strips.	MCDOT	Bob Herz	06/04/2014 05/18/2015	Approved 08/05/2015	13 0 0	Yes No Abstain
Summary	<p>The case proposed revisions to Sections 336.3 and 336.4 to add pavement removal criteria to prevent full depth pavement cuts from being located within a lane wheel path and to prevent creation of narrow pavement edge strips. Revisions were also made in Sections 321, 601 and Details 200-1 and 200-2. Some discussion included concerns that it may require contractors to determine design issues in the roadway. There was also concern about increasing the amount and cost of pavement replacement. Revisions made to the case during 2015 addressed these issues and also:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Identified location restrictions for full depth longitudinal joints for asphalt pavement widening and for asphalt pavement trench repairs. 2. Defined a vertically offset joint as an alternative for full depth sawed joint. Added an offset joint section view on Detail 200-1. 3. Added pavement removal requirements when replacing existing curb or gutter. 4. Added requirement for asphalt pavement edge replacement to have a safety edge or thickened edge constructed per Detail 201 except when the asphalt edge abuts a concrete curb or gutter. 5. Required trenching into portland cement concrete pavement, sidewalk, or other concrete flatwork to require complete joint to joint replacement of damaged panels. Type C Trench Repair in Detail 200-1 was deleted. 6. Adjusted the measurement for trench surface replacement to include the extra area required to eliminate narrow edge remnants and to move full depth asphalt cuts outside of defined lane wheel paths. 						
14-17	Case 14-17: Create New Section 322 Decorative Asphalt Placement. Provide specifications for materials and methods.	Materials WG	Brian Gallimore	07/09/2014 09/02/2015	Approved 09/02/2015	11 0 1	Yes No Abstain
Summary	<p>The case proposed creating a new SECTION 322 DECORATIVE ASPHALT. The specification was based on supplements from Gilbert and Scottsdale for Asphalt Stamping. The title was changed to include decorative asphalt coloring without stamping. The case was reviewed by the Asphalt Working Group and several agencies including Maricopa County. The material specifications for the asphalt surfacing system properties (Table 322-1) were updated to include ASTM testing specification requirements. A clear coat sealant is typically used and was included in the specification. The committee also wanted to include a two year warranty from flaking, wearing and defects.</p> <p>During the meeting prior to voting on the case, the committee updated the language including changing “bid” to “contract documents” and other minor updates for clarification. These changes are listed in the 09/02/2015 committee meeting minutes.</p>						

2015 PROPOSED REVISIONS TO MAG SPECIFICATIONS AND DETAILS

(Updated information can be found on the website: <http://www.azmag.gov/Projects/Project.asp?CMSID=1055&CMSID2=7154>)

CASE	DESCRIPTION	PROPOSED BY	MEMBER	SUBMITTAL DATE Last Revision	VOTE DATE	VOTE	
	NEW CASES FOR 2015						
15-01	<p>Case 15-01: Miscellaneous Corrections:</p> <p>A. Add omitted text to Section 735.1. Text was approved by Case 14-07 and merged into Case 13-15. Both cases were approved in 2014.</p> <p>B. Revise “OA” to Quality Assurance and “OC” to Quality Control in Section 710.</p> <p>C. Update notes in Detail 225.</p> <p>D. Correct Titles in Detail 270. Update section view.</p> <p>E. Remove a conflict between specification Section 206 and Section 601.</p> <p>F. Replace ‘Section 712’ with ‘Section 718’ in the third paragraph of Section 334.3.</p> <p>G: Correct Title of Section 345 to read: ADJUSTING FRAMES, COVERS AND VALVE BOXES</p>	MCDOT	Bob Herz	02/05/2014 08/24/2015	Approved 09/02/2015	12 0 0	Yes No Abstain
Summary	The Miscellaneous Corrections case compiles minor updates due to typos, drafting errors, incorrect references, spelling, formatting and incomplete updates that were made in previous cases. The updates A-G were approved; however, changes to Detail 225 were superseded by revisions made in Case 15-07.						
15-02	Case 15-02: Adjust Fence Requirements to Reference ASTM F1043. Revise Section 772, Table 771-1 and Detail 145.	MCDOT	Bob Herz	01/07/2015	Approved 03/04/2015	15 0 1	Yes No Abstain
Summary	<p>The purpose of the case was to adjust fence requirements to reference ASTM F1043 Standard Specification for Strength and Protective Coatings on Steel Industrial Fence Framework. The following revisions were made:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Detail 145: Revise Note 1 to read as follows: Posts and rails shall be 1.90 inch outside diameter high strength heavy industrial steel pipe conforming to ASTM F1043 Material Group IA-2 (2.72 lb/ft, minimum yield strength = 50 ksi) or Material Group IC galvanized after forming (2.28 lb/ft, minimum yield strength = 50 ksi). 2. Specification Section 771 GALVANIZING: Modify Table 771-1 by adding ASTM F1043 groups IA and IC to the row for Steel Pipe – Rails and Post. 3. Section 772 CHAIN LINK FENCE: Revise the material requirements identified in 772.2 POSTS, RAILS AND BRACES. 						

2015 PROPOSED REVISIONS TO MAG SPECIFICATIONS AND DETAILS

(Updated information can be found on the website: <http://www.azmag.gov/Projects/Project.asp?CMSID=1055&CMSID2=7154>)

CASE	DESCRIPTION	PROPOSED BY	MEMBER	SUBMITTAL DATE Last Revision	VOTE DATE	VOTE	
15-03	Case 15-03: Revise Section 601.4.5 trench final backfill placement requirements.	MCDOT	Bob Herz	02/04/2015 07/16/2015	Approved 09/02/2015	12 0 0	Yes No Abstain
Summary	<p>The purpose of the case was to revise trench final backfill placement requirement of loose non-compacted material from two feet to layers not exceeding twelve inches in depth, and require agency approval for depths greater than 12.” It also added CLSM and granular material to the listing of acceptable materials for final backfill as presently shown on Detail 200-1. In Section 601.4.8, identification of the testing procedures required to determine the percent passing the 200 sieve was added.</p> <p>Initially the case identified types of compaction equipment that could vary the size of the layers, but during discussion it was determined that it would be best to allow the Engineer discretion rather than try and capture it in the specification. The final wording for the backfill placement requirement was:</p> <p>“Final backfill shall be placed in horizontal layers not more than twelve inches in depth before compaction. With Agency approval an increase in the loose non-compacted lift depth may be obtained for a project based on specific equipment, methods, and soil conditions. For approval of an increase of the loose non-compacted lift depth, the Contractor shall demonstrate to the satisfaction of the Agency that the required density shall be obtained using the Contractor identified equipment and methods. The loose lift height shall not be more than can be compacted to the required density with the equipment and methods being used.”</p>						
15-04	Case 15-04: Revise Section 602 Trenchless Installation of Steel Casing. Update ASTM references for casing material and add minimum casing wall thickness.	Water/Sewer WG	Arvid Veidmark	02/04/2015 02/24/2015	Approved 04/08/2015	13 0 0	Yes No Abstain
Summary	<p>Case 14-04 was developed and reviewed by the Water/Sewer Working Group. Revisions to Section 602 included the following: The ASTM and API references have been updated, as well as the wall thickness for casing, as now shown in Table 602-1. Some rewriting was done in Section 602.3 paragraphs 1, 2 and 5 (see below). Requiring stenciling of the materials on the outside of the casing was an addition to the spec to allow easier verification on site.</p> <p>The following specs were added under Section 602.3 TRENCHLESS OPERATION:</p> <p>“The contractor shall submit a procedure detailing the trenchless installation method selected from 602.1 to be used for the project, if a geotechnical report is not available in the contract documents, the contractor shall define the soil limitation for the method selected.” “Survey of the bore alignment shall be taken prior to the installation of steel casing and taken after the installation of steel casing and shall be presented to the engineer.” “Unexpected loose soil conditions that do not accommodate the method submitted by the contractor, (horizontal earth auger boring, hand tunneling or pipe ramming), shall be brought to the agency attention to determine further course of action. Contractor shall stop boring until an alternative method is mutually agreed on.”</p> <p>Payment requirements were also clarified with the addition of this statement: "Payment for steel casing does not include payment for the carrier pipe, a separate payment will be made for the carrier pipe and any required testing of the carrier pipe."</p>						

2015 PROPOSED REVISIONS TO MAG SPECIFICATIONS AND DETAILS

(Updated information can be found on the website: <http://www.azmag.gov/Projects/Project.asp?CMSID=1055&CMSID2=7154>)

CASE	DESCRIPTION	PROPOSED BY	MEMBER	SUBMITTAL DATE Last Revision	VOTE DATE	VOTE
15-05	Case 15-05: Proposed Revisions to Section 616 Reclaimed Water Line Construction and NEW Reclaimed Valve Box detail.	Chandler	Warren White	03/04/2015 06/24/2015	Carry Forward	0 Yes 0 No 0 Abstain
Summary	<p>A draft Detail 270-2, based on the City of Chandler supplement, was developed that used a square valve box for reclaimed water to differentiate it from round ones used for potable water. The draft detail was reviewed by the Water/Sewer Working Group as well as the main committee. The sponsor also reached out to a current manufacturer to get feedback and current shop drawings to help revise the draft detail. It was determined that the entire box was cast, and did not have machined surfaces. There was also discussion on labeling the box as “NON-POTABLE” rather than “RECLAIMED WATER.”</p> <p>Some agencies use the round valve box, but painted purple in order to distinguish it from normal boxes. Any new detail would also need to be appropriately referenced in Section 616 Reclaimed Water Line Construction.</p> <p>Since the detail was still under review, the sponsor elected to carry the case forward for further work in 2016.</p>					
15-06	Case 15-06: Delete 744 ABS TRUSS PIPE AND FITTINGS.	MCDOT	Bob Herz	03/04/2015	Approved 05/06/2015	12 Yes 0 No 0 Abstain
Summary	<p>The purpose of the case was to remove as an obsolete specification if MAG agencies no longer use or allow this type of pipe. Section 744.3.2 Material references ASTM D1788 which was withdrawn in 1988. Options presented were:</p> <p>1: Delete Section 744 in its entirety. Section 744 is only referenced in the Index. Since the specification has not been valid since 1988, it likely has not been be used in recent years and is no longer needed.</p> <p>2: Update the specification to delete references ASTM D1788 and be consistent with ASTM D2680 Acrylonitrile-Butadiene-Styrene (ABS) and Poly (Vinyl Chloride) (PVC) Composite Sewer Piping. The current version of ASTM D2680 includes material requirements for both ABS and PVC used for Truss Pipe and Fittings.</p> <p>Since no agency was still using ABS Truss Pipe, option 1 was selected and it was approved to delete Section 744 in its entirety.</p>					

2015 PROPOSED REVISIONS TO MAG SPECIFICATIONS AND DETAILS

(Updated information can be found on the website: <http://www.azmag.gov/Projects/Project.asp?CMSID=1055&CMSID2=7154>)

CASE	DESCRIPTION	PROPOSED BY	MEMBER	SUBMITTAL DATE Last Revision	VOTE DATE	VOTE	
15-07	Case 15-07: Revisions to Concrete Paver Standards for Non-Traveled Surfaces, Section 342 and Detail 225.	Chandler	Warren White	03/04/2015 08/06/2015	Approved 09/02/2015	12 0 0	Yes No Abstain
Summary	<p>The case proposed revisions to Detail 225 Concrete Pavers to depict pavers/decorative concrete on ABC for raised medians or other non-traffic areas. A revised detail was presented that incorporated pavers in raised median areas using a modified Chandler supplement. The new raised median section shows ABC base material rather than a concrete base required for traffic areas. The drawing also added details for contraction and expansion joints. The title of the drawing was changed to “INTERLOCKING CONCRETE PAVERS.”</p> <p>The case also made revisions to Section 342.3 Construction Standards, and other parts of Section 342 including retitling it as INTERLOCKING CONCRETE PAVER INSTALLATIONS. The type and size of pavers was updated in 342.2.4 Concrete Pavers to allow 60mm pavers in non-traffic areas. References for expansion joint filler and joint sealant were also updated. Under Construction Procedures, the required subgrade now references Section 301, and base course references 310. Also revised were the paragraphs on expansion joints, construction joints, and concrete pavers. Finally, subsection 324.4 MEASUREMENT AND PAYMENT was split into two sections: MEASUREMENT and PAYMENT, with the later expanded to include information payment for pavers in non-traffic areas.</p>						
15-08	Case 15-08: Revisions to clarify Table 710-4 to eliminate misinterpretation of Criteria 8.	MCDOT	Bob Herz	04/08/2015	Approved 06/03/2015	14 0 0	Yes No Abstain
Summary	<p>The purpose of Case 15-08 was to eliminate misinterpretation of Criteria 8 in Table 710-4. The way the current table is formatted, some readers believed that 3/8 inch mix and 1/2 inch mix are required to be designed for Low Traffic only and that 3/4 inch mix is required to be designed for High Traffic only. To clarify the specification it was proposed to relocate item 8 (Number of Gyration) as a new table in Section 710.3.2.2 prior to the existing Table 710-4. This new Table 710-4, requires renumbering the existing one as Table 710-5, and correcting all references to it.</p> <p>This case primarily addresses a formatting issue to clarify the intent, rather than making any actual changes to the requirements.</p>						

2015 PROPOSED REVISIONS TO MAG SPECIFICATIONS AND DETAILS

(Updated information can be found on the website: <http://www.azmag.gov/Projects/Project.asp?CMSID=1055&CMSID2=7154>)

