

**A RESOLUTION OF THE MARICOPA ASSOCIATION OF GOVERNMENTS  
AND THE ARIZONA STATE TRANSPORTATION BOARD  
REGARDING STATE AND REGIONAL MAINTENANCE FUNDING**

WHEREAS, the Maricopa Association of Governments (MAG) is the Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO) for transportation planning in the Maricopa County region; and

WHEREAS, through TEA-21, the MPO and the State are directed to cooperatively develop estimates of funds that are reasonably expected to be available and to cooperatively develop the highway program for the MAG region; and

WHEREAS, through ARS 28-6308, 28-6353 and 28-6354, transportation-related responsibilities given to MAG include planning freeway corridors, adopting freeway prioritization criteria, approving freeway priorities and approving material cost increases; and

WHEREAS, the Arizona Department of Transportation's (ADOT) stated mission is to provide a safe and efficient transportation system, together with the means of revenue collection and licensing for Arizona; and

WHEREAS, through ARS 28-304 and 28-305, the State Transportation Board is responsible for development and oversight of the State's Five-Year Transportation Facilities Construction Program and is responsible for policy and rule-making in areas such as priority programs; establishing, altering or vacating highways; construction contracts; and accelerated funding mechanisms; and

WHEREAS, MAG and ADOT recognize the need to address a shortfall in state and regional maintenance funding for landscaping, litter pick up and sweeping ("maintenance"), and that this deficit will continue to grow larger as more highway mileage is added to the state highway system without a corresponding increase in the maintenance budget; and

WHEREAS, the residents of the MAG region have invested several billion dollars for the construction of almost 150 miles of new freeways and the public sector has a responsibility to properly maintain these important community assets; and

WHEREAS, a Maintenance Stakeholders Group was convened at MAG with representatives of the Transportation Policy Committee, ADOT, the State Transportation Board, Governor's Office, Legislative Staff, and Joint Legislative Budget Committee (JLBC) to discuss options to address maintenance funding; and

WHEREAS, the Maintenance Stakeholders Group recognized that landscape maintenance, litter pick-up and sweeping are important to the quality of life of the resident of this region and to the image that is portrayed of this region to tourism and economic development prospects; and

WHEREAS, the Maintenance Stakeholders Group has acknowledged that State and Regional maintenance funding is a complex issue that will need a variety of approaches to fully address the issue;

NOW THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that the Regional Council for the Maricopa Association of Governments recommends working with the State Transportation Board for the Arizona Department of Transportation to support and enact the following:

- 1. Dedicate part of the extension of the half-cent sales tax for maintenance of the freeways:**  
On September 17, 2003, the Transportation Policy Committee (TPC) designated \$279 million of the half-cent sales tax to be dedicated for landscaping, litter control and sweeping maintenance for freeways designated in the Regional Transportation Plan for Maricopa County. This funding commitment is intended to supplement normal regional maintenance funding allocated by ADOT to ensure adequate maintenance of the freeway system.
- 2. Create a dedicated funding stream:**  
MAG and ADOT can work together to create a long-term funding strategy and process that provides a dedicated funding stream for maintenance. Additionally, firewalls should be created to protect these funds. A formula can be developed to accomplish an equitable distribution of funds. A dedicated funding stream can be accomplished through a variety of means, including:

  - ▶ Working with the Governor, Legislature and JLBC to explore options such as consideration for designating a portion of the Highway User Revenue Funds (HURF) for maintenance statewide and/or consideration for allocating a portion of Vehicle License Tax for maintenance.
  - ▶ Discretionary funds – Consider supplementing maintenance funding deficiencies by earmarking ADOT discretionary funds. Working together, MAG and ADOT can develop a plan to shift a portion of available funds so that there will be a dedicated set-aside for maintenance.
- 3. Track maintenance expenditures through the Annual Report for the MAG Regional Freeway Program and increase communication on the budget process:**  
Arizona Revised Statutes 28-6354 charges MAG with the responsibility of developing an annual report for the MAG Regional Freeway Program. This report reviews the fiscal status of the Program, reports on the progress made over the past year, and identifies major issues or concerns that could impact the Program. MAG is also required to hold public hearings to share the findings and solicit input.

Through this resolution, MAG will add to the reporting requirements the status of maintenance expenditures within the region. By tracking these expenditures in the Annual Report, there will be more public input and dialogue in the process.

Additionally, better communication and clarification of the maintenance budgeting process is needed in order for all stakeholders (MAG member agencies, State Transportation Board, Legislators and the Governor) to understand the process. There needs to be increased communication as to how capital, aesthetic and safety needs are reflected in the maintenance category. This would allow all stakeholders to participate in discussions when budgetary decisions are being made.
- 4. Partnering between ADOT and cities to encourage Adopt-a-Highway sponsors:**  
MAG member agencies will work to find and encourage corporate participants for ADOT's *Sponsored Adopt-a-Highway Program*. Annually, ADOT will provide a map of the regional freeway system that notes which sections are available for sponsorship.
- 5. Develop a long-term litter prevention program:**  
Research provided by Arizona Clean & Beautiful suggests that prevention programs can change public perception and habits regarding litter. Programs targeted at public education and litter prevention, such as litter fine signing, publications and brochures, videos for public service announcements and municipal cable channels, should be developed from various funding sources. Litter generating fees and taxes should be evaluated as a long-term solution.

PASSED AND ADOPTED BY THE MARICOPA ASSOCIATION OF GOVERNMENTS THIS \_\_\_\_\_ DAY  
OF \_\_\_\_\_, 2003 AND PASSED AND ADOPTED BY THE ARIZONA STATE  
TRANSPORTATION BOARD THIS \_\_\_\_\_ DAY OF \_\_\_\_\_, 2003.

---

Wendy Feldman-Kerr, Chair  
MAG Regional Council

---

Ingo Radicke, Chairman  
State Transportation Board

# **MARICOPA ASSOCIATION OF GOVERNMENTS**

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

**DATE:**

October 28, 2003

**SUBJECT:**

Proposed 2004 Revisions to MAG Standard Specifications and Details for Public Works Construction

**SUMMARY:**

The MAG Standard Specifications and Details for Public Works Construction represent the best professional thinking of representatives of several Public Works Departments and are reviewed and refined by members of the construction industry. They were written to fulfill the need for uniform rules governing public works construction performed for Maricopa County and the various cities and public agencies in the county. It further fulfills the need for adequate standards by the smaller communities and agencies who could not afford to promulgate such standards for themselves. The MAG Standard Specifications and Details Committee has completed its 2003 review of proposed revisions to the MAG Publication. A summary of these recommendations has also been sent to MAG Public Works Directors, in addition to members of the Management Committee, for review for a period of one month. If no objections to any of the proposed revisions have been suggested within the month review time frame, then the proposed revisions will be regarded as approved and formal changes to the printed and electronic copies will be released. It is anticipated that the annual update packet will be available for purchase in early January 2004.

**PUBLIC INPUT:**

Development of these revisions has been achieved during open meetings of the MAG Specifications and Details Committee and has included input from several professional contractor and utility groups and private companies. There have been no members of the public present to address the Committee, although there were some interested parties present during discussions on the possible implementation of Americans with Disabilities Act provisions with regard to curb ramps.

**PROS & CONS:**

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

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

**TECHNICAL & POLICY IMPLICATIONS:**

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

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

**ACTION NEEDED:**

Information and discussion.

**PRIOR COMMITTEE ACTIONS:**

MAG Specifications and Details Committee. Review and recommendations for the cases submitted for consideration were achieved throughout 2003.

