

MINUTES OF THE
MARICOPA ASSOCIATION OF GOVERNMENTS
REGIONAL COUNCIL EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE MEETING
November 14, 2005
MAG Offices
302 North 1st Avenue, Phoenix, Arizona

MEMBERS ATTENDING

Mayor Keno Hawker, Mesa, Chair
Mayor Woody Thomas, Litchfield Park,
Vice Chair
Mayor Mary Manross, Scottsdale, Treasurer
Mayor Wendy Feldman-Kerr, Queen Creek

* Mayor Phil Gordon, Phoenix
Mayor Joan Shafer, Surprise
Mayor James M. Cavanaugh, Goodyear

* Not present

Participated by videoconference or telephone conference call

1. Call to Order

The Executive Committee meeting was called to order by Chair Keno Hawker at 12:00 p.m.

Chair Hawker 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.

2. Call to the Audience

Chair Hawker noted that according to MAG's public comment process, members of the audience who wish to speak are requested to fill out the public comment cards. He stated that there is a three minute time limit. Public comment is provided at the beginning of the meeting for items that are not on the agenda that are within the jurisdiction of MAG, or non-action agenda items that are on the agenda for discussion or information only.

Chair Hawker recognized Blue Crowley for public comment. Blue Crowley stated that this region is not as multi-modal as possible. He also noted that there are still inadequate bus pull outs and shelters for people. There are almost 6,914 bus stops and only 1,800 have shelters. Mr. Crowley stated that there numerous park and rides with covered parking. He noted that it is more important to provide cover for people and not vehicles. Mr. Crowley asked if the park and ride lot at 19th Avenue and Peoria was related to light rail not going across I-17. He said if it is called the Metrocenter Extension you would figure if would go to Metrocenter. He then noted that the map shows light rail goes to Metrocenter, but the document says it stops in the Metrocenter area. Mr. Crowley stated that ADOT needs to understand that the bridge needs to be strengthened to accommodate light rail. Chair Hawker thanked Mr. Crowley for his comments.

3. Approval of Consent Agenda

Chair Hawker stated that 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. Chair Hawker stated that agenda items #3A, #3B and #3C were on the consent agenda.

Chair Hawker recognized public comment from Mr. Crowley. Mr. Crowley stated that he was glad to see the human services part of transportation being addressed. He noted that there needs to be more participation by committees and more collaboration with rural areas. Mr. Crowley stated that the County donated furniture to the Human Services Campus, and suggested that other member agencies consider donating. He noted that he was glad to see that homelessness was being address from various avenues. Chair Hawker thanked Mr. Crowley for his comments.

Mayor Cavanaugh moved to approve consent agenda items #3A, #3B and #3C with a change in agenda item #3C that states “Stardust Foundation will reimburse MAG approximately \$10,000 in costs.” Mayor Thomas seconded, and the motion carried unanimously.

3A. Approval of the September 12, 2005 Executive Committee Meeting Minutes

The Executive Committee, by consent, approved the September 12, 2005 meeting minutes.

3B. Consultant Selection for the MAG Human Services and Senior Transportation Assessment and Coordination Project

The Executive Committee, by consent, approved the selection of RLS and Associates, Inc. for the MAG Human Services and Senior Transportation Assessment and Coordination Project for an amount not to exceed \$65,000. The FY 2005 MAG Unified Planning Work Program and Annual Budget, approved by the MAG Regional Council, includes \$65,000 of Surface Transportation Planning funding for the development of the MAG Human Services and Senior Transportation Assessment and Coordination Project. The purpose of the project is to develop recommendations on coordinating a human services transportation plan in conjunction with the state Arizona Rides program and the federal United We Ride program. A request for proposals was advertised and two proposals were received. A multi-agency review team evaluated the proposals and recommended to MAG the selection of RLS and Associates, Inc. This item was on the November 9, 2005 Management Committee agenda for recommendation.