CASE	DESCRIPTION	PROPOSED BY	MEMBER	SUBMITTAL DATE Last Revision	VOTE DATE	VOTE	
15-09	Case 15-09: Miscellaneous revisions to Section 321: PLACEMENT AND CONSTRUCTION OF ASPHALT CONCRETE PAVEMENT.	Asphalt WG	Jeff Benedict	04/22/2015 09/02/2015	Approved 09/02/2015	12 0 0	Yes No Abstain
Summary	<p>The primary purpose for this case was to remove the placement temperature table and replace it with simple minimum placement temperature of 265 °F. The existing table was too complex and difficult to implement. The current approach can result in required minimum mix temperature changing multiple times during the day depending on environmental and weather conditions. This could result in mix being rejected which was produced at the plant based on original project conditions, but then change during transport. Also, temperature measuring devices being used on underlying base (infrared guns) are only accurate to approximately ± 20°F, potentially resulting in incorrect mix temperature being required.</p> <p>Several other parts of Section 321 were also updated as summarized below:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 321.10.2 - Added and/or revised wording for binder content and laboratory air voids to indicate that Contractor must obtain the approval of the Engineer to perform additional coring to determine the limits or extent of a deficiency. • 321.10.4 - Added and/or revised wording for pavement thickness to incorporate MCDOT sponsored changes approved by Asphalt Working Group. • 321.10.5.2- Added wording to indicate that acceptable in-place air voids must fall within a range; i.e. there is both a lower and upper limit. • 321.10.5.2- Deleted note from Table 321-5 related to in-place air voids since this table is intended to address laboratory air voids only. • 321.10.5.2- Revised wording for additional coring to correctly reflect intent of verifying a deficient in place air void test result. • 321.10.5.2- Added and/or revised wording to indicate that Contractor must obtain the approval of the Engineer to perform additional coring to determine the limits or extent of a deficiency. • 321.10.5.2- Deleted note from Table 321-8 and moved information into table itself to improve clarity. • 321.10.5.2- Deleted parentheses, space, and colon from heading of column 3 of Table 321-8 to match formatting in rest of Section 321. 						
15-10	Case 15-10: Add subsection 321.10.5.3 “Rehabilitation Work” into the MAG Specifications.	Materials WG	Brain Gallimore	06/03/2015 07/23/2015	Carry Forward	0 0 0	Yes No Abstain
Summary	<p>Agencies have been specifying edge mill and overlay projects without requiring repair of substandard base (when encountered) due to funding issues. Currently, industry is being held to same standards on spot removals and edge mill/overlays as new construction over optimal base materials.</p> <p>A proposed new subsection 321.10.5.3 for Rehabilitation Work would allow for some relief on asphalt density when provisions for reworking substandard bases (removals) or existing asphalts (overlays) to meet Section 310 or Section 321 for overlays, are missing from bid documents or scope of work.</p> <p>Agencies were concerned that this could be used by contractors as an excuse for not meeting the current requirements when the status of the base material is unknown. The sponsor wished to develop clearer language and gather feedback from industry and agencies, so the case will be carried forward to 2016.</p>						

2015 PROPOSED REVISIONS TO MAG SPECIFICATIONS AND DETAILS

(Updated information can be found on the website: <http://www.azmag.gov/Projects/Project.asp?CMSID=1055&CMSID2=7154>)

CASE	DESCRIPTION	PROPOSED BY	MEMBER	SUBMITTAL DATE Last Revision	VOTE DATE	VOTE	
15-11	Case 15-11: Incorporate revisions to Section 717, "Mix Design Requirements" into the MAG Specifications.	Asphalt WG	Jeff Benedict	06/03/2015 07/28/2015	Approved 09/02/2015	12 0 0	Yes No Abstain
Summary	<p>In 717.3.1 The case added clarification (in 717.3.1) regarding the mineral admixture calculation as prescribed under the Arizona Test Method 832. Currently admixtures are incorporated as a percentage of the total aggregate when submitting new designs and are approved as such. That is the admixture is seen as a percentage of the aggregate (totals 100%). The Arizona Test Method 832 is an ADOT method requiring admixtures to be back calculated after the aggregates are determined (totals 101 – 102% and must be back calculated to 100% proportionately by each percentage of contributing aggregates to the mix)</p> <p>For the MAG specification, it was clarified that the admixture was included in the total aggregates. The title of Table 717-3 added "WITH MINERAL ADMIXTURE." And the following sentences were added under 717.3 MIX DESIGN REQUIREMENT: "(1) Mineral admixture shall be considered part of the total weight of aggregate and all combined specific gravity and combined absorption calculations for aggregates and mineral admixture will be done in accordance with Asphalt Institute's Manual MS-2. (2) Course aggregate shall be separated from the fine aggregate on the #8 sieve."</p> <p>The sieve size for Table 717-1 GRADATION REQUIREMENTS OF CRUMB RUBBER was also adjusted as needed.</p>						
15-12	Case 15-12: New Section 608 HORIZONTAL DIRECTIONAL DRILLING.	Water/Sewer WG	Arvid Veidmark	06/03/2015 08/25/2015	Approved 09/02/2015	12 0 0	Yes No Abstain
Summary	<p>A new Section 608 HORIZONTAL DIRECTIONAL DRILLING (HDD) was developed to address this commonly used practice for which MAG currently has no specifications. The draft specification began with the sponsor getting assistance from an ASU engineering professor, and went through many revisions that were reviewed by the Water/Sewer Working Group, AZUCA and several utility companies including SW Gas and Cox Communications. The case was also thoroughly reviewed by Maricopa County, and received additional comments from the Specs and Details Committee.</p> <p>The proposed specification provides a description, definition of terms, and a Figure 608-1 that illustrates a typical HDD layout. The specification divides the types of HDD based on the size of the project, with different submittal requirements determined by the size of job as shown in Table 608-1. The vast majority of projects in the MAG region would fall under the "small" category that would require agency approved plans, personnel qualifications, bore data and as-builts. Additional submittal requirements for medium and large projects are shown in Table 608-2. Typical construction methods are outlined in 608.5 CONSTRUCTION and include information on the drilling equipment, guidance system and drilling fluid system, and the actual directional drilling operation.</p> <p>The operation includes first the drilling of a pilot hole, and then typically a reamer to enlarge the hole for the conduit, which is then pulled through. A minimum separation of 1' for existing underground utilities is specified. During committee discussion, it was determined that additional separation would be required depending on the type of utility, so TABLE 608-3 was added to clarify these requirements.</p> <p>The final parts of the new specification included MEASUREMENT and PAYMENT requirements.</p>						

2015 PROPOSED REVISIONS TO MAG SPECIFICATIONS AND DETAILS

(Updated information can be found on the website: <http://www.azmag.gov/Projects/Project.asp?CMSID=1055&CMSID2=7154>)

CASE	DESCRIPTION	PROPOSED BY	MEMBER	SUBMITTAL DATE Last Revision	VOTE DATE	VOTE	
15-13	Case 15-13: Add text to Section 725.6 to identify what to include in a concrete mix design submittal.	Concrete WG	Jeff Hearne	06/03/2015	Carry Forward	0 0 0	Yes No Abstain
Summary	<p>Currently asphalt mix designs have specific requirements for mix design submittals. This case clarifies what should be included in a concrete mix design submittal in a similar way. A second paragraph was added under 725.6 MIX DESIGN PROPORTIONAING that stated: “A concrete mix design submittal shall include the mix identification number and the applicable proportions, weights, and quantities of individual materials incorporated into the mix including the size and source of concrete aggregates, the type and source of cement and fly ash or SCM, and the brand and designation of chemical admixtures or other additives.”</p> <p>The case also revised when modifications to the mix design do not require a new mix design submittal/approval in the sentence below: “(1) Modifications which do not result in batch target weights for the fine aggregate or combined coarse aggregates changing by more than 10 percent from the original approved mix design.”</p> <p>The proposed percentage was changed from 5 percent to 10 percent. To research this last proposed change further, the case sponsor requested to carry forward the case to 2016.</p>						
15-14	Case 15-14: Revise Sections 321 and 325 to coordinate overlay work requirements.	MCDOT	Bob Herz	06/03/2015 09/02/2015	Approved 09/02/2015	12 0 0	Yes No Abstain
Summary	<p>The purpose of this case is to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Coordinate overlay work requirements within Sections 321 and 325. • Clarify measurement and payment for work associated with the construction of Safety Edges. • Eliminate the 10% overrun penalty for pavements less than 2.5 inches in thickness (overlays). • Add measurement and payment sections for Safety Edge Preparation for overlay projects that require construction of a safety edge when none exists. <p>This required updates to Section 321 for the Asphalt Concrete Overlay (321.8.6), Measurement (321.12) and Payment (321.13).</p> <p>It also made updates to Section 325. The first paragraph of 325.7.1 Surface Preparation now states, “The provisions for preparation of pavement surfaces in Section 321.8.6 (Asphalt Concrete Overlay) shall apply to ARAC overlays. Placement, compaction, and surface smoothness shall be as specified in this section.”</p> <p>325.7.2 Placing and Construction Methods added the reference for Safety Edges, “Safety edge construction when required shall comply with Section 321.8.9.”</p> <p>It also provides for the measurement and payment of Safety Edges in subsections 325.11 and 325.12 respectively.</p>						

MAG Specification & Detail Committee

VOTING SUMMARY for 2015

Case No.	Title – Section/Detail	Vote Date	Avondale	Buckeye	Chandler	El Mirage	Florence	Gilbert	Glendale	Goodyear	Maricopa County	Mesa	Peoria	Phoenix	Scottsdale	Surprise	Tempe	Valley Metro	Youngtown	Voting Summary Y-N-A-NP
14-03	Updates to Guardrail Details. Revisions to Section 415 and/or inclusion of MCDOT guardrail details.	Withdrawn																		0-0-0-0
14-06	Revisions to Section 718 Preservative Seal for Asphalt Concrete.*	09/02/2015	—	Y	Y	—	—	Y	—	—	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	—	Y	11-0-0-6
14-12	Proposed Revisions to Sections 336.3 and 336.4. Add pavement removal criteria to prevent full depth pavement cuts from being located within a lane wheel path. Update Detail 200-1, 200-2.	08/05/2015	Y	Y	Y	Y	—	Y	—	—	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	—	13-0-0-4
14-17	Create New Section 322: Decorative Paving. Provide specifications for materials and methods.*	09/02/2015	Y	A	Y	—	—	Y	—	—	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	—	Y	11-0-1-5
15-01	Miscellaneous Corrections: A through G.	09/02/2015	Y	Y	Y	—	—	Y	—	—	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	—	Y	12-0-0-5
15-02	Case 15-02: Adjust Fence Requirements to Reference ASTM F1043. Revise Section 772, Table 771-1 and Detail 145.	03/04/2015	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	—	Y	Y	Y	A	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	15-0-1-1
15-03	Case 15-03: Revise Section 601.4.5 trench final backfill placement requirements.	09/02/2015	Y	Y	Y	—	—	Y	—	—	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	—	Y	12-0-0-5
15-04	Case 15-04: Revise Section 602 Trenchless Installation of Steel Casing. Update ASTM references for casing material and add minimum casing wall thickness.	04/08/2015	Y	Y	Y	Y	—	—	Y	—	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	—	Y	13-0-0-4
15-05	Case 15-05: Proposed Revisions to Section 616 Reclaimed Water Line Construction and NEW Reclaimed Valve Box detail.	Carry Forward																		0-0-0-0

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

*: Indicates changes made to proposal prior to vote.

MAG Specification & Detail Committee

VOTING SUMMARY for 2015

Case No.	Title – Section/Detail	Vote Date	Avondale	Buckeye	Chandler	El Mirage	Florence	Gilbert	Glendale	Goodyear	Maricopa County	Mesa	Peoria	Phoenix	Scottsdale	Surprise	Tempe	Valley Metro	Youngtown	Voting Summary Y-N-A-NP
15-06	Case 15-06: Delete or Update Section 744 ABS TRUSS PIPE AND FITTINGS.	05/06/2015	Y	Y	Y	Y	—	—	Y	—	Y	Y	Y	Y	—	Y	Y	Y	—	12-0-0-5
15-07	Case 15-07: Revisions to concrete Paver Standards for Non-Traveled Surfaces.	09/02/2015	Y	Y	Y	—	—	Y	—	—	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	—	Y	12-0-0-5
15-08	Case 15-08: Revision to clarify Table 710-4 to eliminate misinterpretation of Criteria 8.	06/03/2015	Y	Y	Y	Y	—	Y	Y	—	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	—	Y	14-0-0-3
15-09	Case 15-09: Miscellaneous revisions to Section 321: PLACEMENT AND CONSTRUCTION OF ASPHALT CONCRETE PAVEMENT.*	09/02/2015	Y	Y	Y	—	—	Y	—	—	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	—	Y	12-0-0-5
15-10	Case 15-10: Add subsection 321.10.5.3 “Rehabilitation Work” into the MAG Specifications.	Carry Forward																		0-0-0-0
15-11	Case 15-11: Incorporate revisions to Section 717, “Mix Design Requirements” into the MAG Specifications.*	09/02/2015	Y	Y	Y	—	—	Y	—	—	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	—	Y	12-0-0-5
15-12	Case 15-12: New Section 608 HORIZONTAL DIRECTIONAL DRILLING.	09/02/2015	Y	Y	Y	—	—	Y	—	—	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	—	Y	12-0-0-5
15-13	Case 15-13: Add text to Section 725.6 to identify what to include in a concrete mix design submittal.	Carry Forward																		0-0-0-0
15-14	Case 15-14: Revise Sections 321 and 325 to coordinate overlay work requirements.*	09/02/2015	Y	Y	Y	—	—	Y	—	—	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	—	Y	12-0-0-5

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

*: Indicates changes made to proposal prior to vote.

MARICOPA ASSOCIATION OF GOVERNMENTS

INFORMATION SUMMARY... for your review

DATE:

December 8, 2015

SUBJECT:

Maricopa and Pinal County Resident Population and Employment Projections

SUMMARY:

According to Executive Order 2011-04, the Arizona Department of Administration (ADOA) is responsible for preparing an official set of population projections for Arizona and each of its counties. ADOA has prepared a set of draft resident population projections for Maricopa County and Pinal County consistent with the 2015 Population Estimates. MAG has also developed draft employment projections which are consistent with the ADOA population projections using an updated methodology. MAG staff worked with staff of Central Arizona Governments (CAG) to create figures for Pinal County. Because there may be changes to the State and county projections totals by ADOA, on November 10, 2015, the MAG Population Technical Advisory Committee (POPTAC) recommended approval of the draft ADOA 2015 to 2050 population projections for Maricopa County and Pinal County; and the draft 2015 to 2050 employment projections for Maricopa County and Pinal County provided the county control totals are within three percent of the final control totals.

On November 18, 2015, MAG Management Committee recommended approval of the draft ADOA 2015 to 2050 population projections for Maricopa County and Pinal County; and the draft 2015 to 2050 employment projections for Maricopa County and Pinal County provided the county control totals are within three percent of the final control totals. The Pinal County control total will be presented to the CAG Regional Council.

UPDATE: Subsequent to the November 18 Management Committee meeting, the State Demographer revised the population projections by updating migration assumptions. The revised Pinal County population control total is 11.05 percent lower than the previous draft, and the revised Maricopa County population control total is 0.04 percent higher than the previous draft. Previously, the Pinal County 2050 population figure was 1,164,000. In the revised draft it is 1,036,000. Previously, the Maricopa County 2050 population figure was 6,696,000. In the revised draft it is 6,698,000. Employment totals were adjusted due to population change, with the population-to-employment ratios remaining constant. The revised control totals are attached.