VOTING MEMBERS

Doug Davis, Mesa, Co-Chairman,  
Rod Ramos, Scottsdale, Co-Chairman,  
David Fern, Chandler  
Mark Weiner, Gilbert  
Pat Thurman, Glendale  
David Ramirez, Goodyear  
Ted Collins, Maricopa County DOT

Steven Borst, Maricopa County ESD  
Keith Kesti, Peoria  
Jeff Van Skike, Phoenix (Street Transportation)  
Troy Hayes, Phoenix (Water)  
Bret Huskey, Surprise  
James Bond, Tempe

ADVISORY MEMBERS

John Ashley, ACA  
Baird H. Fullerton, ACEC  
Jim Grose, AGC  
Brian Gallimore, AGC

Jeff Benedict, ARPA  
Peter Kandaris, SRP Engineering  
Tom Domizi, NUCA  
Paul Nebeker, NUCA

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

CASE	DESCRIPTION	PROPOSED BY	VOTE DATE /Draft Date	VOTE
02-03	Section 321.6 - Corrective Req. AC for Deficiencies	MCDOT	3 Sep 03 3 Sep 03	8 Yes 0 No 2 Abstain
02-04	Section 710 - Asphalt Concrete	MCDOT	3 Sep 03 3 Sep 03	7 Yes 0 No 3 Abstain
02-14	Section 738.1 - Third Party Certification for HDPE	Scottsdale	6 Aug 03 4 Jun 03	10 Yes 0 No 0 Abstain
02-15/ 02-17	Section 603.3.2/601.1 - Trench Width	Scottsdale	3 Sep 03 3 Aug 03	9 Yes 0 No 0 Abstain
02-16	Section 603.5.5 - Affidavit of Installation	Scottsdale	3 Sep 03 22 Aug 03	10 Yes 0 No 0 Abstain
02-18	Section 601.4.2 - Bedding by Water Consolidation	Scottsdale	Withdrawn by sponsor	Yes No Abstain
02-20	Section 601.2.2.1 - Center Clearance of Multiple Pipes	Scottsdale	6 Aug 03 2 July 03	10 Yes 0 No 0 Abstain
03-01	Miscellaneous Corrections A, B (English) & C	MCDOT/ Gilbert	3 Sep 03 Various	10 Yes 0 No 0 Abstain

CASE	DESCRIPTION	PROPOSED BY	VOTE DATE /Draft Date	VOTE
03-02	Section 350.2 & 350.3 - Various Removals	MCDOT	2 Apr 03 5 Feb 03	8 Yes 0 No 0 Abstain
03-03	Details 252, 253 & 254 - Bus Bays	MCDOT	Carried over to next year	Yes No Abstain
03-04	Section 718 - Preservative Seal for Asphalt Concrete	Chandler	3 Sep 03 6 Aug 03	10 Yes 0 No 0 Abstain

\* Case approved as noted.

A summary of the above cases is shown as Attachment One.

**CONTACT PERSON:**

Paul Ward, MAG, (602) 254-6300

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

Date: October 1, 2003

**GENERAL INFORMATION:**

Case Number:           **02-03 (Carry Over)**  
Section/Detail:       **Section 321.6**  
Title:                   **Various Modification to Asphalt Concrete Deficiencies**  
Sponsor:               **Maricopa County Department of Transportation**  
Advisor:                **-**

**DISCUSSION:**

This case modifies Section 321.6 - Corrective Requirements for Deficiencies. Each subsection has been reviewed and modified to provide a clearer understanding of the testing frequency, the tests to be conducted, the acceptable tolerances, penalties and/or corrective action for each percentage point below the minimum standard, etc. The modifications in this case will improve the quality of the asphalt being placed.

**RECOMMENDATION:**

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

Draft Date:	September 3, 2003		Vote Summary:	Affirmative:	<b>8</b>
Vote Date:	September 3, 2003		Negative:	<b>0</b>	
			Abstention:	<b>2</b>	

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

Date: October 1, 2003

**GENERAL INFORMATION:**

Case Number:           **02-04 (Carry Over)**  
Section/Detail:       **Section 710**  
Title:                   **Asphalt Concrete**  
Sponsor:               **Maricopa County Department of Transportation**  
Advisor:                -

**DISCUSSION:**

This case modified a number of areas within Section 710 - Asphalt Concrete. Some of the modified areas are the elimination of the medium traffic asphalt concrete design, modifying the mix design criteria, clarifying and changing the production tolerances in field testing, establish sampling frequencies and standards for plant testing, etc. The modifications in this case will provide better control on the product the Agencies are receiving.

**RECOMMENDATION:**

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

Draft Date:	September 3, 2003		Vote Summary:	Affirmative:	<b>7</b>
Vote Date:	September 3, 2003		Negative:	<b>0</b>	
			Abstention:	<b>3</b>	

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

Date: October 1, 2003

**GENERAL INFORMATION:**

Case Number:           **02-14 (Carry Over)**  
Section/Detail:       **Section 738.1**  
Title:                   **Third Party Certification for HDPE**  
Sponsor:               **Scottsdale**  
Advisor:                -

**DISCUSSION:**

This case will require a third party plant inspection of all High Density Polyethylene Pipe (HDPE) manufacturers. The inspection will insure that the pipe is being manufactured by the current ASTM standards. Once the plant has passed the inspection, the certification of compliance will be affixed on the pipe. Also, this case further defines the information that will need to be placed on each length of HDPE pipe.

**RECOMMENDATION:**

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

Draft Date:	June 4, 2003		Vote Summary:	Affirmative:	<b>10</b>
Vote Date:	August 6, 2003		Negative:	<b>0</b>	
			Abstention:	<b>0</b>	

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

Date: October 1, 2003

**GENERAL INFORMATION:**

Case Number:           **02-15/17 (Carry Over)**  
Section/Detail:       **Sections 603.3.2 and 601.1**  
Title:                   **Trench Width**  
Sponsor:               **Scottsdale**  
Advisor:                **-**

**DISCUSSION:**

Because of their similarities, carry over Cases 02-15 and 02-17 were combined into one case. This combined case will allow the Engineer to make modifications in the width of a pipe trench. This modification can only be permitted when the contractor cannot achieve the required compaction in the pipe zone. This case will provide flexibility to the Specifications without sacrificing quality in installation.

**RECOMMENDATION:**

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

Draft Date:	August 22, 2003		Vote Summary:	Affirmative:	9
Vote Date:	September 3, 2003		Negative:	0	
			Abstention:	0	

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

Date: October 1, 2003

**GENERAL INFORMATION:**

Case Number:           **02-16 (Carry Over)**  
Section/Detail:       **Section 601.5**  
Title:                   **Affidavit of Installation**  
Sponsor:               **Scottsdale**  
Advisor:                **-**

**DISCUSSION:**

This case will, upon request of the Engineer, Plans and/or Special Provisions, require the manufacturer's representative to provide an affidavit that the contractor is familiar with the installation methods and procedures. Also, the case requires the manufacturer's representative to review the contractor's installation of the pipe. If the installation is not correct, the contractor will make corrections as necessary. The manufacturer's representative will then provide an Affidavit of Installation stating the contractor is complying with the manufacturer recommended installation methods. This requirement is currently in Section 303.5.5 for High Density Polyethylene Pipe (HDPE). This case will move the requirement from the HDPE Section and make it a requirement for all types of pipes.

**RECOMMENDATION:**

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

Draft Date:           September 3, 2003  
Vote Date:            August 22, 2003

Vote Summary:	Affirmative:	<b>10</b>
	Negative:	<b>0</b>
	Abstention:	<b>0</b>

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

Date: October 1, 2003

**GENERAL INFORMATION:**

Case Number:           **02-18 (Carry Over)**  
Section/Detail:       **Section 601.4.2**  
Title:                   **Bedding by Water Consolidation**  
Sponsor:               **Scottsdale**  
Advisor:                -

**DISCUSSION:**

This case was intended to provide further control in the placement and compaction of the material within the pipe zone. After several drafts, the Committee could not come to consensus as to the proper wording of the case. The wording considered did not fully or correctly portray the methods applied in the field and as a result, the proposed case could be misleading. Therefore, instead of creating additional misunderstanding, the Sponsor withdrew the Case.

**RECOMMENDATION:**

Based on the Sponsor's request to withdraw the case. No action is required at this time. This summary is for information only.

