

October 31, 2006

TO: Members of the MAG Management Committee

FROM: Ed Beasley, Glendale, Chair

SUBJECT: MEETING NOTIFICATION AND TRANSMITTAL OF TENTATIVE AGENDA

Wednesday, November 8, 2006 - noon to 1:00 p.m. (Meeting will begin promptly at noon)  
MAG Office, Suite 200 - Saguaro Room  
302 North 1<sup>st</sup> Avenue, Phoenix

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

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

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

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

c: MAG Regional Council

**MAG MANAGEMENT COMMITTEE  
TENTATIVE AGENDA  
November 8, 2006**

**COMMITTEE ACTION REQUESTED**

1. Call to Order

2. Pledge of Allegiance

3. Call to the Audience

An opportunity is provided to the public to address the Management Committee on items that are not on the agenda that are within the jurisdiction of MAG, or non-action agenda items that are on the agenda for discussion or information only. Citizens will be requested not to exceed a three minute time period for their comments. A total of 15 minutes will be provided for the Call to the Audience agenda item, unless the Management Committee requests an exception to this limit. Please note that those wishing to comment on agenda items posted for action will be provided the opportunity at the time the item is heard.

4. Approval of Consent Agenda

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

3. Information.

4. Recommend approval of the Consent Agenda.

**ITEMS PROPOSED FOR CONSENT\***

\*4A. Approval of October 4, 2006 Meeting Minutes

4A. Review and approval of the October 4, 2006 meeting minutes.

\*4B. Proposed 2007 Revisions to the MAG Standard Specifications and Details for Public Works Construction

4B. Information and discussion.

The The Maricopa Association of Governments (MAG) Standard Specifications and Details Committee has completed its review of proposed 2007 revisions to the MAG Standard Specifications and Details for Public Works Construction and

these revisions are currently being reviewed by MAG Member Agency Public Works Directors and/or Engineers. It is anticipated that the annual update packet will be available for purchase in early January 2007. Please refer to the enclosed material.

\*4C. Public Hearing on the 2006 Annual Report on the Status of the Implementation of Proposition 400

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 and hold a Public Hearing on the report. A Public Hearing on the Draft 2006 Annual Report was held at the MAG office on October 19, 2006. A transcript of this Public Hearing was prepared and is enclosed for information. MAG committees were briefed prior to the Public Hearing regarding the key findings and issues identified in the report. Please refer to the enclosed material.

\*4D. Amendment to the FY 2007 Public Safety Answering Point (PSAP) Annual Element/Funding Request and FY 2007-2011 Equipment Program for the MAG 9-1-1 System

On September 28, 2005, the MAG Regional Council approved the MAG FY 2007 Public Safety Answering Point (PSAP) Annual Element/Funding Request and FY 2007-2011 Equipment Program. Since the approval, the funding request needs to be amended to include upgrades at 9-1-1 facilities. The Phoenix Police Department project will require \$3.5 million, the Phoenix Fire Department project will require \$750,000, and the Scottsdale Police Department project will require \$500,000. These costs are currently paid by the 9-1-1 state excise tax. The MAG PSAP Managers and the MAG 9-1-1 Oversight Team recommended approval of the amendment. Please refer to the enclosed material.

4C. Information and discussion.

4D. Recommend approval of the amendment to the FY 2007 Public Safety Answering Point (PSAP) Annual Element/Funding Request and FY 2007-2011 Equipment Program for the MAG 9-1-1 System to include a 9-1-1 phone system upgrade for the Phoenix Police Department in the amount of \$3.5 million; a 9-1-1 system upgrade for the Phoenix Fire Department in the amount of \$750,000; and a 9-1-1 system upgrade for the Scottsdale Police Department in the amount of \$500,000.

\*4E. Changes to the Approved June 28, 2006 Arterial Life Cycle Program (ALCP) Policies and Procedures

Minor technical refinements (concerning invoices and administrative adjustments) need to be made to the approved June 28, 2006 Arterial Life Cycle Program (ALCP) Policies and Procedures. These have been discussed with the ALCP Working Group, and on October 26, 2006, the MAG Transportation Review Committee recommended approval of the proposed changes to the ALCP Policies and Procedures. Please refer to the enclosed material.

\*4F. Arterial Life Cycle Program (ALCP) – Status Report

Each quarter, MAG staff provides member agencies with an update on projects in the Arterial Life Cycle Program (ALCP). This is the third Status Report (covering the period from July to September 2006) for the ALCP. The Status Report includes an update on ALCP Project work, and ALCP revenue/financial section, information about ALCP amendments and administrative adjustments, and the remaining FY 2007 ALCP schedule. Please refer to the enclosed material.

\*4G. Maricopa County Resident Population and Employment Projections

According to Executive Order 95-2, the Arizona Department of Economic Security (DES) is responsible for preparing an official set of population projections for Arizona and each of its counties. The projections are required to use the latest Census as the base. Because the results of the 2005 Census Survey were not available at the time that projections were adopted by DES in March 2006, Census 2000 was used as the base. Subsequent to the release of the 2005 Census Survey in June 2006, DES prepared a new set of Maricopa County projections consistent with the 2005 Census Survey. MAG has also developed a set of employment projections for Maricopa County that are consistent with these DES population projections. The projections are for

4E. Recommend approval of the proposed changes to the previously approved June 28, 2006 ALCP Policies and Procedures.

4F. Information and discussion.

4G. Recommend approval of the Maricopa County resident population and employment projections for 2010, 2015, 2020, 2025, 2030, and 2035.

2010, 2015, 2020, 2025, 2030 and 2035. They will be used as the control totals from which MAG will develop a set of subregional projections that will be brought to the Management Committee and Regional Council in 2007. Please refer to the enclosed material.

\*4H. Conformity Consultation

MAG is conducting consultation on a conformity assessment for a City of Phoenix project-level conformity determination for a park-and-ride facility located at the southwest corner of 27th Avenue and Baseline Road. The proposed facility will provide parking for approximately 240 vehicles. The construction phase of the project is programmed in FY 2008 of the FY 2007-2011 MAG Transportation Improvement Program. MAG has reviewed the project air quality assessment for compliance and concurs with the project-level conformity determination. Comments are requested by November 17, 2006. Please refer to the enclosed material.

\*4I. Annual Homeless Street Count

The MAG region receives more than \$20 million each year from the Department of Housing and Urban Development to support homeless assistance programs. These funds require a homeless street count to help determine how many homeless people live in the region. This item is presented for information and discussion about upcoming plans for the street count and opportunities for involvement. This item is also presented in recognition of National Homeless and Hunger Awareness Week. Please refer to the enclosed material.

\*4J. Contract Amendment for the Avondale Littleton School Sidewalk Design Assistance Project

On June 28, 2006, the MAG Regional Council approved an additional \$31,240 of CMAQ funds as part of the FY 2006 Closeout process for the Avondale Littleton School Sidewalk Pedestrian Design Assistance Project. These funds were approved specifically to complete the

4H. Consultation.

4I. Information and discussion.

4J. Recommend approval of an amendment to the City of Avondale contract #298 to increase the total contract amount from \$27,270 to \$58,510.

environmental clearance for the project. In order for the additional funds to be utilized, it is necessary to amend the City of Avondale's current contract #298 from \$27,270 to \$58,510. Please refer to the enclosed material.

\*4K. Proposed Amendment and Administrative Adjustment to the FY 2007- June 28, 2006 Arterial Life Cycle Program (ALCP)

The FY 2007 Arterial Life Cycle Program (ALCP) was approved by MAG Regional Council on June 28, 2006. Since that time, one project has been identified that needs to be segmented, two projects have been identified that need to change project and reimbursement schedules, and two projects have been identified that need to lower and adjust the regional reimbursement amounts. An amendment is required to add the segment to the ALCP and change the project and reimbursement schedules, and an administrative adjustment is needed to adjust the project reimbursement amounts due to lower actual costs. On October 26, 2006, the MAG Transportation Review Committee recommended approval of the changes to the ALCP. Please refer to the enclosed material.

4K. Recommend approval of an Amendment and an Administrative Adjustment to the FY 2007 – June 28, 2006 ALCP to add a new segment to a Chandler project, change two Maricopa County project and reimbursement schedules, and make an administrative adjustment to a Phoenix project and a Chandler project to reflect actual project costs.

**ITEMS PROPOSED TO BE HEARD**

5. Statewide Transportation Acceleration Needs (STAN) Account

House Bill 2865 created the Statewide Transportation Acceleration Needs (STAN) account that provides \$307 million to be used for the acceleration of the construction or reconstruction of freeways, state highways, bridges, and interchanges that are included in the Regional Transportation Plan. The Maricopa County region will receive 60 percent (\$184.2 million) of the fund, the Pima County area 16 percent, and the remainder of the state 24 percent. The legislation requires that the funds for this region be allocated to projects in the MAG Regional Transportation Plan. A report on the activities related to the STAN account will be provided.

5. Information and discussion.

6. Approval of the Draft MAG Public Participation Plan

MAG has developed a new Draft Public Participation Plan in accordance with new federal transportation guidelines contained in the Safe, Accountable, Flexible, Efficient Transportation Equity Act: A Legacy for Users (SAFETEA-LU). This new plan would define the process for public participation at MAG and serve as a guideline in obtaining public input on future updates to the Transportation Improvement Program and Regional Transportation Plan. Staff will present key elements of the plan and describe how it adheres to the new public participation guidelines outlined in SAFETEA-LU. Please refer to the enclosed material.

7. Update on the Regional Office Center

On March 29, 2006, the MAG Regional Council selected the McKinley and 1st Avenue site in Phoenix for the Regional Office Center. The Executive Director was authorized to contract for financial, legal and project management services related to the regional building project. Since that time, MAG staff and the partnering agencies have worked with the developer and the architects to complete a schematic design package. Staff will provide an update on the progress of the project and the architect, RNL, will deliver a presentation on the conceptual design of the building. This item is on the December 4, 2006 Executive Committee and the December 13, 2006 Regional Council agendas for action. Please refer to the enclosed material.

8. Comments from the Committee

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

6. Recommend approval of the Draft MAG Public Participation Plan.

7. Information and discussion.

8. Information.

MINUTES OF THE  
MAG MANAGEMENT COMMITTEE MEETING  
October 4, 2006  
MAG Office Building - Saguaro Room  
Phoenix, Arizona

MEMBERS ATTENDING

- |   |  |
|---|--|
| Dana Tranberg for Ed Beasley, Glendale,<br>Chair                      | Jerene Watson for Stephen Cleveland,<br>Goodyear             |
| Jan Dolan, Scottsdale, Vice Chair                                     | Mark Johnson, Guadalupe                                      |
| # George Hoffman, Apache Junction                                     | Mike Cartsonis for Darryl Crossman,<br>Litchfield Park       |
| Rogene Hill for Charlie McClendon,<br>Avondale                        | Jim Huling for Christopher Brady, Mesa                       |
| * Jeanine Guy, Buckeye  | Tom Martinsen, Paradise Valley                               |
| Jon Pearson, Carefree   | Carl Swenson for Terry Ellis, Peoria                         |
| Wayne Anderson for Usama Abujbarah,<br>Cave Creek                     | Frank Fairbanks, Phoenix                                     |
| Mark Pentz, Chandler  | # John Kross, Queen Creek                                    |
| Mark Fooks for B.J. Cornwall, El Mirage                               | * Bryan Meyers, Salt River Pima-Maricopa<br>Indian Community |
| Alfonso Rodriguez for Orlando Moreno, Fort<br>McDowell Yavapai Nation | Jim Rumpeltes, Surprise                                      |
| # Tim Pickering, Fountain Hills                                       | Will Manley, Tempe   |
| * Lynn Farmer, Gila Bend  | * Reyes Medrano, Tolleson                                    |
| Joseph Manuel, Gila River Indian<br>Community                         | + Shane Dille, Wickenburg                                    |
| George Pettit, Gilbert  | Lloyce Robinson, Youngtown                                   |
|   | Dale Buskirk for Victor Mendez, ADOT                         |
|   | Mike Sabatini for David Smith,<br>Maricopa County            |
|   | David Boggs, Valley Metro/RPTA                               |

\* Those members neither present nor represented by proxy.

# Participated by telephone conference call.

+ Participated by videoconference call.

1. Call to Order

The meeting was called to order by Vice Chair Jan Dolan at 12:04 p.m.

2. Pledge of Allegiance

The Pledge of Allegiance was recited.

Vice Chair Dolan announced that George Hoffman from Apache Junction, Tim Pickering from Fountain Hills, and John Kross from Queen Creek, were attending the meeting via teleconference; Shane Dille from Wickenburg was attending by videoconference.

Vice Chair Dolan noted that MAG staff was available to assist members of the public in turning in their public comment cards, who will bring the cards to the Chair. Vice Chair Dolan stated that transit tickets were available from Valley Metro/RPTA for those using transit to come to the meeting. Parking validation was available from MAG staff for those who parked in the parking garage.

Vice Chair Dolan noted that the revised summary transmittals for agenda items #4E and #4F, that were previously faxed, were at each place.

3. Call to the Audience

Vice Chair Dolan stated that Call to the Audience provides an opportunity to the public to address the Management Committee on items that are not on the agenda that are within the jurisdiction of MAG, or non-action agenda items that are on the agenda for discussion or information only. Vice Chair Dolan noted that those wishing to comment on agenda items posted for action will be provided the opportunity at the time the item is heard. Public comments have a three minute time limit and there is a timer to help the public with their presentations. Vice Chair Dolan noted that no public comment cards had been turned in.

4. Approval of Consent Agenda

Vice Chair Dolan stated that agenda items #4A, #4B, #4C, #4D, #4E, #4F, #4G, #4H, and #4I were on the consent agenda and reviewed the public comment guidelines. Public comment would be heard before action was taken on the consent items. Each speaker is provided with a total of three minutes to comment on the consent agenda. After hearing public comments, any member of the Committee can request that an item be removed from the consent agenda and considered individually. She noted that no public comment cards had been turned in.

Mr. Dille commented on agenda item #4F, Pedestrian and Bicycle Design Assistance Programs. He said that the Town of Wickenburg had submitted an application for design assistance for a project that is very important to the Town. Mr. Dille remarked that he understood why the project was not furthered in the process. He explained that ADOT is planning a bypass and after this bypass is completed there will not be a pedestrian mode across the Hassayampa River. Mr. Dille added that ADOT is trying to be responsive by leaving part of the old bridge in place, which the Town will turn into a pedestrian bridge. Mr. Dille stated that the Town will be moving forward on this project in the MAG closeout process and requested that the Management Committee give the project consideration at that time.

Mr. Pettit expressed that the Town of Gilbert would like to assist the Town of Wickenburg with the application in any way.

Ms. Hill offered the City of Avondale's support.

Mr. Pettit moved to recommend approval of the Consent Agenda. Mr. Fooks seconded, and the motion carried unanimously.

4A. Approval of September 6, 2006 Meeting Minutes

The Management Committee, by consent, approved the September 6, 2006 meeting minutes.

4B. 9-1-1 Budget Request to the Arizona Department of Administration for Equipment and Operating Funds

The Management Committee, by consent, recommended approval of the MAG FY 2008 PSAP Annual Element/Funding Request and FY 2008-2012 Equipment Program for submittal to the Arizona Department of Administration. Each year, the Public Safety Answering Point (PSAP) Managers submit inventory and upgrade requests that are used to develop a five-year equipment program that forecasts future 9-1-1 equipment needs of the region and will enable MAG to provide estimates of future funding needs to the Arizona Department of Administration (ADOA). The funding request for FY 2008 is required to be submitted to the ADOA by December 15, 2006. The ADOA Order of Adoption stipulates allowable funding under the Emergency Telecommunications Services Revolving Fund. The Emergency Telecommunications Services Revolving Fund is funded by the monthly 9-1-1 excise tax on wireline and wireless telephones. The 9-1-1 excise tax has been reduced from 37 cents a month to 28 cents a month as of July 1, 2006. The excise tax is scheduled for a further reduction to 20 cents a month effective July 1, 2007. The ADOA has projected 9-1-1 funding will be depleted by FY 2010. Efforts are being made to stabilize the 9-1-1 funds through legislation to ensure appropriate funding in the future.

4C. Amendment to the Approved List of Consultants for the MAG ITS/Traffic Engineering/Transportation Safety On-Call Services

The Management Committee, by consent, recommended approval of an amendment that would add Works Consulting and HDR, Inc. to the approved list of consultants qualified to carry out Traffic Engineering projects under the MAG ITS/Traffic Engineering, Transportation Safety On-Call services. The FY 2007 MAG Unified Planning Work Program and Annual Budget, approved by the MAG Regional Council in May 2006, includes projects to be launched in the areas of Intelligent Transportation Systems (ITS), Traffic Engineering and Transportation Safety. Approximately 21 projects, in nine areas of technical expertise, will be carried out using a list of On-Call consultants that are qualified in each area of technical expertise. This list of On-Call consultants was approved by the Regional Council Executive Committee at its meeting on February 13, 2006. The MAG ITS Committee, at its January 4, 2006 meeting, had recommended ten consultants for the Traffic Engineering area of expertise. However, the list of recommended consultants that was provided for subsequent Management Committee and Executive Committee consideration had inadvertently left out two firms that ranked at #9 and #10 in the area of Traffic Engineering. The approved list of On-Call consultants needrd to be amended to include these two firms.

4D. Consultant Selection for the MAG Commuter Rail Strategic Plan

The Management Committee, by consent, recommended approval of the selection of URS Corporation to develop the MAG Commuter Rail Strategic Plan for an amount not to exceed \$300,000. The FY 2007 MAG Unified Planning Work Program and Annual Budget, approved by the MAG Regional Council in May 2006, includes funding to develop a Commuter Rail Strategic Plan for the MAG urbanized area. Key tasks include conducting a SWOT Analysis (Strengths, Weaknesses, Opportunities, and Threats) and developing a strategic implementation plan. MAG issued a Request for Qualifications on July 14, 2006, and received three responses. A multi-agency evaluation team reviewed the Statements of Qualifications and conducted consultant interviews. The evaluation team recommended to MAG that URS Corporation be selected to develop the Commuter Rail Strategic Plan for an amount not to exceed \$300,000.

4E. Prioritized List of Proposed PM-10 Certified Street Sweeper Projects for FY 2007 CMAQ Funding

The Management Committee, by consent, recommended approval of a prioritized list of proposed PM-10 certified street sweeper projects for FY 2007 CMAQ funding and retain the prioritized list for any additional FY 2007 CMAQ funds that may become available due to year-end closeout, including any redistributed obligation authority, or additional funding received by this region. The FY 2007 MAG Unified Planning Work Program and Annual Budget and the FY 2007-2011 MAG Transportation Improvement Program contain \$1,440,000 in Congestion Mitigation and Air Quality (CMAQ) funding for the purchase of PM-10 certified street sweepers. PM-10 certified street sweeper projects were solicited from member agencies in the Maricopa County PM-10 nonattainment area and 12 applications requesting \$1.95 million in federal funds were received. On September 28, 2006, the MAG Air Quality Technical Advisory Committee recommended a prioritized list of proposed PM-10 certified street sweeper projects for FY 2007 CMAQ funding.

