

MARICOPA ASSOCIATION OF GOVERNMENTS

INFORMATION SUMMARY... for your review

DATE:

September 30, 2003

SUBJECT:

Red Letter Notification

SUMMARY:

The Regional Council approved the Red Letter Process in 1996 to provide early notification of potential development in planned freeway alignments. Development activities include actions on plans, zoning, and permits. Key elements of the process include:

Notifications:

- ADOT will periodically forward Red Letter notifications to MAG
- Notifications will be placed on the consent agenda for information and discussion at the Transportation Review Committee, Management Committee, and Regional Council meetings
- If a member wishes to take action on a notification, the item can be removed from the consent agenda for further discussion. The item could then be placed on the agenda of a subsequent meeting for action.

Advance acquisitions:

- ADOT is authorized to proceed with advance right-of-way acquisitions up to \$2 million [per year] in funded corridors.
- Any change in funding limits for advance right-of-way acquisitions constitutes a material cost change as well as a change in freeway priorities and therefore would have to be reviewed by MAG and would require Regional Council action.
- In June 1999, the Regional Council allocated \$5 million per year through FY 2003 for advance acquisition requests where needed to prevent development in freeway alignments.

For information, the ADOT Advance Acquisition policy allows the expenditure of funds to obtain right-of-way where needed to address hardship cases (residential only), forestall development (typical Red Letter case), respond to advantageous offers or, with remaining funds, acquire properties in the construction sequence for which right-of-way acquisition has not already been funded.

In addition to forestalling development within freeway corridors, ADOT under the Red Letter Process works with developers on projects adjacent to or close to existing and proposed routes that may have a potential impact on drainage, noise mitigation, and/or access. This is now a focal point of the ADOT program. For this purpose, ADOT needs to be informed of all zoning and development activity within one-half mile of any existing and planned facility. Without ADOT input on development plans adjacent to or near existing and planned facilities, there is a potential for increased costs to the local jurisdiction, the region and/or ADOT.

ADOT received 257 Red Letter notifications in the first six months of 2003, of which 59 notices impacted the Regional Freeway System. In the same period in 2002, ADOT received only 62 notices of which 3 were in or potentially in freeway right-of-way. The reasons for the increase in number of notices appears to be two fold: 1) as a result of more activity along existing and planned freeways, and 2) as a result of increased communication by ADOT with local jurisdictions by telephone, e-mail, and attendance at local staff meetings to inform zoning and planning staff members of the importance of the process.

Of the 59 notices received in 2003 for development in or potentially in freeway right-of-way, three were from the City of Avondale, one from the Town of Buckeye, four from the City of Chandler, one from

the Town of El Mirage, ten from the Town of Gilbert, two from the City of Glendale, seven from the City of Mesa, five from the City of Peoria, twelve from the City of Phoenix, one from the City of Scottsdale, five from the City of Surprise, two from the City of Tempe, and four from Maricopa County.

As a result of zoning changes that would put future developments in or close to freeway right-of-way, thirty-eight notices were distributed by ADOT to advise that they reserved rights to review all plans as they become available.

PUBLIC INPUT:

None.

PROS & CONS:

PROS: Notification can lead to action to forestall development activity in freeway corridors and help minimize costs as well as ensure eventual completion of the facility.

CONS: By utilizing funds for advance purchase of right-of-way, these funds are not available for other uses such as design and construction.

TECHNICAL & POLICY IMPLICATIONS:

TECHNICAL: Development within freeway alignments will result in increased future right-of-way costs.

POLICY: In June 1999, the MAG Regional Council approved the regional Transportation Improvement Program that included approval of \$5 million per year for advance right-of-way acquisition in funded freeway corridors through FY 2003. There are no advance acquisition funds beyond FY 2003.

ACTION NEEDED:

Information and discussion.

PRIOR COMMITTEE ACTIONS:

Transportation Review Committee: This item was on the September 25, 2003 agenda for information and discussion.

MEMBERS ATTENDING

*Scottsdale: Jan Dolan, Chair
Phoenix: Tom Callow for Jack Tevlin,
Vice Chair
*ADOT: Dan Lance
Avondale: Dave Fitzhugh
Buckeye: Carroll Reynolds for Joe Blanton
Chandler: Bryan Patterson for
Patrice Kraus
Fountain Hills: Randy Harrel for Tom Ward
*Gila Bend: David Evertsen
*Gilbert: Tami Ryall
Glendale: Terry Johnson for Jim Book

Goodyear: Grant Anderson
Guadalupe: Antonio Figueroa-Iturralde
Litchfield Park: Mike Cartsonis
Maricopa County: Chris Plumb for
Tom Buick
Mesa: Jim Huling for Jeff Martin
Paradise Valley: Robert M. Cicarelli
*Peoria: David Moody
RPTA: Ken Driggs
*Surprise: Scott Phillips
Tempe: Mary O'Connor
*Wickenburg: Shane Dille

EX-OFFICIO MEMBERS ATTENDING

*Regional Bicycle Task Force: Pat
McDermott, Chandler
*Street Committee: Don Herp, Phoenix
*ITS Committee: Jim Book

Pedestrian Working Group: Reed
Kempton, Maricopa County
Dept of Transportation
*Telecommunications Advisory Group: Greg
Binder

* Members neither present nor represented by proxy.

CONTACT PERSON:

Chris Voigt, MAG, (602) 254-6300, or Sabra Mousavi, ADOT (602) 712-6840

MARICOPA ASSOCIATION OF GOVERNMENTS

INFORMATION SUMMARY... for your review

DATE:

September 30, 2003

SUBJECT:

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

SUMMARY:

The 1990 Clean Air Act Amendments require that the MAG Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) be in conformance with the applicable air quality plans. This Special TIP serves as a four-year regional guide for the preservation, management and expansion of public transportation services, including highways, ridesharing, transit facilities and various congestion mitigation and air quality improvement projects. On September 25, 2003, the Transportation Review Committee unanimously recommended approval of the Draft Special FY 2004-2007 MAG TIP for an air quality conformity analysis.

Approval of an updated Special 2004-2007 TIP and the accompanying air quality conformity analysis will give the region maximum flexibility during the development of the future 2005-2009 TIP document, which will contain major elements of the Regional Transportation Plan. All MAG member agencies have been consulted regarding changes to projects in the current 2003-2007 TIP and these changes have been incorporated in the draft document, including some new locally and privately funded projects. The draft TIP contains over 1,000 transportation projects, totals more than \$3.86 billion and identifies Federally funded projects; ADOT projects; transit projects; and all regionally significant projects within the region. Members will be asked to recommend approval of the program to undergo an air quality conformity analysis process. A copy of the Draft TIP (Listing of Projects) is included.

PUBLIC INPUT:

The Draft Special FY 2004-2007 MAG TIP is predominantly based on the 03-07 MAG TIP, which was approved on July 24, 2002. The public involvement process for the development of that TIP was summarized in the FY 2003 Final Phase Input Opportunity Report which accompanied the original document. The projects recommended for inclusion in the Draft Special FY 2004-2007 MAG TIP are the result of changes made through 10 TIP Amendments between July, 2002 and September, 2003, which have all had opportunities for public review during the requisite Transportation Review Committee, Management Committee, Transportation Policy Committee, and Regional Council meetings. Further changes have been made by MAG member agencies, ADOT and Valley Metro, and additional opportunities for public review for this updated program were provided at the Transportation Review Committee meeting on September 25, 2003, and will be provided at the Management Committee meeting on October 8, 2003, the Transportation Policy Committee meeting on October 15, 2003, and at the Regional Council meeting on October 22, 2003. Comments received at these meetings will be included in the FY 2004 Special Input Opportunity Report and will be presented at the Public Hearing on the Special FY 2004-2007 MAG TIP, tentatively scheduled for November 21, 2003.

PROS & CONS:

PROS: Approval of this item will allow the projects included in the TIP to undergo a conformity analysis and continue the process to enable them to be implemented. If this item is not approved, most of the projects that are not included in the previous TIP will remain invalid projects and will not be eligible for construction or for using federal funds.

CONS: None.

TECHNICAL & POLICY IMPLICATIONS:

TECHNICAL: The TIP needs to undergo a conformity analysis for air quality purposes prior to being formally approved by the Regional Council and the Governor. The conformity analysis and the federally funded program also need to be approved by federal officials.

POLICY: Projects included in the TIP have been developed in accord with MAG policies regarding freeways, High Occupancy Vehicle Lanes, Transportation Control Measures and Transportation Demand Management. Approval of the TIP for a conformity analysis implies approval of the projects contained within the TIP, including agreeing that the allocation of federal funds is appropriate, and agreement that these projects should proceed.

ACTION NEEDED:

Recommend approval of the Draft Special FY 2004-2007 MAG Transportation Improvement Program for an air quality conformity analysis.

PRIOR COMMITTEE ACTIONS:

Transportation Review Committee: On September 25, 2003, the TRC unanimously recommended approval of the Draft Special FY 2004-2007 MAG TIP for an air quality conformity analysis.

MEMBERS ATTENDING:

- | | |
|----------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------|
| *Scottsdale: Jan Dolan, Chairperson | Goodyear: Grant Anderson |
| Phoenix: Tom Callow for Jack Tevlin,
Vice Chairperson | Guadalupe: Antonio Figueroa-Iturralde |
| *ADOT: Dan Lance | Litchfield Park: Mike Cartsonis |
| Avondale: Dave Fitzhugh | Maricopa County: Chris Plumb for Tom Buick |
| Buckeye: Carroll Reynolds for Joe Blanton | Mesa: Jim Huling for Jeff Martin |
| Chandler: Bryan Patterson for Patrice Kraus | Paradise Valley: Robert M. Cicarelli |
| Fountain Hills: Randy Harrel for Tom Ward | *Peoria: David Moody |
| *Gila Bend: David Evertsen | RPTA: Ken Driggs |
| *Gilbert: Tami Ryall | *Surprise: Scott Phillips |
| Glendale: Terry Johnson for Jim Book | Tempe: Mary O'Connor |
| | *Wickenburg: Shane Dille |

EX-OFFICIO MEMBERS ATTENDING

- | | |
|----------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| *Regional Bicycle Task Force: Pat McDermott,
Chandler | Pedestrian Working Group: Reed Kempton,
Maricopa County Dept of Transportation |
| *Street Committee: Don Herp, Phoenix | *Telecommunications Advisory Group: Greg
Binder |
| *ITS Committee: Jim Book | |

* Members neither present nor represented by proxy.