Draft Date:            -  
Vote Date:             -

	Vote Summary:	Affirmative:	-
		Negative:	-
		Abstention:	-

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

Date: October 1, 2003

**GENERAL INFORMATION:**

Case Number:           **02-20 (Carry Over)**  
Section/Detail:       **Section 601.2.2**  
Title:                   **Multiple Pipe Installations**  
Sponsor:               **Scottsdale**  
Advisor:                -

**DISCUSSION:**

This case places a condition on Table 601-1, Trench Widths, relating to the installation of a single pipe in a single trench. In some installations, the Table has been used for multiple installations which may not be correct. If multiple pipes are desired in a single trench, the Engineer will need to design for the condition and place the design criteria such as, the distance between pipes, type of back fill, etc. on the plans and/or in the Special Provisions. Because multiple pipe installations are not frequently used and because of the various considerations required for each type of pipe, the Committee chose not to insert a multiple pipe table at this time.

**RECOMMENDATION:**

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

Draft Date:	July 2, 2003		Vote Summary:	Affirmative:	10
Vote Date:	August 6, 2003		Negative:	0	
			Abstention:	0	

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

Date: October 1, 2003

**GENERAL INFORMATION:**

Case Number:           **03-01**  
Section/Detail:       **Details 502.2, 426 and 420.1**  
Title:                   **Miscellaneous Corrections (A, B & C)**  
Sponsor:               **Maricopa County Department of Transportation and Town of Gilbert**  
Advisor:                -

**DISCUSSION:**

This case will correct various typos, bloopers and other errors in the Details. None of the changes affect the meaning of the Details. This case was generated to provide a mechanism to ensure that the various errors will be corrected in the original documents. There was a total of three Details submitted for corrections this year.

**RECOMMENDATION:**

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

Draft Date:	Various Dates		Vote Summary: Affirmative:	10
Vote Date:	September 3, 2003		Negative:	0
			Abstention:	0

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

Date: October 1, 2003

**GENERAL INFORMATION:**

Case Number:           **03-02**  
Section/Detail:       **Section 350.2 and 350.3**  
Title:                   **Various Removals**  
Sponsor:               **Maricopa County Department of Transportation**  
Advisor:                -

**DISCUSSION:**

This case addresses various removal items in Sections 350.2 and 350.3. The case provides better separation for the removals of non-structural items, e.g., roots rubbish, etc. to that which is considered as structure in nature, e.g., headwalls, irrigation structures, storm water inlets, catch basins, etc. This will help the contractors in placing the correct cost for such removals in the appropriate item within the bid proposal.

**RECOMMENDATION:**

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

Draft Date:           February 5, 2003

Vote Date:            April 2, 2003

Vote Summary:	Affirmative:	8
	Negative:	0
	Abstention:	0

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

Date: October 1, 2003

**GENERAL INFORMATION:**

Case Number:           **03-03**  
Section/Detail:       **Details 252, 256 and 254**  
Title:                   **Bus Bays**  
Sponsor:               **Maricopa County Department of Transportation**  
Advisor:                -

**DISCUSSION:**

Initially, MCDOT wanted to make a couple of changes to provide some additional clarification to the Bus Bay Detail. In a review at the last regular meeting, the committee realized that none of the agencies use the detail and the changes proposed would not improve the Agency's use of it. As a result, the Case was carried over to next year to allow more time to develop a common Detail that would be used by the Agencies.

**RECOMMENDATION:**

Based on the action of the Committee to carry over the case to next year, no action is required at this time. This summary is for information only.

Draft Date:	July 3, 2002		Vote Summary:	Affirmative:	-
Vote Date:	-		Negative:	-	
			Abstention:	-	

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

Date: October 1, 2003

**GENERAL INFORMATION:**

Case Number:           **03-04**  
Section/Detail:       **Section 718**  
Title:                   **Preservative Seal for Asphalt Concrete**  
Sponsor:               **City of Chandler**  
Advisor:                -

**DISCUSSION:**

This case is two fold. First it changes the existing Type D generic polymer modified asphalt to a specific acrylic polymer asphalt preservative seal. This acrylic polymer is the latest product offered today and is used by two of the member Agencies. Second, the case updates the testing procedures and limits on the other types of seals.

**RECOMMENDATION:**

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

Draft Date:           August 6, 2003  
Vote Date:            September 3, 2003

	Vote Summary:	Affirmative:	10
		Negative:	0
		Abstention:	0

# **MARICOPA ASSOCIATION OF GOVERNMENTS**

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

### **DATE:**

October 28, 2003

### **SUBJECT:**

Draft MAG 208 Water Quality Management Plan Amendment for the Town of Buckeye Festival Ranch Water Reclamation Facility

### **SUMMARY:**

The Town of Buckeye has requested that MAG amend the 208 Water Quality Management Plan to include the Festival Ranch Water Reclamation Facility with an ultimate capacity of 4.0 million gallons per day. Reclaimed water from the facility would be disposed through reuse, recharge and a discharge to Wagner Wash through an Arizona Pollutant Discharge Elimination System Permit. The City of Surprise and Maricopa County unincorporated area are within three miles of the project, and both have indicated they do not object to the proposed facility. Please refer to attached Executive Summary and Clean Water Act Section 208 Checklist for the draft 208 Plan Amendment.

### **PUBLIC INPUT:**

A public hearing on the Draft MAG 208 Plan Amendment was held on October 16, 2003 at 4:00 p.m. No public comments on the amendment were received.

### **PROS & CONS:**

**PROS:** Approval of the 208 Plan Amendment for the Town of Buckeye Facility would make the facility consistent with the MAG 208 Plan. The MAG 208 Water Quality Management Plan is the key guiding document used by Maricopa County and the Arizona Department of Environmental Quality in granting permits for wastewater treatment systems in the MAG region.

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

### **TECHNICAL & POLICY IMPLICATIONS:**

**TECHNICAL:** The proposed Festival Ranch facility is needed to accommodate growth in the Buckeye Wastewater Planning Area.

**POLICY:** The MAG 208 Water Quality Management Plan is the key guiding document used by Maricopa County and the Arizona Department of Environmental Quality in granting permits for wastewater treatment systems in the MAG region. Approval of the facility would enable the facility to be deemed consistent with the MAG 208 Plan. Consistency is necessary for permit approvals.

### **ACTION NEEDED:**

Recommend approval of the Draft MAG 208 Water Quality Management Plan Amendment for the Town of Buckeye Festival Ranch Water Reclamation Facility.

**PRIOR COMMITTEE ACTIONS:**

Water Quality Advisory Committee: On October 16, 2003, the MAG Water Quality Advisory Committee conducted a public hearing on the Draft 208 Amendment for the Town of Buckeye Festival Ranch Water Reclamation Facility. Immediately following the hearing, the Committee unanimously recommended approval of the Draft 208 Plan Amendment to the MAG Management Committee.

MEMBERS ATTENDING

Roger Klingler, Scottsdale, Chairman  
\*Avondale: Esmeralda Avila  
#Chandler: Doug Toy for  
                  Jacqueline Strong  
#Gilbert: Lonnie Frost  
Glendale: Larry Brotman for  
                  Chris Ochs  
\*Goodyear: Joel Wade  
\*Mesa: Bill Haney  
Peoria: Steven Bontrager

Phoenix: Robert Hollander  
\*Surprise: Rich Williams  
\*Tempe: David McNeil  
Maricopa County: Dale Bodiya for  
                  John Power  
\*Pinnacle West Capital: John Boyer  
\*Salt River Project: Ray Hedrick  
U of A Cooperative Extension:  
                  Patrick Clay  
Citizen Representative: Eugene Jensen

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

**CONTACT PERSON:**

Brenda Day, MAG, 602-254-6300

# **MARICOPA ASSOCIATION OF GOVERNMENTS**

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

**DATE:**

October 28, 2003

**SUBJECT:**

Amendment to the FY 2004 MAG Unified Planning Work Program and Annual Budget to Accept Additional Federal Transit Administration Funding

**SUMMARY:**

A modification is being requested to the FY 2004 MAG Unified Planning Work Program and Annual Budget. The Arizona Department of Transportation has notified MAG that the amount of Federal Transit Administration (FTA) 5303 planning funds for 2003 has been increased by \$21,270. This funding needs to be added to the FY 2004 MAG Work Program.

**PUBLIC INPUT:**

No public input has been received.

**PROS & CONS:**

PROS: Amending the FY 2004 MAG Work Program and Annual Budget will make it possible for the additional funding to be utilized.

CONS: None.