4F. Pedestrian and Bicycle Design Assistance Programs

The Management Committee, by consent, recommended approval of the following projects for funding from the Pedestrian Design Assistance Program: City of Avondale - Van Buren Connection Pedestrian Project, \$46,000; Town of Buckeye - Eason and 7th Street Pedestrian Project, \$24,000; Town of Fountain Hills - Four Peaks Elementary School Sidewalk Project, \$45,000; Town of Gilbert - Gilbert Industrial Pedestrian Campus, \$50,000; City of Mesa - Adobe Road Pedestrian Project, \$35,000; and recommended approval of the following projects for funding from the Bicycle/Shared Use Design Assistance Program: City of Avondale - Bridge Bicycle Design Project, \$75,000; Town of Gilbert - Bicycle Crossing Improvement and Safety Demonstration Project, \$75,000; City of Mesa - Longmore Shared-Use Path Project, \$75,000; City of Phoenix - Little Canyon Shared-Use and Canal Path Project, \$75,000. The FY 2007 MAG Unified Planning Work Program and Annual Budget, approved by the MAG Regional Council in May 2006, includes \$200,000 for the Pedestrian Design Assistance Program and \$300,000 for the Bicycle/Shared-Use Design Assistance Program. Ten project applications were submitted by member agencies for the program. On September 19, 2006, the MAG Bicycle Task Force and the MAG Pedestrian Working Group recommended nine projects for approval. On

September 28, 2006, the Transportation Review Committee recommended approval of the list of projects for funding from the Pedestrian and Bicycle Design Assistance Program.

4G. Bicycle and Pedestrian Design Assistance On-Call Consultant List

The Management Committee, by consent, recommended approval of the selection of the following consultants for the Bicycle and Pedestrian Design On-Call Consultant List: A Dye Design; e group; HDR Engineering, Inc.; J2 Engineering and Environmental Design; Otak; and Sherman Group, Inc. The FY 2007 MAG Unified Planning Work Program and Annual Budget, approved by the MAG Regional Council in May 2006, includes \$200,000 for the Pedestrian Design Assistance Program and \$300,000 for the Bicycle/Shared-Use Design Assistance Program. The Bicycle and Pedestrian Design On-Call Consultant List provides member agencies with a pre-approved consultant list to provide assistance for their design project. A request for consultants to submit Statements of Qualifications was sent out in early July and submittals were received at MAG on July 31, 2006. A multi-agency evaluation team reviewed the applications and recommended to MAG that A Dye Design; e group; HDR Engineering, Inc.; J2 Engineering and Environmental Design; Otak; and Sherman Group, Inc. be selected for the Bicycle and Pedestrian Design On-Call Consultant List. On September 19, 2006, the MAG Bicycle Task Force and the MAG Pedestrian Working Group recommended the selection of the consultant list.

4H. Proposed Amendments to the FY 2007 MAG Unified Planning Work Program and Annual Budget and the Regional Public Transportation Authority Regional Rideshare Program Contract

The Management Committee, by consent, recommended amending the FY 2007 MAG Unified Planning Work Program and Annual Budget and the Federal FY 2007 Regional Public Transportation Authority Regional Rideshare Program Contract to add \$47,346.63. The FY 2007 MAG Unified Planning Work Program and Annual Budget includes \$594,000 in consultant funding for the Regional Public Transportation Authority Regional Rideshare Program. The Regional Public Transportation Authority has indicated that \$47,346.63 will be remaining on the Federal FY 2006 Regional Rideshare Program Contract due to a timing issue with manufacturing and installing the Rideshare/Transit Info, Call 511 freeway signs. To complete this project in Federal FY 2007, it is necessary to amend the FY 2007 MAG Unified Planning Work Program and Annual Budget and the Federal FY 2007 Regional Rideshare Program Contract to add the \$47,346.63. This would revise the total funding for the Federal FY 2007 Regional Rideshare Program Contract to \$641,346.63.

4I. Efforts to Address the Impact of Domestic Violence on Youth

The MAG Regional Domestic Violence Council and MAG Human Services Coordinating Committee (HSCC) Youth Policy Stakeholders Group are partnering on a project to address the impact of domestic violence on youth. The Youth Empowerment Project, funded by the Governor's Office, Division for Women, will promote messages developed by teens for teens about resources for healthy relationships. This item is presented in honor of October as Domestic Violence Awareness Month. The Youth Empowerment Project aims to deliver accurate, accessible and age-appropriate resource information directly into the hands of teens. Their

feedback has indicated that when teens experience domestic violence, either in the home or in the context of a dating relationship, they most frequently seek the assistance of their peers, rather than from adults. Implementation of the project will involve the development of a teen-specific resource list, recorded peer testimonials, and a fact sheet about the process and consequences of reporting violence. All of these materials will be made available online at a new website currently developed specifically for teens. The web address is [www.WebofFriends.org](http://www.WebofFriends.org).

5. FY 2007 MAG Early Phase Input Opportunity Report

Jason Stephens, MAG Public Involvement Planner, gave a presentation on the FY 2007 MAG Early Phase Input Opportunity Report. Mr. Stephens stated that MAG has a four-phase public involvement process, which was adopted by the MAG Regional Council in 1994 and enhanced in 1998. Mr. Stephens stated that the FY 2007 Early Phase Input Opportunity was conducted from August through September 2006. Opportunities for input included an Early Phase Stakeholders Meeting, Chicanos Por La Causa Business Seminar in Spanish and several I-17 Road Shows. Most of these opportunities were conducted in conjunction with the Arizona Department of Transportation, Regional Public Transportation Authority and Valley Metro Rail. Mr. Stephens stated that staff members from these agencies were available during these events to answer questions, receive suggestions and respond to comments related to the Valley's transportation system. Mr. Stephens noted that comments were also received online and by telephone.

Mr. Stephens noted that a summary of input and all correspondence received during the phase is included in the Draft FY 2007 Early Phase Input Opportunity Report. He reviewed some of the questions and comments received: 1) The freeway program needs to be accelerated. 2) We need more capacity on the entire transportation system. 3) Commuter rail should see more consideration as a key plan component. 4) Valley Metro should follow up with the Dial-a-Ride study that it said it would complete. 5) Who is responsible for the speeders along the Loop 101? Light rail should follow the entire freeway system. 6) When will light rail go to the new Cardinals stadium? 7) When is bus service going to be increased in the West Valley? 8) I hope air quality improves once we get all the transit in place.

Mr. Stephens added that as part of a requirement of Safe, Accountable, Flexible, Efficient Transportation Equity Act: A Legacy for Users (SAFETEA-LU), MAG has recently completed a new public participation plan. He noted that the draft plan is in a 45-day review process. Chair Dolan thanked Mr. Stephens for his report. No questions from the Committee were noted.

6. Statewide Transportation Acceleration Needs (STAN) Account

Eric Anderson, MAG Transportation Director, stated that House Bill 2865 created the Statewide Transportation Acceleration Needs (STAN) account. He said that the STAN account provides \$307 million statewide to be used for the acceleration of the construction or reconstruction of freeways, state highways, bridges, and interchanges. He noted that this does not include streets and transit. Mr. Anderson advised that the Maricopa County region will receive 60 percent (\$184.2 million) of the fund, the Pima County area 16 percent, and the remainder of the state 24

percent. Mr. Anderson noted that this is the first time that the Legislature and Executive Branch have put a substantial amount of money toward transportation needs.

Mr. Anderson advised that the legislation requires that the funds for this region be allocated to projects in the MAG Regional Transportation Plan and that STAN funds are intended to supplement, not supplant, committed funding.

Mr. Anderson then explained that the MAG Transportation Policy Committee and the MAG Regional Council will recommend projects to the State Transportation Board, which is required to take action at its next meeting. He stated that MAG is also required to report on activities related to the STAN account to the House and Senate by December 15, 2006.

Mr. Anderson provided a review of guidance given by the Transportation Policy Committee and discussion by the September Regional Council at their September meetings. Mr. Anderson stated that the TPC discussed that projects would generally follow adopted RTP priorities. He said that one important consideration is project readiness. He explained that some projects are not ready to be accelerated because they are in the design stage or are undergoing environmental studies, such as the South Mountain Freeway and the I-10 Collector Distributor. He noted that projects being targeted are those that could start construction in 2008.

Mr. Anderson stated that the TPC discussed projects that would provide congestion relief and being performance based. He mentioned legislative bills put forward unsuccessfully this past session that earmarked funds for I-10 and I-17 projects, and added that what has been heard from legislators is to move dirt on important projects as soon as possible.

Mr. Anderson noted that typical projects to utilize STAN funds could include construction that provides congestion relief, for right-of-way protection, or advance engineering and environmental work. He indicated that engineering and environmental work could be advanced to provide future project readiness in case the Legislature gives us more money next year. Mr. Anderson noted that purchasing right-of-way could help avoid future cost increases, however, there seems to be a preference for doing construction projects.

Mr. Anderson stated that MAG will consult with ADOT on the status of projects. Mr. Anderson stated that the TPC discussed having subregional meetings or a workshop to discuss options for using the STAN funds. He added that because there was insufficient time to hold the subregional meetings prior to the October 11th TPC meeting, it has been cancelled. Mr. Anderson indicated that possible action by the TPC could be taken November 15th. He added that if the Regional Council makes a recommendation at its meeting on December 13th, this could be included in the report to the House and Senate. Vice Chair Dolan thanked Mr. Anderson for his report and asked members if they had comments or questions.

Mr. Rumpeltes requested support for accelerating Loop 303. He said that the City of Surprise Mayor and Council are pitching this project to other cities. Mr. Rumpeltes stated that the City of Surprise, with a population of 100,000, has no freeway. Mr. Rumpeltes noted that Loop 303 has been in the plan since the 1980s in Proposition 300 and it is now in Proposition 400. He noted that 60 percent of the Northwest Valley voters supported Proposition 400. Mr. Rumpeltes

commented that Loop 303 was promised to the people and it is not happening quickly because it is a Phase 2 project. He asked the Committee's consideration on this project.

Mr. Fairbanks stated that everyone knows that I-17 has major problems.

Dennis Smith commented that there are a lot of worthy freeway projects, including some from 1985. He referenced what Mr. Anderson had mentioned, the key is project readiness. Some projects are in the environmental or design stages and cannot be accelerated.

Vice Chair Dolan stated that it was important to keep the Management Committee advised on the STAN process. She added that any communications to the Committee would be helpful.

Mr. Rumpeltes noted that the Loop 303 project is ready to go.

7. Comments from the Committee

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

Vice Chair Dolan asked Mr. Smith if MAG had any recent news to share. Mr. Smith requested that Kelly Taft, MAG Communications Manager, update the Committee on an upcoming visit to the MAG Region by the Greater Dallas Planning Council.

Ms. Taft stated that the Greater Dallas Planning Council (GDPC) is composed of elected officials, business representatives, and staff who will be visiting the MAG Region November 1-3, 2006. She said that GDPC is interested in looking at best practices in regard to urban form, transit oriented development, and aviation. Ms. Taft reviewed the functions planned that included visits to MAG and venues in the Cities of Glendale, Phoenix, Tempe, and Scottsdale. She noted that an invitation would be sent to Regional Council and Transportation Policy Committee members.

There being no further business, the meeting adjourned at 12:30 p.m.

---

Chairman

---

Secretary

# **MARICOPA ASSOCIATION OF GOVERNMENTS**

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

**DATE:**

October 31, 2006

**SUBJECT:**

Proposed 2007 Revisions to 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 of several Public Works Departments and are reviewed and refined by members of the construction industry. They were written to fulfill the need for uniform rules for public works construction performed for Maricopa County and the various cities and public agencies in the county. It further fulfills the need for adequate standards by the smaller communities and agencies who could not afford to promulgate such standards for themselves. The MAG Standard Specifications and Details Committee has completed its 2006 review of proposed revisions to the MAG Publication. A summary of cases is shown in Attachment One.

A summary of these recommendations has also been sent to MAG Public Works Directors, in addition to members of the Management Committee, for review for a period of one month. If no objections to any of the proposed revisions have been suggested within the month review time frame, then the proposed revisions will be regarded as approved and formal changes to the printed and electronic copies will be released. It is anticipated that the annual update packet will be available for purchase in early January 2007.

**PUBLIC INPUT:**

Development of these revisions has been achieved during open meetings of the MAG Specifications and Details Committee and has included input from several professional contractor and utility groups and private companies. There have also been some members of the public present to address the Committee and present their comments. Comments received relating to the 2006 cases include:

Regarding Case 06-02: On February 1, Alan Bohnenkamp of the Arizona Corporation Commission Pipeline Safety Group was present to answer questions on recent changes in the Blue Stake law. He noted that changes mainly focus on areas outside the right-of-way. He provided some clarifications on use of multiple identification methods and ways to comply if facilities are difficult to locate.

Regarding Case 06-04: On July 5, Joe Zicaro, Chairman ASTM C 76 committee provided background information on the ASTM committee's past considerations for Portland cement quantity requirements for concrete sewer pipe. The designated cement content originated as part of a prescriptive specification, the present standard is primarily a performance based specification and there have been committee discussions to delete the minimum cement content requirement from the standard.

**PROS & CONS:**

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

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

**TECHNICAL & POLICY IMPLICATIONS:**

TECHNICAL: The MAG Specifications and Details are a series of recommendations developed over many years, principally by senior inspectors and their supervisors from many MAG agencies. These recommendations are not prescriptive, but are often adopted entirely, or in part, by MAG agencies in developing public works projects.

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

**ACTION NEEDED:**

Information and discussion.

**PRIOR COMMITTEE ACTIONS:**

MAG Specifications and Details Committee. Reviewed and provided recommendations for the cases submitted for consideration throughout 2006.

VOTING MEMBERS

Robert Herz, P.E., RLS, Maricopa County DOT,  
Chairman  
Jim Badowich, Avondale  
Steven Borst P.E., Buckeye  
David Fern, P.E., Chandler  
Mark Weiner, Gilbert  
Greg Rodzenko, P.E., Glendale  
Tom Vassallo, Goodyear

Kelly Jensen, P.E., Mesa  
Maher Hazine, P.E., Peoria  
Jeff Van Skike, P.E., Phoenix (Street Trans.)  
Matthew Woodland, Phoenix (Water)  
Rodney Ramos, P.E., Scottsdale  
Don Moseley, Surprise  
James E. Bond, P.E., Tempe

ADVISORY MEMBERS

John Ashley, ACA  
Brian Gallimore, AGC  
Jeff Benedict, AGC  
Don Green, ARPA  
Don Cornilson, ARPA

Paul Nebeker, Independent  
Dale Phelan, NUCA  
William Ast, NUCA  
Peter Kandarlis, SRP Engineering

**CONTACT PERSON:**

Gordon Tyus, MAG, (602) 254-6300

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

MARICOPA ASSOCIATION OF GOVERNMENTS  
SPECIFICATIONS AND DETAILS COMMITTEE  
SUMMARY OF RECOMMENDATIONS FOR 2006 CASES FOR CONSIDERATION

<b>Case</b>	<b>Description</b>	<b>Recommended Action</b>
06-01	Safety Rail Addition to Concrete Scupper Detail 206	Approval
06-02	Clarification of Sanitary Sewer Service Line Markings Detail 440	Approval
06-03	Miscellaneous Corrections, Details 533-3 and 533-4	Approval
06-04	Reduced Cement Content for Reinforced Concrete Pipe (RCP) Mixes	Carry Forward
06-05	Revisions to Survey Marker Detail 120-2	Approval
06-06	Revisions to Drop Sewer Connection Detail 426	Approval
06-07	Add 24-inch Wide Mountable Curb and Gutter with Transition View, Detail 220-2	Approval
06-08	Add 30-inch Wide Mountable Curb and Gutter with Transition View, Detail 220-2	Approval
06-09	Modify Section View of Integral Roll Curb and Gutter and add Transition View, Detail 220-1	Approval

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

October 5, 2006

**GENERAL INFORMATION:**

Case Number: 06-01  
Section/Detail: Details 206-1, 206-2 and 206-3.  
Title: Safety Rail Addition to Concrete Scupper Detail  
Sponsor: Maricopa County Department of Transportation  
Advisor: -

**DISCUSSION:**

The purpose of this case was to add safety rail protection at the back-side of the sidewalk scupper where the drop off distance exceeds 12-inches. In order to add the safety rail securely, the scupper slab thickness was increased to 5" and an anchor weld plate detail was added. The case also deleted property line references and provided missing information and corrections to section, plan and isometric views.

Revisions to Detail 206-1 included increasing the slab thickness, correctly indicating the position and type of reinforcing bars, making the concrete spillway consistent with section views, and adding notes to revise the concrete class from Class B to Class A for the scupper.

Revisions to Detail 206-2 included moving the isometric view to a new Detail 206-3, and adding the safety rail (per Detail 145) at a 5" offset from the back edge of the sidewalk to Section D-D. Other changes to Section D-D included showing the revised thickness of scupper slab, location of reinforcing bars and changes to the nose detail. In addition, a detail was added for the safety rail weld plate.

New Detail 206-3 included the isometric view previously shown on Detail 206-2, which was modified to include the safety railing and clarifying notes.

**RECOMMENDATION:**

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

Submittal Date:	January 4, 2006	Vote Summary:	Affirmative:	8
Vote Date:	September 6, 2006		Negative:	0
			Abstention:	0

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

October 5, 2006

**GENERAL INFORMATION:**

Case Number: 06-02  
Section/Detail: Sections 615.6.2 and 615.7/Details 440-1, 440-2 and 440-3  
Title: Clarification of Sanitary Sewer Service Line Marking Details  
Sponsor: Maricopa County Department of Transportation  
Advisor: -

**DISCUSSION:**

The purpose of this case was to add clarity to Details 440-1, 440-2 and 440-3 by depicting electronic markers at the desired locations and by using consistent descriptions of the electronic markers as shown on the drawings and in the notes.

Section 615.6.2 was revised to add PVC pipe and now states: "Water stops will be required when connecting *PVC or HDPE* pipe to concrete structures, manholes, etc. The water stop shall comply with Section 738 and will be installed per manufacturer recommendations."

The last sentence of Section 615.7 was revised to correct the typical depth of electronic markers and now states: "Electronic markers shall be placed at no greater depth than electronic locating devices can locate them (*typically 2'-4'*)."

Revisions to all three Details, 440-1, 440-2 and 440-3, included properly sizing and locating the electronic marker on the plan and elevation views to be at the angle point of the bend on the sewer line connection, at a depth of 2' to 4'. Changes to the notes included using consistent terminology for the electronic markers and correcting typographic errors.

**RECOMMENDATION:**

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

Submittal Date:	February 1, 2006	Vote Summary:	Affirmative:	8
Vote Date:	September 6, 2006		Negative:	0
			Abstention:	0

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

October 5, 2006

**GENERAL INFORMATION:**

Case Number: 06-03  
Section/Detail: Details 533-3 and 533-4  
Title: Miscellaneous Corrections  
Sponsor: Maricopa County Department of Transportation  
Advisor: -

**DISCUSSION:**

This case corrected drafting errors brought to the attention of the committee. These corrections included:

Revision to Grate Detail 533-3: Increased length of Section F-F reference arrows to include two cross bars as shown in Section F-F.

Revision to Grate Detail 533-4: Increased length of Section B-B reference arrows to include two cross bars as shown in Section B-B.

**RECOMMENDATION:**

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

Submittal Date:	February 1, 2006	Vote Summary:	Affirmative:	8
Vote Date:	September 6, 2006		Negative:	0
			Abstention:	0

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

October 5, 2006

**GENERAL INFORMATION:**

Case Number:	06-04
Section/Detail:	Section 735
Title:	Reduced Cement Content for Reinforced Concrete Pipe (RCP) Mixes
Sponsor:	City of Chandler
Advisor:	-

**DISCUSSION:**

This case proposed deleting Section 735.4(B) and 735.4(C). This change would delete the prescriptive elements of the specification resulting in a performance base specification. Pipe performance requirements would remain unchanged.