3C. Amendment of the FY 2006 Unified Planning Work Program and Annual Budget to Accept Additional Funds to Support the MAG Human Service Program

The Executive Committee, by consent, approved to amend the FY 2006 Unified Planning Work Program and Annual Budget to accept \$16,732 from the Arizona Department of Economic Security for Regional homeless planning and to accept approximately \$10,000 from the Stardust

Foundation for the Annual Continuum of Care luncheon. MAG has recently received notice from the Arizona Department of Economic Security that \$16,732 is being provided to MAG for regional homeless planning. The Stardust Foundation has also notified MAG that it will reimburse MAG approximately \$10,000 in costs for the annual Continuum of Care luncheon to support homeless advocacy efforts. It is necessary to amend the MAG FY 2006 Unified Planning Work Program and Annual Budget to receive these funds.

4. Update on Phase I of the Regional Governmental Service Center

Denise McClafferty stated that on September 12, 2005, the Executive Committee recommended authorizing MAG to enter into a contract with LangdonWilson for Phase I of the Regional Governmental Service Center. Since then, the consultant and staff have met with partnering agencies and the subconsultant, Daniel Smith and Associates to discuss programming building space. She noted that other potential partners have been contact, including the Greater Phoenix Economic Council (GPEC) and Valley Forward. Ms. McClafferty stated that the Building Lease Working Group (BLWG) was provided an update at their meeting on Thursday, November 10th. Ms. McClafferty then introduced Ken Lufkin from Langdon Wilson and the real estate team Gee Gee Entz and Patti Boyd Gentry, who will provide more details on the project to date, including potential sites that were discussed at the BLWG meeting.

Mr. Lufkin updated the group on the meetings with the partnering agencies and the subconsultant, Daniel Smith and Associates. These meeting were to discuss the programming of space, including office space, meeting rooms, storage, public space and parking. He noted that each agency is scheduled to meet individually with Daniel Smith and Associates to review information provided from a questionnaire. Mr. Lufkin stated that contact has been made with some potential partners, including GPEC and Valley Forward. GPEC is interested in increasing collaboration and learning more about the project. They have agreed to participate in the questionnaire and the initial look at the programming of space. GPEC has approximately 23 staff members and about 10,600 square feet of space. He reported that they do not anticipate any growth in staff and their lease was just renewed for five years. Mr. Lufkin noted one potential obstacle is that GPEC would like to keep their business/corporate look, which is conflicting with the image of the Regional Governmental Service Center. He noted that GPEC would need to go to their board and the new building or office space would need to be economically feasible.

Mr. Lufkin stated that Mr. Smith spoke with Valley Forward and they were also interested in hearing more about the project. Valley Forward's lease expires in December 2007 and they currently have 1498 square feet of space and four employees. Mr. Lufkin then introduced the real estate team. Gee Gee Entz reviewed the leases for each agency.

Patti Boyd-Gentry provided an overview on potential sites:

- 1) Collier Center at 3rd Street and Washington - some infrastructure in place (foundation and utilities).
- 2) Arizona Center at 5th Street and Van Buren - Ground lease only.

- 3) Lund Property at 2nd Avenue and Van Buren (south side) - would work with a developer on this property.
- 4) 1st Avenue and Van Buren (north of YMCA)
- 5) Central and McDowell (northwest corner) - 6-7 acres; less construction costs; have all zoning.
- 6) Central & Palm Lane - 2 acres north of Viad; would work with a developer on this site.
- 7) Park Central - redevelopment project.
- 8) Central and Clarendon
- 9) Central and Osborn
- 10) 3rd Avenue and Osborn - north of Osborn; existing building.
- 11) County Superblock - 7th Avenue and Jefferson
- 12) Washington and 44th Street Corridor - lower cost of land; existing conference center; child care center; amphitheater.

Ms. Boyd-Gentry stated that they are also investigating a building for sale, which is the Wells Fargo Building. She noted that this building is probably bigger than what is needed with 470,000 square feet.