The projections are for 2010, 2015, 2020, 2025, 2030, 2035, 2040, 2045, and 2050. They will be used as the control totals from which MAG will develop a set of sub-regional projections that will be brought to the Management Committee and Regional Council in 2016.

PUBLIC INPUT:

None.

PROS & CONS:

PROS: Maricopa and Pinal County employment and population projections will serve as control totals from which MAG will update its socioeconomic projections.

CONS: None

TECHNICAL & POLICY IMPLICATIONS:

TECHNICAL: The projections will be used to generate the subregional projections which will be input into traffic and air quality models.

POLICY: The final outputs of the population, transportation and air quality models will be used to identify infrastructure requirements.

ACTION NEEDED:

Approval of the Maricopa County and Pinal County resident population and employment projections for 2015, 2020, 2025, 2030, 2035, 2040, 2045, and 2050 provided the Maricopa County and Pinal County control totals are within three percent of the final control totals.

PRIOR COMMITTEE ACTIONS:

On November 18, 2015, the MAG Management Committee recommended approval of the Maricopa and Pinal County resident population and employment projections for 2015, 2020, 2025, 2030, 2035, 2040, 2045, and 2050 provided the county control totals are within three percent of the final control totals.

MEMBERS ATTENDING

- | | |
|---|---|
| Darryl H. Crossman, Litchfield Park, Chair | Kari Kent for Christopher Brady, Mesa |
| Tom Remes for Ed Zuercher, Phoenix | Dawn Marie Buckland for Kevin Burke, Paradise Valley |
| Matt Busby for Bryant Powell, Apache Junction | Carl Swenson, Peoria |
| Jessica Blazina for David Fitzhugh, Avondale | # Louis Andersen for Greg Stanley, Pinal County |
| Stephen Cleveland, Buckeye | John Kross, Queen Creek |
| * Gary Neiss, Carefree | * Bryan Meyers, Salt River Pima-Maricopa Indian Community |
| Peter Jankowski, Cave Creek | Brad Lundahl for Fritz Behring, Scottsdale |
| Marsha Reed, Chandler | # Bob Wingenroth, Surprise |
| Dr. Spencer Isom, El Mirage | Andrew Ching, Tempe |
| # Jess Knudson for Lisa Garcia, Florence | Reyes Medrano, Jr., Tolleson |
| Alfonso Rodriguez for Phil Dorchester, Fort McDowell Yavapai Nation | Joshua Wright, Wickenburg |
| # Grady Miller, Fountain Hills | Jeanne Blackman, Youngtown |
| # Ernest Rubi, Gila Bend | Sintra Hoffman for John Halikowski, ADOT |
| * Tina Notah, Gila River Indian Community | Tom Manos, Maricopa County |
| Patrick Banger, Gilbert | Wulf Grote for Steve Banta, Valley Metro/RPTA |
| Brent Stoddard for Dick Bowers, Glendale | |
| Brian Dalke, Goodyear | |
| * Rosemary Arellano, Guadalupe | |
| * Gregory Rose, City of Maricopa | |

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

On November 10, 2015, the MAG Population Technical Advisory Committee (POPTAC) recommended to the Management Committee approval of the Maricopa and Pinal County resident population and employment projections for 2015, 2020, 2025, 2030, 2035, 2040, 2045, and 2050 provided the county control totals are within three percent of the final control totals.

Member/Proxy

- | | |
|----------------------------------|------------------------------|
| * Patrick Banger, Gilbert, Chair | Larry Kirch, Apache Junction |
| # Tracy Clark, ADOT | Alison Rondone, Avondale |

- # Andrea Marquez, Buckeye
- * Stacey Bridge-Denzak, Carefree
- * Luke Kautzman, Cave Creek
- * Sam Andrea, Chandler
- Thomas Doyle, El Mirage
- # Ken Valverde, Fountain Hills
- * VACANT, Gila Bend
- * Thomas Ritz, Glendale
- Joe Schmitz, Goodyear
- * VACANT, Guadalupe
- * Sonny Culbreth, Litchfield Park
- # Rodolfo Lopez for Kazi Haque, Maricopa
- # Rachel Applegate for Matt Holm, Maricopa County

- * Wahid Alam, Mesa
- * Paul Michaud, Paradise Valley
- Jason Cleghorn, Peoria
- Adam Miller, Phoenix
- Travis Ashbaugh, Pinal County
- * Keith Newman, Queen Creek
- * Bryan Meyers, Salt River Pima-Maricopa Indian Community
- # Adam Yaron, Scottsdale
- Lloyd Abrams, Surprise
- Suparna Dasgupta, Tempe
- Corey Whittaker, Valley Metro
- Gregory Arrington, Youngtown
- Joshua Wright, Wickenburg, Vice Chair

* Those not present

Those attending by audioconference

+ Those attending by videoconference

On November 10, 2015, the MAG POPTAC Ad Hoc Subcommittee recommended to the MAG POPTAC that the Maricopa and Pinal County resident population and employment projections for 2015, 2020, 2025, 2030, 2035, 2040, 2045, and 2050 be approved provided the county control totals are within three percent of the final control totals.

Member/Proxy

- Joshua Wright, Wickenburg, Chair
- * Sam Andrea, Chandler
- * Thomas Ritz, Glendale
- * Wahid Alam, Mesa

- Adam Miller, Phoenix
- # Rachel Applegate for Matt Holm, Maricopa County
- # Adam Yaron, Scottsdale
- Suparna Dasgupta, Tempe

* Those not present

Participated via audioconference

+ Those attending by videoconference

CONTACT PERSON:

Anubhav Bagley, MAG (602) 254-6300

DRAFT Population and Employment Projections for July 1 of each year

Maricopa County

Year	Total Resident Population	Total Employment
2015	4,076,500	1,920,900
2020	4,481,000	2,153,000
2025	4,886,000	2,311,700
2030	5,280,000	2,477,300
2035	5,666,000	2,657,300
2040	6,031,000	2,849,800
2045	6,372,000	3,047,100
2050	6,698,000	3,252,400

Pinal County

Year	Total Resident Population	Total Employment
2015	407,000	68,000
2020	464,000	77,300
2025	528,000	89,600
2030	605,000	111,900
2035	697,000	139,400
2040	801,000	172,100
2045	913,000	210,100
2050	1,036,000	254,500

Notes:

Population projections are from the Arizona Department of Administration Draft Projections, December 2015. Employment projections are based on the attached methodology.

Population and employment projections above have been rounded to the nearest thousand.

MARICOPA ASSOCIATION OF GOVERNMENTS

INFORMATION SUMMARY... for your review

DATE:

December 8, 2015

SUBJECT:

Approval of the Draft July 1, 2015 Municipality Resident Population Updates

SUMMARY:

MAG staff has prepared draft July 1, 2015 Municipality Resident Population Updates. MAG staff worked with staff from Central Arizona Governments (CAG) to create sub-county updates for Pinal County communities. The Updates, which are used to prepare budgets and set expenditure limitations, were prepared using the 2010 Census as the base and updated with housing unit data supplied and verified by MAG member agencies. Because there may be changes to the state and county control total by the Arizona Department of Administration (ADOA), on November 10, 2015, the MAG Population Technical Advisory Committee (POPTAC) recommended approval of these draft Updates provided that the County control totals are within one percent of the final control totals.

The Arizona Department of Administration Council for Technical Solutions is currently reviewing these updates along with those for the remainder of the State. 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, 2015 Municipality Resident Population Updates are needed to gauge growth in the region, prepare budgets and set expenditure limitations.

CONS: None.

TECHNICAL & POLICY IMPLICATIONS:

TECHNICAL: The July 1, 2015 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, 2015 Municipality Resident Population Updates are needed by local officials to accommodate and budget for growth.

ACTION NEEDED:

Approval of the draft July 1, 2015 Municipality Resident Population Updates for MAG Member Agencies provided that the Maricopa County and Pinal County control totals are within one percent of the final control total.

PRIOR COMMITTEE ACTIONS:

On November 18, 2015, the MAG Management Committee recommended to Regional Council approval of the July 1, 2015 Municipality Resident Population Updates provided that the county control totals are within one percent of the final control totals.

MEMBERS ATTENDING

- Darryl H. Crossman, Litchfield Park, Chair
- Tom Remes for Ed Zuercher, Phoenix
- Matt Busby for Bryant Powell, Apache Junction
- Jessica Blazina for David Fitzhugh, Avondale
- Stephen Cleveland, Buckeye
- * Gary Neiss, Carefree
- Peter Jankowski, Cave Creek
- Marsha Reed, Chandler
- Dr. Spencer Isom, El Mirage
- # Jess Knudson for Lisa Garcia, Florence
- Alfonso Rodriguez for Phil Dorchester, Fort McDowell Yavapai Nation
- # Grady Miller, Fountain Hills
- # Ernest Rubi, Gila Bend
- * Tina Notah, Gila River Indian Community
- Patrick Banger, Gilbert
- Brent Stoddard for Dick Bowers, Glendale
- Brian Dalke, Goodyear
- * Rosemary Arellano, Guadalupe
- * Gregory Rose, City of Maricopa

- Kari Kent for Christopher Brady, Mesa
- Dawn Marie Buckland for Kevin Burke, Paradise Valley
- Carl Swenson, Peoria
- # Louis Andersen for Greg Stanley, Pinal County
- John Kross, Queen Creek
- * Bryan Meyers, Salt River Pima-Maricopa Indian Community
- Brad Lundahl for Fritz Behring, Scottsdale
- # Bob Wingenroth, Surprise
- Andrew Ching, Tempe
- Reyes Medrano, Jr., Tolleson
- Joshua Wright, Wickenburg
- Jeanne Blackman, Youngtown
- Sintra Hoffman for John Halikowski, ADOT
- Tom Manos, Maricopa County
- Wulf Grote for Steve Banta, Valley Metro/RPTA

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

MAG POPTAC: On November 10, 2015, the MAG Population Technical Advisory Committee unanimously recommended approval of the July 1, 2015 Municipality Resident Population Updates provided that the county control totals are within one percent of the final control totals.

MEMBERS ATTENDING

- * Patrick Banger, Gilbert, Chair
- # Tracy Clark, ADOT
- Larry Kirch, Apache Junction
- Alison Rondone, Avondale
- # Andrea Marquez, Buckeye
- * Stacey Bridge-Denzak, Carefree
- * Luke Kautzman, Cave Creek
- * Sam Andrea, Chandler
- Thomas Doyle, El Mirage
- # Ken Valverde, Fountain Hills
- * VACANT, Gila Bend
- * Thomas Ritz, Glendale
- Joe Schmitz, Goodyear
- * VACANT, Guadalupe
- * Sonny Culbreth, Litchfield Park

- # Rodolfo Lopez for Kazi Haque, Maricopa
- # Rachel Applegate for Matt Holm, Maricopa County
- * Wahid Alam, Mesa
- * Paul Michaud, Paradise Valley
- Jason Cleghorn, Peoria
- Adam Miller, Phoenix
- Travis Ashbaugh, Pinal County
- * Keith Newman, Queen Creek
- * Bryan Meyers, Salt River Pima-Maricopa Indian Community
- # Adam Yaron, Scottsdale
- Lloyd Abrams, Surprise
- Suparna Dasgupta, Tempe
- Corey Whittaker, Valley Metro

Gregory Arrington, Youngtown

Joshua Wright, Wickenburg, Vice Chair

Those attending by audioconference

+ Those attending by videoconference

* Those not present

MAG POPTAC Ad Hoc Subcommittee: On November 10, 2015, the MAG Population Technical Advisory Committee Ad Hoc Subcommittee unanimously recommended approval of the Municipality July 1, 2015 Resident Population Updates provided that the county control totals are within one percent of the final control totals.

MEMBERS ATTENDING

Joshua Wright, Wickenburg, Chair

Adam Miller, Phoenix

* Sam Andrea, Chandler

Rachel Applegate for Matt Holm, Maricopa County

* Thomas Ritz, Glendale

Adam Yaron, Scottsdale

* Wahid Alam, Mesa

Suparna Dasgupta, Tempe

* Those not present

Participated via audioconference

+ Those attending by videoconference

CONTACT PERSON:

Anubhav Bagley, MAG, (602) 254-6300.

DRAFT
Jurisdiction Population Update
Census 2010 and July 1, 2015

Jurisdiction	Total Population			Percent Change	
	April 1, 2010 (Census 2010)	July 1, 2015	Change	Overall	Annual
Apache Junction	35,840	38,451	2,611	7.29%	1.35%
Maricopa County portion	294	303	9	3.06%	0.58%
Pinal County portion	35,546	38,148	2,602	7.32%	1.35%
Avondale	76,238	78,917	2,679	3.51%	0.66%
Buckeye	50,876	61,195	10,319	20.28%	3.58%
Carefree	3,363	3,526	163	4.85%	0.91%
Cave Creek	5,015	5,431	416	8.30%	1.53%
Chandler^	236,326	255,176	18,850	7.98%	1.47%
El Mirage	31,797	33,351	1,554	4.89%	0.91%
Florence	25,536	26,416	880	3.45%	0.65%
Fort McDowell	971	1,000	29	2.99%	0.56%
Fountain Hills	22,489	23,356	867	3.86%	0.72%
Gila Bend	1,922	1,977	55	2.86%	0.54%
Gila River	11,712	11,900	188	1.61%	0.30%
Maricopa County portion	2,994	3,086	92	3.07%	0.58%
Pinal County portion	8,718	8,814	96	1.10%	0.21%
Gilbert^	208,352	242,955	34,603	16.61%	2.97%
Glendale	226,721	234,859	8,138	3.59%	0.67%
Goodyear	65,275	77,806	12,531	19.20%	3.40%
Guadalupe	5,523	6,138	615	11.14%	2.03%
Litchfield Park	5,476	6,022	546	9.97%	1.83%
Maricopa	43,482	48,162	4,680	10.76%	1.97%
Mesa	439,041	461,135	22,094	5.03%	0.94%
Paradise Valley	12,820	13,679	859	6.70%	1.24%
Peoria*	154,058	167,607	13,549	8.79%	1.62%
Phoenix^	1,447,128	1,528,115	80,987	5.60%	1.04%
Queen Creek	26,361	33,981	7,620	28.91%	4.96%
Maricopa County portion	25,912	33,506	7,594	29.31%	5.02%
Pinal County portion	449	475	26	5.79%	1.08%
Salt River	6,289	6,644	355	5.64%	1.05%
Scottsdale	217,385	231,297	13,912	6.40%	1.19%
Surprise	117,517	125,672	8,155	6.94%	1.29%
Tempe	161,719	172,086	10,367	6.41%	1.19%
Tolleson	6,545	6,840	295	4.51%	0.84%
Wickenburg*	6,363	6,646	283	4.45%	0.83%
Youngtown	6,156	6,470	314	5.10%	0.95%
Unincorporated Maricopa County	272,552	283,267	10,715	3.93%	0.74%
Unincorporated Pinal County**	178,799	196,083	17,284	9.67%	1.77%
Portions in MAG MPA	124,428	138,159	13,731	11.04%	2.01%