Committee members requested further study of this case. The agency sponsor of this case requested that it be carried forward to 2007.

**RECOMMENDATION:**

The MAG Standard Specifications and Details Committee recommends to carry forward this case for further discussion in 2007.

Submittal Date:	May 3, 2006	Vote Summary:	Affirmative:	<b>0</b>
Vote Date:	No vote taken		Negative:	<b>0</b>
			Abstention:	<b>0</b>

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

October 5, 2006

**GENERAL INFORMATION:**

Case Number:	06-05
Section/Detail:	Detail 120-2
Title:	Revisions to Survey Marker Detail (for Unincorporated Areas of Maricopa County)
Sponsor:	Maricopa County Department of Transportation
Advisor:	-

**DISCUSSION:**

The purpose of case 06-05 was to correct a drawing dimension error and update the detail drawing to obtain better compliance with the Arizona Boundary Survey Minimum Standards.

Revisions to Detail 120-2 included revising the minimum pipe length to 16" for the 'Type D' galvanized pipe and adjusting the layout on the plan view of the brass cap to provide space for the Registered Land Surveyor (RLS) number. Additional corrections to the notes are also included.

**RECOMMENDATION:**

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

Submittal Date:	May 3, 2006	Vote Summary:	Affirmative:	8
Vote Date:	September 6, 2006		Negative:	0
			Abstention:	0

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

October 5, 2006

**GENERAL INFORMATION:**

Case Number: 06-06  
Section/Detail: Section 625.2/Detail 426  
Title: Revisions to Drop Sewer Connection Detail  
Sponsor: Advisory Member Paul Nebeker  
Advisor: -

**DISCUSSION:**

The purpose of this case was to delete the detail requirement for the use of vitrified clay pipe since not all sewer lines are constructed with this type of pipe and mixing pipe types is not recommended.

Revisions to Section 625.2 and Detail 426 include changing the notes specifying vitrified clay pipe to "Pipe material of drop connection to match new construction." Also notes were revised on Detail 426 to state "connection as required" in lieu of the existing coupler notes, and that the connections shall comply with Section 615 in the specification.

Also a note on Detail 426 was revised to specify masonry anchors are for brick manholes only.

**RECOMMENDATION:**

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

Submittal Date:	July 5, 2006	Vote Summary:	Affirmative:	7
Vote Date:	September 6, 2006		Negative:	1
			Abstention:	0

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

October 5, 2006

**GENERAL INFORMATION:**

Case Number: 06-07  
Section/Detail: Details 220-1, 220-2  
Title: Add 24-inch Wide Mountable Curb and Gutter with Transition View  
Sponsor: City of Scottsdale  
Advisor: -

**DISCUSSION:**

Case 06-07 proposed the addition of a 24-inch mountable curb detail used to enable maintenance vehicles to access areas in back of the curb.

The existing detail 220 was changed to 220-1 and a new detail 220-2 was added. It included a section view of the 24-inch 'Mountable Curb and Gutter (Type E)' and a pictorial view showing the 24" curb transition from this mountable curb (Type E) to the typical vertical curb (Type A). The section and pictorial view were dimensioned and noted. Detail 220-2 added general notes on construction materials, expansion joint placement, finishing, and that "the slope of the gutter pan shall match the pavement cross slope when the adjacent pavement slopes away from the gutter."

It was also noted that revisions to all curb sections on Details 220-1 and 220-2 show consistent broom finish notes, and that adjacent asphalt pavement be dimensioned as 1/4" above the lip of the gutter where appropriate. Additional corrections to dimensions, notes and layout were made as required.

**RECOMMENDATION:**

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

Submittal Date:	July 5, 2006	Vote Summary:	Affirmative:	8
Vote Date:	September 6, 2006		Negative:	0
			Abstention:	0

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

October 5, 2006

**GENERAL INFORMATION:**

Case Number:	06-08
Section/Detail:	Details 220-1, 220-2
Title:	Add 30-inch Wide Mountable Curb and Gutter with Transition View
Sponsor:	City of Scottsdale
Advisor:	-

**DISCUSSION:**

Case 06-08 proposed the addition of a 30-inch mountable curb detail used to enable emergency vehicles such as fire trucks to better traverse through restrictive traffic calming installations.

The existing detail 220 was changed to 220-1 and a new detail 220-2 was added. It included a section view of the 30-inch 'Mountable Curb and Gutter (Type F)' and a pictorial view showing a 5' curb transition from this mountable curb (Type F) to the typical vertical curb (Type A). The section and pictorial view were dimensioned and noted. Detail 220-2 added general notes on construction materials, expansion joint placement, finishing, and that "the slope of the gutter pan shall match the pavement cross slope when the adjacent pavement slopes away from the gutter."

It was also noted that revisions to all curb sections on Details 220-1 and 220-2 show consistent broom finish notes, and that adjacent asphalt pavement be dimensioned as 1/4" above the lip of the gutter where appropriate. Additional corrections to dimensions, notes and layout were made as required.

**RECOMMENDATION:**

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

Submittal Date:	July 5, 2006	Vote Summary:	Affirmative:	8
Vote Date:	September 6, 2006		Negative:	0
			Abstention:	0

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

October 5, 2006

**GENERAL INFORMATION:**

Case Number: 06-09  
Section/Detail: Detail 221  
Title: Modify Section View of Integral Roll Curb and Gutter and add Transition View  
Sponsor: City of Scottsdale  
Advisor: -

**DISCUSSION:**

Case 06-09 proposed to remove the section view of the vertical curb and gutter and add a transition view, which would help contractors and construction crews to visualize the smooth transition required between curb types.

Revisions to Detail 221 included replacing section A-A with a pictorial view depicting the desired curb transition geometrics. The view shows a smooth transition from Type 'A' vertical curb to Type 'C' roll curb and gutter, by matching the flow line and top of curb line with transition lines between each over the 5' curb transition.

In addition, general notes describing the curb and gutter transition were added including adding the note: "Transition between typical sections shall be accomplished by the use of direct straight line transitions of the flow line and other surface features." Finally, under the integral roll curb and gutter notes, the contraction joint spacing was changed from 16 feet to 5 feet.

**RECOMMENDATION:**

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

Submittal Date:	July 5, 2006	Vote Summary:	Affirmative:	8
Vote Date:	September 6, 2006		Negative:	0
			Abstention:	0

# **MARICOPA ASSOCIATION OF GOVERNMENTS**

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

**DATE:**

October 31, 2006

**SUBJECT:**

Public Hearing on the 2006 Annual Report on 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 and hold a Public Hearing on the report. A Public Hearing on the Draft 2006 Annual Report was held at the MAG office on October 19, 2006. A transcript of this Public Hearing was prepared and is enclosed for information. MAG committees were briefed prior to the Public Hearing regarding the key findings and issues identified in the report.

**PUBLIC INPUT:**

Public comment was received by telephone that the regional grid bus route on Glendale Avenue should be extended east to Scottsdale Road, and bus service should be expanded to reduce congestion in areas where arterial improvements are scheduled. Also, a comment was received that the appendix listing for transit routes should be in order of service start year as in the 2005 Annual Report. A transcript of the Public Hearing on the Draft 2006 Annual Report, which was held on October 19, 2006, is also enclosed.

**PROS & CONS:**

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

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 Regional Transportation Plan and identify changing conditions that may require plan and program adjustments.

**ACTION NEEDED:**

Information and discussion.

**PRIOR COMMITTEE ACTIONS:**

Regional Council: On September 27, 2006, the Regional Council was briefed by MAG staff on the key findings and issues identified in the Draft 2006 Annual Report. The item was on the agenda for information and discussion.

## MEMBERS ATTENDING

Mayor James M. Cavanaugh, Goodyear, Chair  
Mayor Mary Manross, Scottsdale, Vice Chair  
+ Councilmember Dave Waldron for Mayor Douglas Coleman, Apache Junction  
\* Mayor Marie Lopez-Rogers, Avondale  
# Mayor Bobby Bryant, Buckeye  
\* Mayor Edward Morgan, Carefree  
Vice Mayor Dick Esser, Cave Creek  
Mayor Boyd Dunn, Chandler  
Mayor Fred Waterman, El Mirage  
\* President Raphael Bear, Fort McDowell Yavapai Nation  
\* Mayor Wally Nichols, Fountain Hills  
+ Mayor Daniel Birchfield, Gila Bend  
\* Governor William Rhodes, Gila River Indian Community  
Mayor Steven Berman, Gilbert  
# Mayor Elaine Scruggs, Glendale  
\* Mayor Bernadette Jimenez, Guadalupe

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

Transportation Policy Committee: On September 20, 2006, the Transportation Policy Committee was briefed by MAG staff on the key findings and issues identified in the Draft 2006 Annual Report. The item was on the agenda for information and discussion.

## MEMBERS ATTENDING

Councilmember Peggy Bilsten, Phoenix, Chair  
Mayor Keno Hawker, Mesa, Vice Chair  
Kent Andrews, Salt River Pima-Maricopa Indian Community  
F. Rockne Arnett, Citizens Transportation Oversight Committee  
+ Councilmember Gail Barney, Queen Creek  
# Stephen Beard, SR Beard & Associates  
Mayor Steven Berman, Gilbert  
Dave Berry, Swift Transportation  
\* Jed S. Billings, FNF Construction  
Mayor Bobby Bryant, Buckeye

\* Not present  
# Participated by telephone conference call  
+ Participated by videoconference call

Mayor Thomas Schoaf, Litchfield Park  
Supervisor Max Wilson, Maricopa County  
Mayor Keno Hawker, Mesa  
Mayor Ed Winkler, Paradise Valley  
Vice Mayor Vicki Hunt for Mayor John Keegan, Peoria  
Councilmember Peggy Neely, Phoenix  
+ Mayor Art Sanders, Queen Creek  
\* President Joni Ramos, Salt River Pima-Maricopa Indian Community  
Councilmember Cliff Elkins for Mayor Joan Shafer, Surprise  
# Mayor Hugh Hallman, Tempe  
\* Mayor Adolfo Gamez, Tolleson  
+ Mayor Ron Badowski, Wickenburg  
\* Mayor Bryan Hackbarth, Youngtown  
Joe Lane, State Transportation Board  
\* Felipe Zubia, State Transportation Board  
# F. Rockne Arnett, Citizens Transportation Oversight Committee

Mayor James Cavanaugh, Goodyear  
Councilmember Pat Dennis, Peoria  
Mayor Boyd Dunn, Chandler  
Councilmember Cliff Elkins, Surprise  
# Mayor Hugh Hallman, Tempe  
\* Eneas Kane, DMB Associates  
Joe Lane, State Transportation Board  
Mayor Marie Lopez-Rogers, Avondale  
Mayor Mary Manross, Scottsdale  
David Scholl, Westcor  
Mayor Elaine Scruggs, Glendale  
Supervisor Don Stapley, Maricopa County

Management Committee: On September 6, 2006, the Management Committee was briefed by MAG staff on the key findings and issues identified in the Draft 2006 Annual Report. The item was on the agenda for information and discussion.

## MEMBERS ATTENDING

- Ed Beasley, Glendale, Chair
- Jan Dolan, Scottsdale, Vice Chair
- # George Hoffman, Apache Junction
- Charlie McClendon, Avondale
- Jeanine Guy, Buckeye
- \* Jon Pearson, Carefree
- \* Usama Abujbarah, Cave Creek
- Mark Pentz, Chandler
- Mark Fooks for B.J. Cornwall, El Mirage
- Alfonso Rodriguez for Orlando Moreno, Fort McDowell Yavapai Nation
- # Tim Pickering, Fountain Hills
- \* Lynn Farmer, Gila Bend
- \* Joseph Manuel, Gila River Indian Community
- George Pettit, Gilbert
- \* Stephen Cleveland, Goodyear
- Mark Johnson, Guadalupe
- Darryl Crossman, Litchfield Park
- Jim Huling for Christopher Brady, Mesa
- \* Tom Martinsen, Paradise Valley
- John Wendersky for Terry Ellis, Peoria
- Frank Fairbanks, Phoenix
- John Kross, Queen Creek
- \* Bryan Meyers, Salt River Pima-Maricopa Indian Community
- Jim Rumpeltes, Surprise
- Amber Wakeman for Will Manley, Tempe
- \* Reyes Medrano, Tolleson
- # Shane Dille, Wickenburg
- Lloyce Robinson, Youngtown
- Dale Buskirk for Victor Mendez, ADOT
- Mike Ellegood for David Smith, Maricopa County
- David Boggs, Valley Metro/RPTA

\* Those members neither present nor represented by proxy.

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

Transportation Review Committee: On August 24, 2006, the Transportation Review Committee was briefed by MAG staff on the key findings and issues identified in the Draft 2006 Annual Report. The item was on the agenda for information and discussion.

## MEMBERS ATTENDING

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

## EX-OFFICIO MEMBERS ATTENDING

- \* Regional Bicycle Task Force: Randi Alcott
- \* Street Committee: Darryl Crossman
- Pedestrian Working Group: Eric Iwersen
- \* ITS Committee: Alan Sanderson

\* Members neither present nor represented by proxy.

+ - Attended by Videoconference

# - Attended by Audioconference

## **CONTACT PERSON:**

Roger Herzog, MAG, (602) 254-6300

October 31, 2006

TO: Management Committee

FROM: Eric Anderson, MAG Transportation Director

SUBJECT: PUBLIC HEARING ON THE 2006 ANNUAL REPORT ON THE STATUS OF THE IMPLEMENTATION OF PROPOSITION 400

As part of the process for developing the 2006 Annual Report, MAG staff held a public hearing on Thursday, October 19, 2006 at 5:00 p.m. at the MAG offices.

The public hearing was facilitated by MAG Transportation Director Eric Anderson, with representatives from the Arizona Department of Transportation (ADOT), Valley Metro and Valley Metro Rail (METRO) also in attendance. MAG Senior Project Manager Roger Herzog provided a presentation on the 2006 Annual Report detailing the reports contents. Following the presentation, hearing attendees were provided an opportunity to comment on the Annual Report. A court reporter was in attendance to record all comments made at the hearing. Although there were no comments made by the public at the hearing, there were comments received prior to the hearing via telephone and during a special event attended by MAG staff at which many comments were made regarding the Valley's transportation system. An entire transcript of the hearing is attached for further consideration and review.

Summary of Input:

- Bus route 24 needs to continue into Scottsdale.
- The half-mile street bus routes need to connect with light rail.
- Rural connectors (SR-85, US-60, SR-87, and eventually SR-71) need to connect with arterials.
- All communities are paying the tax even though they are not on the RPTA Board.
- Need to connect Fort McDowell, Salt River, and Fountain Hills to the transit system.
- The strategic plan is not being done multi-modally; if there is light rail, there needs to be bus connectors, otherwise you will need to take a car.
- More outreach to the public on meeting announcements is needed.
- Proposition 400 needs to be more flexible; arterials need to be addressed more or we will be further behind.
- The cost for rural routes is 80/20 funding. With the success of rural connectors, additional routes can be funded.
- We need to have a 404 freeway to reach the outlying areas of the Valley.
- Light rail should be along the entire freeway system.
- More outreach to the public on meeting announcements is needed.



Maricopa Association of )  
 Governments Public Hearing on )  
 the 2006 Annual Report on the )  
 Status of the Implementation of )  
 Proposition 400. )  
 )

Phoenix, Arizona  
 October 19, 2006  
 5:06 p.m.

REPORTER'S TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS

Reported by: RENE' METTY KING, RMR  
 Certified Court Reporter No. 50342 (AZ)  
 Certified Shorthand Reporter No. 7437 (CA)

□

- 1 APPEARANCES:
  - 2 Mr. Eric Anderson - Chairman
  - 3 Mr. Bill Hayden - Arizona Department of Transportation
- Page 1

1019MAG

4 Mr. Brian Jungworth - Regional Public Transportation  
Authority  
5 Valley Metro Rail representative  
6 Mr. Roger Herzog - Senior Project Manager  
7 Mr. Jason Stephens - MAG  
8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

□

3

1

P R O C E E D I N G S

2

3

MR. ANDERSON: We're going to call this  
4 meeting to order.

5

This is a public hearing on the 2006 Annual  
6 Report on the status of the implementation of the Regional  
7 Transportation Plan that was funded out of

8 Proposition 400.

9 My name is Eric Anderson, transportation  
10 director for the Maricopa Association of Governments.  
11 welcome. Thank you for taking your time out of your busy  
12 schedule to be here today.

13 The first order of business is a  
14 presentation by Roger Herzog.

15 Roger?

16 MR. HERZOG: Mr. Chairman, I'd like to spend  
17 a few minutes reviewing the findings of the 2006 Annual  
18 Report.

19 Back up one, please.

20 Okay. The Annual Report is required by  
21 Arizona statutes, and it calls for a discussion of status  
22 of projects, changes to the Regional Transportation Plan  
23 and priorities, also a look at project financing, and as  
24 part of the requirements, to hold a public hearing, which  
25 we're doing today.

□

4

1 Key topics that I'd like to cover today  
2 include the changes to the Regional Transportation Plan,  
3 the status of revenues, and also the status of the modal  
4 Life Cycle Programs including freeways, arterial streets,  
5 and transit.

6 So far as the Regional Transportation Plan,  
7 one of the key changes this year was to incorporate the  
8 Life Cycle Programs directly into the plan. This replaces  
9 the phasing that was originally in the plan and will help  
10 us monitor and make decisions regarding priorities. Also  
11 during the year a number of area and modal studies are  
12 underway to help prepare for potential future updates.

13 In the revenue area, tax receipts from  
14 Proposition 400 were approximately 11.4 percent higher  
15 than the estimate in the 2005 Annual Report. However, the  
16 forecasts of future revenues from this source are largely  
17 unchanged from the prior Annual Report.

18 As you can see on this table, total revenues  
19 for the -- actually, the second half of fiscal year '06  
20 totaled approximately 11 percent more than what was  
21 forecasted last year. Also in this chart you can see the  
22 future outlook for revenues from the half-cent is largely  
23 unchanged for the remainder of the Life Cycle period.

24 Revenues from other sources, such as state  
25 15 percent money or federal funds, are also at this point

□

5

1 not expected to change significantly over the 20-year  
2 period compared to forecasts.

3 Also in the revenue area, a new source was  
4 approved by the legislature, with about 184 million made  
5 available for projects on the state highway system in the  
6 MAG area. This is called the Statewide Transportation  
7 Acceleration Needs Account.

8 Getting into the specific Life Cycle  
9 Programs, the Freeway/Highway Program includes 115  
10 projects over the next 20 years; but backing up for a  
11 minute, to look at the predecessor of Proposition 400,  
12 which was Proposition 300, a number of accomplishments  
13 occurred during FY '06 in that area. The San Tan Freeway  
14 was completed, the final grade separation on Grand Avenue  
15 was also opened, and it's expected that the final segment  
16 of the Red Mountain Freeway will be done by mid-2008.

17                                    Looking at Proposition 400 projects, a lot  
18 of preliminary engineering work is proceeding on several  
19 of the corridors. Also, design work is underway. On the  
20 Freeway/Highway Program, projects on I-10 and I-17 were  
21 accelerated from later years up to fiscal year '07 and  
22 fiscal year '08 through the help of GAN and HELP loans.  
23 During FY '06, approximately 58 million in total was  
24 expended on projects in the Freeway/Highway Life Cycle  
25 Program.

□

6

1                                    This chart shows that a lot of that went  
2 into, as we would expect, design work, and also a fair  
3 amount into construction, which is largely represented by  
4 work on the completion of the widening of the Superstition  
5 Freeway.