CONTACT PERSON:

Paul Ward or Stephen Tate, (602) 254-6300.

MARICOPA ASSOCIATION OF GOVERNMENTS

INFORMATION SUMMARY... for your review

DATE:

September 30, 2003

SUBJECT:

Consultant Selection for the MAG Air Quality Technical Assistance On-Call Services Request for Qualifications

SUMMARY:

The FY 2004 MAG Unified Planning Work Program includes potential consultant assistance for air quality planning and modeling activities. A request for qualifications was advertised on August 26, 2003 for technical assistance in development of air quality plans, conformity, modeling, and addressing issues resulting from a future court ruling on the Serious Area Particulate Plan lawsuit.

Three proposals were received by the September 25, 2003 deadline. They were submitted by Arizona State University Environmental Fluid Dynamics Program, ENVIRON, and Sierra Research. A multi-jurisdictional evaluation team consisting of Maricopa County, Arizona Department of Environmental Quality, City of Phoenix, and MAG staff will review the proposals received on October 1, 2003. A recommendation will be forwarded to the Management Committee.

PUBLIC INPUT:

None has been received.

PROS & CONS:

PROS: The procurement of on-call consultant services will enable MAG to obtain technical expertise to address issues resulting from a future court ruling on the Serious Area Particulate Plan lawsuit.

CONS: None.

TECHNICAL & POLICY IMPLICATIONS:

TECHNICAL: The procurement of technical assistance will provide consultant expertise to MAG in several areas, including: analysis of control measures, air quality modeling, implementation of control measures, air quality plan preparation, and transportation conformity.

POLICY: On July 30, 2002, a lawsuit was filed by Arizona Center for Law in the Public Interest challenging Environmental Protection Agency approval of the Serious Area Particulate Plan. The Center's arguments center around EPA's interpretation of Best Available Control Measures and Most Stringent Measures and its discretion in granting an extension of the attainment date. Oral arguments in the lawsuit were heard on June 9, 2003, and a court ruling is expected in the future. The consequences of a potential Serious Area Particulate Plan disapproval could impact regional transportation projects, programs, and plans. Technical assistance may be needed to remedy any deficiencies from the court ruling in the Serious Area Particulate Plan.

ACTION NEEDED:

Recommend approval of a selected list of consultants for the Air Quality Technical Assistance on-call services, for an amount not to exceed \$100,000.

PRIOR COMMITTEE ACTIONS:

A multi-jurisdictional evaluation team consisting of Maricopa County, Arizona Department of Environmental Quality, City of Phoenix, and MAG staff will review the proposals received on October 1, 2003 to reach a consensus on a list of qualified consultants. An update will be provided on the outcome of their evaluations.

CONTACT PERSON:

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

MARICOPA ASSOCIATION OF GOVERNMENTS

INFORMATION SUMMARY... for your review

DATE:

September 30, 2003

SUBJECT:

Approval of the Draft July 1, 2003 Maricopa County and Municipality Resident Population Updates

SUMMARY:

MAG staff has prepared draft July 1, 2003, Maricopa County and Municipality Resident Population Updates. The Updates were prepared using Census 2000 data as the base and housing unit data supplied and verified by MAG member agencies. The method used to calculate the updates was approved by the MAG Population Technical Advisory Committee (POPTAC). Because there was some question regarding the draft July 1, DES Maricopa County resident population control total, MAG used 3.4 million as an estimate of the County population. The DES POPTAC will be considering a final County control total for acceptance on October 24, 2003 and the Municipality Updates on November 21, 2003.

The MAG POPTAC recommended approval of the July 1, 2003 County and Municipality Resident Population Updates on September 23, 2003 provided that the final County estimate is within one percent of 3.4 million people. The State Population Technical Advisory Committee will be considering these updates along with those for the remainder of the State. The Director of DES is required to forward the Updates to the Economic Estimates Commission by December 15th of each year. The Updates are used to allocate \$23 million in lottery funds to local jurisdictions and to set expenditure limitations where appropriate.

PUBLIC INPUT:

None.

PROS & CONS:

PROS: The July 1, 2003 Maricopa County and Municipality Resident Population Updates are needed to gauge growth in the region, are used by member agencies for budgeting purposes and are required for distributing \$23 million in lottery funds.

CONS: None.

TECHNICAL & POLICY IMPLICATIONS:

TECHNICAL: The July 1, 2003 Maricopa County and Municipality Resident Population Updates have been prepared using a methodology that is consistent for all counties and municipalities in the State of Arizona.

POLICY: The July 1, 2003 Maricopa County and Municipality Resident Population Updates are needed by local officials to accommodate and budget for growth.

ACTION NEEDED:

Recommend approval of the Draft July 1, 2003 Maricopa County and Municipality Resident Population Updates provided that the final update is within one percent of 3.4 million people.

PRIOR COMMITTEE ACTIONS:

MAG POPTAC: On September 23, 2003, the MAG Population Technical Advisory Committee unanimously recommended approval of the July 1, 2003 Maricopa County and Municipality Resident Population Updates provided that the final update is within one percent of 3.4 million people.

Member/Proxy

George Pettit, Gilbert, Chairman
Apache Junction: John Petroff
*Avondale: Adrian Williamson
*Buckeye: Liz Zeller
*Cave Creek: Usama Abujbarah
Chandler: David de la Torre
El Mirage: Mark Smith
Fountain Hills: Denise Ruhling
*Gila River Indian Community: Terry Yergan
*Gila Bend: Ralph Vasquez
Glendale: Ron Short
Goodyear: Tony Widowski

Guadalupe: Gary Smith
*Litchfield Park: Horatio Skeete
Mesa: Tom Ellsworth
*Peoria: Prisila Ferreira
*Phoenix: Tim Tilton
*Queen Creek: John Kross
Scottsdale: Harry Higgins
**Surprise: Scott Phillips
Tempe: Ryan Levesque
Youngtown: Mark Fooks
*Wickenburg: Jerry Stricklin
Maricopa County: Matt Holm

*Those not present
** Participated via audioconference

MAG POPTAC Ad Hoc Subcommittee: On September 23, 2003, the MAG Population Technical Advisory Committee Ad Hoc Subcommittee unanimously recommended approval of the Maricopa County and Municipality July 1, 2003 Resident Population Updates provided that the final update is within one percent of 3.4 million people.

Member/Proxy*

Harry Higgins, Chairman, Scottsdale
Chandler: David de la Torre
Glendale: Ron Short
Mesa: Tom Ellsworth

Phoenix: Penny Colotoff for Tim Tilton
Tempe: Ryan Levesque
*Maricopa County: Matt Holm

*Those not present

CONTACT PERSON:

Harry Wolfe or Anubhav Bagley, MAG, (602) 254-6300.

MARICOPA ASSOCIATION OF GOVERNMENTS
POPULATION BY JURISDICTION
2000 CENSUS AND JULY 1, 2003

DRAFT - Based on a "placeholder" county control total of 3,400,000 -

DRAFT

Jurisdiction	Total Population			Percent Growth		Share	
	April 1, 2000 (Census)	July 1, 2003 (Draft)	Change	Overall	Annual	Share of Growth	Share of County
Apache Junction *	273	275	2	0.7%	0.2%	0.0%	0.0%
Avondale	35,883	54,100	18,217	50.8%	13.5%	5.6%	1.6%
Buckeye **	8,497	13,050	4,553	53.6%	14.1%	1.4%	0.4%
Carefree	2,927	3,225	298	10.2%	3.0%	0.1%	0.1%
Cave Creek	3,728	4,155	427	11.5%	3.4%	0.1%	0.1%
Chandler	176,581	208,760	32,179	18.2%	5.3%	9.8%	6.1%
El Mirage	7,609	25,505	17,896	235.2%	45.1%	5.5%	0.8%
Fountain Hills	20,235	22,120	1,885	9.3%	2.8%	0.6%	0.7%
Gila Bend	1,980	2,025	45	2.3%	0.7%	0.0%	0.1%
Gila River *	2,699	2,740	41	1.5%	0.5%	0.0%	0.1%
Gilbert	109,697	151,695	41,998	38.3%	10.5%	12.8%	4.5%
Glendale	218,812	230,730	11,918	5.4%	1.6%	3.6%	6.8%
Goodyear	18,911	30,395	11,484	60.7%	15.7%	3.5%	0.9%
Guadalupe	5,228	5,330	102	2.0%	0.6%	0.0%	0.2%
Litchfield Park	3,810	3,870	60	1.6%	0.5%	0.0%	0.1%
Mesa	396,375	434,585	38,210	9.6%	2.9%	11.7%	12.8%
Paradise Valley	13,664	14,220	556	4.1%	1.2%	0.2%	0.4%
Peoria *	108,363	126,585	18,222	16.8%	4.9%	5.6%	3.7%
Phoenix	1,321,045	1,388,310	67,265	5.1%	1.5%	20.5%	40.8%
Queen Creek *	4,197	7,390	3,193	76.1%	19.0%	1.0%	0.2%
Salt River	6,405	6,740	335	5.2%	1.6%	0.1%	0.2%
Scottsdale	202,705	217,695	14,990	7.4%	2.2%	4.6%	6.4%
Surprise	30,848	51,790	20,942	67.9%	17.3%	6.4%	1.5%
Tempe	158,625	159,620	995	0.6%	0.2%	0.3%	4.7%
Tolleson	4,974	5,420	446	9.0%	2.7%	0.1%	0.2%
Wickenburg	5,082	5,690	608	12.0%	3.5%	0.2%	0.2%
Youngtown	3,010	3,675	665	22.1%	6.3%	0.2%	0.1%
Unin-New River	10,740	11,010	270	2.5%	0.8%	0.1%	0.3%
Unin-Rio Verde	1,419	1,545	126	8.9%	2.7%	0.0%	0.0%
Unin-Sun City	38,309	38,640	331	0.9%	0.3%	0.1%	1.1%
Unin-Sun City West	26,344	26,345	1	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.8%
Unin-Sun Lakes	11,936	13,150	1,214	10.2%	3.0%	0.4%	0.4%
Unin-Other	111,238	129,615	18,377	16.5%	4.8%	5.6%	3.8%
Total	3,072,149	3,400,000	327,851	10.7%	3.2%	100.0%	100.0%

* Maricopa County portion only

** Buckeye's growth rate from 2000 to 2003 resulted in part from the transfer of the Lewis Prison population.

The Census Bureau had incorrectly assigned the prison population to the unincorporated area in the 2000 Census.