**TECHNICAL & POLICY IMPLICATIONS:**

TECHNICAL: None.

POLICY: Under MAG budget policies, "modifications causing the overall size of the budget to increase or decrease in total, require the approval of the Regional Council or the Regional Council Executive Committee at a public meeting."

**ACTION NEEDED:**

Recommend approval of an amendment to the FY 2004 MAG Unified Planning Work Program and Annual Budget to add \$21,270 in FY 2003 Federal Transit Administration 5303 planning funds.

**PRIOR COMMITTEE ACTIONS:**

None.

**CONTACT PERSON:**

Becky Kimbrough, Fiscal Services Manager, (602) 254-6300.

# **MARICOPA ASSOCIATION OF GOVERNMENTS**

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

**DATE:**

October 28, 2003

**SUBJECT:**

Finding of Conformity for the Draft Special FY 2004-2007 MAG Transportation Improvement Program and Draft Regional Transportation Plan

**SUMMARY:**

On September 24, 2003, the MAG Regional Council approved the Regional Transportation Plan for an air quality conformity analysis. Also, on October 22, 2003, the Regional Council approved the Draft Special FY 2004-2007 MAG Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) for an air quality conformity analysis. MAG has prepared the Draft 2003 MAG Conformity Analysis for the TIP and the Regional Transportation Plan. The analysis indicates that the TIP and Regional Transportation Plan meet all applicable federal transportation conformity requirements and are in conformance with applicable air quality plans. Please refer to the attachment.

Following a 30-day public review and comment period, a public hearing will be held November 21, 2003 on the draft TIP, Regional Transportation Plan, and Conformity Analysis. The MAG Air Quality Technical Advisory Committee is anticipated to make a recommendation on the conformity analysis on November 24, 2003. Approval of the conformity finding by the Regional Council is required for MAG adoption of the TIP and Regional Transportation Plan.

**PUBLIC INPUT:**

The Draft 2003 MAG Conformity Analysis was made available for a 30-day public and interagency review period beginning on October 23, 2003.

**PROS & CONS:**

PROS: Approval of the conformity finding is required prior to approval of a TIP or Regional Transportation Plan by a metropolitan planning organization. The purpose of conformity is to ensure that transportation actions will not cause or contribute to violations of air quality standards.

CONS: None.

**TECHNICAL & POLICY IMPLICATIONS:**

TECHNICAL: Implementation of the TIP and Regional Transportation Plan will not cause or contribute to new violations of ambient air quality standards, increase the frequency or severity of any existing violations, or delay timely attainment of any standard or required emission reduction.

POLICY: The TIP and Regional Transportation Plan cannot be adopted until the conformity finding is approved. The Draft 2003 MAG Conformity Analysis is being prepared in accordance with MAG Conformity Consultation Processes adopted by the Regional Council in February 1996 and with MAG

Transportation Conformity Guidance and Procedures adopted by the Regional Council in March 1996. In addition, federal guidance is followed in response to court rulings regarding transportation conformity.

**ACTION NEEDED:**

For information and discussion.

**PRIOR COMMITTEE ACTIONS:**

None.

**CONTACT PERSON:**

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

October 28, 2003

TO: Members of the MAG Management Committee

FROM: Dean Giles, Air Quality Planning Program Manager

SUBJECT: CONSULTATION ON THE DRAFT 2003 MAG CONFORMITY ANALYSIS FOR  
THE DRAFT SPECIAL FY 2004-2007 MAG TRANSPORTATION IMPROVEMENT  
PROGRAM AND DRAFT MAG REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION PLAN

In accordance with the federal Clean Air Act, the Maricopa Association of Governments has prepared the Draft 2003 MAG Conformity Analysis for the Draft Special FY 2004-2007 MAG Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) and the Draft MAG Regional Transportation Plan (RTP). The analysis indicates that the Draft TIP and RTP satisfy the requirements of the federal transportation conformity rule and are in conformance with applicable air quality plans. A copy of the Executive Summary from the Draft 2003 MAG Conformity Analysis is being transmitted for your review, along with copies of the Draft TIP and the Draft RTP. Copies of these documents will be available at [www.mag.maricopa.gov](http://www.mag.maricopa.gov), and are available upon request. Comments on the Draft 2003 MAG Conformity Analysis are requested by November 21, 2003.

The Draft 2003 MAG Conformity Analysis was made available for public review and comment beginning October 23, 2003. The minimum 30-day public comment period will be followed by a public hearing to be conducted on November 21, 2003. After considering the public comments, the MAG Air Quality Technical Advisory Committee may make a recommendation on the Draft 2003 MAG Conformity Analysis on November 24, 2003. The MAG Regional Council may take action on these documents at the November 25, 2003 meeting. If you have any questions about the Draft 2003 MAG Conformity Analysis, please call me at (602) 254-6300.

Attachments

cc: Intergovernmental Representatives

# **MARICOPA ASSOCIATION OF GOVERNMENTS**

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

**DATE:**

October 28, 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 one percent, would be able to do so if they agreed to incur any additional local costs associated with the larger sample size.

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 Three. 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. At the October Management Committee meeting it was requested that action on the recommendation be deferred to November to provide additional time for evaluation.

On October 24, 2003, a 2005 Population Options Workshop was held at MAG to review the process that the Subcommittee used to reach its recommendation. At the Workshop new tables were distributed showing the revenue implications of using a 2005 population figure based upon recently approved July 1, 2003 MAG estimates; and the potential costs that would be incurred to undertake a 2005 Census Survey or a 2005 Special Census. Those tables are attached.

**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 2006 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 October 8, 2003, the Management Committee was briefed on the recommendation that was advanced by the Management Subcommittee on 2005 Population Options. It was requested that action be deferred until the November Management Committee meeting.

MEMBERS ATTENDING

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

\*Those members neither present nor represented by proxy.

# Participated by videoconference or telephone conference call.

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	Todd Hileman, Avondale
Mike Hutchinson, Vice Chair, Mesa	Joe Blanton, Buckeye
#George Hoffman, Apache Junction	* Jon Pearson, Carefree

\* Usama Abujbarah, Cave Creek  
Pat McDermott, Chandler  
Dick Yost, El Mirage  
#Tim Pickering, Fountain Hills  
Richard Stuart for Don Steele, 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  
John Kross for Cynthia Seelhammer,

Queen Creek  
Jacob Moore for Bryan Meyers, Salt  
River Pima-Maricopa Indian Community  
Roger Klingler for Jan Dolan,  
Scottsdale  
Phil Testa for Jim Rumpeltes, Surprise  
Will Manley, Tempe  
Ralph Velez, Tolleson  
Shane Dille, Wickenburg  
Mark Fooks, Youngtown  
Dale Buskirk for Victor Mendez, ADOT  
Tom Buick for David Smith,  
Maricopa County  
Ken Driggs, Valley Metro/RPTA

\*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. 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  
*Charlie McClendon, Avondale*  
Prisila Ferreira, Peoria

Norris Nordvold, Phoenix  
Jim Huling, Mesa  
\*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  
Mesa: Mike Hutchinson, Vice Chair  
Apache Junction: Pat Brenner for  
George Hoffman  
Avondale: Kristin Greene Skabo for  
Todd Hileman  
\* Buckeye: Joe Blanton  
Carefree: Jon Pearson  
Cave Creek: Usama Abujbarah  
Chandler: Patrice Kraus for Donna Dreska  
El Mirage: Stuart Brackney  
\* Fountain Hills: Tim Pickering  
Gila Bend: Shane Dille  
\* Gila River Indian Community: Urban Giff  
Gilbert: Tami Ryall for George Pettit  
Glendale: Ed Beasley  
Goodyear: Stephen Cleveland