6                                    The pace will pick up in FY 2007 with  
7 540 million in projects programmed to go to bid during  
8 FY '07. Also in the period last year, 252 million in cost  
9 increases were identified in the Freeway/Highway Program.  
10 These projects were primarily in the first five years of  
11 the 20-year program.

12                                   However, at this point, for the full Life  
13 Cycle Program, estimated future costs and future revenues  
14 are in balance. It's a close total there, with revenues  
15 slightly exceeding future costs. However, during the  
16 coming year, significant additional project cost increases  
17 may be encountered in the program as detailed engineering  
18 studies are completed.

19                                   Also, now, looking at the Streets Program,  
20 94 projects were originally identified in the Arterial  
21 Life Cycle Program. During FY '06, this program was

22 refined and updated to reflect the latest information on  
23 project status and also revisions to Life Cycle  
24 programming policies. During FY '06, a total of 7 million  
25 in reimbursements were distributed to local governments,

□

7

1 and it is anticipated in FY '07 that total will go up to  
2 56 million.

3                   A lot of work is proceeding on all projects  
4 in the Arterial Life Cycle Program, including design  
5 activities, right-of-way; and a number of the projects  
6 over the 20-year period have been advanced by local  
7 governments for earlier work, which will be reimbursed  
8 according to the original schedule.

9                   As with the freeways, the total estimated  
10 revenues for reimbursement are slightly higher than the  
11 future demands on the reimbursement program. However,  
12 although the Arterial Program costs are basically capped,  
13 that is, the reimbursements are capped, the construction  
14 costs have been going up; and this has brought about a  
15 concern regarding the ability of jurisdictions to provide  
16 full funding for all projects in the program. This is an  
17 issue that we'll be watching over the next several years.

18                   Also, some of the projects in the program  
19 are funded with -- from federal sources, and the  
20 requirements for federal processing can be lengthy and may  
21 cause schedule problems.

22                   Finally, the Transit Program, which includes  
23 the BRT/Express System, with 32 new routes added to the  
24 system; it also includes a Regional Grid Bus System, with  
25 31 routes being funded there; and then also the Light Rail

□

1 Transit System.

2                   During FY '06, funding began for 14 existing  
3 express routes and four rapid bus routes. Also, funding  
4 went to the ADA Program and other programs. New equipment  
5 was purchased, with 62 new coaches and 20 used coaches  
6 being acquired. A total of about 66 million was expended  
7 in FY '06, and as this chart shows, a lot of that went to  
8 acquisition of new vehicles.

9                   As part of the program, planning studies are  
10 going forth on the BRT System, other aspects, such as the  
11 bus performance measures. In addition to the planning  
12 studies, during the next five years, 11 new BRT routes and  
13 seven new Super Grid routes will be initiated. Actually,  
14 one route started in July already of 2006 on Scottsdale  
15 Road.

16                   On the Light Rail System, construction is  
17 continuing on the Minimum Operating Segment, and it's  
18 expected service will be beginning in December 2008. The  
19 Life Cycle Program also includes a number of extensions to  
20 that system, and study work is going forth on those.

21                   The balance between costs and revenues is  
22 shown here, and we do have a balance. Actually, future  
23 costs were adjusted to exactly meet the future revenues,  
24 with the variable being the level of bus service. But at  
25 this point the Life Cycle Program can be met within

□

9

1 existing revenues.

2                   As with freeways and arterials, the recent  
3 trends of things like wages, fuel prices, et cetera, as

4 well as construction costs and right-of-way, raise  
5 problems so far as keeping the transit program within  
6 available revenues, and that is definitely something that  
7 will be requiring a lot of attention over the coming  
8 years.

9                   So to summarize the key findings of the 2006  
10 Annual Report, so far as the Regional Transportation Plan,  
11 the key activity was inclusion of the Life Cycle Programs  
12 into the plan. So far as revenues, perhaps the key  
13 finding there is at this point, future forecasts for  
14 available revenues for the remainder of the Life Cycle  
15 period are largely unchanged from prior forecasts.

16                   In the freeway area, during next fiscal year  
17 we'll be seeing some new cost estimates, or more detailed  
18 estimates, that will quite likely show a number of  
19 significant cost increases that we'll be facing in the  
20 Freeway program.

21                   Similarly, in the Arterial Street Program,  
22 the issue of raising -- or rising costs will have to be  
23 addressed in the coming year. And the Transit Life Cycle  
24 Program also will be facing challenges as to maintaining a  
25 balance in the face of cost pressures.

□

10

1                   So, Mr. Chairman, that completes my  
2 presentation.

3                   MR. ANDERSON: Thank you, Mr. Herzog.

4                   I understand this presentation was also  
5 given to the MAG Management Committee, Transportation  
6 Policy Committee, and Regional Council prior to today?

7                   MR. HERZOG: That's correct.

8 MR. ANDERSON: Thank you.

9 Just for purposes of the record, I'd like to  
10 say that Mr. Bill Hayden is here representing the Arizona  
11 Department of Transportation, and Brian Jungworth is here  
12 representing the Regional Public Transportation Authority.  
13 And we do have a representative from Valley Metro Rail  
14 also representing the four -- with MAG, the four agencies  
15 responsible for implementation of the Proposition 400  
16 program.

17 I'd like to thank you, Mr. Herzog, for your  
18 presentation.

19 The next part of the meeting is the public  
20 comment. Do we have any members of the public in the  
21 audience who would like to provide any public testimony?

22 Seeing none, we will adjourn this hearing.  
23 Thank you very much.

24 (The proceedings concluded at 5:21 p.m.)

25

□

1

2

3

4

5 I, RENE' METTY KING, do hereby certify that  
6 the foregoing 10 pages constitute a full, true, and  
7 accurate transcript of all the proceedings had in the  
8 above matter, all done to the best of my skill and  
9 ability.

10 DATED this 20th day of October, 2006.

11

12

1019MAG

13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25

RENE' METTY KING  
Certified Court Reporter  
Certificate No. 50342

# **MARICOPA ASSOCIATION OF GOVERNMENTS**

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

**DATE:**

October 31, 2006

**SUBJECT:**

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

**SUMMARY:**

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

Since the approval, the funding request needs to be amended to include upgrades at three 9-1-1 facilities. The Phoenix Police Department is scheduled for a 9-1-1 phone system upgrade for 58 positions, along with 44 new positions, at its two locations at 620 W. Washington and 100 E. Elwood. The two PSAP locations will handle 9-1-1 traffic simultaneously. This project was originally requested in FY 2006 in the amount of \$1,850,000. Due to facility issues, the project was delayed to FY 2007. In addition, two PBX switches and equipment to run the two centers simultaneously require an upgrade for 58 positions. The Phoenix Police Department project will now require a total of \$3.5 million. The Phoenix Fire Department is scheduled for a 9-1-1 system upgrade for 18 positions, along with five new positions. This project will require \$750,000. The Scottsdale Police Department is scheduled for a 9-1-1 system upgrade for 11 positions, along with four new positions. This project will require \$500,000. Management at the Phoenix Police Department, the Phoenix Fire Department, and the Scottsdale Police Department have all expressed support for the approval of these projects. The State 9-1-1 Office has indicated that funding is available to pay the costs of these upgrades.

**PUBLIC INPUT:**

Opportunities for public comment on the Amendment were provided at the October 19, 2006 PSAP Managers meeting and the October 24, 2006 Oversight Team meeting. No comments were received. At the September 7, 2005 Management Committee meeting, a citizen commenting on the FY 2007 PSAP Annual Element/Funding Request and FY 2007-2011 Equipment Program, expressed concern that State legislation calls for a decrease in the monthly 37-cent excise tax, which will put the 9-1-1 fund into a deficit. The citizen commented that, if anything, the tax should be increased, not decreased.

**PROS & CONS:**

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

**CONS:** None.

**TECHNICAL & POLICY IMPLICATIONS:**

**TECHNICAL:** None.

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

**ACTION NEEDED:**

Recommend approval of the amendment to the FY 2007 Public Safety Answering Point (PSAP) Annual Element/Funding Request and FY 2007-2011 Equipment Program for the MAG 9-1-1 System to include a 9-1-1 phone system upgrade for the Phoenix Police Department in the amount of \$3.5 million; a 9-1-1 system upgrade for the Phoenix Fire Department in the amount of \$750,000; and a 9-1-1 system upgrade for the Scottsdale Police Department in the amount of \$500,000.

**PRIOR COMMITTEE ACTIONS:**

MAG 9-1-1 Oversight Team: On October 24, 2006, the MAG 9-1-1 Oversight Team recommended approval of the amendment.

**MEMBERS ATTENDING**

- # Harry Beck, Mesa Fire Department, Chair
- # Jim Higgins for Mark Burdick, Glendale Fire Department
- Steve Werner, Maricopa Co. Sheriff's Office
- Mike Fusco, Emergency Management, Peoria
- \* Cassie Peters, Phoenix Fire Department
- \* Robert Demlong, Phoenix Police Department
- \* Helen Gandara-Zavala, Scottsdale Police Department
- # Brenda Buren, Tempe Police Department
- # Lawrence Rodriguez, Tolleson Police Department

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

MAG PSAP Managers: On October 19, 2006, the MAG PSAP Managers recommended approval of the amendment.

**MEMBERS ATTENDING**

- \* Chris Nadeau, Goodyear, Chairperson
- Lisa Eminhizer for Kathy Jeter, Apache Junction
- \* Carrie Lombana, Avondale
- Velma Washington, Buckeye
- Vicki Szczepkowski, Chandler
- Michelle Busch, El Mirage
- \* Mary Schlosser, Ft. McDowell Yavapai Nation
- \* Janet Laird, Gilbert
- Loretta Hadlock for Denny Bennett, Glendale
- Erika Wilson, Mesa
- Mary Millard, Maricopa County
- Larry Scott, Paradise Valley
- Vicky Scott, Peoria
- Michelle Kessler for Tami deRuitter, Phoenix
- Darren Shortey for Curtis Thomas, Salt River Pima-Maricopa Indian Community
- Tom Melton, Scottsdale
- Donula McHenry for Carol Campbell, Surprise
- Karen Allen, Tempe
- \* Toni Rogers, Tolleson
- Ed Syzponik, Wickenburg
- \*+ Brian Tobin, ASU
- + Maria Hall for Barbara Jaeger, ADOA
- \*+ Nicole Ankenman, Capitol Police
- + Debbie Henry, DPS
- \*+ David Demers Luke AFB
- + Felicia Austin for Doug Mummert, Phoenix
- + Ellen Anderson, Rural Metro/Southwest Ambulance

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

**CONTACT PERSON:**

Liz Graeber, 9-1-1 Administrator, 602-534-9775 or Mary D. Franklin 602-262-6260, 9-1-1 Coordinator.

# **MARICOPA ASSOCIATION OF GOVERNMENTS**

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

**DATE:**

October 31, 2006

**SUBJECT:**

Changes to the Approved June 28, 2006 Arterial Life Cycle Program (ALCP) Policies and Procedures

**SUMMARY:**

Since the approval of the June 28, 2006 Arterial Life Cycle Program (ALCP) Policies and Procedures, three questions have been raised.

The first relates to what is needed for backup documentation to support right-of-way costs; the current policies and procedures address design and construction, not right-of-way. The second relates to how the documentation for the project costs should be organized to support the amounts on the Project Reimbursement Request Invoice. The third relates to the reallocation of project costs among project phases if the cost for a work phase is less than estimated.

MAG staff and the ALCP Working Group worked together to develop the suggested technical changes to the June 28, 2006 ALCP Policies and Procedures. These suggestions are explained in the attached document.

The Arterial Life Cycle Program is a key part of Proposition 400 and represents more than \$1.6 billion of regional investment over the next 20 years. The updated ALCP Policies and Procedures will continue to provide guidance to MAG and to MAG member agencies to ensure that the program is implemented in an efficient and effective manner.

The attached document provides the suggested changes to the ALCP Policies and Procedures that address these three questions. The approved June 28, 2006 ALCP Policies and Procedures are in the left column and the suggested changes are in the right column.

**PUBLIC INPUT:**

There was no public comment at the October 26, 2006 Transportation Review Committee meeting.

**PROS & CONS:**

**PROS:** Once the changes to the ALCP Policies and Procedures are approved, involved jurisdictions and MAG will continue to move forward with Project Requirements. If not approved, MAG staff and involved jurisdictions will not have complete policies and procedures regarding proper right-of-way documentation, project reimbursement request organization and clarification of the administrative adjustment process.

**CONS:** There are no cons to approving the proposed technical changes to the June 28, 2006 ALCP Policies and Procedures.

**TECHNICAL & POLICY IMPLICATIONS:**

**TECHNICAL:** MAG will be able to continue implementation of the ALCP regarding Project Requirements.

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

**ACTION NEEDED:**

Recommend approval of the proposed changes to the previously approved June 28, 2006 ALCP Policies and Procedures.

**PRIOR COMMITTEE ACTIONS:**

The Transportation Review Committee voted to recommend approval of the proposed changes to the ALCP Policies and Procedures on October 26, 2006.

MEMBERS ATTENDING

Maricopa County: Mike Sabatini for Mike Ellegood, Chairperson  
ADOT: Dan Lance  
Avondale: Shirley Gunther for David Fitzhugh  
Buckeye: Timothy Edwards for Scott Lowe  
Chandler: Patrice Kraus  
El Mirage: Mark Fooks for B.J. Cornwall  
Fountain Hills: Randy Harrel  
\* Gila Bend: Lynn Farmer  
Gilbert: Tami Ryall  
Glendale: Terry Johnson  
Goodyear: Cato Esquivel  
Guadalupe: Jim Ricker

\* Litchfield Park: Mike Cartsonis  
Mesa: Jim Huling  
Paradise Valley: Robert M. Cicarelli  
Peoria: David Moody  
Phoenix: Tom Callow  
Queen Creek: Mark Young  
RPTA: Bryan Jungwirth  
Scottsdale: Mary O'Connor  
Surprise: Randy Overmyer  
Tempe: Carlos De Leon  
\*Wickenburg: Shane Dille  
Valley Metro Rail: John Farry

EX-OFFICIO MEMBERS ATTENDING

\*Regional Bicycle Task Force: Randi Alcott  
\*Street Committee: Darryl Crossman

\*Pedestrian Working Group: Eric Iwersen  
\*ITS Committee: Alan Sanderson

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

**CONTACT PERSON:**

Eileen O. Yazzie, Transportation Planner II, 602.452.5058, eyazzie@mag.maricopa.gov

## Suggested Changes to the June 28, 2006 ALCP Policies and Procedures

### June 28, ALCP Policies and Procedures

#### Section 130: MAG Committee Process

- C. The MAG Committee Process will apply for:
1. Approval of amendments to the ALCP Policies and Procedures.
  2. Adoption of the Arterial Life Cycle Program.
  3. Approval of amendments to the ALCP, TIP, and RTP

#### Section 250: ALCP Administrative Adjustment

A. If MAG Staff has to adjust Project budgets after the ALCP has been adopted, it can do an Administrative Update to the ALCP and it is not necessary to do a Program Amendment.

B. There is a one-month lag time for the Maricopa County Excise taxes that are deposited in the RARF

C. The ALCP and project budgets will be adjusted at that time to reflect the remaining project funds.

D. MAG may initiate a separate ALCP Administrative Adjustment, if necessary, at the end of the federal fiscal year as well.

#### Section 330: Project Reimbursement Requests

A. The invoice will include:

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

### Suggested Changes to the June 28, 2006 ALCP Policies and Procedures

#### Changes are noted in bold

#### Section 130: MAG Committee Process

- C. The MAG Committee Process will apply for:
1. Approval of amendments to the ALCP Policies and Procedures.
  2. Adoption of the Arterial Life Cycle Program.
  3. Approval of amendments to the ALCP, TIP, and RTP
  4. Approval of administrative adjustments to the ALCP

#### Section 250: ALCP Administrative Adjustment

A. An administrative adjustment will adjust the ALCP regional reimbursement Project budgets in the current and later fiscal years of the ALCP due to actual Project expenditures and regional reimbursements.

1. This does not require a Program or Project amendment because it is not a Project Update (Section 220) and does not cause a negative fiscal impact to the current fiscal year.
2. Regional reimbursement budgets can not be moved from a later fiscal year to an earlier fiscal year in an administrative adjustment. This would require an amendment.

B. An administrative adjustment is needed when:

1. Project expenditures for a Project work phase or a Project Segment are lower than the estimate, causing the 70% regional reimbursement to be less than what is programmed in the current ALCP.
2. The remaining regional reimbursement funds can be moved within the original Project, to another work phase or a Project Segment that is programmed in that fiscal year or a later fiscal year.

C. The ALCP and project budgets will be adjusted at that time to reflect the remaining project funds.

D. Administrative Adjustments can occur each quarter, the changes will be reported in the ALCP Status Report, and the ALCP will be reprinted.

#### Section 330: Project Reimbursement Requests

A. The invoice will include:

1. Invoice #
2. Project name, description and RTP ID
3. Reimbursable items and related costs
4. Proper documentation of reimbursable items and reimbursable costs contained in invoice is necessary. The list below provides options for sufficient backup documentation:
  - a. A copy of the invoice from the contractor is sufficient documentation for contracted work,
  - b. An administrative breakdown chart including staff name, hours on Project, hourly rate, and total costs is sufficient documentation for administrative work,
  - c. A copy of the Court Order,
  - d. A copy of the Settlement Statement,
  - e. A copy of the agency's payment documentation,
  - f. Or a completed Cost Attachment Form. If the Cost Attachment form is explaining dedicated right of way, easements, or Public Utility and Facilities Easements (PUFE), please include a signed letter from the appropriate department (Real Estate, Transportation, etc) to verify the items in the cost attachment form. Please use costs that are relevant to the time of dedication and if necessary, use the inflation chart to inflate the costs to the current value.
5. If an item for reimbursement (design, ROW, construction, etc.) has more than one backup invoice, please provide a chart, per time for reimbursement that:
  - a. Lists each invoice/backup documentation number or describe the document
  - b. The dollar amount of each invoice/backup documentation
  - c. And have the chart include the total dollar amount of all invoices, per each item. This total dollar amount should match what is on the Project Reimbursement Request invoice.
  - d. MAG will provide an example chart/form.



**TRANSPORTATION DIVISION**  
**Arterial Life Cycle Program (ALCP) – Status Report**  
**July - September 2006**

**ALCP Project Status: July - September 2006**

Fiscal year 2007 is the first full fiscal year of implementation for the Arterial Life Cycle Program (ALCP). During the year 39 projects will begin or continue work, which will vary from studies to construction completion. Twenty-three of the 39 are programmed to receive \$56 million for reimbursement in FY07. The other 16 are being advanced by local jurisdictions and will receive reimbursement later in the Program.

In August 2006, all involved jurisdictions provided the Maricopa Association of Governments (MAG) with a monthly FY07 schedule of when the project requirements (Project Overview, Project Agreement and Project Reimbursement Requests (PRR)) are expected to be submitted for the FY07 projects.



*Arizona Ave. & Chandler Blvd.  
 Intersection Improvement*

During this quarter, three Project Overviews were submitted, and MAG signed five Project Agreements. Additionally in this time period, MAG processed three PRR's, and ADOT paid a total of three PRR's, one from the last quarter and two from this quarter. One PRR is still being processed by ADOT.

Table 1, located on pages two and three, provides the status of the current and advanced projects that are programmed this fiscal year. For each project, information on the progress and budget is presented.