DRAFT, last updated: November 6, 2015

Note: Totals may not add due to rounding

* Maricopa County portion only

** Excludes Gila River portion

^ Census 2010 counts adjusted to reflect Census Count Question Resolutions

Sources: U.S. Census Bureau, Arizona State Demographer's Office, Maricopa Association of Governments (MAG), Central Arizona Governments (CAG)

Pinal County jurisdiction estimates were created in collaboration with CAG staff; Pinal County control total and sub-county estimates will be presented to CAG Regional Council

See attached document for methodology

DRAFT

Population Update Census 2010 and July 1, 2015

	July 1, 2010	July 1, 2015	Change
Maricopa County	3,817,117	4,078,062	260,945
Pinal County	375,770	405,363	29,593
In MAG MPA	238,159	260,174	22,015
MAG MPA total	4,055,276	4,338,236	282,960

Sources: U.S. Census Bureau,
Arizona State Demographer's Office,
Maricopa Association of Governments,
Central Arizona Governments

DRAFT, last updated: November 6, 2015

Pinal County jurisdiction estimates were created in collaboration with CAG staff; Pinal County control total and sub-county estimates will be presented to CAG Regional Council

MARICOPA ASSOCIATION OF GOVERNMENTS

INFORMATION SUMMARY... for your review

DATE:

December 8, 2015

SUBJECT:

MAG 208 Water Quality Management Plan Amendment for the Central Buckeye Wastewater Treatment Plant Arizona Pollutant Discharge Elimination System Permit Discharges to the Roosevelt Canal and Buckeye Canal

SUMMARY:

The City of Buckeye has requested that the MAG 208 Water Quality Management Plan be amended to include the Central Buckeye Wastewater Treatment Plant Arizona Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (AZPDES) Permit Discharges to the Roosevelt Canal and Buckeye Canal. The facility is identified in the MAG 208 Plan with an ultimate capacity of 45.8 million gallons per day. Reclaimed water is currently disposed of through reuse and an AZPDES Permit discharge to a lateral of the Buckeye Canal located near the facility. This amendment identifies additional AZPDES Permit discharge points for the Central Buckeye Wastewater Treatment Plant to the Roosevelt Canal and the Buckeye Canal. Although this amendment includes additional AZPDES Permit discharge points, the methods of effluent disposal currently identified in the MAG 208 Plan for the facility will continue to remain options. Unincorporated Maricopa County is located within three miles of the project. Maricopa County has submitted a letter indicating that the project is not in conflict with Maricopa County plans for the area and it is acceptable.

On October 1, 2015, the MAG Water Quality Advisory Committee authorized a public hearing on the Draft MAG 208 Water Quality Management Plan Amendment for the Central Buckeye Wastewater Treatment Plant Arizona Pollutant Discharge Elimination System Permit Discharges to the Roosevelt Canal and Buckeye Canal. The MAG Water Quality Advisory Committee conducted the public hearing on November 17, 2015 and no public comments were received. Immediately following the public hearing, the Committee recommended approval for the Draft 208 Plan Amendment. On November 18, 2015, the MAG Management Committee recommended approval of the Draft 208 Amendment. The amendment is posted on the MAG website at: [http://www.azmag.gov/Documents/Central Buckeye AZPDES Permit Discharges.pdf](http://www.azmag.gov/Documents/Central_Buckeye_AZPDES_Permit_Discharges.pdf).

PUBLIC INPUT:

On November 17, 2015, the MAG Water Quality Advisory Committee conducted a public hearing on the Draft MAG 208 Plan Amendment. No public comments were received. An opportunity for public comment was also provided at the November 18, 2015 MAG Management Committee meeting and no public comments were received.

PROS & CONS:

PROS: Approval of the 208 Plan Amendment would make the additional Arizona Pollutant Discharge Eliminations System Permit discharges to the Roosevelt Canal and Buckeye Canal consistent with the MAG 208 Plan. The MAG 208 Water Quality Management Plan is the key guiding document used

by Maricopa County and the Arizona Department of Environmental Quality in granting permits for wastewater treatment systems in the MAG region.

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

TECHNICAL & POLICY IMPLICATIONS:

TECHNICAL: The 208 Plan Amendment is needed to accommodate future effluent discharges from the Central Buckeye Wastewater Treatment Plant to the Roosevelt Canal and Buckeye Canal.

POLICY: The MAG 208 Water Quality Management Plan is the key guiding document used by Maricopa County and the Arizona Department of Environmental Quality in granting permits for wastewater treatment facilities in the MAG region. Approval of the MAG 208 Plan Amendment would enable the additional AZPDES discharge points to the Roosevelt Canal and Buckeye Canal for the Central Buckeye Wastewater Treatment Plant to be deemed consistent with the MAG 208 Plan. Consistency is necessary for permit approvals.

ACTION NEEDED:

Approval of the MAG 208 Water Quality Management Plan Amendment for the Central Buckeye Wastewater Treatment Plant Arizona Pollutant Discharge Elimination System Permit Discharges to the Roosevelt Canal and Buckeye Canal.

PRIOR COMMITTEE ACTIONS:

Management Committee: On November 18, 2015, the MAG Management Committee recommended approval of the Draft MAG 208 Water Quality Management Plan Amendment for the Central Buckeye Wastewater Treatment Plant Arizona Pollutant Discharge Elimination System Permit Discharges to the Roosevelt Canal and Buckeye Canal, with three abstentions (shaded). According to the MAG By-Laws, "Members of MAG that are in the Pinal County Area are entitled to vote on all matters coming before any meetings of its membership except those that are exclusive to the Maricopa County Boundary defined by State Law or through a planning designation by a Governor's Executive Order, including but not limited to the Transportation Excise Tax enacted by Maricopa County, Section 208 Water Quality Management Planning, and Solid Waste Management Planning."

MEMBERS ATTENDING

- Darryl H. Crossman, Litchfield Park, Chair
- Tom Remes for Ed Zuercher, Phoenix
- Matt Busby for Bryant Powell, Apache Junction
- Jessica Blazina for David Fitzhugh, Avondale
- Stephen Cleveland, Buckeye
- * Gary Neiss, Carefree
- Peter Jankowski, Cave Creek
- Marsha Reed, Chandler
- Dr. Spencer Isom, El Mirage
- # Jess Knudson for Lisa Garcia, Florence
- Alfonso Rodriguez for Phil Dorchester, Fort McDowell Yavapai Nation
- # Grady Miller, Fountain Hills
- # Ernest Rubi, Gila Bend
- * Tina Notah, Gila River Indian Community

- Patrick Banger, Gilbert
- Brent Stoddard for Dick Bowers, Glendale
- Brian Dalke, Goodyear
- * Rosemary Arellano, Guadalupe
- * Gregory Rose, City of Maricopa
- Kari Kent for Christopher Brady, Mesa
- Dawn Marie Buckland for Kevin Burke, Paradise Valley
- Carl Swenson, Peoria
- # Louis Andersen for Greg Stanley, Pinal County
- John Kross, Queen Creek
- * Bryan Meyers, Salt River Pima-Maricopa Indian Community
- Brad Lundahl for Fritz Behring, Scottsdale

Bob Wingenroth, Surprise
Andrew Ching, Tempe
Reyes Medrano, Jr., Tolleson
Joshua Wright, Wickenburg
Jeanne Blackman, Youngtown

Sintra Hoffman for John Halikowski,
ADOT
Tom Manos, Maricopa County
Wulf Grote for Steve Banta, Valley
Metro/RPTA

* Those members neither present nor represented by proxy.

Participated by telephone conference call. + Participated by videoconference call.

Water Quality Advisory Committee: On November 17, 2015, the MAG Water Quality Advisory Committee unanimously recommended approval of the Draft MAG 208 Water Quality Management Plan Amendment for the Central Buckeye Wastewater Treatment Plant Arizona Pollutant Discharge Elimination System Permit Discharges to the Roosevelt Canal and Buckeye Canal.

MEMBERS ATTENDING

Randy Gottler, Phoenix, Chair
Barbara Chappell, Avondale, Vice Chair
Roger Klingler for Arnold Coronado,
Buckeye
Anupa Jain, Chandler
* Larry Dobrosky, El Mirage
Mark Horn, Gilbert
Megan Sheldon, Glendale
Javier Setovich for Mark Seamans,
Goodyear
Daniel Cleavenger, Mesa
Michael Weber, Peoria
Greg Homol, Queen Creek
Terry Lowe, Surprise
* Suzanne Grendahl, Scottsdale
* David McNeil, Tempe

Reyes Medrano for Mark Berrelez,
Tolleson
Kevin Chadwick, Maricopa County
* Henry Day, Arizona Public Service
Company
Jim Kudlinski, Salt River Project
* Edward Martin, University of Arizona
Maricopa County Cooperative
Extension
Michael Byrd, Salt River Pima-Maricopa
Indian Community
* Carole Coe Klopatek, Fort McDowell
Yavapai Nation
Elisabeth Kahn for Glenn Stark, Gila
River Indian Community
Ray Jones, Water Utilities Association of
Arizona

* Those members neither present nor represented by proxy.

Participated by telephone conference call. + Participated by videoconference call.

CONTACT PERSON:

Julie Hoffman, Environmental Planning Program Manager, (602) 254-6300.

Public Hearing on the Draft MAG 208 Water Quality
Management Plan Amendment for the Central Buckeye
Wastewater Treatment Plant Arizona Pollutant Discharge
Elimination System Permit Discharges to the Roosevelt
Canal and Buckeye Canal

Phoenix, Arizona

November 17, 2015

3:02 p.m.

PREPARED FOR:
MARICOPA ASSOCIATION OF
GOVERNMENTS
(ORIGINAL)

REPORTED BY:
Debora Mitchell
Arizona CCR No. 50768
AZ Registered Reporting Firm No. R1008



Ottmar & Associates, Inc.
Court Reporters/Videoconference/Transcription
3770 N. 7th Street, Suite 150
Phoenix, AZ 85014
T 602.485.1488
scheduling@ottmarassoc.com

PUBLIC HEARING on the Draft MAG 208 Water Quality Management Plan Amendment for the Central Buckeye Wastewater Treatment Plant Arizona Pollutant Discharge Elimination System Permit Discharges to the Roosevelt Canal and Buckeye Canal, taken on November 17, 2015, commencing at 3:02 p.m., at MARICOPA ASSOCIATION OF GOVERNMENTS, 302 North First Avenue, Suite 200, Phoenix, Arizona, before Debora Mitchell, an Arizona Certified Reporter, in and for the County of Maricopa, State of Arizona.

COMMITTEE MEMBERS ATTENDING

Randy Gottler, Phoenix, Chair
Barbara Chappell, Avondale, Vice Chair
Roger Klingler for Arnold Coronado, Buckeye
Anupa Jain, Chandler
Mark Horn, Gilbert
Megan Sheldon, Glendale
Daniel Cleavenger, Mesa
Michael Weber, Peoria
Greg Homol, Queen Creek
Reyes Medrano for Mark Berrelez, Tolleson
Kevin Chadwick, Maricopa County
Jim Kudlinski, Salt River Project
Elisabeth Kahn for Glenn Stark, Gila River Indian Community
Ray Jones, Water Utilities Association of Arizona

COMMITTEE MEMBERS ATTENDING BY TELEPHONE CONFERENCE
CALL

Javier Setovich for Mark Seamans, Goodyear
Terry Lowe, Surprise
Michael Byrd, Salt River Pima-Maricopa Indian
Community

OTHERS PRESENT

Julie Hoffman, Maricopa Association of Governments
Kara Johnson, Maricopa Association of Governments
Scott Miller, Arizona Public Service
Ron Whitler, Buckeye

1 MR. GOTTLER: All right, what we are here
2 for. The next item on the agenda is an open public
3 hearing on the Draft MAG 208 Water Quality Management
4 Plan Amendment for the Central Buckeye Wastewater
5 Treatment Plant Arizona Pollutant Discharge Elimination
6 System Permit Discharges to the Roosevelt and Buckeye
7 Canals.

8 We are going to begin this briefing on the
9 draft amendment, but I want everyone to know we have a
10 court reporter here to record these minutes so we have
11 an official record. And written comments, if you have
12 them, are welcome. Just recognize that if you have
13 comments or questions, the City will have to answer
14 those. And with that, I will introduce Ron Whitler.

15 MR. WHITLER: Thank you, everyone, for
16 attending. We appreciate your support. We appreciate
17 you taking the time to consider our amendment.

18 The purpose of the amendment is to add an
19 additional -- add two additional AZPDES discharge
20 points for the Central Buckeye Wastewater Treatment
21 Plant. The plant currently discharges Class A+
22 effluent to a lateral of the Buckeye Canal, which is
23 located adjacent to the Central Buckeye Wastewater
24 Treatment Plant. We would like to add two additional
25 discharge points. One will enable discharge of

1 Class A+ effluent to the Roosevelt Canal, and the other
2 will allow discharge as a contingency to the main
3 Buckeye Canal. So that will give us three options.

4 I will give you a description of some of
5 the cross streets in the area so you can picture where
6 the discharge points will be. The current discharge
7 adjacent to the Central Buckeye Wastewater Treatment
8 Plant is located between Miller Road and Apache Road on
9 the west and east, and between Beloat Road on the north
10 and the Gila River on of the south. It is actually
11 about a quarter mile south of Beloat Road.

12 The proposed discharge to the Roosevelt
13 Canal is located adjacent to the Sundance Water
14 Reclamation Facility, which is also owned and operated
15 by the City of Buckeye. That plant also produces Class
16 A+ effluent. The location of that discharge to the
17 Roosevelt Canal will be north of Lower Buckeye Road and
18 east of Dean Road. The proposed contingency discharge
19 to the main Buckeye Canal will be located near Dean
20 Road about a quarter mile south of Southern Avenue.

21 I will give you a few facts. The current
22 design capacity of the Central Buckeye Wastewater
23 Treatment Plant is 4.5 MGD. In 2014, we discharged a
24 daily average of 1.1 MGD. The ultimate design buildout
25 projection is 45.8 MGD for the plant. I will get

1 started with the slide show.

2 The project is located entirely within
3 Buckeye's Municipal Planning Area. Portions are within
4 Buckeye's incorporated area, and it is entirely within
5 Buckeye's sewer service areas. The only jurisdiction
6 within three miles, except the City of Buckeye, is
7 unincorporated Maricopa County. A letter of no
8 conflict was received from Maricopa County.