Mr. Lufkin stated that the BLWG identified key sites located primarily in the Copper Square area. Chair Hawker expressed his concern that only two elected officials sit on the BLWG and he was more comfortable bringing this item to this body for review and comment. He briefly stated his preferences with his first choice being site #4. He noted the #5 and #6 have good access to the freeway and transit. Number 11 is too distant from rail and amenities. He noted that #7, #8, #9 and #10 are not good sites because they are not easily accessible.

Mayor Cavanaugh stated that he agrees that the Wells Fargo building should be investigated, however, it is substantial in size. He also suggested continued communication with ASU on any partnering opportunities. Chair Hawker asked the other members for their input. Mayor Shafer stated that many member agencies do not have light rail. She noted that site #5 would be excellent location with great access to the freeway and less congestion. Mayor Manross noted that light rail access should also be considered from the employee and visitor's perspective. She noted that the focus should be on the downtown area and sites #3 and #4 are great locations. Mayor Thomas agreed with Mayor Manross. He also agreed that there should be further research on the Well Fargo building. Mayor Wendy Feldman-Kerr ranked her preferences as #4, #3, #5 and the Wells Fargo Building. She noted that sites #1 and #2 were too close to a hub and would be too congested.

Ms. Entz noted that this committee's recommendations are in order with the BLWG's recommendations. She noted the recommendations from the committee as #3, #4 and #5 to focus on. Mr. Lufkin noted that the programming will be completed in the next few weeks, which may have an impact on the site. Mayor Shafer asked if the City of Phoenix would help mitigate infrastructure costs. Mr. Lufkin stated that would impact the cost of land. Mayor Manross noted that this building will be creating an employment center.

Mr. Lufkin updated the committee on the meeting with GPEC. He noted that the Executive Director of GPEC was interested, but everything would have to pencil out. He noted that GPEC is looking for a different image - a corporate image. Mr. Smith added that the consultant and staff are scheduled to meet with ASU and the City of Phoenix Downtown Development Office to investigate any new potential partnerships with ASU. Mayor Wendy Feldman-Kerr noted to keep in mind that there may be potential parking concerns when partnering with ASU. Mayor Manross asked if this would be a green building. Mr. Smith replied that it would be close to a green building without the costs. Chair Hawker summarized the suggested sites to pursue as site #3, #4, #5 and the Wells Fargo Building. The committee agreed. Chair Hawker thanked Mr. Lufkin for the update.

5. Update on Cost, Supply and Schedule Issues for Regional Freeway Program

Mr. Anderson gave an overview of highway construction costs. He said that supply and demand are affecting material costs. He said that transportation costs, material availability, increasing demand for materials from China and the Pacific rim countries, the Gulf Coast rebuilding, the 75 percent tariff on Mexican cement, railroad capacity, and energy are all factors in rising costs.

Mr. Anderson stated that there have been recent significant increases on cement, aggregate, steel, lumber, petroleum products, and PVC conduit. He gave as examples the cost for cement was \$100 per ton in August and \$117 per ton in October. Steel rose from 55 cents per pound in 2003 to \$1.03 per pound in 2005. Mr. Anderson stated that the cost of aggregate, which is used in concrete, increased 30 percent in the past year due to processing and hauling costs and reduced availability of sources. Mr. Anderson noted that difficulties in obtaining governmental permits due to environmental concerns also added to the cost of aggregate. He noted that PM-10 is a great concern for this region. Mr. Anderson stated that another significant factor is the price of diesel fuel, that increased 70 percent in the past year.

Mr. Anderson stated that even though there are thousands of people moving here there still is a shortage of skilled available labor. He said that some of it is due to the high level of construction in state and Gulf coast rebuilding. Mr. Anderson noted that rail and trucking are at capacity. In addition, railroads are tending to carry higher value products at the expense of high-weight, low-value commodities.