The *Status* field provides a snapshot of what is programmed for this fiscal year and the *Other Project Information* column provides more detailed information. Projects that are underway will submit regular progress reports, either with the request for payment or by project milestone. The *Regional Funding Reimbursements* and *Total Expenditure* columns provide detailed financial information that is updated each quarter.

A new column, *FY07 Reimbursements to Date*, was added to this report, which shows the cumulative reimbursements for this fiscal year, while the *Total Reimbursement* column displays the cumulative reimbursements for the entire life cycle program.

This is the third Status Report for the Arterial Life Cycle Program (ALCP). Each quarter, MAG staff will provide member agencies with an update on the projects in the ALCP. As the program progresses, the information provided in this report will be updated. This report and all other ALCP information is available online at <http://www.mag.maricopa.gov/project.cms?item=5034>.

**TABLE 1 – Arterial Life Cycle Program: July - September 2006, Status of Projects Underway (2006 and Year of Expenditure, Dollars in Millions, Consistent with the June 28, 2006 ALCP)**

Lead Agency & Facility	Project Requirement Completed	Status S=Study, P=Pre-Design, D=Design, R=Right of Way, C=Const. C/O=Close d out	Regional Funding Reimbursements				Total Expenditures			FY for Final Constr.	FY(s) for Reimb.	Other Project Information	
			Programmed FY07 Reimb.	Estimated Future Reimb.: FY 2008-2026 (2006 Dollars)	FY07 Reimb. To Date	Total Reimb.: FY 2006-2026 (2006 and YOE Dollars)	Expend. through FY 2007 (YOE Dollars)	Estimated Future Expend. FY 2007-2026 (2006 Dollars)	Total Expend. FY 2006-2026 and YOE Dollars				
<b>CHANDLER</b>													
Arizona Ave. at Chandler Blvd.	PO, PA	C		3.464				7.346	7.346		2007	2014	Project is nearing completion.
Arizona Ave. at Elliot Rd.	PO, PA	D, R, C		3.464				5.363	5.363		2007	2022	Currently under construction.
Arizona Ave. at Ray Rd.	PO, PA	D, R, C	3.464		0.714	0.714	1.068	1.068	5.0	1.068	2007	2007	Have received 2 Project Reimbursement Requests, one has been paid and one is at ADOT for processing. Design and ROW are complete, and construction is 7% complete.
Chandler Blvd. at Dobson Rd.	PO, PA	D	1.32	2.144	0.013	0.013	0.336	0.336	7.349	0.336	2008	2006-2008	The study is 100% complete and design is underway.
Gilbert Rd: Loop 202 to Queen Creek Rd. - SEGMENT A	PO, PA	D		6.317				11.874	11.874		2008	2022	This segment has been advanced. Design will begin in FY07.
Ray at Alma School Rd	PO, PA	D	0.363	3.101					9.709		2008	2006-2008	Design will begin in FY07.
Ray at McClintock (NE Corner Only)	PO	D		3.464					8.603		2007 & 2010	2012	The NE corner of the project is being advanced and will be constructed in 2007. The design is underway. The remaining intersection improvement will be done in 2010-2011 and dollar amounts reflect the entire project.
<b>GILBERT</b>													
Val Vista Rd: Warner Rd to Pecos Rd		D, R, C	3.464	6.705					20.353		2006	2007-2008, 2015	Project has been advanced and reimbursement funds have been exchanged with Elliot/Cooper & Guadalupe/Cooper projects. Reimb. will be in 2007-2008, 2015.
Warner Rd.: Cooper Rd.		D	1.316	2.148					5.619		2008	2006-2008	
<b>MARICOPA COUNTY</b>													
Dobson, Gilbert and McKellips Bridge Projects		S		42.797							2015	2015	Three ALCP Bridge Projects are being studied together.
El Mirage Road Corridor: Northern to Bell		S		35.087							2018	2008-2018	Two El Mirage Projects are being studied as a corridor.
Northern Ave.: Dysart Rd. to SR-303L - PHASE 1		P, D	19.016	36.855			3.5	3.5	104.4		2010	2007-2010	Project Design is underway and the reimbursement has been deferred from FY06 to FY07
<b>M.C./MESA</b>													
Power Rd: East Maricopa Floodway (EMF) to Galveston - SEGMENT A		P, D	2.587	6.826					11.107		2008	2006-2008	
Power Rd: Baseline Rd to East Maricopa Floodway (EMF) - SEGMENT B		D, R	5.014	2.223					10		2007	2007-2008	
<b>MESA</b>													
Broadway Rd.: Dobson Rd. to Country Club Dr.		P	0.429	6.387					10.975		2009	2007-2009	



Lead Agency & Facility	Project Requirement Completed	Status S=Study, P=Pre-Design, D=Design, R=Right of Way, C=Const, C/O=Closed out	Regional Funding Disbursements				Total Expenditures			Years for Reimb.	Other Project Information		
			Programmed FY07 Reimb.	Estimated Future Reimb.: FY 2008-2026 (2006 Dollars)	FY07 Reimb. To Date	Total Reimb.: FY 2006-2026 (2006 and YOY Dollars)	Expended through FY 2007 (YOY Dollars)	Estimated Future Expend. FY 2007-2026 (2006 Dollars)	Total Expend. FY 2006-2026 (2005 and YOY Dollars)			Year for Final Constr.	
<b>MESA</b>													
Country Club Dr.: University Dr.		P		2.57					3.206		2009	2017	
Dobson Rd.: Guadalupe Rd.		P	0.14	2.43					2.796		2009	2007-2009	
Gilbert Rd.: University Dr.	PO	D, R		2.57					8.1		2007	2021	Design is underway.
Greenfield Rd: Baseline Rd to Southern - SEGMENT A		D, R	1.401	3.767					7.382		2008	2007-2008	
Greenfield Rd: Southern Rd. to University Rd. - SEGMENT B		P	0.345	4.432					12.6		2010	2009-2010	
McKelips Rd.: Gilbert Rd. to Power Rd		S		20.002					26.95		2013	2007-2013	
McKelips Rd.: Gilbert Rd. to Val Vista - SEGMENT A		D, R	1.46	3.138					6.555		2008	2007-2008	
McKelips Rd.: Val Vista Rd to Higley - SEGMENT B		P	0.34	7.777					11.109		2010	2007-2010	
Mesa Dr: Broadway Rd to US-60		P	0.18	8.424					11.94		2010	2007-2010	
Southern Ave: Country Club Dr to Stapley - SEGMENT A		S,D	0.86	7.12					11.3		2009	2007-2009	
Thomas Rd: Gilbert Rd to Val Vista Dr		D	0.346	4.794					7.269				
<b>PEORIA</b>													
Beardsley Road Project		D		21.343					43.87		2009	2011-2012	Design is underway and reimbursement will be in Phase 2.
Happy Valley Rd: Lake Pleasant Pkwy to Terramar Blvd - SEGMENT A		D, R		8.649					14.952		2008	2022-2024	Design is underway.
Lake Pleasant Pkwy: Union Hills Dr to Dynamite Rd, 4 lane portion - SEGMENT B	PO, PA	D, R, C	7.263	7.778			7.027		48.049	19.124	2006	2006-2007, 2011-2014	Construction is ongoing.
<b>PHOENIX</b>													
Happy Valley Rd: I-17 to 35th Avenue - SEGMENT A	PO	C/O		6.635					7.647		2005	2023	The Project is complete.
Happy Valley Rd: I-17 to 35th Avenue - SEGMENT B		D		1.917					2.738		2009	2023	
Happy Valley Rd: I-17 to 35th Avenue - SEGMENT C		D		2.178					3.111		2009	2024	
<b>SCOTTSDALE</b>													
SR-101L North Frontage Rd: Hayden to Scottsdale Rd - SEGMENT A		D,R,C	5.474								2007	2007	
SR-101L North Frontage Rd: Pima Rd/Princess Dr to Hayden		P,D,R	1.191	4.341							2007	2007-2008	
SR-101L South Frontage Rd: Hayden to Pima			0.123	12.616							2010	2007-2010	
Shea Blvd: SR-101L to SR-87		D,R,C		21.343							2008	2021-2024	



## ALCP Revenue & Finance: July - September 2006

For the period July to September 2006, \$9,999,597 was collected from tax revenues for the ALCP Regional Area Road Fund (RARF) account, as

	July	August	September	Total
Freeways	\$ 18,807,785	\$ 16,827,963	\$ 17,885,906	\$ 53,521,655
Arterial Streets	\$ 3,513,910	\$ 3,144,014	\$ 3,341,673	\$ 9,999,597
Transit	\$ 11,144,115	\$ 9,971,017	\$ 10,597,877	\$ 31,713,009
Prop. 400 (total)	\$ 33,465,810	\$ 29,942,994	\$ 31,825,456	\$ 95,234,261

seen in Table 2. In this period, the Arterial RARF account paid \$7,541,856.37 in Project Reimbursement Requests. The remaining balance in the RARF account at the end of September is \$15,243,227. There has not been any expenditures made from MAG-Surface Transportation Program (STP) or the Congestion Mitigation Air Quality (CMAQ) arterial accounts to date.

Looking at the overall revenues, Table 3 shows the tax revenues collected in this quarter for the Maricopa Transportation Excise Tax, which are \$95,234,261. The tax collections for both July and September came higher than the estimated forecast for the month, while August came in lower than expected. August signaled the first non double digit increase from year over year.

	Estimate Total RARF	Actual Total RARF	% Difference
July	\$ 32,667,000	\$ 33,465,810	2.4%
August	\$ 31,026,000	\$ 29,942,994	-3.5%
September	\$ 31,484,000	\$ 31,825,456	1.1%
Total	\$ 95,177,000	\$ 95,234,261	0.1%

### ALCP Amendment or Administrative Adjustment, Which One to Do?

The ALCP Policies and Procedures provide for two types of changes to the ALCP, an Amendment or an Administrative Adjustment. Both types of changes can be done, if necessary, on a quarterly basis. Background information on Amendments and Administrative Adjustments will be presented in this Status Report. An important question is which type of change, an amendment or an administrative adjustment, is appropriate to reflect a change for an ALCP project.

If an ALCP Project is undergoing a Project Update outside of the regular ALCP Update schedule, an amendment is required. There are seven types of Project Updates (Section 220 of the ALCP Policies and Procedures): advancing a project, deferring a project, segmenting a project, exchanging two projects, substituting a project, changing a project scope, or using Project Savings on another ALCP Project. If any of these updates are needed outside of the normal annual ALCP Update schedule, which is shown on the ALCP schedule on page 3 of this report, an amendment is needed.

What is an administrative adjustment then? An administrative adjustment is an adjustment to the ALCP regional reimbursement Project budget(s) in the current and later fiscal years of the ALCP, due to actual Project expenditures and regional reimbursements.

This is needed when Project expenditures for a Project work phase or Segment in the current and later fiscal years are lower than the estimate, causing the 70% regional reimbursement to be less than

what is programmed in the current ALCP. The remaining balance of regional funds for the project can be moved to another work phase or Segment of the original project that is programmed in the same or a later fiscal year. Regional reimbursement budgets can not be moved from a later fiscal year to an earlier fiscal year in an administrative adjustment since this will negatively impact the ALCP cash flow.

Since the ALCP was approved on June 28, 2006, the City of Chandler has made a request to amend one project due to an advanced segment of a project and Maricopa County has requested that two projects are amended to reflect current project and reimbursement schedules. Additionally, an administrative adjustment is needed for two projects, one in the City of Chandler and one in the City of Phoenix, due to lower project costs. These requests will go through the MAG Committee starting in October 2006. As with both the ALCP Amendments and Administrative Adjustments, appropriate amendments will also be made to the TIP and the RTP.

### **Remaining FY07 Arterial Life Cycle Program Schedule**

<b>TABLE 4: Fiscal Year 2006-2007 Arterial Life Cycle Program Schedule</b>	
<b>November</b>	<b>8<sup>th</sup>, 15<sup>th</sup>:</b> Management Committee (MC), Transportation Policy Committee (TPC) – ALCP Status Report and any necessary amendments or administrative adjustments - Release ALCP information for 2008-2012 TIP Update
<b>December</b>	<b>13<sup>th</sup>:</b> Regional Council (RC) – ALCP Status Report and any necessary amendments or administrative adjustments
<b>January</b>	<b>5<sup>th</sup>:</b> Information due for ALCP Projects in 2007-2012 for the TIP Report - Transportation Review Committee (TRC) – ALCP Status Report and any necessary amendments or administrative adjustments
<b>February</b>	<b>9<sup>th</sup>:</b> Information due for ALCP Projects in 2013-2026 for the RTP Update and Air Quality Conformity Analysis (AQCA) - MC, TPC, RC – ALCP Status Report and any necessary amendments or administrative adjustments - TRC –TIP Report and RTP Update for AQCA are presented
<b>March</b>	- MC, TPC, RC –TIP Report and RTP Update for AQCA are presented
<b>April</b>	- ALCP Working Group – Final review of updated information for the FY08 ALCP - TRC – ALCP Status Report and any necessary amendments or administrative adjustments
<b>April/May</b>	- TIP Report and RTP Update undergoes AQCA
<b>May</b>	- TRC - Present Draft FY 08 ALCP - MC, TPC, RC - ALCP Status Report and any necessary amendments or administrative adjustments
<b>June</b>	- MC, TPC and RC - Present Draft FY 08 ALCP and FY08 ALCP Schedule

# **MARICOPA ASSOCIATION OF GOVERNMENTS**

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

**DATE:**

October 31, 2006

**SUBJECT:**

Maricopa County Resident Population and Employment Projections

**SUMMARY:**

According to Executive Order 95-2, the Arizona Department of Economic Security (DES) is responsible for preparing an official set of population projections for Arizona and each of its counties. The projections are required to use the latest Census as the base. Because the results of the 2005 Census Survey were not available at the time that projections were adopted by DES in March 2006, Census 2000 was used as the base. Subsequent to the release of the 2005 Census Survey in June 2006, DES prepared a new set of Maricopa County projections consistent with the 2005 Census Survey. MAG has also developed a set of employment projections for Maricopa County that are consistent with these DES population projections. The projections are for 2010, 2015, 2020, 2025, 2030 and 2035. The time frame for the projections has been established to meet the requirements of the Transportation and Air Quality divisions of MAG. They will be used as the control totals from which MAG will develop a set of subregional projections. The draft projections for Maricopa County are attached.

In preparation for the development of subregional projections, MAG has been working with member agencies to define a buildout housing and employment for each jurisdiction. These buildout figures will be circulated to city managers for review and evaluation of adequate water resources to support the level of development. The subregional projections will then be brought to the Management Committee and Regional Council in 2007.

**PUBLIC INPUT:**

None.

**PROS & CONS:**

PROS: Maricopa 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:**

Recommend approval of the Maricopa County resident population and employment projections for 2010, 2015, 2020, 2025, 2030, and 2035.

**PRIOR COMMITTEE ACTIONS:**

On October 24, 2006, the MAG Population Technical Advisory Committee (POPTAC) unanimously recommended to the Management Committee approval of the population and employment projections for Maricopa County for 2010, 2015, 2020, 2025, 2030, and 2035.

MEMBERS ATTENDING

- George Pettit, Gilbert, Chairman
- \* Bryant Powell, Apache Junction
- \* Scott Wilken, Avondale
- Brian Rose, Buckeye
- \* Gary Neiss, Carefree
- \* Ian Cordwell, Cave Creek
- David de la Torre, Chandler
- Mark Smith, El Mirage
- Richard Turner for Ken Valverde, Fountain Hills
- \* Bev Turner, Gila Bend
- \* Terry Yergan, Gila River Indian Community
- Thomas Ritz, Glendale
- Katie Wilken, Goodyear
- + Gail Acosta, Guadalupe
- + Those attending by video/audio conference
- \* Those not present or represented by proxy
- \* Sonny Culbreth, Litchfield Park
- Shawn Murray for Wahid Alam, Mesa
- John Verdugo for Matt Holm, Maricopa Co.
- Molly Hood, Paradise Valley
- Chad Daines, Peoria
- Tim Tilton, Phoenix
- Shawny Ekadis, Queen Creek
- \* Stacey Gubser, Salt River Pima-Maricopa Indian Community
- Harry Higgins, Scottsdale
- \* Janice See, Surprise
- Sherri Lesser, Tempe
- \* Miles Johnson, Wickenburg
- \* Ann McCracken, Valley Metro

On October 24, 2006, the MAG POPTAC Ad Hoc Subcommittee unanimously recommended to the MAG POPTAC that the projections be approved.

MEMBERS ATTENDING

- Harry Higgins, Scottsdale, Chairman
- David De La Torre, Chandler
- Thomas Ritz, Glendale
- \* Wahid Alam, Mesa
- Tim Tilton, Phoenix
- Chad Daines, Peoria
- \* Matt Holm, Maricopa County

\*Those not attending or represented by proxy.

**CONTACT PERSON:**

Anubhav Bagley, MAG (602) 254-6300

**DRAFT Maricopa County Population and Employment  
For July 1 of Each Projection Year**

<b>Year</b>	<b>Total Resident Population</b>	<b>Total Employment</b>
<b>2010</b>	4,216,500	2,157,400
<b>2015</b>	4,733,400	2,477,600
<b>2020</b>	5,230,300	2,788,100
<b>2025</b>	5,698,200	3,107,100
<b>2030</b>	6,135,000	3,378,800
<b>2035</b>	6,545,000	3,599,600

**Notes:**

Population Projections are from the Arizona Department of Economic Security Draft Revised Projections, created to be consistent with Census Survey 2005.

Employment projections are based on the methodology described in Draft Employment Projections, Control Totals for Maricopa County, approved by the MAG Population Technical Advisory Committee, October 24, 2006.

Population and employment numbers have been rounded to the nearest hundred.

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

**DATE:**

October 31, 2006

**SUBJECT:**

Conformity Consultation

**SUMMARY:**

The Maricopa Association of Governments is conducting consultation on a conformity assessment for a City of Phoenix project-level conformity determination for a park-and-ride facility located at the southwest corner of 27th Avenue and Baseline Road. The proposed facility will provide parking for approximately 240 vehicles. The construction phase of the project is programmed in FY 2008 of the FY 2007-2011 MAG Transportation Improvement Program (TIP). Comments on the conformity assessment are requested by November 17, 2006.

MAG has reviewed the project air quality assessment for compliance with the federal conformity rule and concurs with the project-level conformity determination. The current conformity finding of the TIP and the associated Regional Transportation Plan that was made by the Federal Highway Administration and Federal Transit Administration on August 17, 2006 remains unchanged by this action. A description of the project is provided in the attached interagency consultation memorandum.

**PUBLIC INPUT:**

Copies of the conformity assessment have been distributed for consultation to the Federal Highway Administration, Federal Transit Administration, Arizona Department of Environmental Quality, Arizona Department of Transportation, Regional Public Transportation Authority, Maricopa County Air Quality Department, U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Central Arizona Association of Governments, Pinal County Air Quality Control District, and other interested parties including members of the public.

**PROS & CONS:**

**PROS:** Completion of a project-level conformity determination is required prior to federal approval of the project.

**CONS:** The review of the conformity assessment requires additional time in the project approval process.

**TECHNICAL & POLICY IMPLICATIONS:**

**TECHNICAL:** The City of Phoenix project-level conformity determination concludes that the proposed park-and-ride facility will not cause or contribute to any new localized carbon monoxide or PM-10 violations or increase the severity or number of existing violations during the time frame of the transportation plan.