MAG is required to round the county resident population total to the nearest 25 persons and the municipality population to the nearest 5 persons.

Sources: U.S. Bureau of the Census Year 2000 Census, MAG Residential Completion database.

Prepared by the Maricopa Association of Governments, September 2003.

July 1, 2003 Municipality Resident Population and Housing Unit Update

Methodology

1. Using the Year 2000 Census as the base, determine the April 1, 2000 total housing units, occupied housing units, occupancy rates and population per occupied unit by unit type for each jurisdiction.
2. Calculate the new housing stock by unit type by municipality from the Census base by:
 - a) adding the residential units by unit type completed for the time period from April 1, 2000 to June 30, 2003.
 - b) subtracting the residential demolitions by unit type for the time period from April 1, 2000 to June 30, 2003.
 - c) adding annexations by unit type for the time period from April 1, 2000 to June 30, 2003.
 - d) subtracting de-annexations by unit type for the time period from April 1, 2000 to June 30, 2003.
3. Multiply the July 1, 2003 housing stock times the Census occupancy rates and persons per occupied unit.
Note: Housing stock, occupancy rates and persons per occupied unit are all by municipality and by unit type.
4. Sum the residential population in households components and bench to the county control total for population in households. In this case, a "placeholder" county control total of 3,400,000 persons was used. Add the revised group quarter population to obtain Total Resident Population for July 1, 2003
5. MAG is required to round the county resident population total to the nearest 25 persons and each municipality population to the nearest 5 persons.

July 1, 2003 Maricopa County Resident Population and Housing Unit Update

Methodology

1. Using the Census Summary File One as the base, determine the April 1, 2000 total housing units, occupied housing units, occupancy rates and population per occupied unit for total units for each jurisdiction.
2. Calculate the new total housing stock by municipality from the Census base by:
 - a) adding the total residential units completed for the time period from April 1, 2000 to June 30, 2003.
 - b) subtracting the total residential demolitions for the time period from April 1, 2000 to June 30, 2003.
 - c) adding annexations for the time period from April 1, 2000 to June 30, 2003.
 - d) subtracting de-annexations for the time period from April 1, 2000 to 2003.
3. Multiply the total July 1, 2003 housing units by municipality, by the municipality Census occupancy rate and persons per occupied unit and then sum to determine the County control total in accordance with the same practice used by DES to develop control totals for other counties in the state. For July 1, 2003, the number is 3,349,537.
4. Add population in Group Quarters as identified by DES. This results in a total July 1, 2003 resident population of 3,400,654.
5. The adopted county control total is rounded to the nearest 25 in accordance with DES requirements. Because no formal action has been taken on the county control total methodology by DES, MAG used 3,400,000 as a placeholder for the control total.

DRAFT

**HOUSING UNIT METHOD
MARICOPA COUNTY
JULY 1, 2003 POPULATION ESTIMATE**

HUM STEPS	AMOUNT	DESCRIPTION
1. 7/1/2002 TOTAL HOUSING STOCK	1,340,219	CENSUS 2000 PLUS COMPLETIONS UP TO 6/30/2002
2. 7/1/02 - 6/30/03 COMPLETIONS	43,140	COMPLETIONS CONFIRMED BY JURISDICTIONS (7/1/02 - 6/30/03)
3. 7/1/2003 TOTAL HOUSING STOCK	1,383,359	STEP 1 PLUS STEP 2
4. 7/1/02 - 6/30/03 ANNEXED UNITS	0	ANNEXED UNITS CONFIRMED BY JURISDICTIONS (FROM 7/1/02 - 6/30/03)
5. 7/1/02 - 6/30/03 DEMOLITIONS	79	RESIDENTIAL DEMOLITIONS CONFIRMED BY JURISDICTIONS (FROM 7/1/02 - 6/30/03)
6. 7/1/2003 ADJUSTED TOTAL HOUSING STOCK	1,383,280	STEP 3 PLUS STEP 4 MINUS STEP 5
7. EFFECTIVE 2003 TOTAL VACANCY RATE (a)	9.38587%	EFFECTIVE TOTAL VACANCY RATE
8. OCCUPIED HOUSING UNITS	1,253,447	STEP 6 TIMES (1 MINUS STEP 7)
9. CENSUS 2000 PERSONS PER HOUSEHOLD	2.67226	CENSUS 2000 AVERAGE OF PERSONS PER HOUSEHOLD
10. NON GROUP QUARTER POPULATION	3,349,537	STEP 8 MULTIPLY BY STEP 9
11. GROUP QUARTER POPULATION	51,117	DES ANNUAL SURVEY
12. 7/1/03 CONTROLLED TOTAL POPULATION (b)	3,400,654	COUNTY CONTROLLED PLACE ESTIMATE

(a) The effective Vacancy Rate is the 2000 Census Vacancy rate adjusted statistically to account for potential changes in population due to (b) below. It is not a new or different vacancy rate.

(b) Starting in 2001, the balance of county have been estimated as a separate entity. The sum of the balance of county estimate and place estimates will be controlled to the county estimate. As a result, the HUM place and balance of county estimate can change from its original calculation.

Source: Arizona Department of Economic Security September 2003

DRAFT

MARICOPA ASSOCIATION OF GOVERNMENTS

INFORMATION SUMMARY... for your review

DATE:

September 30, 2003

SUBJECT:

Memorandum of Understanding on the Regional Concept of Transportation Operations

SUMMARY:

The first comprehensive Intelligent Transportation Systems (ITS) Strategic Plan for the Phoenix metropolitan region was developed in April 2001, through the MAG ITS Committee. This Plan identified the need for developing a Regional Concept of Transportation Operations (RCTO), as the appropriate strategy for implementing systematic improvements to transportation operations in the region. In September 2002, a project was launched through the MAG Unified Planning Work Program to develop this Concept.

The approach to developing this concept is based on the following steps:

- Build a coalition through the development of a Vision and a Mission for the undertaking
- Document the current state of transportation operations in the region
- Conduct a full a review of the state-of-the-practice in transportation operations
- Set realistic goals and performance measures for the region to achieve in three to five years with existing infrastructure
- Recommend and adopt new and improved practices in the region
- Develop and execute a Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) on the Concept
- Begin developing the Operations Manual - a living document

The project is currently at about 90 percent completion and is expected to be completed by end of October 2003.

This undertaking by MAG is the first attempt in the country to develop such a regional concept. The USDOT and FHWA are monitoring this project closely and the approach taken by MAG is being incorporated into national guidelines. The SAFETEA reauthorization bill as proposed will require every urban region in the nation to develop such a concept or a regional strategy to improve transportation operations utilizing advanced technology.

PUBLIC INPUT:

None has been received.

PROS & CONS:

PROS: The implementation of the Concept of Operations will lead to significant improvements in surface transportation operations across the MAG region. The concept will lead to consistent operations throughout the region.

CONS: None.

TECHNICAL & POLICY IMPLICATIONS:

TECHNICAL: Needs for improvement have been identified in a number of areas pertinent to traffic operations and management. By expressing support for this MOU, member agencies are accepting the overall concept and willingness to participate in regional initiatives to improve operations.

POLICY: This project will generate information that will be useful to decision makers at MAG member agencies on resources that may need to be allocated to improve traffic operations and reduce congestion. Information on operations related system performance measures will be made available via the MAG website.

ACTION NEEDED:

Recommend approval of the Memorandum of Understanding on a Regional Concept of Transportation Operations for consideration by the MAG member agencies.

PRIOR COMMITTEE ACTIONS:

The MOU is identified an essential component of the Regional Concept of Transportation Operations project. On August 6, 2003, the MAG Intelligent Transportation Systems Committee reviewed and finalized the MOU.

MEMBERS ATTENDING

Jim Book, Glendale
*Alan Sanderson, Mesa
Mike Mah, Chandler
Mike Sutton for Bruce Ward, Gilbert
Nicolaas Swart, Maricopa County
Bob Steele, Phoenix
Bob Ciotti, RPTA
Iven Wooten for Terry Conner, DPS
Bob Maki, Surprise

Bruce Dressel, Scottsdale
Jim Decker, Tempe
Marian Thompson for Tim Wolfe, ADOT
Scott Nodes, Peoria
Chuck Hydeman, Goodyear
Mary Kihl, ASU
*Alan Hansen, FHWA
*Dennis Murphy, Phoenix Aviation
*Michael Smith, Avondale

* not present.