9 The purpose of the amendment is to add
10 additional AZPDES discharge points for the Central
11 Buckeye Wastewater Treatment Plant to the Roosevelt
12 Canal and to the Buckeye Canal, which would be for a
13 contingency discharge. The amendment will not result
14 in a change in flow, which is currently 1.1 MGD. The
15 amendment will not result in a change in treatment
16 processes. It will still be Class A+ effluent that is
17 discharged.

18 Recently, ADEQ, the Arizona Department of
19 Environmental Quality, evaluated total maximum daily
20 loads for boron and selenium on the middle Gila River.
21 Boron and selenium concentrations from the Central
22 Buckeye Wastewater Treatment Plant and Sundance Water
23 Reclamation Facility were considered during ADEQ's
24 evaluation.

25 Why does Buckeye need this project?

1 Currently 90 percent of the effluent from the Central
2 Buckeye Wastewater Treatment Plant is discharged
3 without benefit to the City. And that is because the
4 plant is located within the Buckeye waterlogged area.
5 In December 2011, the depth to groundwater at the plant
6 was three feet, so we had to install dewatering wells
7 to keep the groundwater levels below manholes and
8 electrical duct banks. We need to convey the effluent
9 out of the Buckeye waterlogged area to areas where we
10 can reuse it and eventually recharge it. We can't
11 recharge anywhere near the plant due to the shallow
12 groundwater levels.

13 The benefits of this project, it will
14 convey Class A+ effluent to the Roosevelt Canal. The
15 Roosevelt Canal was permitted as a groundwater savings
16 facility. By sending effluent to the Roosevelt Canal
17 groundwater savings facility, they can use the effluent
18 for nonedible crops and landscape irrigation. And in
19 turn, the City of Buckeye can receive long-term storage
20 credits that are needed to maintain an assured water
21 supply.

22 Also this project involves the
23 construction of a 12-inch diameter effluent pipeline.
24 Building the pipeline to get it up to the Roosevelt
25 Canal will also allow us to get it to Sundance Park

1 where we can use the effluent for turf irrigation
2 instead of potable groundwater.

3 I will back up. Also eventually we would
4 like to build a recharge facility north of the
5 Roosevelt Canal. We've met with the Arizona Department
6 of Water Resources, and they are not comfortable with
7 us building a recharge facility anywhere south of the
8 Roosevelt Canal because it is too close to the Buckeye
9 waterlogged area. But they have a level of comfort
10 with us building one north of the Roosevelt Canal. So
11 the goal of this whole project is to pipe the effluent
12 to a location where we can reuse it, get some long-term
13 storage credits, and eventually recharge it.

14 An additional benefit is, since this
15 project will allow us to reuse more of the effluent,
16 less of the effluent will be discharged to the Gila
17 River.

18 The project is being financed by a WIFA
19 loan. Repayment will be from sewer and reclaimed water
20 rates and fees.

21 Here are a few maps. This map shows
22 Buckeye's Municipal Planning Area. The project is
23 entirely within Buckeye's Municipal Planning Area. You
24 can see that asterisk is the Central Buckeye Wastewater
25 Treatment Plant, and the Sundance Water Reclamation

1 Facility is located up there on the Roosevelt Canal.
2 This is the main Buckeye Canal, and then the Gila River
3 is down here just south of the Central Buckeye
4 Wastewater Treatment Plant.

5 This map also shows Buckeye's Municipal
6 Planning Area, the red or orange boundary. But it only
7 shows the sewer service areas for the Central Buckeye
8 Wastewater Treatment Plant and the Sundance Water
9 Reclamation Facility.

10 This asterisk is the proposed discharge
11 point along the main Buckeye Canal. This would be for
12 a contingency discharge. And this asterisk shows the
13 primary discharge point on the Roosevelt Canal.

14 This exhibit shows the effluent pipeline
15 in purple. It will cross under the Roosevelt Canal,
16 which you can see on the south side, and then work its
17 way up to the Sundance Water Reclamation Facility.
18 That portion of the pipeline is already constructed,
19 and you can see the asterisk on the Roosevelt Canal.
20 That is the proposed discharge point. The City has yet
21 to build a pipeline across to the discharge point. We
22 hope to accomplish that soon.

23 This figure shows the entire pipeline.
24 The portion in blue is newly constructed. The portion
25 in red was already in existence because the Sundance

1 Water Reclamation Facility discharged to the main
2 Buckeye Canal. So we built a new portion of the
3 pipeline, and then we will push the effluent north up
4 to the Roosevelt Canal.

5 You can see this circle here, the Central
6 Buckeye Wastewater Treatment Plant is located within
7 that circle. And the Sundance Water Reclamation
8 Facility is located within that circle. The Buckeye
9 waterlogged area is down in this area. And this is a
10 schematic that shows the current reuse locations. And
11 the proposed pipeline route is dashed, and the existing
12 darker purple lines are existing lines.

13 Currently effluent from the Central
14 Buckeye Wastewater Treatment Plant, a small amount goes
15 to Earl Edgar Park, and some is used at the fire
16 training facility adjacent to the Central Buckeye
17 Wastewater Treatment Plant. But 90 percent of the
18 effluent is currently discharged without benefit to the
19 City.

20 The pipeline will trans east along Beloat
21 Road and then north along Dean Road, and this is the
22 contingency discharge point to the Buckeye Canal. And
23 then the line will continue up north to near the
24 Sundance Water Reclamation Facility where it will be
25 discharged to the Roosevelt Canal. This is Sundance

1 Park where the effluent can be reused. This is the
2 Sundance Golf Course where the effluent is currently
3 reused from the Sundance plant.

4 Are there any questions?

5 MR. GOTTLER: Okay. At this time public
6 comments are invited on the Draft 208 Amendment. I
7 just want to remind people of a couple of things: one,
8 if you are with the public and you wish to comment, we
9 will need those cards filled out prior to your
10 comments. The second is a reminder for the committee
11 that an opportunity for questions and discussions on
12 the draft amendment were provided under the next item.
13 So with that, does anybody have any questions?

14 Thank you.

15 MR. WHITLER: Thank you very much.

16 MR. GOTTLER: MAG appreciates everyone's
17 interest in this, and we are glad you are here, and at
18 this time we would like to close the hearing and
19 request that the court reporter end transcription.

20 Thank you.

21 (Conclusion of public hearing at
22 3:17 p.m.)

23

24

25

STATE OF ARIZONA)
) ss.
 COUNTY OF MARICOPA)

BE IT KNOWN that the foregoing proceedings were taken before me; that the foregoing proceedings were taken down by me using the voice writing method and translated into text via speech recognition under my direction; and that the foregoing typewritten pages are a full, true, and accurate transcript of all proceedings, all done to the best of my ability.

I CERTIFY that I am in no way related to any of the parties hereto, nor am I in any way interested in the outcome hereof.

- Review and signature was requested.
 Review and signature was waived.
 Review and signature not required.

I CERTIFY that I have complied with the ethical obligations set forth in ACJA 7-206(F)(3) and ACJA (J)(1)(g)(1) and (2). Dated at Phoenix, Arizona, this 18th day of November, 2015.

Debra Mitchell

Debora Mitchell
 AZ Certified Reporter No. 50768

I CERTIFY that OTTMAR & ASSOCIATES, INC., has complied with the ethical obligations set forth in ACJA 7-206(J)(1)(g)(1) through (6).

Julie T. Ottmar

OTTMAR & ASSOCIATES, INC.
 AZ Registered Reporting Firm No. R1008

MARICOPA ASSOCIATION OF GOVERNMENTS

INFORMATION SUMMARY... for your review

DATE:

December 8, 2015

SUBJECT:

Streamlining of the MAG 208 Plan Small Plant Review and Approval Process

SUMMARY:

The Maricopa Association of Governments shares the importance of economic development for the region with the Arizona Department of Environmental Quality (ADEQ) and has agreed to work cooperatively with them on streamlining options for the 208 Water Quality Management Plan Process that would not jeopardize the integrity of the process. The goal of this effort is to make the process more efficient and the region more globally competitive. On August 26, 2015, the MAG Regional Council approved the Proposal for Streamlining the 208 Water Quality Management Plan Process. The 208 Process was evaluated by a small Stakeholder Group that included representatives from cities and towns, Maricopa County, private utilities, homebuilders, and ADEQ. A representative from the Governor's Office was also invited. As part of the streamlining process, the Stakeholder Group on June 30, 2015 recommended that corresponding changes be made to the MAG 208 Plan Small Plant Review and Approval Process. This is a shortened process for wastewater treatment facilities 2.0 million gallons per day or less with no discharge. The corresponding changes have now been made that streamline the Small Plant Review and Approval Process from approximately 12 to 17 months to approximately six months. This represents a 50 to 65 percent reduction in the overall timeline for a Small Plant Review and Approval (see attachments).

As the designated Regional Water Quality Management Planning Agency for Maricopa County, MAG prepares the 208 Water Quality Management Plan for the region. The MAG 208 Plan consists of two major elements: the Point Source element and the Nonpoint Source element. The Point Source element describes the preferred wastewater treatment system to serve the needs of the area over a 20 year time period. The Nonpoint Source element primarily describes regional surface and groundwater quality, and federal and state program activities designed to control nonpoint source pollution. The MAG 208 Water Quality Management Plan is the key guiding document used by the Arizona Department of Environmental Quality and Maricopa County in granting permits for wastewater treatment plants in the region. Consistency with the 208 Plan is required for the Aquifer Protection Permit and Arizona Pollutant Discharge Elimination System Permit (AZPDES) issued by ADEQ. Consistency with the 208 Plan is also required for the Approval to Construct issued by the Maricopa County Environmental Services Department.

The streamlining efforts have resulted in improvements throughout the Small Plant Review and Approval Process including at the local level before a 208 application is provided to MAG for consideration, the MAG Process at the regional level, and the ADEQ Process from the point in which the approved application is submitted to ADEQ from MAG. As part of the streamlined process, the cities, towns, and Maricopa County will provide project updates to MAG to ensure new deadlines are met.

The proposal to streamline the Small Plant Review and Approval Process includes changes that streamline the process without jeopardizing its integrity. Improvements were made to the MAG member agency portion of the Small Plant Review and Approval Process to provide clarity, assistance to the business community, and a shortened time frame. A pre-application packet has been developed by MAG to assist the applicant in determining if a Small Plant Review and Approval is needed and what would be the next steps. A 60 day deadline has been set for the jurisdiction in which the facility would be located to determine the Small Plant Review and Approval application complete. Once it has been determined complete, the jurisdiction has 60 days to review the Small Plant Review and Approval and submit it to MAG. A workshop would be held by the jurisdiction in which the facility would be located to inform the other jurisdictions within three miles of the Small Plant Review and Approval and request letters of no objection, support, or comment. The jurisdiction would provide updates to MAG staff on the timelines for the small plant application completeness and review. MAG would then monitor the projects to ensure these deadlines are met. During the MAG member agency portion of the 208 Process, the applicant would also identify and contact private utilities within three miles of the Small Plant Review and Approval to make them aware of the project.

Improvements to the MAG portion of the Small Plant Review and Approval Process include changes that provide clarity, transparency, and a shortened time frame due to the MAG pre-application packet. The pre-application packet has been developed and includes: a step-by-step description of the Small Plant Review and Approval Process, a table on the guidelines for small plants within Municipal Small Plant Planning Areas; a table on the criteria for the feasibility report for small plants outside Municipal Small Plant Planning Areas; and links to previously approved Small Plant Review and Approvals to use as an example.

Improvements to the Arizona Department of Environmental Quality portion of the Small Plant Review and Approval Process include changes that provide parallel processing, concurrent reviews, and a shortened time frame. The ADEQ could issue a conditional Aquifer Protection Permit that would allow for parallel processing and concurrent reviews with the Small Plant Review and Approval Process. In addition, ADEQ has indicated that it would make its certification decision within 15 days of receiving the Small Plant Review and Approval from MAG. The ADEQ would then submit a letter and proposal summary to the Maricopa County Environmental Services Department and developer stating whether the proposed project is in conformance with the MAG 208 Plan.

The Stakeholder Group has requested that an annual evaluation be conducted of the streamlined Small Plant Review and Approval Process to determine if there is a need for additional improvements. An update would then be provided to the MAG Management Committee and the MAG Regional Council.

With the corresponding changes now being made to the Small Plant Review and Approval Process, the Stakeholder Group has made great strides to ensure both the 208 Plan Amendment and Small Plant Review and Approval Processes are more efficient and business friendly. In addition, the conditional Aquifer Protection Permit that could be issued by ADEQ allows for parallel processing and concurrent reviews with the Small Plant Review and Approval Process.

PUBLIC INPUT:

No public input has been received.

PROS & CONS:

PROS: The proposal has been developed to streamline the entire MAG 208 Plan Small Plant Review and Approval Process to make it more efficient and the region more globally competitive. The streamlining efforts shorten the time frame from approximately 12 to 17 months to approximately six

months, which is a 50 to 65 percent reduction in the overall timeline. The improvements provide clarity, transparency, assistance to the business community, parallel processing, concurrent reviews, and a shortened time frame.

CONS: There were many improvements made to the 208 Amendment Process and now to the Small Plant Review and Approval Process to address comments from the Stakeholder Group, especially the private sector. However, there was not agreement to eliminate MAG member agency sponsorship of a 208 Amendment or Small Plant Review and Approval. The homebuilders representative on the Stakeholder Group indicated that streamlining efforts have gone beyond what he had expected; however, it does not go far enough. Representatives from the Homebuilders Association of Central Arizona and the Water Utilities Association of Arizona commented that any party should be allowed to submit a 208 application to MAG, not just the MAG member agencies. The MAG member agencies on the Stakeholder Group felt sponsorship was important since citizens reside in the local jurisdictions and look to the elected bodies for these types of issues. Wastewater treatment plants are one component of a development and they are built in local jurisdictions to serve the residents. In addition, local jurisdictions have general plans and water and wastewater master plans that are woven together. Local governments also have relationships to nearby communities. Therefore, it was important to the MAG member agencies on the Stakeholder Group that sponsorship not be eliminated.

TECHNICAL & POLICY IMPLICATIONS:

TECHNICAL: The streamlining efforts identified in the proposal shorten the time frame for a Small Plant Review and Approval from approximately 12 to 17 months to approximately six months, which is a 50 to 65 percent reduction in the overall timeline. The pre-application packet will also assist applicants in navigating the Small Plant Review and Approval Process.