**POLICY:** Federal transportation conformity regulations require interagency consultation on development of the transportation plan, TIP, and associated conformity determinations to include a

process involving the Metropolitan Planning Organization, State and local air quality planning agencies, State and local transportation agencies, Environmental Protection Agency, Federal Highway Administration, and the Federal Transit Administration. Consultation on the conformity assessment has been prepared in accordance with federal regulations, MAG Conformity Consultation Processes adopted by the Regional Council in February 1996 and MAG Transportation Conformity Guidance and Procedures adopted by the Regional Council in March 1996. In addition, federal guidance is followed in response to court rulings regarding transportation conformity.

**ACTION NEEDED:**

Consultation.

**PRIOR COMMITTEE ACTIONS:**

None.

**CONTACT PERSON:**

Dean Giles, MAG, (602) 254-6300.



**MARICOPA  
ASSOCIATION of  
GOVERNMENTS**

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

October 31, 2006

TO: Leslie Rogers, Federal Transit Administration  
Robert Hollis, Federal Highway Administration  
Victor Mendez, Arizona Department of Transportation  
Stephen Owens, Arizona Department of Environmental Quality  
Dave Boggs, Regional Public Transportation Authority/ Valley Metro  
Robert Kard, Maricopa County Air Quality Department  
Maxine Leather, Central Arizona Association of Governments  
Don Gabrielson, Pinal County Air Quality Control District  
Wienke Tax, U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Region IX  
Other Interested Parties

FROM: Dean Giles, Air Quality Planning Program Specialist

SUBJECT: CONSULTATION ON A CONFORMITY ASSESSMENT FOR A PROJECT-LEVEL  
CONFORMITY DETERMINATION FOR A PROPOSED PHOENIX PARK-AND-  
RIDE FACILITY

The Maricopa Association of Governments is conducting consultation on a conformity assessment for a City of Phoenix project-level conformity determination for a park-and-ride facility located at the southwest corner of 27<sup>th</sup> Avenue and Baseline Road. The proposed facility will provide parking for approximately 240 vehicles. The construction phase of the project is programmed in FY 2008 of the FY 2007-2011 MAG Transportation Improvement Program. Comments on the conformity assessment are requested by November 17, 2006 (see attachment).

MAG has reviewed the project air quality assessment for compliance with the federal conformity rule and concurs with the project-level conformity determination. The current conformity finding of the TIP and the associated Regional Transportation Plan that was made by the Federal Highway Administration and Federal Transit Administration on August 17, 2006 remains unchanged by this action. The conformity assessment is being transmitted for consultation to the agencies and other interested parties listed above. If you have any questions or comments, please contact me at (602) 254-6300.

Attachment

cc: Nancy Wrona, Arizona Department of Environmental Quality

A Voluntary Association of Local Governments in Maricopa County



## ATTACHMENT

### CONFORMITY ASSESSMENT FOR A PROJECT-LEVEL CONFORMITY DETERMINATION FOR A PROPOSED PHOENIX PARK-AND-RIDE FACILITY

In accordance with federal transportation conformity regulations, the City of Phoenix has made a conformity determination with respect to a proposed park-and-ride facility located at the southwest corner of 27<sup>th</sup> Avenue and Baseline Road. Conformity regulations require that a Federal Highway Administration or Federal Transit Administration project not cause or contribute to any new localized CO or PM-10 violations or increase the frequency or severity of any existing violations in CO or PM-10 nonattainment or maintenance areas.

As part of the environmental documentation for the proposed park-and-ride facility, the City of Phoenix has completed an air quality assessment. A project-level hot-spot analysis for carbon monoxide was completed as part of the air quality assessment. The results of the project-level analysis indicate that the predicted carbon monoxide concentrations for the 2008 and 2028 “build” scenarios are less than the 1-hour and 8-hour federal carbon monoxide standards.

In addition, the air quality assessment indicates that the proposed park-and-ride facility meets PM-10 requirements for a project-level determination without a qualitative analysis. The proposed park-and-ride facility has not been found to be “a project of air quality concern” as defined under revised March 2006 guidance issued by the Federal Highway Administration and the Environmental Protection Agency.

The air quality assessment concludes that the proposed park-and-ride facility will not cause or contribute to any new localized CO or PM-10 violations or increase the severity or number of existing violations during the time frame of the transportation plan. This information is provided for consultation as outlined in the MAG Conformity Consultation Processes document adopted by the MAG Regional Council on February 28, 1996. In addition, federal guidance is followed in response to court rulings regarding transportation conformity.

MAG has reviewed the project for compliance with the federal conformity rule. The projects are not expected to create adverse emission impacts or interfere with Transportation Control Measure implementation. The current conformity finding of the TIP and the associated Regional Transportation Plan that was made by the Federal Highway Administration and Federal Transit Administration on August 17, 2006 remains unchanged by this action.

# **MARICOPA ASSOCIATION OF GOVERNMENTS**

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

**DATE:**

October 31, 2006

**SUBJECT:**

Annual Homeless Street Count

**SUMMARY:**

On December 8, 1999, the Regional Council approved MAG becoming the responsible entity for a year-round homeless planning process which includes submittal of the Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) Stuart B. McKinney Continuum of Care Consolidated Application for Maricopa County. The Continuum of Care grant supports permanent and transitional housing and supportive services. Last year, the region received \$20 million, with a total of \$106 million awarded since 2000. The MAG Continuum of Care Regional Committee on Homelessness, formed in January 2000 by the MAG Regional Council, provides oversight of the homeless planning and application processes.

In order to apply for Stuart B. McKinney funding, HUD requires that each Continuum of Care conduct a homeless street count to take place during the last week of January. The data collected in the count are incorporated into the HUD grant application to provide hard data on the number of homeless people in our region. The MAG Continuum of Care Regional Committee on Homelessness is regionally responsible for the planning and coordination of the countywide street count.

The 2007 homeless street count will take place on Tuesday, January 30, 2007. Street count coordinators and volunteers will spread out across the county to count and gather basic demographic information about homeless people seen on the streets that day. The count will focus on public places and service locations over a 24-hour period of time. Street count coordinators have been identified in each of the cities and towns within Maricopa County and training sessions have been scheduled to take place in mid-November. This item is presented to inform the Committee of the planning process and to ensure active participation in each city and town.

**PUBLIC INPUT:**

An opportunity for public input was made available at the October 16, 2006 Planning Subcommittee meeting. No public comments were received.

**PROS & CONS:**

**PROS:** A coordinated homeless street count is required by the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development in order to receive federal Stuart B. McKinney Act funds. Information about unsheltered homeless people is useful for service planning, demonstrating a need for resources, raising public awareness, accurately measuring and identifying the needs of homeless people, and measuring performance in ending homelessness. This activity emphasizes the need for collaboration among public and private agencies.

**CONS:** Coordination of the homeless street count requires staff time within each community. Staff time and other resources may be limited.

**TECHNICAL & POLICY IMPLICATIONS:**

**TECHNICAL:** The data gathered from the street count is used in an effort to help the Continuum of Care prepare the annual HUD funding application and meet Congressional directives on improving the quality

of information on homelessness. In the upcoming 2007 Continuum of Care application, HUD will continue to require Continuum of Care to report population and sub-population information on the homeless people residing in our community. Our methods must conform to HUD's minimum standards for counting unsheltered homeless people.

**POLICY:** Data collected can help justify the need for additional resources, plan for future services, understand trends and changes among homeless people, and comply with reporting requirements from HUD. Collecting good data on the number, characteristics, and service needs of unsheltered homeless people is a critical component of local homeless planning and program development.

**ACTION NEEDED:**

Information and discussion.

**PRIOR COMMITTEE ACTIONS:**

The Continuum of Care Planning Subcommittee reviewed the process at the October 16, 2006 meeting.

**MEMBERS ATTENDING**

- Karen Zienta for Maryann Beerling Thomas, New Arizona Family
- \* Trinity Donovan, Valley of the Sun United Way
- Robert Duvall, Community Information and Referral
- Richard Geasland, Tumbleweed
- Katie Hobbs, Sojourner Center
- \* John Landrum, The Salvation Army
- Nick Margiotta, The City of Phoenix
- \* Mattie McVey, Arizona Department of Education
- \* Elizabeth Morales, Arizona Behavioral Health Corporation
- Darlene Newsom, United Methodist Outreach Ministries
- \* Shane Rabindranath, Streets of Joy
- Margaret Reiber, YWCA of Maricopa County
- \* Michelle Ryan, Arizona Department of Health Services
- Annetee Stein, Maricopa County Human Services (Chair)
- \* John Wall, Central Arizona Shelter Services
- Diana Yazzie Devine, Native American Connections

\*Those members neither present nor represented by proxy.

**CONTACT PERSON:**

Brande Mead, Human Services Planner, 602-254-6300

# **MARICOPA ASSOCIATION OF GOVERNMENTS**

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

**DATE:**

October 31, 2006

**SUBJECT:**

Contract Amendment for the Avondale Littleton School Sidewalk Design Assistance Project

**SUMMARY:**

The FY 2005 MAG Unified Planning Work Program and Annual Budget, approved by MAG Regional Council, includes \$200,000 of Congestion Mitigation and Air Quality (CMAQ) funding for the Pedestrian Design Assistance Program. The Pedestrian Design Assistance Program allows MAG member agencies to apply for funding for the design portion of a bicycle or pedestrian project. On April 19, 2005, the MAG Pedestrian Working Group recommended that the City of Avondale - Littleton School Sidewalk Connection be funded along with four other Pedestrian Design Assistance projects. Management Committee recommended approval on May 11, 2005 and Regional Council approved the funding on May 25, 2005.

On June 28, 2006, the MAG Regional Council approved an additional \$31,240 of CMAQ funds as part of the FY 2006 Closeout process for the Avondale Littleton School Sidewalk Pedestrian Design Assistance Project. These funds were approved specifically to complete the environmental clearance for the project. In order for the additional funds to be utilized, it is necessary to amend the City of Avondale's current contract #298 from \$27,270 to \$58, 510.

**PUBLIC INPUT:**

None.

**PROS & CONS:**

**PROS:** The pedestrian design assistance program assists MAG member agencies to offer facilities for modes of travel which help reduce congestion and improve air quality. Approval to incorporate these closeout funds within the existing contract will allow the project to be completed with the environmental clearance.

**CONS:** According to federal law, any project which is not constructed after being designed with federal transportation funds could be required to return the funds used for design to the Federal Highway Administration.

**TECHNICAL & POLICY IMPLICATIONS:**

**TECHNICAL:** The Design Assistance Program encourages implementation of the adopted MAG Pedestrian Area Policies and Design Guidelines, and provides demonstration projects for "best practice" pedestrian area policies and facilities.

**POLICY:** This program encourages the development of facilities to encourage walking.

**ACTION NEEDED:**

Recommend approval of an amendment to the City of Avondale contract #298 to increase the total contract amount from \$27,270 to \$58, 510.

## **PRIOR COMMITTEE ACTIONS:**

On June 28, 2006, the Regional Council recommended approval of the interim closeout and amending/adjusting the FY 2006-2010 MAG TIP and the FY 2006 and FY 2007 MAG Unified Planning Work Programs and Annual Budgets.

### MEMBERS ATTENDING

Mayor Keno Hawker, Mesa, Chair	Mayor Thomas Schoaf, Litchfield Park
* Mayor Douglas Coleman, Apache Junction	Supervisor Max Wilson, Maricopa County
Mayor Marie Lopez-Rogers, Avondale	Mayor Ed Winkler, Paradise Valley
Mayor Bobby Bryant, Buckeye	Mayor John Keegan, Peoria
* Mayor Edward Morgan, Carefree	Councilmember Peggy Neely, Phoenix
Vice Mayor Dick Esser, Cave Creek	Mayor Art Sanders, Queen Creek
Mayor Boyd Dunn, Chandler	* President Joni Ramos, Salt River
* Mayor Fred Waterman, El Mirage	Pima-Maricopa Indian Community
* President Raphael Bear, Fort McDowell	Mayor Mary Manross, Scottsdale
Yavapai Nation	Mayor Joan Shafer, Surprise
Mayor Wally Nichols, Fountain Hills	Mayor Hugh Hallman, Tempe
Mayor Daniel Birchfield, Gila Bend	* Mayor Adolfo Gamez, Tolleson
* Governor William Rhodes, Gila River	Mayor Ron Badowski, Wickenburg
Indian Community	* Mayor Bryan Hackbarth, Youngtown
Mayor Steven Berman, Gilbert	* Joe Lane, State Transportation Board
Mayor Elaine Scruggs, Glendale	Felipe Zubia, State Transportation Board
Mayor James M. Cavanaugh, Goodyear	F. Rockne Arnett, Citizens Transportation
Mayor Bernadette Jimenez, Guadalupe	Oversight Committee

\* Those members neither present nor represented by proxy.

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

Management Committee: On June 14, 2006, the Management Committee recommended approval of the interim closeout and amending/adjusting the FY 2006-2010 MAG TIP and the FY 2006 and FY 2007 MAG Unified Planning Work Programs and Annual Budgets.

### MEMBERS ATTENDING

Ed Beasley, Glendale, Chair	Christopher Brady, Mesa
Jan Dolan, Scottsdale, Vice Chair	Tom Martinsen, Paradise Valley
# George Hoffman, Apache Junction	Carl Swenson for Terry Ellis, Peoria
Charlie McClendon, Avondale	Frank Fairbanks, Phoenix
Carroll Reynolds, Buckeye	John Kross, Queen Creek
* Jon Pearson, Carefree	* Bryan Meyers, Salt River Pima-Maricopa
Usama Abujbarah, Cave Creek	Indian Community
Patrice Kraus, Chandler	Doug Sandstrom for Jim Rumpeltes,
* B.J. Cornwall, El Mirage	Surprise
* Orlando Moreno, Fort McDowell	Amber Wakeman for Will Manley, Tempe
Yavapai Nation	John P. Lopez for Reyes Medrano,
Tim Pickering, Fountain Hills	Tolleson
* Lynn Farmer, Gila Bend	+ Shane Dille, Wickenburg
Joseph Manuel, Gila River	* Vince Micallef, Youngtown
Indian Community	John Pein for Victor Mendez, ADOT
George Pettit, Gilbert	Mike Sabatini for David Smith,
Stephen Cleveland, Goodyear	Maricopa County
Mark Johnson, Guadalupe	David Boggs, Valley Metro/RPTA
Darryl Crossman, Litchfield Park	

\* Those members neither present nor represented by proxy.

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

Transportation Review Committee: On May 25, 2006, the TRC recommended approving the interim closeout of Federal FY 2006.

**MEMBERS ATTENDING**

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

**EX-OFFICIO MEMBERS ATTENDING**

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| * Regional Bike Task Force: Randi Alcott | *Pedestrian Working Group: Eric Iwersen |
| * Street Committee: Darryl Crossman      | *ITS Committee: Alan Sanderson          |

\*Members neither present nor represented by proxy.      # Attended by Audioconference

**CONTACT PERSON:**

Maureen DeCindis, MAG, (602) 254-6300.

# **MARICOPA ASSOCIATION OF GOVERNMENTS**

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

**DATE:**

October 31, 2006

**SUBJECT:**

Proposed Amendment and Administrative Adjustment to the FY 2007 - June 28, 2006 Arterial Life Cycle Program (ALCP)

**SUMMARY:**

The FY07 ALCP was approved by MAG Regional Council on June 28, 2006. Since that time, one City of Chandler project has been identified that needs to be segmented, two Maricopa County projects have been identified that need to change project and reimbursement schedules, one City of Chandler project has been identified that needs to lower and adjust the regional reimbursement amounts, and one City of Phoenix project has been identified that needs to lower and adjust the regional reimbursement amounts. An amendment is required to add the segment to the ALCP and change the project and reimbursement schedules, and an administrative adjustment is needed to adjust the project reimbursement amounts due to lower actual costs.

The Arterial Life Cycle Program is a key part of Proposition 400 and represents more than \$1.6 billion of regional investment over the next 20 years. The updated ALCP Policies and Procedures will continue to provide guidance to MAG and to MAG member agencies to ensure that the program is implemented in an efficient and effective manner.

The attached document provides both the approved FY07-June 28, 2006 ALCP and the proposed amendments and administrative adjustments.

**PUBLIC INPUT:**

There was no public comment at the October 26, 2006 Transportation Review Committee.

**PROS & CONS:**

PROS: Once the changes to the FY07 ALCP are approved, involved jurisdictions and MAG will continue to move forward with Project Requirements this FY07.

CONS: None.

**TECHNICAL & POLICY IMPLICATIONS:**

TECHNICAL: MAG will be able to continue implementation of the ALCP this fiscal year.

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

**ACTION NEEDED:**

Recommend approval of an Amendment and an Administrative Adjustment to the FY 2007 – June 28, 2006 ALCP to add a new segment to a Chandler project, change two Maricopa County project and reimbursement schedules, and make an administrative adjustment to a Phoenix project and a Chandler project to reflect actual project costs.

**PRIOR COMMITTEE ACTIONS:**

The Transportation Review Committee recommended approval of the amendments and administrative adjustments to the FY07 - June 28, 2006 ALCP on October 26, 2006.

MEMBERS ATTENDING

Maricopa County: Mike Sabatini for Mike Ellegood, Chairperson  
ADOT: Dan Lance  
Avondale: Shirley Gunther for David Fitzhugh  
Buckeye: Timothy Edwards for Scott Lowe  
Chandler: Patrice Kraus  
El Mirage: Mark Fooks for B.J. Cornwall  
Fountain Hills: Randy Harrel  
\* Gila Bend: Lynn Farmer  
Gilbert: Tami Ryall  
Glendale: Terry Johnson  
Goodyear: Cato Esquivel  
Guadalupe: Jim Ricker

\* Litchfield Park: Mike Cartsonis  
Mesa: Jim Huling  
Paradise Valley: Robert M. Cicarelli  
Peoria: David Moody  
Phoenix: Tom Callow  
Queen Creek: Mark Young  
RPTA: Bryan Jungwirth  
Scottsdale: Mary O'Connor  
Surprise: Randy Overmyer  
Tempe: Carlos De Leon  
\*Wickenburg: Shane Dille  
Valley Metro Rail: John Farry

EX-OFFICIO MEMBERS ATTENDING

\*Regional Bicycle Task Force: Randi Alcott  
\*Street Committee: Darryl Crossman

\*Pedestrian Working Group: Eric Iwersen  
\*ITS Committee: Alan Sanderson

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

**CONTACT PERSON:**

Eileen O. Yazzie, Transportation Planner II, 602.452.5058, eyazzie@mag.maricopa.gov

## AMENDMENTS & ADMINISTRATIVE ADJUSTMENTS

To the FY07 – June 28, 2006 Arterial Life Cycle Program (ALCP)

*All dollar amounts are shown in millions and in 2006\$*

**AMENDMENT - City of Chandler – Ray/McClintock Intersection Improvement** – This project is currently programmed as one project. The City of Chandler revised this project and moved the northeast (NE) corner of the project forward to FY07 to coincide with work being done by SRP on that corner. An amendment to the 2007-2011 TIP to reflect the advancement will also be needed.

Fiscal Impact - There is no negative financial impact to the ALCP.

FY07 – June 28, 2006 ALCP:

Ray/McClintock: Intersection Improvements			FY11
	DES	2009	\$ 0.414
	ROW	2010	\$ 0.391
	CONST	2011	\$ 2.659

Proposed:

Ray/McClintock: Intersection Improvements			FY11
Ray/McClintock - NE Corner	DES	2007	
Ray/McClintock - NE Corner	ROW	2007	
Ray/McClintock - NE Corner	CONST	2007	
Ray/McClintock - SE, SW, and NW Corner	DES	2009	\$ 0.414
Ray/McClintock - SE, SW, and NW Corner	ROW	2010	\$ 0.391
Ray/McClintock - SE, SW, and NW Corner	CONST	2011	\$ 2.659

**AMENDMENT - Maricopa County – El Mirage Rd: Thunderbird Rd to Northern Ave** - MCDOT and El Mirage are planning to enter into an MOU this fiscal year regarding the funding and phasing of this project. An amendment is requested to reprogram the regional reimbursements to fit the project schedule.