Mr. Anderson then addressed the impact of these factors on recent bids. He said that the State's estimate was \$59.7 million for the US-60 widening from Gilbert to Power Road project. Two bids were received and the low bid was \$73.7 million, which was 23 percent over the estimate. Mr. Anderson stated that the State's estimate was \$52.4 million for the Red Mountain, University to Southern project. He said that only one bid was received in the amount of \$68.4 million, which was 38 percent over the estimate. Mr. Anderson stated that the State's estimate for the I-17, Cactus Road traffic interchange project was \$3.6 million. One bid was received in the amount of \$5.9 million, which was 64 percent over the estimate. Mr. Anderson noted that this summer, bids received were 20 to 45 percent higher than estimates. He added that ADOT is currently raising cost estimates to reflect current prices.

Mr. Anderson advised that the strategies on the current situation may vary whether it is short term price spikes that will come back down, whether the higher prices will form a new plateau, or if prices will continue to climb. He said that the situation will continue to be monitored.

Mr. Anderson stated that a Task Force with ADOT and industry representatives are examining program delivery options, such as cost adjustment clauses and the size of projects. He said that a progress report will be given to the TPC in January 2006. Mr. Anderson stated that contingencies were built into the RTP. He said that one piece of good news is that revenue from the sales tax was up 18 percent in the July to September period, which is a record level. Mr. Anderson noted that ADOT has been looking at the main source of this increase and it seems to be coming from all sectors. He added that this rate of growth probably will not continue.

Mayor Thomas asked if the state could buy materials at less cost and stock pile the supplies. Mr. Anderson replied that ADOT is using cost adjustment clauses. He noted that ordering material ahead of time would be difficult, but there may be some occasions where you could order material ahead of time. Mayor Manross asked if anyone spoke to other areas that have experience growth, such as California, Texas or Colorado. She asked if this is a regional, state or national problem. Mr. Anderson responded that material cost increase have been all over the country. He explained that the lack of bidders is due to a combination of rapid growth and increased costs. Mayor Manross asked what happens if only one bid is received. Mr. Anderson replied that is an ADOT decision, but typically they analyze the bid and compare the unit costs to market costs to make the decision.

Mayor Shafer asked if extra money is spent in Phase one, what will happen to the projects in the later Phases. Mr. Anderson replied that the goal is to keep the program on track. He noted that one answer is that every project will get moved back. He also stated that if we are proactive we can mitigate some of the problems. Mr. Smith stated that the situation looks positive. He noted that the sales tax collections for July, August and September are at record rates. He also noted that contingencies were built into the Plan. The Life Cycle program was put in place to monitor the progress so that we can mitigate problems.

Mayor Thomas asked about the surplus in the state budget and how that will effect the HURF funds. Mr. Smith stated that preliminary information concludes that \$118 million that was used for the state's general fund will be in the budget to be returned to the HURF.

Mayor Hawker asked if there is a lack of qualified contractors to bid and the bids are coming in higher, should the acceleration policy be taken back to the TPC for review. Mr. Anderson stated that the risk issue needs to be dealt with and that will result in more bidders. He also noted that if bids continue to come in high, it could put accelerations in jeopardy.

Chair Hawker thanked Mr. Anderson for the presentation.

6. Human Services Coordinating Committee Reorganization

Amy St. Peter discussed the effort to provide regional planning for human services and the potential changes to streamline the committee process. She stated that the suggested reorganization of the Human Services Committees includes moving Employers Against Domestic Violence (EADV) to the Arizona Foundation for Women. This will be discussed at their November board meeting. Ms. St. Peter stated that MAG will a primary partner and continue to be involved.

Ms. St. Peter stated that the Human Services Coordinating Committee (HSCC) has not had a quorum in over a year. She noted that this committee could be reconfigured or reviewed as to how work can be refocused.