CONTACT PERSON:

Sarath Joshua, MAG, (602) 254-6300.

**Maricopa Association of Governments
Regional Concept of Transportation Operations
Memorandum of Understanding**

1. Introduction

The undersigned agencies have worked together in calendar year 2002 and 2003 to develop a Regional Concept of Transportation Operations. The Regional Concept of Transportation Operations is a regional strategy for achieving improved operations of the surface transportation system through the use of Intelligent Transportation Systems. It describes what activities are to be accomplished over the next 3 to 5 years, how they will be accomplished, and the resources required. The Regional Concept of Transportation Operations delineates responsibilities of city, county, and state agencies that, when enacted, will help to make the elements of the surface transportation system work better and together.

Transportation operations is making the best use of the existing transportation system by providing integrated systems and services that preserve and improve the system's performance in anticipation of or in response to both recurring and non-recurring conditions. Operations includes a range of activities including: routine traffic and transit operations, public safety responses, incident management, inclement weather management, network/facility management, planned construction disruptions, and traveler information. While static traffic control devices, such as roadway signs and striping have a significant impact on the performance of the system, and are an essential part of operations addressed elsewhere, they are not considered part of 'operations' in the context of the MAG Regional Concept of Transportation Operations.

The purpose of this Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) is to affirm the MAG member agencies' commitment to partnership in transportation operations. By signing this MOU, agencies are taking a significant step towards increasing the safety and reliability of travel within the MAG region, creating efficiency in the delivery of transportation services and infrastructure and smoothing transitions between city boundaries. MAG Region transportation system managers believe that when appropriate resources and funding levels are made available for operations and management, significant improvements to the transportation system in the MAG Region can be realized. These actions will result in a safer and more effective environment for first responders and transportation operations staff, and will greatly improve the quality of life in the MAG Region.

There is a growing national focus on regional operations cooperation and collaboration. The upcoming federal transportation funding reauthorization bill, entitled Safe, Accountable, Flexible, and Efficient Transportation Equity Act of 2003 (SAFETEA), indicates that regional transportation operations collaboration and coordination will likely be added to the list of eligible activities under the Surface Transportation Program, which potentially opens up a new funding source for transportation operations. In addition, development of a regional concept of operations is likely to be necessary for a region to qualify for such funding. The MAG region is well ahead of other U.S. metropolitan areas in development of a regional concept of operations.

This MOU is not a legally binding contract, and does not represent an authorization for funding.

2. Mission and Vision of the Regional Concept of Transportation Operations

Vision A safe, reliable, efficient and seamless surface transportation system for the MAG Region.

Mission This will be achieved through:

- Identifying and securing funding sources
- Actively managing and operating multimodal transportation systems
- A high degree of information sharing, integration and coordination
- Defining and agreeing to appropriate roles and responsibilities
- Establishing and implementing applicable policies, procedures, and practices
- Dedicating and training human resources
- Continuous improvement of performance against customer driven indicators

3. Responsibilities of the Undersigned

The undersigned agree to engage in the roles and responsibilities identified in the Regional Concept of Transportation Operations. These roles and responsibilities are identified under the following categories:

- Arterial Mobility
- Arterial Incident Management
- Freeway Mobility
- Freeway Incident Management
- Operations at the Freeway-Arterial Interface
- Transit Mobility
- Maintenance and Reliability
- Multi-Agency Coordination
- Travel Information
- Performance Measurement

The undersigned commit, based on available resources, to implement the Regional Concept of Transportation Operations as outlined in the Final Report. Resources required include both personnel and funding for planning, implementation, operations, and maintenance of local and regional transportation systems.

The undersigned will continue to cooperate in the development and implementation of policies and practices to facilitate the above named roles, responsibilities, and functions by participating in oversight and scoping that includes, but is not limited to, the following:

- Regional Transportation Engineering Collaboration
- EMS/Public Safety/Transportation Incident Management
- Freeway-Arterial Coordination
- Transit Signal Priority
- Shared Maintenance Resources
- Center-to-Center Communications
- Archived Data
- Local Traffic Management Centers/ADOT Traffic Operations Center Operators
Coordination
- Travel Information Collection and Dissemination
- Emergency Vehicle Signal Preemption Standards
- Education and Outreach
- Performance Measurement

The undersigned will disseminate the information in this MOU and notify all affected employees of the agency's participation in the Regional Concept of Transportation Operations.

4. Conclusion

The undersigned agency hereby supports the Regional Concept of Transportation Operations Final Report, dated 2003, and pledges to coordinate and cooperate with the other MAG member agencies that are signatories to this MOU in surface transportation systems operations in the MAG Region to make the elements of the surface transportation system work better and together.

Agency Name: (MAG member agencies including MAG to sign on individual sheets and then to be added to MOU)

Signed: _____

Name: _____

Title: _____

Date: _____

MARICOPA ASSOCIATION OF GOVERNMENTS

INFORMATION SUMMARY... for your review

DATE:

September 30, 2003

SUBJECT:

2005 Population Options

SUMMARY:

In October 2002, the MAG Management Committee established a Subcommittee on 2005 Population Options to explore more cost-effective alternatives to a Special Census for deriving a 2005 population figure for distributing state-shared revenues to cities and towns. To create the opportunity to use other options, state law needed to be changed to allow for methods other than a Special Census. This year State law was amended to allow for the use of a Census Survey, or a July 1, 2005 Arizona Department of Economic Security Population estimate instead of a Special Census for distributing almost \$1 billion in state-shared revenue annually. After extensive deliberations during ten meetings held over a 10-month period, the MAG Management Subcommittee on 2005 Population Options has recommended that MAG conduct a Census Survey, with a confidence interval of 95 percent plus/minus 2 percent, at a cost of \$9.4 million. Jurisdictions that wish to conduct a survey with the higher confidence interval – 95 percent plus/minus 1 percent, would be able to do so if they agreed to incur any additional local costs associated with the larger sample size (see attached table).

The Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) has agreed to allow MAG to use FHWA Surface Transportation Program (STP) funds to cover half the cost of the survey because of the data benefits offered by the survey, if all MAG member agencies agree to participate. The remaining \$4.7 million in survey costs would be allocated among MAG member agencies in accordance with the attached table. The costs for jurisdictions that wish to conduct a survey using the higher 1 percent confidence interval are also shown in the table. The proposed Census Survey would be conducted in September 2005, and MAG would need to enter into an agreement with the Census Bureau by March 2004 to pursue this option. MAG member agencies would be billed for their share of the costs of the survey at the beginning of Fiscal Year 2006 (July 2005).

The efforts of the Subcommittee could not have been accomplished without the support and guidance of Census Bureau personnel in the Denver Regional Office and at Headquarters in Maryland.

On September 10, 2003, the Management Committee was briefed on the process followed to develop the recommendation and informed that the recommendation would be brought forth to the Management Committee and Regional Council for possible action in October. Subsequent to the Management Committee briefing, another cost allocation table was prepared for informational purposes (see Table Two).

PUBLIC INPUT:

A citizen encouraged efforts to ensure he is counted in the Special Census.

PROS & CONS:

PROS: With about \$1 billion in state-shared revenue distributed annually, the rapid growth in the metropolitan area and the financial condition of member agencies, it is crucial to have a cost-effective method for deriving a 2005 population figure for distributing state-shared revenue.

CONS: Pursuing a Census Survey is less expensive than a Special Census but is subject to sampling error.

TECHNICAL & POLICY IMPLICATIONS:

TECHNICAL: The logistics of carrying out a Census Survey for the region will be demanding, but will carry certain benefits of economies of scale and regional promotional activities to achieve participation and staffing.

POLICY: The 2005 population counts will be used to distribute more than \$1 billion annually in state-shared revenues between 2005 and 2010. The ability to use Federal Highway Administration funds to defray a portion of the cost of a Special Census or survey will require that the entire region pursue the Census Survey option.

ACTION NEEDED:

Recommend approval of the undertaking of a region-wide Census Survey with the \$9.4 million cost to be distributed to member agencies.

PRIOR COMMITTEE ACTIONS:

MAG Management Committee: On September 10, 2003, the Management Committee was briefed on the recommendation that was advanced by the Management Subcommittee on 2005 Population Options and informed that the recommendation would be brought to the Management Committee and Regional Council for action in October.

MEMBERS ATTENDING

Terry Ellis, Peoria, Chair	Tom Martinsen, Paradise Valley
Mike Hutchinson, Vice Chair, Mesa	Frank Fairbanks, Phoenix
#George Hoffman, Apache Junction	John Kross for Cynthia Seelhammer, Queen Creek
Todd Hileman, Avondale	Jacob Moore for Bryan Meyers, Salt River Pima-Maricopa Indian Community
Joe Blanton, Buckeye	Roger Klingler for Jan Dolan, Scottsdale
* Jon Pearson, Carefree	Phil Testa for Jim Rumpeltes, Surprise
* Usama Abujbarah, Cave Creek	Will Manley, Tempe
Pat McDermott, Chandler	Ralph Velez, Tolleson
Dick Yost, El Mirage	Shane Dille, Wickenburg
#Tim Pickering, Fountain Hills	Mark Fooks, Youngtown
Richard Stuart for Don Steele, Gila Bend	Dale Buskirk for Victor Mendez, ADOT
* Urban Giff, Gila River Indian Community	Tom Buick for David Smith, Maricopa County
George Pettit, Gilbert	Ken Driggs, Valley Metro/RPTA
Dana Tranberg for Ed Beasley, Glendale	
Stephen Cleveland, Goodyear	
Tom Morales, Guadalupe	
Horatio Skeete, Litchfield Park	

*Those members neither present nor represented by proxy.

Participated by videoconference or telephone conference call.