Fiscal Impact - The ALCP cash flow can accommodate the requested amendment.

FY07 – June 28, 2006 ALCP:

El Mirage Rd: Thunderbird Rd to Northern Ave			FY16	FY17	FY18
	STUDY	2006			
	DES	2016	\$ 1.542		
	ROW	2017		\$ 4.615	
	CONST	2018			\$ 9.263

Proposed:

El Mirage Rd: Thunderbird Rd to Northern Ave			FY16	FY17	FY18
	STUDY	2006			
	DES	2016	\$ 2.898		
	ROW	2017	\$ 2.800		
	CONST	2018		\$ 7.005	\$ 2.717

**AMENDMENT - Maricopa County – El Mirage Rd: Paradise Ln over Grand Ave to Thunderbird Rd-** MCDOT and El Mirage are planning to enter into an MOU this fiscal year regarding the funding and phasing of this project. An amendment is requested to reprogram the regional reimbursements to fit the project schedule and to correctly define the project's boundaries. This project has a total of \$19.667 of regional reimbursements; \$5.14 is available in Phase I and \$14.527 is available in Phase II

Fiscal Impact - The ALCP cash flow can accommodate the requested amendment.

FY07 – June 28, 2006 ALCP:

El Mirage Rd: Paradise Ln over Grand Ave to Thunderbird Rd			<b>FY15</b>
	STUDY	2006	
	DES	2016	\$ 1.788
	ROW	2017	\$ 3.352
	CONST	2018	\$14.527

Proposed:

El Mirage Rd: Bell Rd. to Thunderbird Rd		<b>FY08</b>	<b>FY09</b>	<b>FY10</b>	<b>FY11</b>	<b>FY12</b>	<b>FY13</b>	<b>FY14</b>	<b>FY15</b>
	DES	\$0.896	\$0.378						
	ROW	\$2.562	\$1.126	\$0.178					
	CONST						\$8.403	\$4.822	\$1.302

**ADMINISTRATIVE ADJUSTMENT - City of Chandler - Arizona Avenue/Chandler Boulevard Intersection Improvement** The costs incurred for the right of way acquisition for the Arizona Ave/Chandler project are less than the estimate listed in the FY07 ALCP. \$650,000 has been moved from the right of way work to the construction to reflect actual project costs. The

Fiscal Impact – There is no negative financial impact on the ALCP.

FY07 – June 28, 2006 ALCP:

			<b>FY14</b>
Arizona Ave/Chandler Blvd: Intersection Improvement	DES	2004	\$ 0.18
	ROW	2005	\$ 1.61
	CONST	2006	\$ 1.67

Proposed:

			<b>FY14</b>
Arizona Ave/Chandler Blvd: Intersection Improvement	DES	2004	\$ 0.18
	ROW	2005	\$ 0.98
	CONST	2006	\$ 2.30

**ADMINISTRATIVE ADJUSTMENT - City of Phoenix – Happy Valley Rd: I-17 to 67<sup>th</sup> Avenue - Segment A:** I-17 to 35th Ave., of the Happy Valley: I-17 to 67th Avenue Project has been completed and the project expenditures came in lower than expected. An Administrative Adjustment is needed to allocate the available funds from Segment A to the other segments of this project. The project has been advanced by the City of Phoenix and the regional reimbursements remain in the same fiscal years.

Fiscal Impact - There is no negative financial impact on the ALCP.

FY07 – June 28, 2006 ALCP

<b>Happy Valley: I-17 to 67th Avenue</b>			<b>FY23</b>	<b>FY24</b>
Happy Valley: I-17 to 35th Avenue – A	DES	2003	\$ 0.46	
Happy Valley: I-17 to 35th Avenue – A	ROW	2004	\$ 0.34	
Happy Valley: I-17 to 35th Avenue – A	CONST	2005	\$ 5.84	
Happy Valley: 35th Avenue to 43rd Avenue -B	DES	2007	\$ 0.14	
Happy Valley: 35th Avenue to 43rd Avenue-B	ROW	2008	\$ 0.54	
Happy Valley: 35th Avenue to 43rd Avenue-B	CONST	2009	\$ 1.23	
Happy Valley: 43rd to 55th Avenue-C	DES	2007		\$ 0.23
Happy Valley: 43rd to 55th Avenue-C	ROW	2008		\$ 0.14
Happy Valley: 43rd to 55th Avenue-C	CONST	2009		\$ 1.81
Happy Valley: 55th to 67th Avenue-D	DES	2008		\$ 0.23
Happy Valley: 55th to 67th Avenue-D	CONST	2009		\$ 2.17
	Savings	2024		\$ 2.07

Proposed:

<b>Happy Valley: I-17 to 67th Avenue</b>			<b>FY23</b>	<b>FY24</b>
Happy Valley: I-17 to 35th Avenue-A	DES	2003	\$ 0.55	
Happy Valley: I-17 to 35th Avenue-A	ROW	2004	\$ 0.01	
Happy Valley: I-17 to 35th Avenue-A	CONST	2005	\$ 4.70	
Happy Valley: 35th Avenue to 43rd Avenue-B	DES	2007	\$ 0.31	
Happy Valley: 35th Avenue to 43rd Avenue-B	ROW	2008	\$ 0.54	
Happy Valley: 35th Avenue to 43rd Avenue-B	CONST	2009	\$ 2.08	
Happy Valley: 43rd to 55th Avenue-C	DES	2007		\$ 0.23
Happy Valley: 43rd to 55th Avenue-C	ROW	2008		\$ 0.14
Happy Valley: 43rd to 55th Avenue-C	CONST	2009		\$ 2.17
Happy Valley: 55th to 67th Avenue-D	DES	2008		\$ 0.23
Happy Valley: 55th to 67th Avenue-D	CONST	2009		\$ 2.17
	Savings	2024		\$ 2.07

# **MARICOPA ASSOCIATION OF GOVERNMENTS**

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

**DATE:**

October 31, 2006

**SUBJECT:**

Approval of the Draft MAG Public Participation Plan

**SUMMARY:**

In response to requirements included in the new federal transportation legislation known as the Safe, Accountable, Flexible, Efficient Transportation Equity Act: a Legacy for Users (SAFETEA-LU), enacted August 10, 2005, MAG has developed a Draft Public Participation Plan. The Plan follows guidelines outlined in section 450.316 *Interested parties, participation, and consultation*. As required under SAFETEA-LU, the purpose of this Public Participation Plan is to “define a process for providing citizens, affected public agencies, representatives of public transportation employees, freight shippers, providers of freight transportation services, private providers of transportation, representatives of users of public transportation, representatives of users of pedestrian walkways and bicycle transportation facilities, representatives of the disabled, agencies or entities responsible for safety/security operations, providers of non-emergency transportation services receiving financial assistance from a source other than Title 49, United States Code (U.S.C), Chapter 53, and other interested parties with reasonable opportunities to be involved in the transportation metropolitan planning process.”

**PUBLIC INPUT:**

As required by federal regulations, the Draft MAG Public Participation Plan was available for public comment for 45 days and advertised through a public notice in the Arizona Republic. The Plan was also available on the MAG Web site for 45 days and distributed at the Early Phase Stakeholders Meeting, which was attended by nearly 50 representatives of local public and private sector organizations as well as citizens.

**PROS & CONS:**

**PROS:** The Draft MAG Public Participation Plan defines a process for providing Valley residents and affected agencies opportunities for input into the transportation planning and programming decision-making process prior to approval by MAG policy committees, in accordance with federal law. The Plan also provides information regarding the meeting process, content, and results to participants, staff, decision makers, federal agencies and other interested parties.

**CONS:** None.

**TECHNICAL & POLICY IMPLICATIONS:**

**TECHNICAL:** This input will be considered in the development of the Draft Public Participation Plan.

**POLICY:** MAG adopted an expanded public involvement process for the annual update of MAG transportation plans and programs, in accordance with the Transportation Equity Act for the 21<sup>st</sup> Century (TEA-21). The Draft Public Participation Plan seeks to continue the legacy of public involvement under TEA-21, while also adhering to the guidelines of SAFETEA-LU.

**ACTION NEEDED:**

Recommend approval of the Draft MAG Public Participation Plan.

**PRIOR COMMITTEE ACTIONS:**

None.

**CONTACT PERSON:**

Jason Stephens, MAG Public Involvement Planner, (602) 254-6300.

# *DRAFT*

## MAG PUBLIC PARTICIPATION PLAN

### INTRODUCTION

The Maricopa Association of Governments (MAG) believes that public participation is a critical and necessary part of the transportation planning process. The involvement of the public helps MAG make better transportation decisions that meet the needs of all people, and to plan transportation facilities that fit more harmoniously into communities. In 1994, MAG adopted a public involvement plan designed to provide complete information on transportation plans, timely public notice, full public access to key decisions, and opportunities for early and continuing involvement in the process for all segments of the region's population, including Title VI and Environmental Justice communities.

This Public Participation Plan updates MAG's public involvement process in response to requirements included in the federal Safe, Accountable, Flexible, Efficient Transportation Equity Act: a Legacy for Users (SAFETEA-LU) legislation, enacted August 10, 2005. The Public Participation Plan requirements are outlined in section 450.316 *Interested parties, participation, and consultation*. As required under SAFETEA-LU, the purpose of this Public Participation Plan is to define a process for providing citizens, affected public agencies, representatives of public transportation employees, freight shippers, providers of freight transportation services, private providers of transportation, representatives of users of public transportation, representatives of users of pedestrian walkways and bicycle transportation facilities, representatives of the disabled, agencies or entities responsible for safety/security operations, providers of nonemergency transportation services receiving financial assistance from a source other than Title 49, United States Code (U.S.C), Chapter 53, and other interested parties with reasonable opportunities to be involved in the transportation metropolitan planning process.

### BACKGROUND

Federal law requires that each state designate a Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO) for urbanized areas with 50,000 or more population. MAG was designated as the MPO for the Maricopa region in 1973, and undergoes federal certification as outlined in transportation regulations.

MAG is responsible for preparing both short-range and long-range transportation plans, and for seeking citizen input into these plans. For its short-range plan, MAG develops a five-year Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) that includes all transportation projects for the region. All transportation projects must be included, regardless of how they are funded. For its long-range plan, MAG is responsible for preparing a 20-year Regional Transportation Plan. Both plans are typically updated every year, and both must undergo an air quality conformity analysis to ensure that transportation activities do not contribute to violations of the federal air quality standards.

In 1994, the MAG Regional Council, which serves as the organization's governing body, adopted an aggressive public involvement program designed to provide Valley residents with as many opportunities for comment on MAG transportation plans as possible. This program was enhanced

in 1998 and has been improved each year through a variety of methods, including consulting with Valley residents on the effectiveness of the process.

MAG's public involvement process currently adheres to all federal requirements related to public involvement. Through the years, MAG has coordinated public involvement processes and activities with the Arizona Department of Transportation (ADOT), the Regional Public Transportation Authority (RPTA/Valley Metro), Valley Metro Rail (METRO) and most recently with the City of Phoenix Public Transit Department. This coordination has helped create an efficient and effective public participation process.

With the passage of SAFETEA-LU, MAG's goal is to continue to improve its public involvement program by incorporating new federal requirements, further ensuring an open and inclusive process for all interested parties.

### MAJOR MILESTONES

Following are a few of the major milestones in the MAG public involvement process.

- The Intermodal Surface Transportation Efficiency Act (ISTEA) of 1991 requires that metropolitan planning organizations adopt a formal public involvement process that is proactive, encourages broad public participation, and considers and responds to public input.
- In June 1992, the Regional Council approves a 15 minute *Call to the Audience* for its meetings, with audience members requested to keep their comments under three minutes each.
- The MAG Process for Public Involvement in Transportation Planning is adopted by the Regional Council in September 1994, following a 45-day comment period. The adopted process provides the guiding principles for public involvement to meet the requirements established in ISTEA and subsequently reaffirmed in the Transportation Equity Act for the 21<sup>st</sup> Century (TEA-21). The process includes four phases: Early Phase, Mid-Phase, Final Phase and Continuous Involvement. The phases allow for early and continuing input and encourage public comment during each step of the planning process. The process calls for Input Opportunity Reports to be completed during each phase detailing the comments received. The reports include staff responses to comments on the Draft Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) and Long-Range Transportation Plan. The 15 minute *Call to the Audience* is retained for public comment at the beginning of MAG policy committee meetings.
- In February 1996, the Regional Council approves recommendations which re-engineer the MAG policy process. Public comment opportunities are increased for the Regional Council meetings. In addition to the *Call to the Audience* at the beginning of the meeting, members of the audience are provided the opportunity to comment on the *Approval of the Consent Agenda* and to speak on each *Action Item*, with audience members requested to keep their comments under three minutes for each public comment opportunity.

**DRAFT \*\*\*\*\*DRAFT\*\*\*\*\*DRAFT \*\*\*\*\*DRAFT \*\*\*\*\*DRAFT\***

- In July 1998, the Regional Council recommends that the process for programming federal transportation funds be enhanced. These enhancements include a more proactive community outreach process and the development of early guidelines to help select transportation projects within resource limits. This proactive community outreach process leads to an enhanced public involvement process beginning with the fiscal year 1999 Public Involvement Program. The enhanced public involvement process involves transportation stakeholders as outlined in the 1998 TEA-21 legislation and includes input from Title VI stakeholders (minority populations and low-income populations). The input received during the enhanced input opportunity is incorporated in the development of early guidelines to guide project selection for the Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) and Long-Range Transportation Plan.
- In 2001, MAG hires four Community Outreach Associates to provide targeted outreach to the Hispanic, Native American, African American, and Disability communities as part of its dedicated Title VI outreach. In 2002, these part-time positions evolve into a full-time Community Outreach Specialist position within MAG to allocate more MAG resources to this effort and to allow for the translation of all major MAG materials into Spanish. The Disability Community Associate continues as a part-time position.
- Beginning in 2001 through 2004, MAG embarks on an intensive and unprecedented public involvement effort surrounding the Long-Range Transportation Plan, which is renamed the Regional Transportation Plan (RTP or Plan). Extensive research is conducted, and more than 350 public input opportunities are provided. Expert panel forums are held early in the process featuring topics in demographics and social change, environmental and resource issues, land use and urban development, and transportation and technology. Sixteen subregional focus groups are also held to receive input from transportation stakeholders across the Valley, including focus groups specific to African American and Hispanic communities. A project Web site, LetsKeepMoving.com, is created to provide information and receive feedback on the Plan. The site, which remains active and is continually updated, includes online surveys, maps, meeting notices, copies of studies and presentations, plan drafts and maps, funding information, feedback links, and calendar listings of public input opportunities.
- In 2005, Congress passes SAFETEA-LU, which requires a documented public participation plan that defines the process for citizen input.

**MAG PUBLIC PARTICIPATION PROCESS**

The federal regulations for metropolitan planning under SAFETEA-LU are easily incorporated within MAG's adopted public involvement structure, and specific strategies for addressing the new regulations are included in the final section of this report. As noted above, MAG's adopted public

involvement process is divided into four phases: Early Phase, Mid-Phase, Final Phase and Continuous Involvement. MAG staff receives comments in a variety of ways, including but not limited to, small group presentations, special events such as large community festivals, public meetings/hearings, telephone and electronic correspondence, and correspondence through the MAG Web site.

The following table details the phases of the public involvement process and the opportunities for input which exist in each phase:

<u>Phase</u>	<u>Public Input Opportunities</u>
Early Phase	A public process for early input into the transportation programming process is held. At this stage, which generally occurs from late summer through early fall, public input is reviewed and considered by MAG policy committees with specific reference to upcoming issues and work topics. Events during this phase include an Early Phase Stakeholders meeting and comment at MAG meetings. Additional efforts may include open houses, booths at special events, and small group presentations. Comments received are summarized and provided to MAG policy committees for review and consideration in the form of an Early Phase Input Opportunity Report. All meetings are widely advertised with appropriate advanced notice. Because projects are not yet programmed, in many ways, the Early Phase represents the best opportunity for members of the public to suggest projects for inclusion in the TIP or Plan.
Mid-Phase	A variety of public outreach methods are used during this phase, which generally occurs from late winter to early spring, to gather input on the initial plan analysis for the Draft TIP and Draft RTP update. The phase culminates with a joint transportation public hearing co-hosted by MAG, the Arizona Department of Transportation (ADOT) and the Regional Public Transportation Authority (RPTA). Comments are summarized, receive a written response and are provided to MAG policy committees for review and consideration – in the form of the Mid-Phase Input Opportunity Report – prior to taking action. All meetings are widely advertised, including major daily and minority newspapers, with appropriate advanced notice.

Final Phase	Several forums are used to obtain input during this phase, which generally occurs from early summer to late summer. The phase culminates with a transportation public hearing on the final Draft RTP update and TIP update. The hearing is advertised with a formal public notice and draft reports are also available for 30 days for public review. All comments receive a written response and are provided to MAG policy committees for review and consideration – in the form of a Final Phase Input Opportunity Report – prior to the committee taking action. All meetings are widely advertised, including major daily and minority newspapers, with appropriate advanced notice.
Continuous Involvement	MAG continuously seeks public input and comment beyond the three structured phases above. Outreach is conducted throughout the annual update process and includes activities such as providing presentations to community and civic groups, participating in special events, hosting booths at shopping malls, distributing press releases and newsletters, and coordinating with partnering agencies. MAG provides speakers upon request to make presentations to community and civic groups, within the limits of available resources.

**FEDERAL LAW**

The role of public involvement in transportation planning and programming was increased with the passage of the Intermodal Surface Transportation Efficiency Act (ISTEA) of 1991. The Transportation Equity Act for the 21<sup>st</sup> Century (TEA-21), passed in 1998, continued to emphasize public involvement in the metropolitan transportation planning process. TEA-21 required that the metropolitan planning organization (MPO) work cooperatively with the state department of transportation and the regional transit operator to provide citizens, affected public agencies, representatives of transportation agency employees, freight shippers, private providers of transportation and representatives of users of public transit a reasonable opportunity to comment on proposed transportation plans and programs.

The intent of the public involvement provisions in SAFETEA-LU, passed in August 2005, is to continue the legacy of TEA-21 when it comes to increasing public awareness and participation in transportation planning and programming, while developing a documented public participation plan that defines the process for citizen input. On June 9, 2006, the U.S. Department of Transportation proposed rules that incorporate the provisions of SAFETEA-LU.

The proposed rules under Section 450.316 require that metropolitan planning organizations develop a public participation plan in consultation with all interested parties and “shall, at a minimum, describe explicit procedures, strategies and desired outcomes for” ten specific provisions. These ten provisions are outlined below, along with MAG’s strategies for meeting these requirements.

## FEDERAL REQUIREMENTS AND MAG PUBLIC PARTICIPATION STRATEGIES

1. *Providing adequate public notice of public participation activities and time for public review and comment at key decision points, including but not limited to reasonable opportunity to comment on the proposed metropolitan transportation plan and the TIP.*

MAG provides timely public notice of public participation activities. All public hearings are announced with a formal public notice, usually 30 days in advance of the hearing, as well as through a display advertisement in the largest circulation newspaper and in minority oriented newspapers two weeks prior to the public hearing. MAG maintains a public involvement mailing list that includes interested citizens, affected public agencies, representatives of transportation agency employees, private providers of transportation, advocates for low-income interests and minority interests, and representatives of community groups with an interest in transportation. This mailing list is used to announce meetings, distribute newsletters, and for other opportunities for public involvement. Interested individuals are added to the mailing list upon request.