POLICY: In 1974, MAG was designated by the Governor as the Regional Water Quality Management Planning Agency for Maricopa County. The MAG 208 Water Quality Management Plan is the key guiding document used by Maricopa County and the Arizona Department of Environmental Quality in granting permits for wastewater treatment facilities in the MAG region. Consistency is necessary for permit approvals. By reducing the time it takes for a Small Plant Review and Approval, wastewater treatment facilities would be able to receive their permits faster. In addition, ADEQ could issue a conditional Aquifer Protection Permit, which would allow for parallel processing and concurrent reviews with the Small Plant Review and Approval Process. The changes in the proposal result in a more efficient Small Plant Review and Approval Process that makes the region more globally competitive.

ACTION NEEDED:

Approval of the Proposal for Streamlining the MAG 208 Water Quality Management Plan Small Plant Review and Approval Process.

PRIOR COMMITTEE ACTIONS:

Management Committee: On November 18, 2015, the MAG Management Committee recommended approval of the Draft Proposal for Streamlining the MAG 208 Water Quality Management Plan Small Plant Review and Approval Process, with three abstentions (shaded). According to the MAG By-Laws, “Members of MAG that are in the Pinal County Area are entitled to vote on all matters coming before any meetings of its membership except those that are exclusive to the Maricopa County Boundary defined by State Law or through a planning designation by a Governor’s Executive Order, including but not limited to the Transportation Excise Tax enacted by Maricopa County, Section 208 Water Quality Management Planning, and Solid Waste Management Planning.”

MEMBERS ATTENDING

Darryl H. Crossman, Litchfield Park, Chair
Tom Remes for Ed Zuercher, Phoenix
Matt Busby for Bryant Powell,
Apache Junction

Jessica Blazina for David Fitzhugh,
Avondale

Stephen Cleveland, Buckeye

* Gary Neiss, Carefree

Peter Jankowski, Cave Creek

Marsha Reed, Chandler

Dr. Spencer Isom, El Mirage

Jess Knudson for Lisa Garcia, Florence

Alfonso Rodriguez for Phil Dorchester,
Fort McDowell Yavapai Nation

Grady Miller, Fountain Hills

Ernest Rubi, Gila Bend

* Tina Notah, Gila River Indian Community

Patrick Banger, Gilbert

Brent Stoddard for Dick Bowers,
Glendale

Brian Dalke, Goodyear

* Rosemary Arellano, Guadalupe

* Gregory Rose, City of Maricopa

Kari Kent for Christopher Brady, Mesa

Dawn Marie Buckland for Kevin Burke,
Paradise Valley

Carl Swenson, Peoria

Louis Andersen for Greg Stanley, Pinal
County

John Kross, Queen Creek

* Bryan Meyers, Salt River Pima-Maricopa
Indian Community

Brad Lundahl for Fritz Behring,
Scottsdale

Bob Wingenroth, Surprise

Andrew Ching, Tempe

Reyes Medrano, Jr., Tolleson

Joshua Wright, Wickenburg

Jeanne Blackman, Youngtown

Sintra Hoffman for John Halikowski,
ADOT

Tom Manos, Maricopa County

Wulf Grote for Steve Banta, Valley

Metro/RPTA

* Those members neither present nor represented by proxy.

Participated by telephone conference call.

+ Participated by videoconference call.

CONTACT PERSON:

Lindy Bauer, Environmental Director, or Julie Hoffman, Environmental Planning Program Manager,
(602) 254-6300.

DRAFT
**Proposal for Streamlining the MAG 208 Water Quality Management Plan
Small Plant Review and Approval Process**

This document is a draft. It is a work in progress document and subject to change based on the outcome of the Streamlining Process.

Rather than amend the MAG 208 Water Quality Management Plan to include every acceptable new small plant, a small plant review and approval process was developed in 1982 by a Small Plants Technical Steering Committee composed of representatives from the cities, state, county, and homebuilders. Under this process, a small wastewater treatment plant not specifically identified in the MAG 208 Plan can be approved as part of the Plan if the facility goes through the Small Plant Review and Approval Process. A small plant is one with an ultimate capacity of 2.0 million gallons per day (mgd) or less, with no discharge requiring an Arizona Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (AZPDES) Permit. By requiring proposed plants in the area to obtain approval using this formal process, an uncontrolled proliferation of small plants that could cause problems in the future could be prevented.

As part of the recent process to streamline the 208 Water Quality Management Plan Process, the Stakeholder Group on June 30, 2015 recommended that the same changes be made to the MAG 208 Plan Small Plant Review and Approval Process. On August 26, 2015 the MAG Regional Council approved the Proposal for Streamlining the 208 Water Quality Management Plan Process. Therefore, the corresponding changes are now being made to the Small Plant Review and Approval Process. The changes below streamline the entire Small Plant Review and Approval Process and shorten the time frame from approximately 12 to 17 months to approximately six months. **This represents a 50 to 65 percent reduction in the overall timeline for a Small Plant Review and Approval.**

Improvements on the MAG Member Agency Portion of the Small Plant Review and Approval Process that Provide Clarity, Assistance to the Business Community, and a Shortened Time Frame (MAG Member Agency Process - 4 Months)

- The Maricopa Association of Governments (MAG) would develop a pre-application packet that includes: a step-by-step description of the Small Plant Review and Approval Process; a table on the guidelines for small plants within Municipal Small Plant Planning Areas; a table on the criteria for the feasibility report for small plants outside Municipal Small Plant Planning Areas; and links to previously approved Small Plant Review and Approvals to use as an example. The pre-application packet would be available on the MAG website. The applicant would contact the jurisdiction in which the facility would be located (sponsoring jurisdiction) to discuss the pre-application packet and the potential need for a Small Plant Review and Approval. If a Small Plant Review and Approval is required, the applicant would draft the small plant document, addressing the guidelines or criteria in the appropriate table in the pre-application packet, and submit it to the sponsoring jurisdiction.
- **The sponsoring jurisdiction would have 60 calendar days to review the application, which includes the draft document that addresses the guidelines or criteria from the appropriate table in the pre-application packet.** The sponsoring jurisdiction would also conduct a pre-application meeting with the Small Plant Review and Approval applicant within the 60 day

completeness review period. The sponsoring jurisdiction would indicate if the application is complete or if additional information is necessary. If the sponsoring jurisdiction requests additional information, the 60 day clock would stop until it is provided.

- **A deadline of 60 calendar days would be set for the city/town or Maricopa County to submit the Small Plant Review and Approval to MAG once the application is determined complete by the sponsoring jurisdiction.** In accordance with Section 208(b)(2) of the Clean Water Act, the MAG 208 Water Quality Management Plan is required to include the identification of the treatment works necessary to meet the anticipated municipal and industrial needs of the area over a twenty-year period and identify the economic, social, and environmental impacts. Therefore, the review of the small plant by the sponsoring jurisdiction may include but would not be limited to: population and flow projections for the twenty-year planning period for the facility; anticipated phasing; unit flows; site location; setbacks; odor control; adjacent areas that could potentially be included in the area to be served; master plans prepared that would provide substantiating information; methods of disposal; any mitigating issues in the area such as Superfund Sites; assumptions used; and the sponsoring jurisdiction's General Plan, Water and Wastewater Master Plans, and Capital Improvement Program. In addition, the sponsoring jurisdiction reviews the small plant based on the guidelines or criteria included in the appropriate table in the MAG 208 Plan and pre-application packet. It is important to note that the 60 day clock would stop if the jurisdiction is waiting for comments to be addressed or additional information to be provided. If the sponsoring jurisdiction has not submitted the small plant at the end of the 60 days, the application would be considered by MAG through the Small Plant Review and Approval Process.

A workshop would be held by the sponsoring jurisdiction during the 60 day small plant review period to inform the other jurisdictions within three miles of the Small Plant Review and Approval and request letters of no objection, support, or comment. For a small plant within a Municipal Small Plant Planning Area, the MAG 208 Plan recommends that the City or Town reviewing a proposed development contact any adjacent community if the proposed development is within three miles of the boundary between the two communities. For a small plant outside a Municipal Small Plant Planning Area, it must have the review and comment of any municipality whose Small Plant Planning Area is within three miles of the proposed plant location or service area. The purpose of the workshop is to make it easier to obtain letters of no objection, support, or comment from neighboring jurisdictions and save time. The workshop makes the local and regional 208 process easier to navigate.

- The sponsoring jurisdiction would provide updates to MAG staff on the timelines for the small plant application completeness and review.
- The applicant would identify and contact private utilities within three miles of the Small Plant Review and Approval.

Improvements on the MAG Portion of the Small Plant Review and Approval Process that Provide Clarity, Transparency, and a Shortened Time Frame Due to the MAG Pre-Application Packet (MAG Process – 1 ½ Months)

- MAG would develop a pre-application packet that includes: a step-by-step description of the Small Plant Review and Approval Process; a table on the guidelines for small plants within Municipal Small Plant Planning Areas; a table on the criteria for the feasibility report for small plants outside

Municipal Small Plant Planning Areas; and links to previously approved Small Plant Review and Approvals to use as an example. The pre-application packet would be available on the MAG website.

- For the pre-application packet, MAG would develop a fact sheet on the step-by-step description of the Small Plant Review and Approval Process, including how long it takes and when a decision will be made.
- For the pre-application packet, MAG would include a table on the guidelines for small plants within Municipal Small Plant Planning Areas and a table on the criteria for the feasibility report for small plants outside Municipal Small Plant Planning Areas. This information is also included in the MAG 208 Water Quality Management Plan.

Improvements on the Arizona Department of Environmental Quality Portion of the Small Plant Review and Approval Process that Provide Parallel Processing, Concurrent Reviews, and a Shortened Time Frame (ADEQ Process - ½ Month)

- The Arizona Department of Environmental Quality could issue a conditional Aquifer Protection Permit that would allow for parallel processing and concurrent reviews with the Small Plant Review and Approval Process.
- Within 15 days of receiving the Small Plant Review and Approval from MAG, the Arizona Department of Environmental Quality would submit a letter and proposal summary to the Maricopa County Environmental Services Department and developer stating whether the proposed project is in conformance with the MAG 208 Plan.

Evaluation of the Streamlined Small Plant Review and Approval Process

- The Stakeholder Group for 208 Water Quality Management Plan Process Streamlining would conduct an annual evaluation of the streamlined Small Plant Review and Approval Process and determine if there is a need for additional improvements. An update would then be provided to the MAG Management Committee and MAG Regional Council.

MAG 208 Water Quality Management Plan Small Plant Review and Approval Process Pre-Application Packet

MAG 208 Plan Small Plant Review and Approval Process Pre-Application Packet

What is the MAG 208 Water Quality Management Plan?

The Maricopa Association of Governments (MAG) is the designated Regional Water Quality Management Planning Agency for Maricopa County. This designation was made in 1974 by the Governor, in accordance with Section 208 of the Clean Water Act. In this capacity, MAG prepares the 208 Water Quality Management Plan for the region. The MAG 208 Plan consists of two major elements: the Point Source element and the Nonpoint Source element. The Point Source element describes the preferred wastewater treatment system to serve the needs of the region over a 20 year time period. The Nonpoint Source element primarily describes regional surface and groundwater quality, and federal and state program activities designed to control nonpoint source pollution.

The MAG 208 Plan is the key guiding document used by the Arizona Department of Environmental Quality

and Maricopa County in granting permits for wastewater treatment plants in the region. If a proposed facility is not included in the MAG 208 Plan, the Plan would need to be modified. The MAG 208 Plan is subject to change in accordance with three established procedures: a Periodic Major Revision of the 208 Plan; the 208 Plan Amendment Process; and the Small Plant Review and Approval Process. This pre-application packet addresses the Small Plant Review and Approval Process, which is a shortened process for small wastewater treatment plants. Under this process, a small plant is one with an ultimate capacity of 2.0 million gallons per day or less with no discharge requiring an Arizona Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (AZPDES) Permit.



MAG 208 Plan Small Plant Review and Approval Process—Where Do I Begin?

This pre-application packet has been developed to provide the applicant with useful tools in navigating the MAG 208 Plan Small Plant Review and Approval Process.

Contact the jurisdiction in which the facility would be located (sponsoring jurisdiction) to discuss the potential need for the small plant and this pre-application packet.

If it is determined that a Small Plant Review and Approval is required, draft the document, addressing the guidelines or criteria from the appropriate table in this pre-application packet, and submit it to the sponsoring jurisdiction.

To assist the applicant in completing the small plant document, please refer to previously approved MAG 208 Plan Small Plant Review and Approvals that are available on the MAG website at <http://www.azmag.gov/Projects/Project.asp?CMSID2=1142&MID=Environmental%20Programs>

Inside This Packet

1. Fact Sheet on Incorporating a Small Plant into the MAG 208 Water Quality Management Plan (Step-by-Step Description of the Small Plant Review and Approval Process).
2. Guidelines for Small Plants Within a Municipal Small Plant Planning Area.
3. Criteria for Feasibility Report for Small Plants Outside of a Municipal Small Plant Planning Area.

For more information:

Maricopa Association of Governments
302 North 1st Avenue, Suite 300, Phoenix, AZ 85003
Phone: (602) 254-6300, Website: www.azmag.gov



Streamlined MAG 208 Small Plant Review and Approval Process Incorporating a Small Plant into the MAG 208 Water Quality Management Plan



What is the MAG 208 Water Quality Management Plan?

As the designated Regional Water Quality Management Planning Agency for Maricopa County, the Maricopa Association of Governments (MAG) prepares the 208 Water Quality Management Plan for the region in accordance with Section 208 of the Clean Water Act. The two major elements of the MAG 208 Water Quality Management Plan are the Point Source Element and the Nonpoint Source Element. The Point Source Element describes the preferred wastewater treatment system to serve the wastewater treatment needs of the area over a twenty year time period. The Nonpoint Source Element primarily describes regional and surface groundwater quality and the federal and state program activities designed to control nonpoint source pollution.

The MAG 208 Plan is the key guiding document used by the Arizona Department of Environmental Quality (ADEQ) and Maricopa County in granting permits for wastewater treatment plants in the MAG region. If a proposed facility is not included in the MAG 208 Plan, the Plan would need to be modified. The MAG 208 Plan is subject to change in accordance with three established procedures: a Periodic Major Revision of the 208 Plan; the 208 Plan Amendment Process; and the Small Plant Review and Approval Process. This pre-application packet addresses the Small Plant Review and Approval Process, which is a shortened process for small wastewater treatment plants. Under this process, a small plant is one with an ultimate capacity of 2.0 million gallons per day or less with no discharge requiring an Arizona Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (AZPDES) Permit issued by the Arizona Department of Environmental Quality. Consistency is also required for the Approval to Construct issued by the County Environmental Services Department.

What is the Approval Process?