MAG Management Subcommittee on 2005 Population Options: On July 11, 2003, the MAG Management Subcommittee on 2005 Population Options recommended that MAG conduct a Census Survey for 2005 figures for distributing state shared revenue; and that the costs of the survey be allocated in accordance with the cost allocation table. MAG members that wish to conduct a survey with a higher confidence interval – 95 percent plus/minus 1 percent – would be able to do so if they agreed to incur the additional local costs associated with the larger sample size as shown in the attached table. The subcommittee unanimously agreed that there is a benefit to collecting regional information and updating Census data, but disagreement on the cost-allocation formula. The motion was recommended with one voting no (*italics*).

MEMBERS ATTENDING

George Pettit, Gilbert, Chairman	Norris Nordvold, Phoenix
Charlie McClendon, Avondale	Jim Huling, Mesa
Prisila Ferreira, Peoria	*Patrick Flynn, Tempe

*Those members not present.

Management Committee: On October 14, 2002, the Management Committee approved establishment of a Subcommittee on 2005 population options to explore alternatives to deriving a 2005 population figure for distributing stated shared revenue.

MEMBERS ATTENDING

Peoria: Terry Ellis, Chairman	Guadalupe: Tom Morales
Mesa: Mike Hutchinson, Vice Chair	Litchfield Park: Horatio Skeete
Apache Junction: Pat Brenner for George Hoffman	Paradise Valley: Tom Martinsen
Avondale: Kristin Greene Skabo for Todd Hileman	Phoenix: Norris Nordvold for Frank Fairbanks
* Buckeye: Joe Blanton	Queen Creek: Cynthia Seelhammer
Carefree: Jon Pearson	*Salt River Pima-Maricopa Indian Community: Bryan Meyers
Cave Creek: Usama Abujbarah	Scottsdale: Steve Olson for Jan Dolan
Chandler: Patrice Kraus for Donna Dreska	Surprise: Bill Pupo
El Mirage: Stuart Brackney	Tempe: Amber Wakeman for Will Manley
* Fountain Hills: Tim Pickering	Tolleson: Reyes Medrano for Ralph Velez
Gila Bend: Shane Dille	*Wickenburg: Jerry Stricklin
* Gila River Indian Community: Urban Giff	Youngtown: Mark Fooks
Gilbert: Tami Ryall for George Pettit	ADOT: Dale Buskirk for Victor Mendez
Glendale: Ed Beasley	Maricopa County: Mike Sabatini for David Smith
Goodyear: Stephen Cleveland	RPTA: Ken Driggs

*Those members not present.

Participated by videoconference or telephone conference call.

Regional Council: On April 24, 2002, the Regional Council approved reserving at least \$6 million of MAG federal funds over a four year period (\$1.5 million per year) to keep our options open regarding taking a 2005 Special Census or using an estimate and to forward an assessment schedule to the MAG member agencies reflecting \$24 million over a four year period. The motion was approved, with one voting no (*italics*).

MEMBERS ATTENDING

Peoria: Mayor John Keegan, Vice Chair	Paradise Valley: Mayor Edward Lowry
Avondale: Mayor Ron Drake	<i>Phoenix: Councilmember Peggy Bilsten for Mayor Skip Rimsza</i>
* Buckeye: Mayor Dusty Hull	Queen Creek: Mayor Wendy Feldman-Kerr
* Carefree: Mayor Edward C. Morgan	* Salt River Pima-Maricopa Indian Community: President Ivan Makil
* Cave Creek: Vice Mayor Ralph Mozilo	* Scottsdale: Mayor Mary Manross
* Chandler: Mayor Jay Tibshraeny	Surprise: Mayor Joan Shafer
El Mirage: Mayor Roy Delgado	* Tempe: Mayor Neil Giuliano
* Fountain Hills: Mayor Sharon Morgan	* Tolleson: Mayor Adolfo Gamez
* Gila Bend: Mayor Chuck Turner	Wickenburg: Mayor Lon McDermott
* Gila River Indian Community: Governor Donald Antone	Youngtown: Councilmember Lucille Retherford for Mayor Daphne Green
Gilbert: Mayor Steven Berman	ADOT: Joe Lane
Glendale: Mayor Elaine Scruggs	ADOT: Dallas Gant
Goodyear: Mayor Bill Arnold	Citizens Transportation Oversight Committee: F. Rockne Arnett
* Guadalupe: Mayor Margarita Cota	
* Litchfield Park: Mayor J. Woodfin Thomas	
Maricopa County: Supervisor Max W. Wilson for Supervisor Don Stapley	
* Mesa: Mayor Keno Hawker	

*Those members not present.

Participated by videoconference or telephone conference call.

Management Committee: On April 10, 2002, the Management Committee recommended reserving at least \$6 million of MAG federal funds over a four year period (\$1.5 million per year) to keep our options open regarding taking a 2005 Special Census or to develop an estimate and to forward an assessment

schedule to the MAG member agencies reflecting \$24 million over a four year period. The motion was recommended, with one abstention (shaded).

MEMBERS ATTENDING

Wickenburg: Fred Carpenter, Chairman
Avondale: Kristin Greene for Scott Schrader
* Buckeye: Joe Blanton
* Carefree: Jon Pearson
* Cave Creek: Usama Abujbarah
Chandler, Donna Dreska
El Mirage: Stuart Brackney
* Fountain Hills: Paul Nordin
Gila Bend: Shane Dille
* Gila River Indian Community: Urban Giff
Gilbert: George Pettit
Glendale: Tim Ernster for Ed Beasley
Goodyear: Stephen Cleveland
* Guadalupe: Tom Morales
* Litchfield Park: Horatio Skeete

Mesa: Mike Hutchinson
Paradise Valley: Tom Martinsen
Peoria: Terry Ellis
Phoenix: Frank Fairbanks
Queen Creek: Cynthia Seelhammer
Salt River Pima-Maricopa Indian Community:
Jacob Moore for Bryan Meyers
Scottsdale: Peggy Carpenter for Jan Dolan
Surprise: Bill Pupo
Tempe: Will Manley
Tolleson: Ralph Velez
*Youngtown: Mark Fooks
ADOT: Mary Lynn Tischer for Victor Mendez
Maricopa County: Tom Buick for David Smith
RPTA: Ken Driggs

*Those members not present.

Participated by videoconference or telephone conference call.

CONTACT PERSON:

George Pettit, Gilbert, (480) 503-6864
Harry Wolfe, MAG, (602) 254-6300

MAG MANAGEMENT SUBCOMMITTEE ON 2005 POPULATION OPTIONS

Member	Agency
George Pettit, Chair, Manager	Gilbert
Prisila Ferreira, Vice Chair, Deputy City Manager	Peoria
Charlie McClendon, Assistant City Manager	Avondale
Jim Huling, Assistant to the City Manager	Mesa
Norris Nordvold, Intergovernmental Programs Director	Phoenix
Patrick Flynn, Assistant City Manager	Tempe

September 30, 2003

TO: Members of the MAG Management Committee

FROM: George A. Pettit, Chair
Management Subcommittee on 2005 Population Options

SUBJECT: RECOMMENDATION ON 2005 POPULATION OPTIONS FOR
DISTRIBUTING STATE SHARED REVENUES

Almost \$1 billion in state-shared revenues is distributed annually to local governments throughout Arizona using population as one part of the distribution formula. This includes state shared income tax, sales tax, gasoline tax, and vehicle license tax. Lottery funds are distributed based on annual population estimates prepared by DES and approved by the Economic Estimates Commission. State law provides for the population to be changed on all other distributions using only the Decennial Census, or a mid-decade Special Census. A 1994 amendment which allowed for use of a Census survey lapsed in June, 2001.

Because of the rapid growth of the MAG Region, member agencies opted in 1985, and again in 1995 to conduct a Special Census to provide updated population data for the state-shared revenue formulas. The cost of a Decennial Census is paid by the federal government, while the costs of a Special Census must be paid by the contracting local governments. In 1985 the cost of the Special Census to MAG member agencies was approximately \$3.5 million. The 1995 Special Census cost approximately \$9 million, with half paid by Federal Highway (FHWA) Surface Transportation Program (STP) funds. FHWA approved use of the funds to provide updated data to use for transportation modeling efforts in the rapidly growing urban area. Initial estimates secured by MAG staff from the Office of Special Census for a 2005 Special Census was \$30 million, based upon an estimated 3.6 million persons to be counted in the region. It was estimated that a maximum of \$6 million in FHWA funds could be available, making the net costs to member agencies \$24 million for a Special Census.

While growth in the urban area continues to be explosive, the characteristics of that growth are changing, and the effects of population formulas upon member agencies distributions is different. There is a likelihood that larger communities that are continuing to grow will actually receive less in state shared revenue as surrounding communities grow faster. Additionally, the financial condition of several communities as a result of decline in state-shared income tax receipts created financial concerns on paying for a Special Census.

Legislative Remedies

A priority for the Subcommittee was securing changes in State Law which would allow for the use of methods other than a Special Census to change the distribution formulas. The 2003 Legislative session approved an amendment to State Law which would allow for use of the following options:

- Census Survey
- Arizona Department of Economic Security population estimate
- Special Census
- Retaining 2000 Census population estimates

Analysis of Options

Over the past ten months, the Subcommittee met to discuss and evaluate the options to a Special Census. Each option afforded by the legislative change is presented below.

Census Survey

A Census Survey is a statistical sampling of the households in a community sufficient to secure enough data to statistically derive the total population.

The Census Bureau has indicated the cost of a Survey with a 95 percent confidence interval, plus or minus 2 percent would be \$9.4 million, assuming a 50 percent mail response rate. If the response rate is lower, then additional costs for enumerators to make follow up visits to secure the information will be added. If the response rate is higher, then the costs could decrease. The cost of a 95 percent confidence interval plus or minus 1 percent approaches \$20 million.