Mayor Thomas stated that he though it was a good idea that EADV move to Arizona Foundation for Women. He also suggested that HSCC be an ad hoc committee. Ms. St. Peter agreed that HSCC could meet less frequently or on an as needed basis. Chair Hawker concurred with the suggested change for EADV. Mayor Wendy Feldman-Kerr suggested asking committee members why they are not attending. She also agrees with the move to Arizona Foundation for Women. Chair Hawker thanked Ms. St. Peter for the update.

7. Commuter Rail Update

Eric Anderson gave an overview of commuter rail. He said that the High Capacity Transit (HCT) Study was completed in 2003, and as a result of the study, \$5 million was placed in the Regional Transportation Plan to examine future implementation issues regarding commuter rail. Mr. Anderson advised that if further action on commuter rail is desired by member agencies, an update of commuter rail information could be considered as a consultant study in the FY 2007 MAG Unified Planning Work Program and Annual Budget.

Mr. Anderson stated that the commuter rail piece of the HCT study involved a comparison of commuter rail and light rail characteristics, a summary of commuter rail operations in other areas, an inventory and evaluation of rail infrastructure in the MAG region, ridership projections based on 2040 population and employment projections, cost estimates for commuter rail capital and operations by corridor. Mr. Anderson also included a report on the Trinity Railway Express in Dallas.

Mr. Anderson showed a table of operating data for peer commuter rail systems in Los Angeles, San Diego, San Jose, Dallas, Chicago, and Toronto. He stated that commuter rail and light rail are complementary to each other; commuter rail is for longer trips and light rail is for shorter trips. Mr. Anderson noted that the average trip length for commuter rail was 25 miles with an average distance between stations of about five miles. He said that the light rail commutes average about five miles with stations located one mile or less apart.

Mr. Anderson showed a map of rail service in the MAG region, which is served by the Burlington Northern Santa Fe (BNSF) and the Union Pacific (UP). He stated that the BNSF

line from Phoenix to Wickenburg is a single track of about 53 miles in length with 55 at-grade street crossings. He noted that about five trains per day use the track, although this number might have increased since the study was done. Mr. Anderson noted that the right-of-way is 100 feet wide making the installation of another track possible. The track does not have an existing train signal system, which would probably be necessary for commuter rail service. Mr. Anderson stated that the corridor has a maximum speed of 49 miles per hour, although for most of the track in the more populated areas the speeds are closer to 20 to 25 miles per hour. Mr. Anderson noted that freight traffic has a priority use for the track.

Mr. Anderson then spoke about the BNSF yard facilities. He said that BNSF has a maintenance and switchyard facility near 19th Avenue and McDowell Road. Another facility, at 51st Avenue along Grand Avenue, is used to load and unload truck trailers onto the rail line, which could be an impediment to commuter rail operations. Mr. Anderson stated that the BNSF operating facilities are at capacity and BNSF has plans to move most of its operations further out on the Grand Avenue corridor.

Mr. Anderson noted that upgrades or changes in the BNSF corridor that would be desirable for implementing commuter rail include installing a train signal control system, laying a second track, lengthening sidings, and reducing main track switching activity by moving BNSF operations. He added that the right-of-way is suitable for accommodating another track.

Mr. Anderson stated that the UP track is about 75 miles long and includes 109 mainline grade crossings. It is a single-track configuration with sidings to allow trains to pass at certain points. Mr. Anderson said that the mainline is signalized and has a speed limit that varies from 15 to 60 miles per hour, depending on the location. The right-of-way is generally 100 feet wide. He said that when the HCT study was done, the UP operated about six trains per day.

Mr. Anderson stated that the principal UP operating yard is located in downtown Phoenix, bounded by 7th Street and 16th Street. He stated that changes in the UP corridor that would be desirable for implementing commuter rail include upgrading rails and replacing ties, replacing the signal systems, and good coordination with freight traffic.

Mr. Anderson stated that there are operational issues common to both companies that would need to be addressed, including the ownership model, liability and risk management, freight/passenger capacity conflicts, grade crossings, noise impacts, station impacts, capital needs, operating and maintenance costs, and governance structure.