Guadalupe: Tom Morales  
Litchfield Park: Horatio Skeete  
Paradise Valley: Tom Martinsen  
Phoenix: Norris Nordvold for Frank Fairbanks  
Queen Creek: Cynthia Seelhammer  
\*Salt River Pima-Maricopa Indian Community:  
Bryan Meyers  
Scottsdale: Steve Olson for Jan Dolan  
Surprise: Bill Pupo  
Tempe: Amber Wakeman for Will Manley  
Tolleson: Reyes Medrano for Ralph Velez  
\*Wickenburg: Jerry Stricklin  
Youngtown: Mark Fooks  
ADOT: Dale Buskirk for Victor Mendez  
Maricopa County: Mike Sabatini for  
David Smith  
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  
Avondale: Mayor Ron Drake  
\* Buckeye: Mayor Dusty Hull  
\* Carefree: Mayor Edward C. Morgan  
\* Cave Creek: Vice Mayor Ralph Mozilo  
\* Chandler: Mayor Jay Tibshraeny  
El Mirage: Mayor Roy Delgado  
\* Fountain Hills: Mayor Sharon Morgan  
\* Gila Bend: Mayor Chuck Turner  
\* Gila River Indian Community: Governor Donald Antone  
Gilbert: Mayor Steven Berman  
Glendale: Mayor Elaine Scruggs  
Goodyear: Mayor Bill Arnold  
\* Guadalupe: Mayor Margarita Cota  
\* Litchfield Park: Mayor J. Woodfin Thomas  
Maricopa County: Supervisor Max W. Wilson for Supervisor Don Stapley  
\* Mesa: Mayor Keno Hawker

Paradise Valley: Mayor Edward Lowry  
*Phoenix: Councilmember Peggy Bilsten for Mayor Skip Rimsza*  
Queen Creek: Mayor Wendy Feldman-Kerr

\* Salt River Pima-Maricopa Indian Community: President Ivan Makil  
\* Scottsdale: Mayor Mary Manross  
Surprise: Mayor Joan Shafer  
\* Tempe: Mayor Neil Giuliano  
\* Tolleson: Mayor Adolfo Gamez  
Wickenburg: Mayor Lon McDermott  
Youngtown: Councilmember Lucille Retherford for Mayor Daphne Green  
ADOT: Joe Lane  
ADOT: Dallas Gant  
Citizens Transportation Oversight Committee: F. Rockne Arnett

\*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

<b>Member</b>	<b>Agency</b>
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

October 28, 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.

The 2003 Legislative session approved an amendment to State Law which would allow for use of the following options for distributing state-shared revenues:

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

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. Although the cost of a Decennial Census is paid by the federal government, 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 Administration (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. Estimates on the cost of a Special Census at this time are \$31 million, based upon an estimated 3.6 million persons to be counted in the region. If all MAG member agencies agreed to participate in the Special Census \$6 million in FHWA funds could be made available, making the net costs to member agencies \$25 million for a Special Census.

In October 2002, the MAG Management Committee established a Subcommittee on 2005 Population Options to explore the advantages and disadvantages for deriving a 2005 population number for distributing state-shared revenues. The objective of the Committee was to seek a “regional solution” for obtaining a 2005 population figure for distributing state-shared revenues to take advantage of the \$6 million in FHWA

revenue that would be made available to defray the cost if all member agencies agreed to pursue the same option (a Special Census or a Census Survey).

George Pettit, Chairman of the MAG Population Technical Advisory Committee and Manager of Gilbert, served as the Chair of the Subcommittee and Prisila Ferreira, Deputy Manager of Peoria, served as the Vice Chair. Managers/Intergovernmental Coordinators of Tempe, Mesa, Avondale and Phoenix also served on the Subcommittee.

Between October 2002 and July 2003, the Subcommittee met ten times to discuss and evaluate a range of options for a 2005 population number. The 2005 population was estimated for each city and town by taking the average annual percentage growth between April 1, 2000 and June 30, 2002 from the DES/MAG population estimates, and assuming the growth rate continued through October 2005. The one exception was for the City of El Mirage. Its average annual growth rate was capped at 30%, because its average annual growth rate for the period in question was unlikely to be sustained over the 5.5 year period within the existing corporate limits. Draft July 1, 2003 population estimates have recently been substituted for jurisdictions within Maricopa County.

Each option explored by the Subcommittee is presented as follows:

#### 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 approached \$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.

The Census Bureau calculated the size of the sample for each jurisdiction based upon the following factors:

- The reliability factor (i.e. 95 percent confidence interval plus/minus 2 percent)
- The variation in the number of persons per housing unit across all units in the jurisdiction
- The size of the sample relative to the total housing units in a jurisdiction.
- The number of samples taken (one for each jurisdiction, except Mesa and Phoenix. Those jurisdictions requested that two and five subregions within their jurisdiction be sampled respectively.)

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) were recommended to receive a full count, rather than Survey. This cost is included in the \$9.4 million estimated total cost.

The Census Survey is a more cost effective approach than a Special Census to secure updated population information.

DES Estimate

The Subcommittee recognized that the DES Estimate approach would cost the least. There would be no cost assuming that no surveys were conducted in connection with the estimate. 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. Therefore the 2000 vacancy rate and household size would likely be used for the 2005 estimate.

Other concerns with the use of an estimate included: the availability and reliability of the necessary input data; potential for underestimating population of MAG member agencies based upon experience in 1990, 1995 and 2000; uncertainty over the methods that would be used to derive the 2005 population estimates and the application of these methods.

Special Census

The Subcommittee determined that the cost/benefit of conducting a Regional Special Census was not realistic or affordable. The \$31 million estimated cost is prohibitive when viewed in terms of other priorities in this economic climate. Additionally a Special Census involves having a Census enumerator visit each household in Mariposa County. The logistical concerns over recruiting sufficient staff to conduct a door to door census for the entire region 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 derive 2005 population figures for the Region.

Cost Distribution Formula

The costs of the previous Special Census were 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 accurate sampling was less costly in larger communities.

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

The Subcommittee further recommended that if a jurisdiction chose to use a 95 percent confidence interval plus/minus 1 percent, it could do so as long as it paid the additional associated costs of the survey after the federal share was applied to the extent that federal funds remained available. (FHWA indicated a maximum federal contribution of \$6 million.) The costs noted do not include the 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 the allocation formula recommended.

### 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, in order to 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 and would continue to be used for distributing state-shared revenue until the 2010 Decennial Census.

The Subcommittee recommendation was presented to the Management Committee for information and discussion in September and October of 2003. If all agencies participate, MAG would use the FHWA funds to cover the initial costs of the Survey (15 percent of costs due in March 2004 and 5 percent due in June 2004), and then invoice member agencies for their share of the projected costs in June 2005. The final costs would be allocated in accordance with the recommended formula and actual population derived.

On October 24, 2003 MAG held a Workshop on 2005 Population Options to explain the process by which the Subcommittee reached its recommendation and to respond to questions. At the Workshop tables were distributed showing the revenue implications of using a 2005 population figure based upon growth rates between April 1, 2000 and the July 1, 2003 MAG Resident Population Estimates approved by the MAG Regional Council on October 22, 2003; and the potential costs that would be incurred to undertake a 2005 Census Survey or a 2005 Special Census. Those tables are attached.

The Management Committee will be considering the recommendation of the Subcommittee on 2005 Population Options on November 5, 2003.

**Table 1**  
**Population Data and Housing Sample Size**  
**Used to Derive the Cost of the Special Census**  
**and the Census Survey with a 95% Confidence Interval Plus/Minus 2 Percent**

Jurisdiction	2% Housing Unit Sample Size	Number of Samples	Population April 1, 2000	Population July 1, 2003	Annual Growth	Estimated Population October 2005
Avondale	3,180	1	35,883	54,100	13.47%	71,900
Buckeye	2,935	1	8,497	13,050	14.11%	17,600
Carefree	1,625	1	2,927	3,225	3.03%	3,400
Cave Creek	1,440	1	3,728	4,155	3.39%	4,500
Chandler	4,635	1	176,581	208,760	5.29%	234,400
El Mirage	4,395	1	7,609	25,505	30.00%	32,200
Fountain Hills	3,610	1	20,235	22,120	2.78%	23,500
Gila Bend	700	1	1,980	2,025	0.69%	2,100
Gilbert	3,360	1	109,697	151,695	10.49%	189,900
Glendale	4,660	1	218,812	230,730	1.65%	239,400
Goodyear	3,225	1	18,911	30,395	15.72%	42,200
Guadalupe	925	1	5,228	5,330	0.60%	5,400
Litchfield Park	1,180	1	3,810	3,870	0.48%	3,900
Mesa	13,850	2	396,375	434,585	2.87%	463,200
Paradise Valley	2,275	1	13,664	14,220	1.23%	14,600
Peoria	4,700	1	108,364	126,585	4.90%	141,000
Phoenix	27,250	5	1,321,045	1,388,310	1.54%	1,436,900
Queen Creek	1,295	1	4,316	7,510	18.58%	11,000
Scottsdale	5,980	1	202,705	217,695	2.22%	228,700
Surprise	6,360	1	30,848	51,790	17.28%	74,100
Tempe	4,725	1	158,625	159,620	0.19%	160,300
Tolleson	1,075	1	4,974	5,420	2.68%	5,800
Wickenburg	2,015	1	5,082	5,690	3.54%	6,200
Youngtown	1,555	1	3,010	3,675	6.33%	4,200
Balance of County	7,430	1	209,090	229,493	2.91%	244,800
<b>Total</b>	<b>114,380</b>		<b>3,071,996</b>	<b>3,399,553</b>	<b>3.17%</b>	<b>3,661,200</b>