An extensive amount of time was spent examining the proper accuracy level to use for the Survey. The Subcommittee worked with the Census Bureau and examined two options, a 95 percent confidence interval, plus or minus 2 percent and a 95 percent confidence interval, plus or minus 1 percent. The Subcommittee recommendation is to use the 95 percent, plus or minus 2 percent Survey.

One of the major underlying concerns of the Subcommittee was accuracy and completeness of a Survey. As a by-product of that concern, Group Quarters (dormitories, prisons, nursing homes, and the homeless) are recommended to receive a special census, rather than Survey. This cost is included in the \$9.4 million estimated cost.

The Census Survey represents a cost effective approach to secure updated population information and characteristics for the region.

DES Estimate

The Subcommittee recognized that the DES Estimate approach would cost the least. However, the Estimate uses completed housing units as a source of estimating population, as well as Census 2000 base data, and does not provide any updated information on the characteristics of the community such as vacancy rates and household size which will be collected by the Survey and be of value in transportation and community planning for the next five years until another Decennial Census in 2010.

Special Census

The Subcommittee determined that the cost/benefit of conducting a Regional Special Census was not realistic or affordable. The \$30 million estimated cost is prohibitive when viewed in terms of the the overall ability to pay given the information received. A Special Census involves having a Census enumerator visit each household in Maricopa County. The logistical concerns over recruiting sufficient staff to conduct a door to door census was also of concern.

Retaining 2000 Population

There was little discussion on this option, since most communities in the region are continuing to grow. However, we recognize the value to communities who might experience population decline in the rest of the State.

The Subcommittee unanimously recommended the use of a Census Survey to secure a mid-decade census count for the Region.

Cost Distribution Formula

The costs of the previous Special Census was distributed on a per capita basis, since there was a relationship between the costs of collecting the information based upon the number of persons being counted.

However, as the Committee reviewed the technical sampling and relative costs of a survey to collect information to achieve the statistical accuracy, a discussion on the cost distribution formula resulted. In some cases, the number of housing units required to sample smaller communities approached or exceeded the cost of a Special Census, while statistical accuracy sampling was less costly in larger communities.

The final compromise formula recommended by the Subcommittee uses a blending of allocating costs on per capita basis for communities with less than 6,000 population and a projected growth rate of less than 3.5 percent with housing unit sample size for all other communities. In no case can the costs of the 95 percent confidence interval, plus or minus 2 percent survey exceed the cost of a Special Census (see Table One).

The Subcommittee further recommended that a community can choose to pay the additional costs associated with an improved accuracy level to plus or minus 1 percent, at their own choice. This recommendation assumes that all member agencies will agree to participate and fund the costs. There are additional costs associated with promotion and local efforts to assure that the return rate of the surveys is achieved.

The Subcommittee had one dissenting opinion on the cost allocation formula. The preference was to stay with per capita costs.

Subsequent to the Management Committee briefing in September, another cost allocation table was prepared for informational purposes (see Table Two). This table raises the population threshold to 15,000 for determining which member agencies would have their Census Survey cost allocated based on its share of the County's population; and reallocates the costs not incurred by cities with less than 15,000 people or less

than a 3.5 percent growth rate to the six largest cities in this Region (Gilbert is added), instead of the five largest.

Timing

The Office of Special Census has indicated that MAG needs to enter into an Agreement for a Census Survey by March, 2004. All member agencies would have to agree to participate in the Survey, which will also allow for half the cost of the Survey to be covered by FHWA funds.

The Survey would be conducted in September, 2005. The change in population distribution would be effective July, 2006 for the 2006-07 Fiscal Year.

The Subcommittee recommendation was presented for information and discussion in September and will be considered for possible action by the Management Committee on October 8, 2003 and the Regional Council on October 22, 2003. If recommended, MAG would use the FHWA funds to cover the initial costs of the Survey, and then invoice member agencies for their share of the projected costs. The final costs would be allocated in accordance with the recommended formula and actual population derived.

Acknowledgments

I want to express my appreciation to the personnel in the Census Bureau's Denver Regional Office and at Census Bureau Headquarters in Maryland who participated in our subcommittee meetings via teleconference, and provided valuable information and counsel to the subcommittee.

Additionally, Harry Wolfe, Rita Walton and others on the MAG staff provided timely information, explanations of the data and support to the subcommittee.

Finally, I appreciate the presence and participation of Norris Nordvold, Jim Huling, Patrick Flynn, Charlie McClendon and Prisila Ferriera in the meetings, deliberations and recommendations of the Subcommittee.

I can be reached at (480) 503-6864 if you have any questions or require additional information, or you can contact Harry Wolfe at (602) 254-6300.

Table 1
Comparison of Recommended
Net Survey Cost at 95% Confidence Interval +/- 2%,
Net Survey Cost at 95% Confidence Interval +/- 1%
and

Jurisdiction	Net Special Census Cost		Net 2005 Special Census cost based on share of 2005 population (after FHWA contribution)*
	Net survey cost (after FHWA contribution)*		
	95% +/- 2%	95% +/- 1%	
Avondale	\$138,800	\$430,500	\$469,800
Buckeye	\$128,100	\$128,300	\$128,300
Carefree	\$4,500	\$12,600	\$23,000
Cave Creek	\$5,800	\$16,200	\$29,500
Chandler	\$213,400	\$717,900	\$1,464,800
El Mirage	\$136,000	\$136,000	\$136,000
Fountain Hills	\$157,600	\$158,200	\$158,200
Gila Bend	\$2,700	\$7,500	\$13,600
Gilbert	\$146,700	\$535,600	\$1,165,800
Glendale	\$215,400	\$731,500	\$1,578,400
Goodyear	\$140,800	\$288,600	\$288,600
Guadalupe	\$7,000	\$19,700	\$35,900
Litchfield Park	\$5,000	\$14,100	\$25,600
Mesa	\$628,400	\$1,298,900	\$3,128,300
Paradise Valley	\$96,600	\$96,600	\$96,600
Peoria	\$205,200	\$684,500	\$970,900
Phoenix	\$1,260,900	\$4,437,200	\$9,397,600
Queen Creek	\$54,800	\$54,800	\$54,800
Scottsdale	\$272,500	\$988,400	\$1,519,500
Surprise	\$277,600	\$512,700	\$512,700
Tempe	\$206,300	\$712,300	\$1,053,300
Tolleson	\$6,600	\$18,600	\$33,900
Wickenburg	\$40,400	\$40,400	\$40,400
Youngtown	\$24,600	\$24,600	\$24,600
Balance of County	\$324,300	\$1,134,200	\$1,650,000
Total	\$4,700,000	\$13,199,900	\$24,000,000

Notes:

Balance of County = Unincorporated areas, Gila River Indian Community and Salt River Pima-Maricopa Indian Community

Unless all member agencies decide to go for a Census Survey or all member agencies decide to go for a Special Census, FHWA funds will not be available

Table 2
Comparison of Alternative
Net Survey Cost at 95% Confidence Interval +/- 2%,
Net Survey Cost at 95% Confidence Interval +/- 1%
and

Jurisdiction	Net Special Census Cost		Net 2005 Special Census cost based on share of 2005 population (after FHWA contribution)*
	Net survey cost (after FHWA contribution)*		
	95% +/- 2%	95% +/- 1%	
Avondale	\$138,800	\$430,500	\$469,800
Buckeye	\$128,100	\$128,300	\$128,300
Carefree	\$4,500	\$12,600	\$23,000
Cave Creek	\$5,800	\$16,200	\$29,500
Chandler	\$219,000	\$721,000	\$1,464,800
El Mirage	\$136,000	\$136,000	\$136,000
Fountain Hills	\$157,600	\$158,200	\$158,200
Gila Bend	\$2,700	\$7,500	\$13,600
Gilbert	\$159,900	\$543,000	\$1,165,800
Glendale	\$221,300	\$734,900	\$1,578,400
Goodyear	\$140,800	\$288,600	\$288,600
Guadalupe	\$7,000	\$19,700	\$35,900
Litchfield Park	\$5,000	\$14,100	\$25,600
Mesa	\$640,200	\$1,305,500	\$3,128,300
Paradise Valley	\$18,900	\$53,100	\$96,600
Peoria	\$205,200	\$684,500	\$970,900
Phoenix	\$1,296,400	\$4,457,100	\$9,397,600
Queen Creek	\$54,800	\$54,800	\$54,800
Scottsdale	\$278,300	\$991,600	\$1,519,500
Surprise	\$277,600	\$512,700	\$512,700
Tempe	\$206,300	\$712,300	\$1,053,300
Tolleson	\$6,600	\$18,600	\$33,900
Wickenburg	\$40,400	\$40,400	\$40,400
Youngtown	\$24,600	\$24,600	\$24,600
Balance of County	\$324,300	\$1,134,200	\$1,650,000
Total	\$4,700,100	\$13,200,000	\$24,000,000

Notes:

Balance of County = Unincorporated areas, Gila River Indian Community and Salt River Pima-Maricopa Indian Community

Unless all member agencies decide to go for a Census Survey or all member agencies decide to go for a Special Census, FHWA funds will not be available

MARICOPA ASSOCIATION OF GOVERNMENTS

INFORMATION SUMMARY... for your review

DATE:

September 30, 2003

SUBJECT:

Update on Compiling Information for Regionally Significant Development Projects

SUMMARY:

In December 2002, MAG Regional Council approved a policy for MAG staff to compile information on Regionally Significant Development Projects. In that same meeting, the Regional Council also approved a budget for MAG Regional Development Division to initiate several new programs, including Regionally Significant Development Projects. Regionally Significant Development Projects and its budget were included in the MAG Unified Planning Work Program & Annual Budget for FY 2004. The MAG FY 2004 Unified Planning Work Program and Annual Budget was approved by the MAG Regional Council in their May 28, 2003 meeting.