In addition, all MAG public meetings and public input opportunities are posted on the MAG Web site at [www.mag.maricopa.gov](http://www.mag.maricopa.gov). A calendar listing major MAG meetings is included on the final page of every issue of *MAGAZine*, MAG's quarterly newsletter. MAG public meetings are also posted 24 hours in advance as required under the Open Meeting Law (*see Appendix A*).

MAG also works closely with the news media to help distribute information about MAG activities. Press releases are prepared and distributed to local media in conjunction with periodic news events and public involvement opportunities. Copies of MAG agendas and other materials are sent to major news publications and to any reporters who request to be included on MAG's mailing lists.

Public comment is allowed at all MAG public meetings (*see MAG Public Comment Process, Appendix B*). MAG's four-phase public input process specifically provides opportunities for interested parties to comment at key decision points (and throughout) the development of the TIP and Regional Transportation Plan. For example, the Early Phase Stakeholders Meeting provides an opportunity for the public to comment during the initial programming process. The Mid-Phase Public Hearing provides the opportunity for comment prior to Regional Council action to approve the Draft TIP and Plan to undergo an air quality conformity analysis, and the Final Phase public hearing provides an opportunity for comment prior to approval of the conformity analysis, final TIP, and final Plan.

MAG also provides ongoing opportunities for input during its Continuous Involvement activities, such as frequent participation in special events, including hosting booths at large community festivals, and through numerous small group presentations as requested (*see #5, below, for additional information*).

Where appropriate, information is provided in a bilingual format or other alternative formats such as large print and Braille.

2. *Providing timely notice and reasonable access to information about transportation issues and processes.*

As outlined above, timely notice of MAG activities is provided through a variety of methods, including formal postings, newspaper ads, direct mail, Web site postings, calendar listings, press releases, and other publications and materials. Similarly, MAG provides information about transportation issues and processes through a number of public involvement and communication strategies.

Prior to the final completion of plans or programs, draft documents are made available to the public for review and comment, so that public concerns can be considered and reflected in the final documents. When draft studies, plans, programs and reports are completed they are available for public review and public comments are presented to the Management Committee, Transportation Policy Committee and Regional Council for review prior to action. Documents are available for review in the MAG library at the MAG Offices, 302 N. 1<sup>st</sup> Avenue, Suite #300, Phoenix. The TIP, Plan, Conformity Analysis and Input Opportunity Reports are distributed to libraries throughout the region as well as to partnering agencies such as the Federal Highway Administration, Federal Transit Administration, Arizona Department of Environmental Quality, Environmental Protection Agency, Arizona Department of Transportation, Regional Public Transportation Authority, Maricopa County, Pinal County, and the Central Arizona Association of Governments.

MAG also provides information about transportation issues and processes through a variety of publications, including a quarterly newsletter called *MAGAZine*, a monthly Regional Council Activity Report, a monthly e-newsletter outlining the activities of the Transportation Policy Committee, and project-specific publications such as fliers, brochures, and notices. These publications report information of general interest on events and programs at MAG, as well as on specific items such as the TIP or Regional Transportation Plan.

As noted above, all major documents, including news releases, notices of meetings and events, news stories, agendas, minutes, plans and studies are posted online at [www.mag.maricopa.gov](http://www.mag.maricopa.gov). An interactive calendar listing MAG meetings and events is available on the home page. Historical reference files of all documents are maintained and these reports are also available for public review <http://www.mag.maricopa.gov>

MAG also responds to public inquiries through e-mail, written correspondence, telephone calls, one-on-one meetings, and Web site feedback. Every attempt is made to respond in a timely manner. A public records request form is available for those requesting MAG documents or public records.

3. *Employing visualization techniques to describe metropolitan transportation plans and TIPs.*

With the help of its graphics, Web, and Information Services staff, MAG utilizes many innovative techniques to help residents better understand what transportation investments are included in its transportation plans and TIPs, and to help them visually conceive what the plans will look like when completed. Examples include project-specific maps and graphs, digital photography, high resolution graphic displays, Geographical Information Systems, map overlays, PowerPoint presentations, aerial photography, photo simulations, technical drawings, charts and graphs. Alternative scenarios, including visual depictions of scenarios, are presented to demonstrate differences among solutions or approaches.

4. *Making public information (technical information and meeting notices) available in electronically accessible formats and means, such as the World Wide Web.*

MAG maintains a Web site that provides easy access to information about MAG meetings, agendas, news releases, and electronic publications through timely posting of these materials. The site includes a calendar of events, monthly meeting schedules, committee activities and actions, requests for proposal and employment notices, and electronic versions of nearly 3,000 MAG documents, including plans, reports, agendas, and minutes. The site includes a search function that allows users to link to specific documents or other information using key words. The site includes a Spanish language Web page and has feedback links as well as staff contact information. In addition to the MAG home Web site, MAG maintains [www.LetsKeepMoving.com](http://www.LetsKeepMoving.com), which is a project-specific site designed to provide detailed information about the Regional Transportation Plan.

Along with the extensive availability of documents, technical information, meeting notices and other information on the Web site as described above, MAG often e-mails electronic documents to individuals or agencies upon request.

5. *Holding any public meetings at convenient and accessible locations and times.*

Understanding that different individuals have different perceptions of “convenient,” MAG strives to hold its public involvement activities at various times to accommodate as many citizens as possible, including during business hours, after work hours, evenings, and weekends. All public events are scheduled in venues that are transit accessible and comply with the provisions of the Americans With Disabilities Act. In addition, Spanish language materials, sign language interpretation, and alternative materials such as large print and Braille, and FM/Infrared Listening Devices, are available on request.

MAG understands that often it is difficult for members of the public to attend formal public meetings. Therefore, MAG makes every attempt to be highly visible and accessible to the broader community by providing information and receiving feedback at well-attended special events. These opportunities include such events as freeway openings, community festivals, trade fairs, minority-oriented events, and booths at heavily populated venues such as shopping malls and the state fair. When possible, MAG coordinates outreach activities with the Arizona Department of Transportation, the Regional Public Transportation Authority (Valley Metro), and Valley Metro Rail,

Inc. (METRO), to allow members of the public access to a wide range of information across all transportation modes. In addition to special events, MAG often makes presentations to smaller groups, such as Kiwanis and Rotary clubs, college classes, chambers of commerce, professional associations, businesses, and nonprofit groups.

6. *Demonstrating explicit consideration and response to public input received during the development of the metropolitan transportation plan and the TIP.*

MAG demonstrates explicit consideration and response to public input received in a variety of ways. Of primary significance is the publication of Input Opportunity Reports during each of the three key public involvement phases (Early Phase, Mid-Phase, and Final Phase). Each report includes a summary of the activities conducted during the phase and a detailed summary of comments received during the phase. The reports also include a list of input opportunities conducted, locations of activities, a description of the MAG public outreach process, copies of publicity materials such as display ads and public notices, and correspondence received since the end of the previous phase. The Mid-Phase and Final Phase public hearings are conducted with a court reporter in attendance. A verbatim transcript of each hearing is included in the Mid-Phase and Final Phase Input Opportunity reports, which also include staff responses to all comments received during the phase. Copies of the reports are distributed to MAG policy committees (including Management Committee, Transportation Policy Committee, and Regional Council) in advance of any plan approvals. In addition, an oral presentation is provided at these meetings summarizing the comments received prior to committee action.

Another way in which MAG demonstrates explicit consideration of public input can be seen in the addition of specific projects that are included in MAG plans as a result of public input.

7. *Seeking out and considering the needs of those traditionally underserved by existing transportation systems, such as low-income and minority households, who may face challenges accessing employment and other services.*

MAG addresses and considers the needs of underserved populations throughout its planning and programming process, and provides outreach in a variety of ways, including the Title VI Community Outreach Program, GIS mapping, the Human Services division of MAG, and through programs run by the Regional Public Transportation Authority (RPTA) using MAG funds. Through the Community Outreach Program, MAG's Community Outreach Specialist coordinates with minority communities to solicit input and to serve as a liaison between MAG and the communities. In addition to minority communities, MAG targets and solicits input from persons with disabilities. Through RPTA's Complementary Paratransit Plan, the needs of the elderly and people with disabilities are served. In addition, a MAG committee reviews and prioritizes applications for federal assistance under the Elderly Persons with Disabilities Transportation Fund, which provides capital investments to programs serving the elderly and people with disabilities. MAG transportation plans and programs are also submitted to the Human Services Coordinating Committee for review. Additionally, MAG provides multimodal transportation information for review and comment to the Human Services planning process. The needs of elderly persons are further being addressed through

the MAG Elderly Mobility Initiative. The Initiative identifies and addresses the changing mobility options that are needed as people age.

8. *Providing an additional opportunity for public comment, if the final metropolitan plan or TIP differs significantly from the version that was initially made available for public comment.*

If the final metropolitan plan or TIP differs significantly from the version initially made available for comment, MAG provides additional opportunities for public comment. MAG prepares a revised draft plan and takes it back through the public involvement and committee approval process.

9. *Coordinating with statewide transportation planning public involvement and consultation processes (as outlined under subpart B of Section 450.316).*

As part of the public involvement process, MAG conducts agency consultation directly with local, state and federal resource agencies. MAG also consults, as appropriate, with agencies and officials responsible for other planning activities within the metropolitan planning area that are affected by transportation. To coordinate the planning functions to the maximum extent practicable, such consultation includes the comparison of the MAG Regional Transportation Plan and TIP, as they are developed, with the plans, maps, inventories, and planning documents developed by other agencies. This consultation includes, as appropriate, consultations with state, local, Indian tribal, and private agencies responsible for planned growth, economic development, environmental protection, airport operations, freight movements, land use management, natural resources, conservation and historic preservation. MAG also seeks input and comment from neighboring counties or contiguous planning areas as appropriate.

Additionally, MAG reaches out to federal, state, tribal, regional, local, and private agencies to consult on environmental and resource issues and concerns. Specific topics of interest include: land use management, wildlife, natural resources, environmental protection, conservation, historic preservation, and potential environmental mitigation activities. An important consideration in the consultation process is the recognition that previously adopted projects in the Plan undergo extensive environmental and resource assessment by the implementing agencies, such as the Arizona Department of Transportation, the Regional Public Transportation Authority, cities, towns and Maricopa County. With these processes already well established, including requirements for input on mitigation and resource issues, the primary goal of the consultation effort is to gain insight regarding concerns that may involve future transportation planning efforts.

To facilitate the agency consultation process and acquisition of resource information, MAG conducts an agency consultation workshop. The purpose of the workshop is to explain the goals of the consultation process, receive input from environmental and resource agencies in attendance, and establish continuing consultation in the regional transportation planning process. In addition, the workshop establishes a beginning point for more in-depth discussions with individual agencies, as may be appropriate. Input is sought on the availability of environmental, cultural and natural resource

mapping or other information sources, as well as comments on potential environmental mitigation measures, resource issues, and land use concerns. Agencies are also invited to provide written input.

10. *Periodically reviewing the effectiveness of the procedures and strategies contained in the participation plan to ensure a full and open participation process.*

MAG continually reviews its public participation efforts as part of its communication planning efforts and makes adjustments as warranted. More formal reviews are conducted during the federal certification process every four years, and as directed by transportation legislation such as ISTEA, TEA-21, and SAFETEA-LU. Additionally, MAG ensures that a minimum public comment period of 45 calendar days is provided before any initial or revised participation plan is adopted, in accordance with federal requirements.

## APPENDIX A

### OPEN MEETINGS

MAG conducts meetings in accordance with the state Open Meeting Law. Meetings of technical committees, working groups, the Management Committee, Transportation Policy Committee, and Regional Council are open to the public. Notices for these meetings are posted at least 24 hours in advance.

The Open Meeting Law is contained in the Arizona Revised Statutes, A.R.S § 38-431.01. The Open Meeting Law also establishes requirements for the taking of minutes. Minutes of MAG meetings are available by request, and are available on the MAG Web site, [www.mag.maricopa.gov](http://www.mag.maricopa.gov).

While MAG makes every attempt to allow for public comment, on rare instances, public comment may be limited based on time availability, based on the discretion of the meeting chair.

In addition to the Open Meeting Law, MAG also adheres to the Arizona Public Records Law, A.R.S. § 39-121. Public records may be obtained through submission of a Public Records Request form, which can be obtained through the MAG office, requested electronically, or downloaded from the MAG Web site.

## APPENDIX B

### PUBLIC COMMENT AT MAG MEETINGS

MAG allows public comment at all of its public meetings. Below is an outline of the rules and procedures relating to the public comment process for MAG meetings.

1. Submittal of Request to Speak Cards: There are two colored cards provided for citizens wishing to speak at MAG committee meetings. Blue cards indicate a “Request to Speak on a Non-Agenda Item” and yellow cards indicate a “Request to Speak on a Specific Agenda Item Designated for Action.” The cards contain information about the rules for speaking, as well as spaces for citizens to provide information, including name, address, city, zip code, phone, agenda item number, and date. Yellow cards additionally include boxes at the top of the card that the speaker can check indicating the following: Support; Statement Only; Oppose; Neither.

Rules outlined on both the yellow and blue cards include:

- Please speak from the podium (accommodation will be made for persons with disabilities).
- Please present your comments in **three minutes or less**.
- Your comments must pertain solely to the agenda item and shall not include any personal attacks on other citizens or persons present at the meeting.
- Please conduct yourself in a professional and appropriate manner.

Citizens are asked to submit the cards to a designated MAG staff member, who will deliver them to the meeting chair.

The yellow cards contain these further statements: *The purpose of this opportunity for public comment is to allow citizens to provide additional information on items slated for action. The Committee may ask questions for clarification; however, this comment period is not designed for debate with the audience. The public is encouraged to provide comment to MAG during the committee process, prior to the Regional Council action. The Regional Council will receive information on comments provided to technical and policy committees. Written comments will always be accepted by the Chair.*

2. Time Allotted for Public Comment: Three opportunities are provided for public comment at MAG meetings, including Call to the Audience, Consent Agenda, and Action Items to be Heard.
  - **Call to the Audience.** Citizens have three minutes to speak on any item of their choosing. Topics may include non-agenda items, or items

that are on the agenda but which are not slated for action. This comment period takes place at the beginning of the meeting.

- **Consent Agenda.** Citizens have a total of three minutes to speak on any or all consent agenda items (cumulatively). Citizens may determine whether an item is a consent item by looking on the meeting agenda. Consent items will be marked in the first column by an asterisk (\*). This comment period usually comes near the beginning of the meeting, after the Executive Director's Report and prior to approval of the consent agenda by the Council.

- **Action Items.** Citizens are given three minutes to speak on any action item (three minutes per item). Citizens may determine whether an item is an action item by looking on the meeting agenda, under the second column, "Committee Action Requested." Action items will state "for action" or "for possible action." This comment period usually is provided just prior to a vote on each action item by the Regional Council.

3. **Speaking Rules and Chairman's Discretion:** The Chairman or his/her designee has the power to strictly enforce the above rules and to revoke speaking rights if rules are violated. The Chair or his/her designee has the power to accept additional comments and extend the time of the speaker, or limit public comment based on time availability.

The cards include this statement: *Note: The Chairman or his/her designee shall have the power to strictly enforce these rules and to revoke your speaking rights if you violate any of these rules. The Chairman may also revoke your rights to speak at the rest of today's meeting and/or at future meetings if you twice refuse to be silent after being directed to do so. (If you lose your right to speak, you may still present written comments.)*

# CONTACT MAG

## Mailing/Physical Address

Maricopa Association of Governments  
302 N. 1<sup>st</sup> Avenue  
Suite #300  
Phoenix, AZ 85003

## E-Mail

General mailbox: [mag.@mag.maricopa.gov](mailto:mag.@mag.maricopa.gov)  
Public Involvement Planner: [jstephens@mag.maricopa.gov](mailto:jstephens@mag.maricopa.gov)  
Communications Manager: [ktaft@mag.maricopa.gov](mailto:ktaft@mag.maricopa.gov)

## Web Address

[www.mag.maricopa.gov](http://www.mag.maricopa.gov)  
Regional Transportation Plan: [www.LetsKeepMoving.com](http://www.LetsKeepMoving.com)



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

October 31, 2006

TO: Members of the MAG Management Committee

FROM: Denise McClafferty, Management Analyst

SUBJECT: REGIONAL OFFICE CENTER UPDATE

At the September 18, 2006 Executive Committee meeting, a presentation was delivered by RNL architects on a conceptual design of the Regional Office Center, including a review of the layout and renderings of the conference center. Leading up to this presentation were several collaborative meetings with the architects, partnering agencies and developer to gather information, such as program needs, parking, technology needs and security. Meetings were also held with the partnering agencies to discuss and develop interior design of their office space and how each agency would accommodate growth space. Additionally, a design charrette was held and valuable input on the concept of the building was received from the partnering agencies and their staff members.

In addition to addressing the partnering agencies' office space needs, staff has been meeting with agency directors to begin discussions on the partnership agreement for the Regional Office Center. These discussions include a conceptual plan for the ownership, operation, and management of the building. The legal consultant for this project is working with the agencies' attorneys on a draft outline of the agreement. In conjunction with these agreement discussions, staff is working with Peacock, Hislop, Staley and Given, the financial advisor, on an estimated financial analysis for this project, including a breakdown for each partnering agency. Both the agreement and financial analysis will need to address how to allocate common space in the building, as well as the conference center.

Another aspect of this project includes communicating with the adjacent neighborhood and the Roosevelt Action Association (RAA). The developer, Kaye/Ryan, and MAG staff have had ongoing communications with the Phoenix Downtown Partnership, the Phoenix Community Alliance, and members of the RAA leadership. The Executive Committee and Building Lease Working Group were provided a tour of the Roosevelt neighborhood, conducted by Ms. Andrea Abkarian, RAA President. A letter was sent to the neighborhood at-large to introduce the project and the four regional agencies.

On May 17, 2006, the neighborhood association held its monthly meeting, in which Ms. Abkarian briefly discussed the project. It was reported that the discussion of the proposed building went well and the RAA requested the opportunity to see the schematic plans. A follow-up meeting with Ms. Abkarian and Mr. Reid Butler, of the RAA Development Committee Boards, was held and the presentation from RNL architects on the building's conceptual design was discussed. Kaye/Ryan is in the process of coordinating a meeting with the full RAA to present the schematic design of the building.

A Voluntary Association of Local Governments in Maricopa County

The Executive Committee has authorized the MAG Executive Director to sign a letter of indemnification with Kaye/Ryan for an amount not to exceed \$280,000 for pre-development costs, including preliminary architectural and interior design and structural engineering services for the Regional Office Center. This indemnification of \$280,000 will result in a schematic design package including plans, specifications and a detailed estimate. Once the detailed estimate is received and analyzed, staff will make recommendations and present courses of action, which could include entering into a purchase agreement with Kaye/Ryan based on the detailed estimate. A second option would be to sign an agreement that further indemnifies Kaye/Ryan to refine the schematic package and move to design development. The agreement would provide us with a design development package including plans, specifications and a Guaranteed Maximum Price (GMP).

An update will be provided to the MAG Management Committee and the MAG Regional Council prior to moving forward with this project. If you have any questions, please contact me at the MAG office.