Mr. Anderson stated that ridership projections were produced based on interim population and employment projections. Phase 1 was based on 2020 projections with three inbound and three outbound peak hour daily trains. Phase 3 was based on the 2040 population and employment forecasts with full commuter service.

Mr. Anderson then addressed cost estimates for commuter rail capital and operations by corridor. He stated that Phase 1 capital costs for BNSF are estimated at more than \$300 million, with a little less for UP. Mr. Anderson reviewed the projected operating costs by corridor.

Mr. Anderson spoke about the Dallas Area Rapid Transit (DART), which operates fixed route bus service, as well as light rail transit (LRT) and commuter rail. He displayed a chart of the operating subsidy per passenger for the various transit services provided by DART.

Mr. Anderson stated that the commuter rail study update could include a review of peer commuter rail systems, an inventory of rail infrastructure and operations, including freight, which was not included in the HCT study, updated ridership projections, capital and operating costs, and implementation steps over the next decade or so. Mr. Anderson stated that there will most likely be discussion with ADOT on rail on a statewide basis. He said that a group of stakeholders could be formed to assist in the development of the scope of work if the consultant study is done.

Chair Hawker asked what the funding source for this study would be. Mr. Smith replied that there is \$5 million in the Regional Transportation Plan to examine implementation issues. He noted that to update the study would cost \$300,000 to \$500,000. Mayor Thomas noted that this conversation regarding commuter rail began with the Governance process. He noted that the Governor spoke at an ASU event and the state is also examining commuter rail. He noted that even after all the freeway are completed there will still be congestion. Mayor Cavanaugh noted that the capital costs for commuter rail are much less than light rail. He then asked why the cost per rail vehicle hour for commuter rail is so expensive. Mr. Anderson replied that the cost to operate large, diesel locomotives is very high. He also noted that liability insurance is high. Mayor Cavanaugh suggested looking at alternative light rail as part of the study. Mr. Anderson replied that could be added to the study. Mayor Shafer asked what the fare would be for light rail and commuter rail. Mr. Anderson replied that light rail and commuter rail requires subsidies. He noted that the fare probably could not be set at a rate high enough to cover operation and maintenance and still attract riders. Mayor Thomas stated that regarding light rail in place of commuter rail, people would not want to stop every half mile as light rail does. Mayor Cavanaugh indicated that Goodyear and Buckeye will become employment centers that will also help change commute patterns. Mayor Feldman-Kerr agreed that light rail versus commuter rail should be look at in the study. She noted that there could be some express lines. Chair Hawker suggested that staff pursue this study and the committee agreed. He thanked Mr. Anderson for his report.

8. Regional Planning Dialogue

Dennis Smith stated that the 2050 growth show was presented at the League of Arizona Cities and Towns Annual Conference in September. He noted that emphasis was placed on the planning regions and agencies working together to address growth. Mr. Smith stated that after the League Conference, the Arizona COG Directors met to discuss the importance of fostering more dialogue among the regional and state planning agencies. The Arizona COG Directors suggested that leaders get together annually to discuss the immediate and future growth issues and how to collectively focus on actions that could be pursued. Mr. Smith stated that it was proposed that this meeting begin with a dinner followed by a presentation and dialogue that evening. The dialogue would continue to the next morning and the meeting would conclude with a wrap-up session at lunch. He noted that the goal is to develop better relationships among

the agencies that are preparing plans for the future of Arizona.

Chair Hawker stated that the idea is to get buy-in from others. He noted that this could be a state-wide retreat with the Regional Council retreat incorporated into the process. Mayor Feldman-Kerr suggested that a pre-questionnaire be developed to gather topics and anticipated outcomes for agencies involved. Mayor Shafer suggested a state-wide report on water be included. Mr. Smith replied that the Department of Water Resources, State Land and the Department of Commerce could be invited if those item of interest surface in the questionnaire.