Notes:

**The annual growth is based upon growth in DES/MAG population estimates between April 1, 2000 and June 30, 2003. These numbers are draft and subject to change.**

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

These numbers include calculations for the portions of Queen Creek and Peoria outside of Maricopa County

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

Apache Junction has requested that the City be included in the Census Survey. The Census Bureau has been requested to estimate the sample size and the cost of such a survey

State-shared revenues to cities and towns assumed to be \$985 million annually

Average annual growth rate capped at 30 percent

Numbers may not add due to rounding

**Table 2**  
**State Shared Revenue Based on 2000 and 2005 Population**  
**and Annual Differences in Revenue**

Jurisdiction*	Census 2000	DES/MAG July 1, 2003	Annual Growth	Estimated October 2005	Estimated SSR 2000	Estimated SSR 2005	Difference
El Mirage	7,609	25,505	30.00%	32,200	\$1,852,000	\$6,709,000	\$4,857,000
Queen Creek	4,316	7,510	18.58%	11,000	\$1,051,000	\$2,295,000	\$1,244,000
Surprise	30,848	51,790	17.28%	74,100	\$7,508,000	\$15,442,000	\$7,934,000
Goodyear	18,911	30,395	15.72%	42,200	\$4,603,000	\$8,793,000	\$4,190,000
Buckeye	8,497	13,050	14.10%	17,600	\$2,069,000	\$3,657,000	\$1,588,000
Avondale	35,883	54,100	13.47%	71,900	\$8,734,000	\$14,973,000	\$6,239,000
Gilbert	109,697	151,695	10.49%	189,900	\$26,701,000	\$39,545,000	\$12,844,000
Youngtown	3,010	3,675	6.33%	4,200	\$733,000	\$879,000	\$146,000
Chandler	176,581	208,760	5.29%	234,400	\$42,980,000	\$48,825,000	\$5,845,000
Peoria	108,364	126,585	4.90%	141,000	\$26,376,000	\$29,361,000	\$2,985,000
Wickenburg	5,082	5,690	3.54%	6,200	\$1,237,000	\$1,282,000	\$45,000
Cave Creek	3,728	4,155	3.39%	4,500	\$907,000	\$933,000	\$26,000
Carefree	2,927	3,225	3.03%	3,400	\$712,000	\$718,000	\$6,000
Balance of County*	209,090	229,493	2.91%	244,800	*	*	*
Mesa	396,375	434,585	2.87%	463,200	\$96,479,000	\$96,473,000	(\$6,000)
Fountain Hills	20,235	22,120	2.78%	23,500	\$4,925,000	\$4,900,000	(\$25,000)
Tolleson	4,974	5,420	2.68%	5,800	\$1,211,000	\$1,198,000	(\$13,000)
Apache Junction	31,814	33,569	2.42%	36,500	\$7,744,000	\$7,257,000	(\$487,000)
Scottsdale	202,705	217,695	2.22%	228,700	\$49,339,000	\$47,639,000	(\$1,700,000)
Glendale	218,812	230,730	1.65%	239,400	\$53,259,000	\$49,855,000	(\$3,404,000)
Phoenix	1,321,045	1,388,310	1.54%	1,436,900	\$321,546,000	\$299,282,000	(\$22,264,000)
Paradise Valley	13,664	14,220	1.23%	14,600	\$3,326,000	\$3,045,000	(\$281,000)
Gila Bend	1,980	2,025	0.69%	2,100	\$482,000	\$428,000	(\$54,000)
Guadalupe	5,228	5,330	0.60%	5,400	\$1,273,000	\$1,125,000	(\$148,000)
Litchfield Park	3,810	3,870	0.48%	3,900	\$927,000	\$815,000	(\$112,000)
Tempe	158,625	159,620	0.19%	160,300	\$38,610,000	\$33,391,000	(\$5,219,000)

Notes:

The distribution of state-shared revenues to counties uses population growth to a lesser degree than for cities and towns, making it difficult to predict the impact of using a 2005 population figure versus using 2000.

**The annual growth is based upon growth in DES/MAG population estimates between April 1, 2000 and June 30, 2003. These numbers are draft and subject to change.**

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

These numbers include calculations for the portions of Queen Creek and Peoria outside of Maricopa County

Apache Junction has requested that the City be included in the Census Survey. The Census Bureau has been requested to estimate the sample size and the cost of such a survey

State-shared revenues to cities and towns assumed to be \$985 million annually

Average annual growth rate capped at 30 percent

Numbers may not add due to rounding

**Table 3**  
**Cost of the Census Survey Using 95% Confidence Interval Plus/Minus 2**  
**Percent and Cost of Special Census**

<b>Jurisdiction</b>	<b>Net Survey Cost (after FHWA contribution)*</b>	<b>Net 2005 Special Census Cost Based on Share of 2005 Population (after FHWA contribution)*</b>
Avondale	\$130,700	\$490,900
Buckeye	\$119,900	\$119,900
Carefree	\$4,400	\$23,600
Cave Creek	\$5,700	\$30,600
Chandler	\$220,200	\$1,600,700
El Mirage	\$180,600	\$220,000
Fountain Hills	\$148,300	\$160,700
Gila Bend	\$2,600	\$14,000
Gilbert	\$138,100	\$1,296,500
Glendale	\$221,900	\$1,634,500
Goodyear	\$132,500	\$288,300
Guadalupe	\$6,900	\$36,900
Litchfield Park	\$5,000	\$26,700
Mesa	\$627,800	\$3,162,900
Paradise Valley	\$93,500	\$99,800
Peoria	\$193,100	\$962,600
Phoenix	\$1,301,900	\$9,811,900
Queen Creek	\$53,200	\$75,300
Scottsdale	\$274,700	\$1,561,800
Surprise	\$261,300	\$506,200
Tempe	\$194,200	\$1,094,700
Tolleson	\$7,400	\$39,300
Wickenburg	\$42,000	\$42,000
Youngtown	\$28,800	\$28,800
Balance of County	\$305,300	\$1,671,500
<b>Total</b>	<b>\$4,700,000</b>	<b>\$25,000,000</b>

Notes:

The annual growth is based upon growth in DES/MAG population estimates between April 1, 2000 and June 30, 2003. These numbers are draft and subject to change.

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

These numbers include calculations for the portions of Queen Creek and Peoria outside of Maricopa County

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

Apache Junction has requested that the City be included in the Census Survey. The Census Bureau has been requested to estimate the sample size and the cost of such a survey

State-shared revenues to cities and towns assumed to be \$985 million annually

Average annual growth rate capped at 30 percent

Numbers may not add due to rounding

# **MARICOPA ASSOCIATION OF GOVERNMENTS**

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

**DATE:**

October 28, 2003

**SUBJECT:**

Draft Policies for the MAG Community Emergency Notification System

**SUMMARY:**

In January 2003, the Arizona Department of Environmental Quality (ADEQ) awarded a \$2.5 million contract to the Maricopa Association of Governments to develop and operate a Community Emergency Notification System (CENS) for Maricopa County. The system will rapidly notify by telephone those living or working near the scene of an emergency and provide them with information and any required emergency instructions in English, Spanish, or Telecommunication Device for the Deaf (TDD). CENS will be activated through the Public Safety Answering Points (PSAP). In addition, the CENS program will continue to work with member agencies on the integration of those notification systems already in place.