Rather than a small plant was developed. Steering the cities process is as part of the Review with (mg Per ob try

Streamlined MAG 208 Small Plant Review and Approval Process

include but would not be limited to: population and flow projections for the twenty-year planning period for the facility; anticipated phasing; unit flows; site location; setbacks; odor control; adjacent areas that could potentially be included in the area to be served; master plans prepared that would provide substantiated information; methods of disposal; any mitigating issues in the area such as Superfund Sites; assumptions used; and the sponsoring jurisdiction's General Plan, Water and Wastewater Master Plans, and Capital Improvement Program. In addition, the sponsoring jurisdiction reviews the small plant based on the appropriate table in the pre-application packet (e.g., Guidelines for Small Plants Within Municipal Small Plant Planning Area, Criteria for Feasibility Report for Small Plants Outside of Municipal Small Plant Planning Area). It is important to note that the 60 day clock would stop if the jurisdiction is waiting for comments to be addressed or additional information to be provided. If the sponsoring jurisdiction has not submitted the small plant at the end of the 60 days, the application would be considered by MAG through the Small Plant Review and Approval Process.

To be approved for construction within a Municipal Small Plant Planning Area, a small wastewater treatment plant (2.0 mgd ultimate capacity or less) not otherwise mentioned in the MAG 208 Plan, must have the approval of the municipality in whose planning area it will be located; not adversely affect the operation or financial structure of existing or proposed wastewater treatment plants; be consistent with State and County regulations and other requirements; and be otherwise consistent with the MAG 208 Plan.

To be approved for construction outside of a Municipal Small Plant Planning Area, a small wastewater treatment plant (2.0 mgd or less) not otherwise mentioned in the MAG 208 Plan, must have the review comment of any municipality whose Small Plant Planning Area is within three miles of the proposed location of service area; not adversely affect the operation or financial structure of existing or proposed wastewater treatment plants; be consistent with State and County regulations and other requirements; be otherwise consistent with the MAG 208 Plan; and, if approved, or modified by Maricopa County Environmental Services Department.

DRAFT
October 2015



302 N. 1st Avenue, Suite 300, Phoenix, AZ 85003 • www.azmag.gov

What is the MAG 208 Water Quality Management Plan?

The Maricopa Association of Governments (MAG) is the designated Regional Water Quality Management Planning Agency for Maricopa County. This designation was made in 1974 by the Governor, in accordance with Section 208 of the Clean Water Act. In this capacity, MAG prepares the 208 Water Quality Management Plan for the region. The MAG 208 Plan consists of two major elements: the Point Source element and the Nonpoint Source element. The Point Source element describes the preferred wastewater treatment system to serve the needs of the region over a 20 year time period. The Nonpoint Source element primarily describes regional surface and groundwater quality, and federal and state program activities designed to control nonpoint source pollution.

The MAG 208 Plan is the key guiding document used by the Arizona Department of Environmental Quality

and Maricopa County in granting permits for wastewater treatment plants in the region. If a proposed facility is not included in the MAG 208 Plan, the Plan would need to be modified. The MAG 208 Plan is subject to change in accordance with three established procedures: a Periodic Major Revision of the 208 Plan; the 208 Plan Amendment Process; and the Small Plant Review and Approval Process. This pre-application packet addresses the Small Plant Review and Approval Process, which is a shortened process for small wastewater treatment plants. Under this process, a small plant is one with an ultimate capacity of 2.0 million gallons per day or less with no discharge requiring an Arizona Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (AZPDES) Permit.



MAG 208 Plan Small Plant Review and Approval Process—Where Do I Begin?

This pre-application packet has been developed to provide the applicant with useful tools in navigating the MAG 208 Plan Small Plant Review and Approval Process.

Contact the jurisdiction in which the facility would be located (sponsoring jurisdiction) to discuss the potential need for the small plant and this pre-application packet.

If it is determined that a Small Plant Review and Approval is required, draft the document, addressing the guidelines or criteria from the appropriate table in this pre-application packet, and submit it to the sponsoring jurisdiction.

To assist the applicant in completing the small plant document, please refer to previously approved MAG 208 Plan Small Plant Review and Approvals that are available on the MAG website at

<http://www.azmag.gov/Projects/Project.asp?CMSID2=1142&MID=Environmental%20Programs>.

Inside This Packet

1. Fact Sheet on Incorporating a Small Plant into the MAG 208 Water Quality Management Plan (Step-by-Step Description of the Small Plant Review and Approval Process).
2. Guidelines for Small Plants Within a Municipal Small Plant Planning Area.
3. Criteria for Feasibility Report for Small Plants Outside of a Municipal Small Plant Planning Area.

For more information:

Maricopa Association of Governments
302 North 1st Avenue, Suite 300, Phoenix, AZ 85003
Phone: (602) 254-6300, Website: www.azmag.gov



Incorporating a Small Plant into the MAG 208 Water Quality Management Plan



What is the MAG 208 Water Quality Management Plan?

As the designated Regional Water Quality Management Planning Agency for Maricopa County, the Maricopa Association of Governments (MAG) prepares the 208 Water Quality Management Plan for the region in accordance with Section 208 of the Clean Water Act. The two major elements of the MAG 208 Water Quality Management Plan are the Point Source Element and the Nonpoint Source Element. The Point Source Element describes the preferred wastewater treatment system to serve the wastewater treatment needs of the area over a twenty year time period. The Nonpoint Source Element primarily describes regional and surface groundwater quality and the federal and state program activities designed to control nonpoint source pollution.

The MAG 208 Plan is the key guiding document used by the Arizona Department of Environmental Quality (ADEQ) and Maricopa County in granting permits for wastewater treatment plants in the MAG region. Consistency is required for the Aquifer Protection Permit and Arizona Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (AZPDES) Permit issued by the Arizona Department of Environmental Quality. Consistency is also required for the Approval to Construct issued by the Maricopa County Environmental Services Department.

What is the Small Plant Review and Approval Process?

Rather than amend the MAG 208 Water Quality Management Plan to include every acceptable new small plant, a small plant review and approval process was developed in 1982 by a Small Plants Technical Steering Committee composed of representatives from the cities, state, county, and homebuilders. Under this process, a small wastewater treatment plant not specifically identified in the MAG 208 Plan can be approved as part Plan if the facility goes through the Small Plant Review and Approval Process. A small plant is one with an ultimate capacity of 2.0 million gallons per day (mgd) or less, with no discharge requiring an AZPDES Permit. By requiring proposed plants in the area to obtain approval using this formal process, an uncontrolled proliferation of small plants that could cause problems in the future could be prevented.

Three areas of responsibility apply in the Small Plant Review and Approval Process. The first is the Municipal Small Plant Planning Area, which is the same as the MAG Municipal Planning Area. This is the area identified by the municipality within which the City or Town would have responsibility for the first review and approval of proposed wastewater reclamation facilities. The second is the County Planning Area, in which the County would have the responsibility for deciding which wastewater reclamation facilities were constructed. Between the two areas is a third area. This is the area in the County that is within three miles of a Municipal Small Plant Planning Area. Although this area is within the County's area of responsibility, the County must consider the comments of the nearby City or Town concerning proposed facilities in this three mile area.

Streamlined MAG 208 Small Plant Review and Approval Process

Incorporating a Small Plant into the MAG 208 Water Quality Management Plan (continued)

When is a MAG 208 Plan Small Plant Review and Approval required?

A MAG 208 Plan Small Plant Review and Approval is required for:

- New publicly or privately owned wastewater treatment facility 2.0 mgd or less with no discharge requiring an AZPDES Permit that is not identified in the MAG 208 Plan.
- Increasing the capacity of a publicly or privately owned small wastewater treatment facility specifically identified in the MAG 208 Plan where the expanded facility would still meet the small plant threshold of 2.0 mgd or less.

Plants greater than 2.0 mgd and those with a discharge requiring an AZPDES Permit would go through the MAG 208 Water Quality Management Plan Amendment Process. Contact MAG for more information on this process.



How Long Does the Small Plant Review and Approval Process Take?

The Small Plant Review and Approval Process takes approximately six months, which includes the MAG member agency (sponsoring jurisdiction) portion: four months; MAG portion: one-and-one-half months; and the Arizona Department of Environmental Quality portion: one-half month. The steps of the Small Plant Review and Approval Process are provided on the following pages.



For More Information:

Maricopa Association of Governments

302 North 1st Avenue, Suite 300

Phoenix, Arizona 85003

Phone: (602) 254-6300 Website: www.azmag.gov



Steps for the Small Plant Review and Approval Process

Step 1: Determination if a Small Plant Review and Approval is Required

The applicant would contact the jurisdiction in which the facility would be located (sponsoring jurisdiction) to discuss the potential need for a Small Plant Review and Approval and the pre-application packet, which is available on the MAG website at www.azmag.gov. The pre-application packet includes: a step-by-step description of the Small Plant Review and Approval Process; a table on the Guidelines for Small Plants Within Municipal Small Plant Planning Area; a table on the Criteria for Feasibility Report for Small Plants Outside of Municipal Small Plant Planning Area; and links to previously approved small plants to use as an example. If a Small Plant Review and Approval is required, the applicant would draft the small plant document, addressing the guidelines or criteria in the appropriate table in the pre-application packet, and submit it to the sponsoring jurisdiction.

Step 2: 60 Day Completeness Review by the Sponsoring Jurisdiction

The sponsoring jurisdiction has 60 days to review the application, which includes the draft small plant document that addresses the guidelines or criteria from the appropriate table in the pre-application packet. A pre-application meeting is conducted by the sponsoring jurisdiction within the 60 day completeness review period. The sponsoring jurisdiction indicates if the application is complete or if additional information is necessary. If the sponsoring jurisdiction requests additional information, the 60 day clock stops until it is provided.

Step 3: 60 Day Small Plant Review by the Sponsoring Jurisdiction and Workshop with Neighboring Jurisdictions

The sponsoring jurisdiction has 60 days to submit the Small Plant Review and Approval to MAG once it has determined that the small plant application is complete. In accordance with Section 208(b)(2) of the Clean Water Act, the MAG 208 Water Quality Management Plan is required to include the identification of the treatment works necessary to meet the anticipated municipal and industrial needs of the area over a twenty-year period and identify the economic, social, and environmental impacts. Therefore, the review of the small plant by the sponsoring jurisdiction may

include but would not be limited to: population and flow projections for the twenty-year planning period for the facility; anticipated phasing; unit flows; site location; setbacks; odor control; adjacent areas that could potentially be included in the area to be served; master plans prepared that would provide substantiating information; methods of disposal; any mitigating issues in the area such as Superfund Sites; assumptions used; and the sponsoring jurisdiction's General Plan, Water and Wastewater Master Plans, and Capital Improvement Program. In addition, the sponsoring jurisdiction reviews the small plant based on the appropriate table in the pre-application packet (e.g., Guidelines for Small Plants Within Municipal Small Plant Planning Area, Criteria for Feasibility Report for Small Plants Outside of Municipal Small Plant Planning Area). It is important to note that the 60 day clock would stop if the jurisdiction is waiting for comments to be addressed or additional information to be provided. If the sponsoring jurisdiction has not submitted the small plant at the end of the 60 days, the application would be considered by MAG through the Small Plant Review and Approval Process.

To be approved for construction within a Municipal Small Plant Planning Area, a small wastewater treatment plant (2.0 mgd ultimate capacity of less) not otherwise mentioned in the MAG 208 Plan, must: have the approval of the municipality in whose planning area it will be located; not adversely affect the operation or financial structure of existing or proposed wastewater treatment plants; be consistent with State and County regulations and other requirements; and, be otherwise consistent with the MAG 208 Plan.

To be approved for construction outside of a Municipal Small Plant Planning Area, a small wastewater treatment plant (2.0 mgd or less) not otherwise mentioned in the MAG 208 Plan, must: have the review and comment of any municipality whose Small Plant Planning Area is within three miles of the proposed plant location of service area; not adversely affect the operation or financial structure of existing or proposed wastewater treatment plants; be consistent with State and County regulations and other requirements; be otherwise consistent with the MAG 208 Plan; and, be evaluated and approved, or modified by Maricopa County Environmental Services Department.

Steps for the Small Plant Review and Approval Process (continued)

A workshop is held by the sponsoring jurisdiction during the 60 day small plant review period to inform the other jurisdictions within three miles of the small plant and request letters of no objection, support, or comment. For a small plant within a Municipal Small Plant Planning Area, the MAG 208 Plan recommends that the City or Town reviewing a proposed development contact any adjacent community if the proposed development is within three miles of the boundary between the two communities. For a small plant outside a Municipal Small Plant Planning Area, it must have the review and comment of any municipality whose Small Plant Planning Area is within three miles of the proposed plant location or service area. The purpose of the workshop is to make it easier to obtain letters of no objection, support, or comment from neighboring jurisdictions and save time. The workshop makes the local and regional 208 process easier to navigate.

The sponsoring jurisdiction provides updates to MAG staff on the timelines for the small plant application completeness and review.

The applicant identifies and contacts private utilities within three miles of the Small Plant Review and Approval to make them aware of the proposed small plant.

Step 4: Request for Small Plant Review and Approval

The sponsoring jurisdiction initiates the request to MAG to include the new small wastewater treatment facility in the MAG 208 Plan. Prior to the official request, the jurisdiction may also request an informal review of the Small Plant Review and Approval by MAG staff to ensure that all pertinent items have been addressed in the document. The Guidelines for Small Plants Within Municipal Small Plant Planning Area and Criteria for Feasibility Report for Small Plants Outside of Municipal Small Plant Planning Area and examples of previously approved Small Plant Review and Approvals are available on the MAG website at www.azmag.gov.

Step 5: MAG Water Quality Advisory Committee

Once MAG receives the official request from the jurisdiction in which the facility would be located and the Small Plant Review and Approval document, a meeting of the MAG Water Quality Advisory Committee is scheduled. The Committee reviews the proposal for overall 208 Plan compliance to ensure that the Small

Plant Process is followed, and to ensure that regional impacts are addressed. The MAG Water Quality Advisory Committee then makes a recommendation to the MAG Management Committee. In general, the MAG Water Quality Advisory Committee meetings are conducted on an as needed basis.

Step 6: MAG Management Committee

The MAG Management Committee reviews the recommendation from the Water Quality Advisory Committee. The Management Committee then makes a recommendation to the MAG Regional Council. In general, the MAG Management Committee meets on a monthly basis.

Step 7: MAG Regional Council

The MAG Regional Council reviews the recommendation from the Management Committee. The Regional Council then takes official action to approve the Small Plant Review and Approval. The Regional Council is the decision-making body of MAG. In general, the MAG Regional Council meets on a monthly basis.