Mayor Feldman-Kerr asked about the next Town Hall. Mr. Smith stated that there was not one planned at this time. Mayor Feldman-Kerr suggested that this retreat would be a good place to gather issues for the next Town Hall. Mayor Cavanaugh suggested that a smaller group of people for the retreat would result in better communications. Mr. Smith suggested that the retreat include MAG Executive Committee and the officers of the COGs which would be approximately 30 people all together. Chair Hawker suggested that planning of this retreat should move forward. The committee agreed. Chair Hawker thanked Mr. Smith for the report.

9. Desert Peaks 2006

Denise McClafferty stated that it will be two years since the last Desert Peaks Awards event and staff is beginning to discuss the planning process for the 2006 Desert Peaks. She noted that staff is looking for input on the event. In October 2003, the MAG Regional Council approved restructuring the Desert Peaks Awards program. Ms. McClafferty noted that this restructuring included changes in the program, location, menu, cost to attendees and how often the event is held. It also included announcing the award recipients prior to the event. She reported that the last event was held on June 23, 2004 at the Arizona Club and there were approximately 220 people in attendance. The total cost, less the \$11,500 in sponsorship, was approximately \$20,000, which was half of the cost of the 2002 event. Ms. McClafferty reported the surveys were distributed at the event to determine how attendees liked the restructuring. She noted that according to the surveys and general comments, it was determined that the attendees enjoyed the casual atmosphere and the extra time to mingle. They also preferred the reception over a formal dinner and like the fact that there was no charge to attend. She stated other general comments included they did not like the set up of the room and the sun was in people's faces.

Ms. McClafferty noted that some of the Executive Committee comments following the 2004 event include: holding the event every other year to highlight the change in leadership; keeping the reception and at no cost to attendees; keeping the event at the Arizona Club; continuing to announce award recipients; nominations should include project that are complete to qualify; Regional Council Chair or member should emcee; and to better prepare award recipient about the logistics of the evening. She noted that staff is now beginning to plan the 2006 event and would like this committees input on how to proceed. Mr. Smith added that it is important to celebrate success and to keep the spirit of cooperation going. He also noted that this project may also be something that this committee wishes to put on the stop doing list.

Mayor Shafer stated that she would rather see the staff get bonuses for their work than see mayors give awards to other mayors. Mr. Smith noted that there are no cities on the judging

panel. Mayor Cavanaugh stated that he supports this program. Mayor Feldman-Kerr agreed and believes this program celebrates regional partnerships and shows how agencies work together to accomplish many different things. Mayor Thomas stated that regional emphasis is important and liked with the structure of the program. Chair Hawker stated that he feels the program is not impressive and it seems to be mayors giving awards to other mayors. He noted that he will defer to the other members. Mayor Thomas stated that sorting out those worthy of the award is important. Chair Hawker stated that he is hearing a consensus to send out the nomination forms and keep the same format for the awards program. The committee agreed.

10. Regional Council Retreat

Dennis Smith noted that staff received direction on the Regional Council Retreat through agenda item number eight. Staff was directed to incorporate the Regional Council Retreat into the Regional Planning Dialogue/Retreat.

11. Annual Performance Review of the MAG Executive Director

Mr. Smith stated that according to the Executive Director's contract, the Executive Committee conducts an annual performance review in consultation with the Regional Council in January. In December 2003, the Executive Committee approved an evaluation survey for the MAG Executive Director' performance review. Mr. Smith stated that according to the contract, the Executive Committee can elect to use the evaluation survey or hire a consultant to conduct the evaluation. The cost of the consultant is included in the budget for an amount up to \$3,000. Mayor Feldman-Kerr asked that if the evaluation survey provided enough feedback. Mr. Smith replied that the survey provided adequate feedback. Mayor Thomas stated that he did not believe an outside consultant would be necessary. The committee members agreed.

12. Adjournment

Mayor Shafer moved to adjourn the Executive Committee meeting. Mayor Cavanaugh seconded, and the motion carried unanimously.

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 1:50 p.m.

Chair

Secretary