In their March, April, and May meetings, the Planners Stakeholders Group developed specific criteria for defining Regionally Significant Development Projects. These criteria were reviewed by the Executive Committee in their May 19, 2003 meeting. In that meeting, the Executive Committee added two policy clarifications: first, that building permits should trigger the evaluation of a Regionally Significant Development Project; and second, that the cumulative impact of all development approved in each calendar year should be presented in the Regional Annual Report. With these changes, the Executive Committee reached a consensus on the criteria for Regional Council adoption.

On June 25, 2003, the MAG Regional Council approved these criteria, which represent sizes of developments in several land use categories that create a transportation impact sufficient for the carrying capacity of a single freeway lane in one direction. Also, those criteria include both projects triggered by member agency building permit applications, or triggered by projects that require member agency council action.

In brief, the policy for Regionally Significant Development Projects is for MAG staff to compile information. The policy for compiling information on regional transportation impacts of such projects, and to share that information with the submitting member agency. In the Regional Annual Report, MAG will also prepare a summary of the cumulative impact of all Regionally Significant Development Projects that are submitted in calendar year 2003.

In July and August, MAG staff met with planning directors of the largest MAG member agencies to review the policy, the criteria, and to discuss potential large projects that may be submitted by member agencies in FY2004. As a result of those meetings, MAG staff developed a formal transmittal form that was mailed to all planning directors.

Additionally, in the July through September period, 10 Regionally Significant Development Projects were transmitted to MAG for compiling information on regional transportation impacts. As of September 30, 2003, these include the following:

- Peoria - Lake Pleasant Heights: 3,267 acres

- Peoria - White Peak Ranch: 3,985 acres
- Peoria - Saddleback Heights: 6,000 acres
- Peoria - Lakeland Village: 3,122 acres
- Queen Creek - General Plan Amendment: 590 acres
- Phoenix: Rio Salado Beyond the Banks General Plan Amendment: 4,500 acres
- Surprise: Municipal Planning Area Expansion, 45,567 acres
- Youngtown - General Plan
- El Mirage - General Plan
- Phoenix - General Plan Amendment: 971 acres

In the July through mid-September period, the Regional Transportation Plan was the focus for the MAG Information Services and Transportation modeling staff. Presently, MAG staff is coding land use information from the projects that have been submitted, and will be conducting a regional transportation analysis on all of them as quickly as possible in order to schedule meetings with the submitting member agencies.

PUBLIC INPUT:

None.

PROS & CONS:

PROS: Information from the preparation of the regional transportation impacts of regionally significant development projects, both in terms of key performance measures and costs, can be used by member agencies to evaluate the regional impact of large development projects prior to their entitlement, and to monitor the regional transportation impacts of all development in the region.

CONS: None.

TECHNICAL & POLICY IMPLICATIONS:

TECHNICAL: The technical implications of compiling information on significant development projects include identifying regional transportation performance measures and costs of large development projects, and monitoring the regional transportation impacts of annual cumulative development in the region.

POLICY: The policy implications of compiling information on significant development projects include possible recommendations by member agencies to mitigate regional transportation impacts of large development projects, plus possible regional policy recommendations as a result of monitoring annual cumulative impact of development in the region.

ACTION NEEDED:

Information and discussion.

PRIOR COMMITTEE ACTIONS:

The information to be compiled on regionally significant development projects was initially prepared by MAG staff from significant involvement and direction of the Planners Stakeholders Group; it was reviewed by member agency Intergovernmental Representatives.

On June 25, 2003, the MAG Regional Council approved the criteria for defining Regionally Significant Development Projects.

MEMBERS ATTENDING

Mayor Wendy Feldman-Kerr, Queen Creek, Chair
Mayor Joan Shafer, Surprise, Vice Chair
Vice Mayor R. E. Eck for Mayor Douglas
Coleman, Apache Junction
Mayor Ron Drake, Avondale
*Mayor Dusty Hull, Buckeye
*Mayor Edward Morgan, Carefree
Mayor Vincent Francia, Cave Creek
Mayor Boyd Dunn, Chandler
Mayor Robert Robles, El Mirage
*Mayor Wally Nichols, Fountain Hills
Mayor Chris Riggs, Gila Bend
*Governor Richard Narcia, Gila River Indian
Community
Mayor Steven Berman, Gilbert
Mayor Elaine Scruggs, Glendale
Mayor James Cavanaugh, Goodyear
Mayor Vinicio Alvarez, Guadalupe

Mayor J. Woodfin Thomas, Litchfield Park
*Supervisor Max W. Wilson, Maricopa County
Mayor Keno Hawker, Mesa
*Mayor Edward Lowry, Paradise Valley
*Mayor John Keegan, Peoria
*Mayor Skip Rimsza, Phoenix
*President Joni Ramos, Salt River
Pima-Maricopa Indian Community
Mayor Mary Manross, Scottsdale
Mayor Neil Giuliano, Tempe
*Mayor Adolfo Gamez, Tolleson
Mayor Lon McDermott, Wickenburg
Mayor Bryan Hackbarth, Youngtown
Rusty Gant, ADOT
Joe Lane, ADOT
F. Rockne Arnett, Citizens Transportation
Oversight Committee

* Those members neither present nor represented by proxy.
Attended by videoconference or by telephone conference call.

Management Committee: On June 11, 2003, the Management Committee recommended approval of compiling information on regionally significant development projects, including annual impact of cumulative development in the region.

MEMBERS ATTENDING

Terry Ellis, Peoria, Chairman
Mike Hutchinson, Mesa, Vice Chairman
George Hoffman, Apache Junction
David Fitzhugh for Todd Hileman, Avondale
*Joe Blanton, Buckeye
Jon Pearson, Carefree
Usama Abujbarah, Cave Creek
Pat McDermott, Chandler
Santos Hernandez for Dick Yost, El Mirage
#Tim Pickering, Fountain Hills
David Everts, Gila Bend
Urban Giff, Gila River Indian Community
George Pettit, Gilbert
Dana Tranberg for Ed Beasley, Glendale
Stephen Cleveland, Goodyear
Tom Morales, Guadalupe
Horatio Skeete, Litchfield Park

Tom Martinsen, Paradise Valley
Frank Fairbanks, Phoenix
Cynthia Seelhammer, Queen Creek
* Bryan Meyers, Salt River Pima-
Maricopa Indian Community
Steve Olson for Jan Dolan, Scottsdale
Bill Pupo, Surprise
Will Manley, Tempe
Reyes Medrano for Ralph Velez, Tolleson
Shane Dille, Wickenburg
Mark Fooks, Youngtown
Dale Buskirk for Victor Mendez, ADOT
Tom Buick for David Smith,
Maricopa County
Bryan Jungwirth for Ken Driggs,
Valley Metro/RPTA

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

Executive Committee: The Planners Stakeholders Group developed specific criteria for defining Regionally Significant Development Projects. These criteria were reviewed by the Executive Committee in their May 19, 2003 meeting. In that meeting, the Executive Committee added two policy

clarifications: first, that building permits should trigger the evaluation of a Regionally Significant Development Project; and second, that the cumulative impact of all development approved in each calendar year should be presented in the Regional Annual Report. With these changes, the Executive Committee reached a consensus on the criteria for Regional Council adoption.

MEMBERS ATTENDING

Mayor Wendy Feldman-Kerr Queen Creek, Chair
Mayor Joan Shafer Surprise, Vice Chair
Mayor Keno Hawker, Mesa
Mayor John Keegan, Peoria

Mayor Mary Manross, Scottsdale
Mayor Skip Rimsza, Phoenix
*Mayor Woody Thomas, Litchfield Park

* Not present

Executive Committee: This item was on the April 21, 2003 agenda and direction was given to get further input on the methodology from the Planners Stakeholders Group.

MEMBERS ATTENDING

Mayor Wendy Feldman-Kerr Queen Creek, Chair
Mayor Joan Shafer Surprise, Vice Chair
Mayor Keno Hawker, Mesa
*Mayor John Keegan, Peoria

Mayor Mary Manross, Scottsdale
*Mayor Skip Rimsza, Phoenix
Mayor Woody Thomas, Litchfield Park

* Not present

Regional Council: On December 11, 2002, the Regional Council approved the Regional Development Scope of Work and after an 18-month evaluation period, this would be brought back to the Regional Council for evaluation and a vote on implementation.

MEMBERS ATTENDING

Mayor Wendy Feldman-Kerr, Queen Creek, Chair
Mayor Joan Shafer, Surprise, Vice Chair
Mayor Douglas Coleman, Apache Junction
Mayor Ron Drake, Avondale
*Mayor Dusty Hull, Buckeye
*Mayor Edward Morgan, Carefree
*Vice Mayor Ralph Mozilo, Cave Creek
Mayor Boyd Dunn, Chandler
Mayor Robert Robles, El Mirage
Mayor Jon Beydler, Fountain Hills
*Mayor Chuck Turner, Gila Bend
*Governor Donald Antone, Gila River Indian
Community
Mayor Steven Berman, Gilbert
*Mayor Elaine Scruggs, Glendale
Mayor Bill Arnold, Goodyear
*Mayor Margarita Cota, Guadalupe
Mayor J. Woodfin Thomas, Litchfield Park

Supervisor Mary Rose Wilcox for Supervisor
Don Stapley, Maricopa County
Mayor Keno Hawker, Mesa
Mayor Edward Lowry, Paradise Valley
Mayor John Keegan, Peoria
*Mayor Skip Rimsza, Phoenix
*President Ivan Makil, Salt River
Pima-Maricopa Indian Community
Mayor Mary Manross, Scottsdale
Mayor Neil Giuliano, Tempe
*Mayor Adolfo Gamez, Tolleson
Mayor Lon McDermott, Wickenburg
*Mayor Daphne Green, Youngtown
Rusty Gant, ADOT
Joe Lane, ADOT
F. Rockne Arnett, Citizens Transportation
Oversight Committee

* Those members neither present nor represented by proxy.