Step 8: Arizona Department of Environmental Quality

Based on Regional Council action, MAG sends a letter to the Arizona Department of Environmental Quality and a proposal summary (copies to developer, City and the Maricopa County Environmental Services Department), stating whether the proposed project is compatible with the overall 208 Plan. Within 15 days, ADEQ submits a letter and proposal summary to the Maricopa County Environmental Services Department and developer stating whether the proposed project is in conformance with the MAG 208 Plan.

Step 9: Maricopa County Environmental Services Department

Upon receipt of an approval letter from the Arizona Department of Environmental Quality, the developer submits plans and specifications, and a copy of the approved design concept to the Maricopa County Environmental Services Department. The County reviews these items based on the ADEQ Bulletin #11 and County regulations, and issues the Approval to Construct.

Maricopa Association of Governments

302 North 1st Avenue, Suite 300, Phoenix, AZ 85003
Phone: (602) 254-6300 Website: www.azmag.gov

GUIDELINES FOR SMALL PLANTS WITHIN MUNICIPAL SMALL PLANT PLANNING AREA

The guidelines below pertain to small plants that would be located within a Municipal Small Plant Planning Area. For purposes of the MAG 208 Water Quality Management Plan, Municipal Small Plant Planning Areas are the same as MAG Municipal Planning Areas.

Guidelines for Small Plants Within Municipal Small Plant Planning Area	
1)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Plant Justification <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Why Plant is Required <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Limited capacity at existing plant or sewer - Too far from trunk sewer - Temporary plant - Soil limitations - Effluent reuse or water conservation - Sludge management options - Other
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Master Plan Compatibility <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Is plant compatible with future plans for the area? - Will proposed plant impact existing or proposed plants? - Will proposed plant impact existing or proposed reuse plans in the region?
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Benefits of Plant <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Net water saving - Delays major capital expenditures - Better scheduling and project control - Allows development
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Potential Problems <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - High capital and operating costs - Impacts on groundwater - Impacts on surface water - Inability to meet State regulations - Financial failure of operation - Poor operation and maintenance (O&M)
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Financial <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Who will fund construction? - Who will fund O&M costs - short term? - Who will fund O&M costs - long term? - Financial security
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Operation <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Who will operate plant - short term? - Who will operate plant - long term?

Note: The guidelines for small plants within a Municipal Small Plant Planning Area are also provided in the October 2002 MAG 208 Plan beginning on Page 4-230 and the June 2014 MAG 208 Plan Point Source Update beginning on Page 3-8.

**CRITERIA FOR FEASIBILITY REPORT FOR SMALL PLANTS OUTSIDE OF
MUNICIPAL SMALL PLANT PLANNING AREA**

The criteria below pertain to small plants that would be located outside a Municipal Small Plant Planning Area. For purposes of the MAG 208 Water Quality Management Plan, Municipal Small Plant Planning Areas are the same as MAG Municipal Planning Areas.

Criteria for Feasibility Report for Small Plants Outside of Municipal Small Plant Planning Area	
1)	<p>Technical Criteria</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Why is small plant desired? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Depth to groundwater less than ____ ft. - Soil limitations prevent use of septic tanks - Potential for reuse or water conservation - Lot size one acre or less - Area not planned for regional service for ____ years - Density of projected population - Will serve industrial or commercial area
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • What is the anticipated quality of the wastewater? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Domestic - Commercial and/or Industrial - If commercial and/or industrial wastes are anticipated, what provisions are being taken to ensure no toxic substances will be discharged?
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • How and why was small plant design and capacity selected? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - What criteria were used? - What alternatives were considered? - What are benefits, problems of alternatives? - Will there be problems meeting State or County regulations? - What sludge management options were considered?
2)	<p>Planning Criteria</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Is proposed plant compatible with County adopted master plans, guidelines, etc., for the area? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - What plans apply? - What guidelines or policies apply?
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Can the proposed plant be expanded to serve growing population? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - What population is projected for the service area? - Would certain areas lend themselves, topographically or hydrologically, by planned use or density to being included in the service area?
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Will proposed plant adversely impact existing or approved nearby land uses? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - What are land uses within ____ miles? - What is zoning for the surrounding area? - What are reactions of nearby landowners to proposed facility?

**CRITERIA FOR FEASIBILITY REPORT FOR SMALL PLANTS OUTSIDE OF
MUNICIPAL SMALL PLANT PLANNING AREA (continued)**

Criteria for Feasibility Report for Small Plants Outside of Municipal Small Plant Planning Area	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Will there be a net water saving from effluent reuse?<ul style="list-style-type: none">- How will effluent be disposed of?- What is the estimated water saving?
	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Do nearby existing or proposed land uses indicate a need for a larger capacity sewage plant than that proposed?<ul style="list-style-type: none">- Should nearby areas be sewered or otherwise join the proposed plant for water quality or economic reasons?- Do these areas wish to join the proposed plant?
3)	<p>Development Criteria</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Who will fund construction?• Who will fund operation and maintenance costs?• Is there adequate financial security to assure continual and proper operation and maintenance?• Who will operate and maintain the plant and system?• What are anticipated capital and operation and maintenance costs?

Note: The criteria for small plants outside a Municipal Small Plant Planning Area are also provided in the October 2002 MAG 208 Plan beginning on Page 4-232 and the June 2014 MAG 208 Plan Point Source Update beginning on Page 3-11.

**Proposed Revisions to the 2007 Exceptional Events Rule and Notice of Availability for
Related Draft Guidance**

FACT SHEET

ACTIONS

- On November 10, 2015, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) proposed revisions to the 2007 Exceptional Events Rule, and announced the availability for public comment of a draft guidance document, which applies the proposed rule revisions to wildfire events that could influence monitored ozone concentrations.

Proposed Revisions to the 2007 Exceptional Events Rule

- The proposed revisions to the Exceptional Events Rule address issues raised by stakeholders since promulgation of the rule and are intended to provide clarity and increase the administrative efficiency of the Exceptional Events Rule criteria and process. Exceptional events include natural events such as wildfires, stratospheric ozone intrusions and volcanic and seismic activities.
- Highlights of the proposal include:
 - More clearly defining the scope of the Exceptional Events Rule to apply only to certain types of regulatory actions,
 - Revising the rule language to more closely align with the language in the CAA,
 - Relying on SIP controls to satisfy the “not reasonably controllable or preventable” criterion provided the EPA has approved the SIP within the last 5 years,
 - Clarifying the analyses, content and organization for exceptional events demonstrations,
 - Requiring an initial notification by the state to the EPA of a potential exceptional event request,
 - Removing the specific deadlines that apply in situations other than initial area designations following promulgation of a new or revised NAAQS; and
 - Clarifying fire-related definitions and demonstration components.
- The EPA intends to finalize these rule revisions before October 1, 2016, which is the date by which states, and any tribes that wish to do so, are required to submit their initial designation recommendations for the 2015 National Ambient Air Quality Standards (NAAQS) for ozone.

Notice of Availability of Draft Exceptional Events Guidance

- The EPA is announcing the availability for public comment of the *Draft Guidance on the Preparation of Exceptional Events Demonstrations for Wildfire Events that May Influence Ozone Concentrations*. The EPA anticipates finalizing this guidance when we promulgate revisions to the Exceptional Events Rule.

- The *Draft Guidance on the Preparation of Exceptional Events Demonstrations for Wildfire Events that May Influence Ozone Concentrations* includes example analyses, conclusion statements, and technical tools that air agencies can use to provide evidence that a wildfire event influenced a monitored ozone concentration(s). In particular, this guidance identifies event characteristics (e.g., season of occurrence, fire emissions, the fire's distance from the ozone monitor and how high ozone levels reached during the fire) that could enable a state air agency to submit a simpler and less resource-consuming demonstration package. The draft guidance reflects and implements the proposed changes to the Exceptional Events Rule.

Notice of Public Hearing

- The EPA will hold a public hearing to solicit and incorporate input from stakeholders and the public. The public hearing will provide interested parties the opportunity to present data, views or arguments concerning the proposed revisions to the 2007 Exceptional Events Rule.
- The public hearing will be held on Tuesday, December 8, 2015, in room 3175 in the Arizona Department of Environmental Quality main office building located at 1110 W. Washington Street, Phoenix, Arizona 85007. The public hearing will convene at 10 a.m. and continue until the earlier of 6:00 p.m. or 1 hour after the last registered speaker has spoken.

BACKGROUND

- On March 22, 2007, the EPA promulgated the "Treatment of Data Influenced by Exceptional Events; Final Rule" (72 FR 13560) pursuant to the 2005 amendment of Clean Air Act (CAA) Section 319. This rule is known as the Exceptional Events Rule.
- The Exceptional Events Rule contains definitions, procedural requirements, requirements for air agency demonstrations and criteria for EPA approval for the exclusion of air quality data from regulatory decisions.
- Interpreting and implementing the 2007 Exceptional Events Rule has been challenging both for the air agencies developing exceptional events demonstrations and for the EPA regional offices reviewing and acting on these demonstrations. As a result of our experiences and stakeholder requests related to implementing the 2007 Exceptional Events Rule, the EPA developed and released Interim Exceptional Events Implementation Guidance documents in May of 2013, available on EPA's Exceptional Events website at <http://www2.epa.gov/air-quality-analysis/treatment-data-influenced-exceptional-events>.
- When EPA released the Interim Exceptional Events Implementation Guidance, we acknowledged the need to consider additional changes that could only be accomplished through a notice-and-comment rulemaking. This proposed action reflects these changes.
- During the preparation of this proposed action, the EPA held conference calls with air agencies to discuss recent implementation experiences and to better understand currently employed exceptional events implementation processes and practices. As a result of these

discussions, the EPA developed a list of best practices for communication and collaboration between the EPA and air agencies. When implemented, these best practices, also available on EPA's Exceptional Events website, and other steps being taken by EPA will optimize resources and save time during the demonstration development and review process.

FOR MORE INFORMATION

- To download a copy of this proposed rule, go to the EPA's Exceptional Events website at <http://www2.epa.gov/air-quality-analysis/treatment-data-influenced-exceptional-events>.
- Today's Proposed Rule and other associated information are available either electronically at <http://www.regulations.gov>, the EPA's electronic public docket and comment system, or in hardcopy at the EPA Docket Center's Public Reading Room. (Docket ID No. EPA-HQ-OAR-2013-0572)
- The draft guidance document and other associated information are available either electronically at <http://www.regulations.gov>, the EPA's electronic public docket and comment system, or in hardcopy at the EPA Docket Center's Public Reading Room. (Docket ID No. EPA-HQ-OAR-2015-0229)
- The Public Reading Room is located in the EPA Headquarters, Room Number 3334 in the William Jefferson Clinton West Building, located at 1301 Constitution Avenue, NW, Washington, D.C. Hours of operation are 8:30 a.m. to 4:30 p.m. eastern standard time, Monday through Friday, excluding Federal holidays.
- Visitors are required to show photographic identification, pass through a metal detector, and sign the EPA visitor log. All visitor materials will be processed through an X-ray machine as well. Visitors will be provided a badge that must be visible at all times.

HOW TO COMMENT

- EPA will accept written comments on the proposed rule and/or draft guidance between the date of publication in the *Federal Register* and January 19, 2016.
- Comments on the proposed rule (identified by Docket ID Number EPA-HQ-OAR-2013-0572) and/or comments on the draft guidance (identified by Docket ID Number EPA-HQ-OAR-2015-0229), may be submitted by one of the following methods:
 - Go to www.regulations.gov and follow the on-line instructions for submitting comments.
 - Mail your comments to:
 - U.S. Environmental Protection Agency
 - EPA Docket Center
 - [Enter Docket ID Number EPA-HQ-OAR-2013-0572 or EPA-HQ-OAR-2015-0229]
 - Mail Code 2821T

1200 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW
Washington, DC 20460

- Deliver your comments in person or via courier to the address below. Such deliveries are only accepted during the Docket's normal hours of operation, and special arrangements should be made for deliveries of boxed information.

EPA Docket Center
WJC West Building, Room 334
1301 Constitution Avenue, NW
Washington, DC 20004

For additional submission methods, the full EPA public comment policy, information about CBI or multimedia submissions and general guidance on making effective comments, please visit <http://www2.epa.gov/dockets/commenting-epa-dockets>.

JEFF FLAKE

ARIZONA

SR-413 RUSSELL SENATE OFFICE BUILDING
(202) 224-4521

COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS

COMMITTEE ON
ENERGY AND NATURAL RESOURCES

COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

COMMITTEE ON AGING

United States Senate

WASHINGTON, DC 20510-0305

November 19, 2015

STATE OFFICES:

2200 EAST CAMELBACK ROAD
SUITE 120
PHOENIX, AZ 85016
(602) 840-1891

6840 NORTH ORACLE ROAD
SUITE 150
TUCSON, AZ 85704
(520) 575-8633

Gina McCarthy
Administrator
Environmental Protection Agency
1200 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW
Washington, DC 20460

Dear Administrator McCarthy,

I am writing to request a 30-day extension of the public comment period for the proposed rule revisions entitled "Treatment of Data Influenced by Exceptional Events" (Docket No. EPA-HQ-OAR-2013-0572), commonly referred to as the Exceptional Events Rule, and the associated draft guidance document referred to as "Draft Guidance on the Preparation of Exceptional Events Demonstrations for Wildfire Events that May Influence Ozone Concentrations" (Docket No. EPA-HQ-OAR-2015-0229).

I am pleased that EPA has acknowledged the need to revisit the original rule promulgated in 2007 by addressing substantive concerns and administrative inefficiencies. EPA's emphasis on returning to the statutory requirements for designating an exceptional event is encouraging, as is the focus on "less burdensome measures" to reduce the amount of resources necessary to quantify that an exceptional event occurred.

Likewise, it is welcome news that EPA is hosting its public hearing in Phoenix, Arizona, where many stakeholders have been impacted by EPA's rigid application of the 2007 rule to Arizona's uniquely arid climate. I share the view of those stakeholders that EPA must instead find a reasonable approach that enables efficient and consistent administration of the Exceptional Events Rule. It is my hope that this effort will lead to that result.

In order to ensure the best product, I respectfully request that EPA extend its public comment period for 30-days. While I recognize that the agency intends to move expeditiously to complete the revision before states and tribes are required to submit recommendations for the 2015 ozone National Ambient Air Quality Standards, I believe a modest extension could help better inform the final revisions. As it stands, the current schedule requires interested parties to digest the 200-plus page proposal and develop comments during the busy holiday season. The prudent course is to extend the deadline.

Thank you for your consideration of this request. As always I ask that it be handled in strict accordance with all agency rules, regulations, and ethical guidelines.

Sincerely,



JEFF FLAKE
United States Senator