Policies and procedures needed to be developed that would guide implementation of the CENS prior to the activation of the system in January 2004. A CENS Stakeholder Working Group was formed to ensure all interested parties had a voice in setting the policies. In March 2003, each MAG member agency received a letter requesting assistance in identifying public safety, flood control, homeland security, animal control, emergency management, and legal representatives to participate in the CENS Stakeholder Working Group.

During a series of three meetings, the Working Group discussed system activation thresholds (emergency and public safety notifications), liability considerations (overuse/underuse of system), and ongoing funding (user fees, cost recovery). At their October 1, 2003 meeting, the Working Group reached consensus on policies for consideration by the MAG 911 Oversight Team. On October 23, 2003, the Oversight Team met and recommended the following two policies for consideration by the Management Committee.

**Policy #1 - System Activation Fee:** Associated annual costs of the CENS program include \$690,000 per year to Qwest for maintaining the database, \$12,000 for event watches, and \$85,000 for the CENS project manager (including benefits). In an activation, the CENS program will be charged 23¢ per 30-second message for each completed call. A notification call is estimated to be one minute in duration (46¢ per call). *Cost Example:* A 60-second message to 116 addresses would be a total cost of \$53.36.

**Recommendation: Emergency activation charges will be fully funded through CENS program funds for the first year of system operation. After the first year of activation, as more system data is available, whether the activating agency will pay the activation charges will be evaluated.**

**Policy #2 - Activation of the System:** The CENS Stakeholders discussed at length when to activate the system. Originally, the group discussed using different levels for activation. Level one was designated for emergencies and level two as public safety messages. Further investigation discovered some potential conflicts with federal law. Senate Bill 800, the *Wireless Communications and Public Safety Act of 1999*, addresses privacy concerns and bans the use of location information except with written permission from the subscriber or for emergency purposes. The bill states: "...to providers of information or database management services solely for purposes of assisting in the delivery of *emergency services in response to an emergency.*" This raised the question of what is an emergency. The bill does not provide any definition for the term emergency. Legal opinion is being sought to provide clarification for system use.

### **Recommendation**

**Initially, the CENS program will be activated for emergency incidents only. The system would be used for level one activations until clarification from legal counsel regarding the verbiage in Senate Bill 800. The CENS program will only be activated for the defined emergency incidents until further legal input is provided.**

**Emergency incidents are defined as follows:**

- **Imminent threats to life or property**
- **Disaster notification**
- **Endangered children**
- **Endangered elderly**
- **Evacuation notices**

Additionally, the Working Group supported the creation of a group that would provide oversight of the CENS program and report back to the Working Group after the first year. The Oversight Team concurred and formed a subgroup that will provide guidance on the implementation of the system to the 911 Oversight Team.

### **PUBLIC INPUT:**

None.

### **PROS & CONS:**

**PROS:** The system will rapidly notify by telephone those living or working near the scene of an emergency by telephone and provide them with information and any required emergency instructions in English, Spanish, or TDD. Allowing each agency activations at no cost during the first year will introduce the program and give users an opportunity to see how helpful and timesaving the system can be. This will enable agencies to justify funding for future use without relying on the CENS maintenance funding.

**CONS:** The system will sustain itself for three to five years on existing funds so alternate funding sources need to be found for system continuation. The disadvantage of requiring each agency to fund their own activations is the system might not get used due to budget constraints. Many agencies are dealing with budget shortages and might hesitate to use the CENS Program because of the costs. The CENS Program will also compete with the other funding needs of an agency.

### **TECHNICAL & POLICY IMPLICATIONS:**

**TECHNICAL:** None.

**POLICY:** The policy process included system activation thresholds, liability considerations, and ongoing funding. Issues surrounding system activation include who is authorized to activate the system, whether to use the system for emergencies only, what is an emergency and would there be

a fee associated with the activation. Potential liability issues included not activating the system in a timely manner or possible overuse of the system. The system will sustain itself for three to five years on existing funds so alternate funding sources need to be found for system continuation. A regional consensus on each of these issues must occur before the system is activated.

**ACTION NEEDED:**

Recommend approval of the draft policies for the MAG Community Emergency Notification System.

**PRIOR COMMITTEE ACTIONS:**

911 Oversight Team: On October 23, 2003, the MAG 911 Oversight Team recommended approval of the draft policies for the Community Emergency Notification System, and formed a subgroup that will provide guidance on the implementation of the system to the 911 Oversight Team.

MEMBERS ATTENDING

Harry Beck, Mesa Fire Department, Chair	Helen Gandara-Zavala, Scottsdale Police Dept.
*Jim Gibson, Glendale Fire Department	Jay Spradling, Tempe Police Department
Steve Werner, Maricopa County Sheriff's Office	*Lawrence Rodriguez, Tolleson Police Dept.
*Mike Fusco, Emergency Management, Peoria	Vacant: Phoenix Fire Department
Blake McClelland, Phoenix Police Department	

\* Those members neither present nor represented by proxy.

# Attended by videoconference or by telephone conference call.

CENS Stakeholders Working Group: The CENS Stakeholders Working Group met on three occasions to discuss draft policies. At their October 1, 2003 meeting, the Working Group reached consensus on draft policies for consideration by the 911 Oversight Team.

Harry M. Beck	Chief, Chair, 911 Oversight Team, Mesa Fire Department
Manny Agah	Arizona Department of Transportation - TOC
Debbie Henry	Operational Communications, Department of Public Safety
Timothy Wolfe	Assistant State Engineer, Arizona Department of Transportation
Greg Workman	Section Manager, Hazardous Waste Section, ADEQ
Monte Egherman	Battalion Chief, Buckeye Fire Department
Danielle Mills	Firefighter, Buckeye Fire Department
Joe Brugman	Lieutenant, Chandler Police Department
Dan Couch	Battalion Chief, Chandler Fire Department
Richard Speer	Communications Commander, Chandler Police Department
Paul Sullivan	Office of Community Preparedness, Chandler Fire Department
Roy Levenda	Chief, El Mirage Fire Department
David Evertsen	Town Manager, Gila Bend
James Brad	Commander, Gilbert Police Department
Wes Kemp	Battalion Chief, Gilbert Fire Department
Jim Gibson	Assistant Chief, Glendale Fire Department
Kelley Mure	Emergency Management Coordination, Glendale Fire Department
Sheila Pattee	Public Safety Answering Point, Glendale Police Department
Debi Willis	Glendale Police Department
Chris Nadeau	Communications Manager, Goodyear Police Department
Timothy Sanger	IT, Maricopa County Animal Care & Control, Emergency Services
Robert Spencer	Director, Maricopa County Department of Emergency Management
Linda Velazquez	Lieutenant, Maricopa County Sheriff's Office
Steve Waters	Flood Warning Branch Manager, Flood Control District of Maricopa Co.

Steve Werner	Deputy Chief, Maricopa County Sheriff's Office
Karl Emberg	Commander, Support Services Administrative Div., Paradise Valley
Cliff Puckett	Assistant Chief, Mesa Fire Department
Mike Fusco	Safety & Emergency Management, Peoria
Rick Picard	Peoria Fire Department
Larry Rooney	Deputy Chief, Peoria Fire Department
Marcus Aurelius	Emergency Management Coordinator, Phoenix
Carol Campbell	Communications Shift Supervisor, Phoenix Police Department
Tami DeRuiter	Phoenix Police Department
Mary Dysinger-Franklin	911 Coordinator, Phoenix Fire Department
Liz Hunt	CENS Program Manager, Phoenix Fire Department
Susan MacFarlane	911 Administrator, Phoenix Fire Dept., Chair, PSAP Managers Group
Blake McClelland	Commander, Phoenix Police Department
Adrian Ruiz	Lieutenant, Phoenix Police Department
Gail Denney	Communications Division, Scottsdale Police Department
Marc Eisen	Director of Emergency Services, Scottsdale
Helen Gandara-Zavala	Administrative Services Director, Scottsdale Police Department
Tom Melton	Public Safety Answering Point, Scottsdale
Dee Taylor	Executive Assistant Chief, Scottsdale Police Department
Michael White	Chief, Surprise Fire Department
Kevin Kotsur	Assistant Chief, Tempe Police Department
Jay Spradling	Assistant Chief, Tempe Police Department
Larry Rodriguez	Chief, Tolleson Police Department
Anthony Melendez	Chief, Wickenburg Police Department

Regional Council: On March 26, 2003, the MAG Regional Council was provided a presentation on the implementation of the CENS system.