Attended by videoconference or by telephone conference call.

CONTACT PERSON:

Jack Tomasik, (602) 254-6300

September 30, 2003

TO: Members of the MAG Management Committee

FROM: Kelly Taft, Communications Manager

SUBJECT: UPDATE ON MAG'S PUBLIC INVOLVEMENT PROCESS

At the Management Committee meeting on September 10, 2003, an issue was raised regarding MAG's Public Records policies. Chairman Ellis requested that staff provide an informational report at the next Management Committee meeting that explains MAG's public involvement process and how we provide public information. A presentation will be provided to the Management Committee regarding our public involvement process and how we respond to citizen comments and concerns.

MAG makes every attempt possible to thoroughly respond to citizen requests for information in a timely manner. Requests for public records are provided in compliance with the Arizona Public Records Law, which requires the requester to contact the public agency during normal business hours, and allows the agency to charge for copies of public records. Additional information must be provided by the requester when the request is for commercial use of the records, and additional charges may be added to the cost per copy. MAG makes all of its public documents available in the MAG library, located at 302 N. 1st Avenue, Suite 300, Phoenix. In addition, all published documents, including formal reports and meeting minutes, are available on the MAG Web site at www.mag.maricopa.gov.

MAG is formalizing its process for public records requests to ensure that all requests are processed in a timely manner and to prevent the possibility of any request "falling through the cracks." Utilizing a template from one of our member agencies, we have developed a MAG Public Request Form so that citizens requesting public records can more effectively communicate the exact record that is desired, and MAG staff can better respond to such requests in a timely fashion. Citizens requesting public records will be asked to fill out the Public Records Request Form. A copy of this form is attached for your review.

The Public Records Request Form will enable citizens to specify the documents being requested. The form will record the date the request is made and track the date the request is fulfilled. It will also note the name of the employee or employees who filled the request in the event any follow-up becomes necessary. The form includes a feedback section that will allow MAG to provide information back to the requester, such as whether any information was redacted or whether no record could be found.

It is important to note that the law refers to public records that are "in the custody of the agency." Public agencies are not required to create or produce documents that currently do not exist. In cases in which citizens request information that has not already been produced by the agency, we will continue to do our best to respond to their request wherever possible.

In addition to the development of a formal Public Records Request policy, MAG is reviewing additional enhancements to its public comment process. To continually improve MAG's public involvement process, members of the public familiar with MAG's process were invited to share their ideas on how the process could be improved. On July 29, 2003, MAG Executive Director Dennis Smith and MAG Communications Division staff met with citizens familiar with the MAG public involvement process, to review questions and concerns the citizens had regarding the MAG process. Fourteen issues of concern were brought forward at the meeting. MAG staff forwarded the information to MAG Chair Wendy Feldman-Kerr. MAG staff is exploring solutions to some of the issues raised by citizens, including potential procedural changes, as well as ways in which we can help clarify the process to citizens. We will forward any recommended enhancements to the Management Committee as soon as we are able to compile all of the information necessary to achieve the soundest solutions possible.

PUBLIC RECORDS REQUEST FORM

YOUR NAME: _____	PHONE NUMBER: _____		
ADDRESS: _____	City: _____	State: _____	Zip: _____
<p>I hereby certify under penalty of perjury that the requested records will not be used for commercial purpose as defined in ARS §39-121.03</p> <p>Your signature: _____ Date: _____</p>			
<p><i>The following information is needed before a records search can be conducted for your information.</i></p> <p>PLEASE PRINT CLEARLY</p>			
<p>If the record will be used for a commercial purpose, please state that purpose below:</p> <p>_____</p> <p>_____</p> <p>_____</p>			
<p>I would like to: <input type="checkbox"/> Review the requested documents <input type="checkbox"/> Purchase existing documents <input type="checkbox"/> Obtain photocopies of the requested documents</p> <p style="text-align: center; font-size: small;">(Full documents priced individually.) (Copying charges will apply based on page size and color.)</p>			
<p>Documents requested (please be as specific as possible):</p> <p>_____</p>			
REQUESTER, PLEASE DO NOT WRITE BELOW THIS LINE			
<p>Amount received \$ _____ Payment received in form of: Cash _____ Check _____ Other _____</p>			
<p>Employee(s) who filled this request: _____</p>			
<p>Date request filled: _____ <input type="checkbox"/> Picked up by requester on _____ <input type="checkbox"/> Left in requester's media box <input type="checkbox"/> Other _____</p> <p style="text-align: center; font-size: x-small;">DATE</p>			
<p><input type="checkbox"/> Enclosed is the record you requested. The record was not edited.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Per Arizona Supreme Court guidelines, the attached record has been edited due to confidentiality rights of individuals named within.</p> <p style="padding-left: 20px;">The following information was redacted _____</p> <p>_____</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> No record was found based on the information you provided.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Other _____</p>			

September 30, 2003

TO: Members of the MAG Management Committee

FROM: Denise McClafferty, Management Analyst

SUBJECT: 2004 DESERT PEAKS AWARDS

The Desert Peaks Awards were initiated in 1998 to recognize regional efforts and the cooperation of governments, citizens, and the private sector. The awards program fosters goodwill and serves as a reminder of the many partnerships and achievements in the region.

On February 26, 2003, the MAG Regional Council voted not to hold the 2003 Desert Peaks event due to local budget conditions. The delay also allowed jurisdictions to have additional time to develop projects for future submission.

At its September 15, 2003 meeting, the Executive Committee discussed whether to continue the 2004 Desert Peaks Awards event. In the past, the Desert Peaks Awards event was held in conjunction with the Regional Council annual meeting in June. The event has traditionally been a formal dinner with presentations and a television personality as master of ceremonies. The Committee discussed restructuring the Desert Peaks Awards event so that it would continue to recognize regional partnerships and consider the budget demands of jurisdictions.

The consensus of the Executive Committee was that the awards program is important to the region and that it should be continued. Members reviewed various options on how to reduce the cost and still have a quality event. The Executive Committee suggested that the awards continue to be held in conjunction with the Regional Council meeting in June. The event could begin with a substantial reception, in place of the Regional Council dinner, followed by the annual Regional Council meeting where the awards would be distributed. Another item discussed but not decided was whether or not to disclose the award recipients prior to the event.

To initiate the planning for this event, we are requesting guidance from the Management Committee on the suggested restructuring of the Desert Peaks Awards event for 2004.

Please let me know if you have any questions or concerns.

MARICOPA ASSOCIATION OF GOVERNMENTS

INFORMATION SUMMARY... for your review

DATE:

September 30, 2003

SUBJECT:

MAG Telecommunications Advisory Group Update

SUMMARY:

The MAG Telecommunications Advisory Group (MAGTAG), was formed by the Regional Council in 1994 to encourage the development of telecommunication infrastructure and applications which increase government efficiency, improve access to public information, and expedite delivery of local government services in the region.

To further these goals over the last year, MAGTAG has been conducting a series of informational sessions on telecommunications issues. Informational sessions so far have included a Government Information Technology Agency (GITA) update by GITA Director Chris Cummiskey and a panel discussion on Member Agencies and Public Safety Telecommunications with presentations on the Arizona Department of Transportation Freeway Management System, the Phoenix-Mesa 800 Megahertz Trunked Radio System, the Community Emergency Notification System and the Department of Public Safety internet protocol. Future scheduled sessions include: Cyber Security, Homeland Security and Wireless.

MAGTAG has also completed two projects: the Regional Connections project and a Regional Community Network (RCN) Study. The Regional Connections sites all have Internet, e-mail and a web presence. Many of the sites have expanded well beyond the startup configuration provided by MAG. The RCN Study was a joint project with the Intelligent Transportation Systems (ITS) Committee. The study itself is complete and the ITS Committee is now working to take the study to the next stage and is incorporating aspects of it in their own plans.

MAGTAG also has two exciting projects underway. These are the Digital Oasis Project and Regional Videoconferencing System. The Digital Oasis Project will encourage the development, certification and marketing of wired buildings. This project was a recommendation of the RCN study and will help promote infrastructure development. Additional high speed infrastructure will promote telecommuting and reduce trips in the region as well as help attract significant business investment and high-paying quality jobs to the MAG region. The Regional Videoconferencing System (RVS) has completed its first full year and is showing increasing usage. The MAGTAG is continuing to promote training and usage and has developed some new RVS marketing initiatives. A status report will be provided.

PUBLIC INPUT:

An opportunity for public input has been provided at every MAGTAG meeting.

PROS & CONS:

PROS: The MAGTAG update will educate and inform meeting participants of the telecommunications activities/projects at MAG.

CONS: None.

TECHNICAL & POLICY IMPLICATIONS:

TECHNICAL: MAGTAG provides a forum to educate MAG member agencies, decision makers and the public on telecommunications and information technology. MAGTAG promotes best practices of telecommunications and information technology through forums and meetings and facilitates communications among stakeholders. MAGTAG is a MAG modal committee that promotes the use of telecommunications for trip reduction and improved government services as shown in the Regional Connections, Regional Community Network and Regional Videoconferencing projects.

POLICY: The MAGTAG projects will educate our members and citizenry, strengthen our region's economic development through telecommunications readiness, link MAG member agencies, reduce travel and congestion, enhance collaboration among member agencies and strengthen public input.

ACTION NEEDED:

For information and discussion.

PRIOR COMMITTEE ACTIONS:

None.

CONTACT PERSON:

Heidi Pahl, MAG, (602) 254-6300