#### MEMBERS ATTENDING

Mayor Wendy Feldman-Kerr, Queen Creek, Chair	Mayor J. Woodfin Thomas, Litchfield Park
Mayor Joan Shafer, Surprise, Vice Chair	Supervisor Max W. Wilson for
Councilmember Brian Milkey for Mayor	Supervisor Don Stapley, Maricopa County
Douglas Coleman, Apache Junction	Mayor Keno Hawker, Mesa
*Mayor Ron Drake, Avondale	Mayor Edward Lowry, Paradise Valley
*Mayor Dusty Hull, Buckeye	*Mayor John Keegan, Peoria
*Mayor Edward Morgan, Carefree	*Mayor Skip Rimsza, Phoenix
*Vice Mayor Ralph Mozilo, Cave Creek	*President Joni Ramos, Salt River
Mayor Boyd Dunn, Chandler	Pima-Maricopa Indian Community
Mayor Robert Robles, El Mirage	Mayor Mary Manross, Scottsdale
Mayor Jon Beydler, Fountain Hills	Mayor Neil Giuliano, Tempe
Mayor Chuck Turner, Gila Bend	*Mayor Adolfo Gamez, Tolleson
Governor Richard Narcia, Gila River Indian	Mayor Lon McDermott, Wickenburg
Community	*Mayor Daphne Green, Youngtown
Mayor Steven Berman, Gilbert	Rusty Gant, ADOT
Mayor Elaine Scruggs, Glendale	Joe Lane, ADOT
Vice Mayor James Cavanaugh, Goodyear	F. Rockne Arnett, Citizens Transportation
Mayor Margarita Cota, Guadalupe	Oversight Committee

\* Those members neither present nor represented by proxy.

# Attended by videoconference or by telephone conference call.

Management Committee: On March 12, 2003, the Management Committee was provided a presentation on the implementation of the CENS system.

MEMBERS ATTENDING

Peoria: Prisila Ferreira for Terry Ellis  
Mesa: Mike Hutchinson, Vice Chair  
Apache Junction: George Hoffman  
Avondale: Todd Hileman  
\*Buckeye: Joe Blanton  
\*Carefree: Jon Pearson  
\*Cave Creek: Usama Abujbarah  
Chandler: Donna Dreska  
\*El Mirage: Dick Yost  
#Fountain Hills: Tim Pickering  
\*Gila Bend: David Evertsen  
Gila River Indian Community: Urban Giff  
Gilbert: George Pettit  
Glendale: Ed Beasley  
Goodyear: Stephen Cleveland  
\*Guadalupe: Tom Morales

Litchfield Park: Horatio Skeete  
Paradise Valley: Tom Martinsen  
Phoenix: Frank Fairbanks  
#Queen Creek: Cynthia Seelhammer  
Salt River Pima-Maricopa Indian Community:  
Jacob Moore for Bryan Meyers  
Scottsdale: Steve Olson Jan Dolan  
Surprise: Jim Rumpeltes for Bill Pupo  
Tempe: Will Manley  
Tolleson: Ralph Velez  
Wickenburg: Shane Dille  
Youngtown: Mark Fooks  
ADOT: Andy Smith for Victor Mendez  
Maricopa County: Tom Buick for  
David Smith  
RPTA: Ken Driggs

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

911 Oversight Team: On October 19, 2000, the 911 Oversight Team recommended accepting the funds from the ADEQ and responsibility for the design, development, management, and implementation of the system, with MAG as the accounting entity pending the settlement funds becoming available.

MEMBERS ATTENDING

Harry Beck, Phoenix Fire Department,  
Chairman  
\*Jim Gibson, Glendale Fire Department  
Shelly Bunn, Maricopa County Sheriff's Office  
Dennis L. Donna, Mesa Police Department  
Mike Fusco, Peoria Fire Department

\*Dave Bennett, Phoenix Police Department  
Dave Jones for Helen Gandara-Zavala,  
Scottsdale Police Dept.  
\*Cliff Jones, Tempe Fire Department  
\*Lawrence Rodriguez, Tolleson Police Dept.

\*Those members neither present nor represented by proxy.

**CONTACT PERSON:**

Chief Harry M. Beck, Mesa Fire Department, 480-644-4945; or Liz Hunt, CENS Program Manager, Phoenix Fire Department, 602-534-9775.

## CENS Activation Time Line

<b>October 1, 2003</b>	CENS Stakeholders meeting
<b>October 16, 2003</b>	PSAP Managers kick-off/ training meeting
<b>October 23, 2003</b>	911 Oversight Team meeting <b>Recommend approval of policies</b>
<b>October 27-November 7, 2003</b>	PSAP personnel training
<b>October-November, 2003</b>	Public Safety command staff/field personnel training
<b>October 28, 2003</b>	First simulation testing
<b>November 5, 2003</b>	MAG Management Committee meeting <b>Recommend approval of policies</b>
<b>November 14, 2003</b>	Second simulation testing
<b>December 3, 2003</b>	MAG Regional Council <b>Approval of policies</b>
<b>December 4, 2003</b>	CENS Program press conference
<b>December 5, 2003</b>	Final simulation testing
<b>December 4-31, 2003</b>	Public Awareness Campaign
<b>January 1, 2004</b>	CENS Program fully operational in MAG Region

# **MARICOPA ASSOCIATION OF GOVERNMENTS**

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

**DATE:**

October 28, 2003

**SUBJECT:**

Update on Human Services Technical Committee and Human Services Coordinating Committee

**SUMMARY:**

The two Human Services Committees have prioritized human service areas for involvement as well as reviewed and studied community initiatives for further development. The Human Services "Advance" (Strategic Planning Session) was held July 17, 2003 with more than 65 elected officials, city staff, human service providers, volunteers, and stakeholders in attendance. During that meeting the accomplishments of the past year(s) were highlighted and a plan for the next 18 months was developed through a priority ranking process.

Highly ranked on the involvement and importance levels during the prioritization process were the continuation of gaining public input and allocating Social Service Block Grant (SSBG) funding (approximately \$4 million); developing initiatives on financial literacy, specifically promoting Earned Income Tax Credit (EITC) throughout Maricopa County; advocacy for the one-half cent sales tax on behalf of public transportation service needs; and studying potential issues for planning around elderly, early intervention and prevention services, as well as web-based services and youth services.

The Human Services Division will continue to maintain domestic violence coordination and planning as well as homeless coordination and planning as deliverables. Additionally, the Human Services Division will provide staff support to the Arizona Department of Transportation Elderly & Persons with Disabilities Transportation Program Section 5310.

A presentation of EITC as a recommended new regional initiative will be given by members of Human Services Technical Committee who have implemented marketing programs for EITC in their municipalities. The EITC is a refundable tax credit that could result in extra money in the hands of eligible taxpayers. The encouragement of residents to apply and receive EITC could increase the resources and dollars coming into local communities and businesses.

This priority ranking was discussed and voted on in the Human Services Technical Committee meeting held on September 18, 2003 and then brought through recommendations to the Human Services Coordinating Committee at their October 9, 2003 meeting. During that joint meeting of the Human Services Coordinating Committee and the Human Services Technical Committee, a consensus was reached to bring the priorities to the Management Committee and the Regional Committee for information, discussion and comment.

**PUBLIC INPUT:**

Input received at the Human Services Advance on July 17, 2003 was incorporated into the plan that was developed through the priority ranking process for the next 18 months.

## **PROS & CONS:**

PROS: During a time of economic decline, it is difficult for many families on a fixed income to maintain a self-sustaining budget. Eligibility for EITC could put up to \$4,140 annually into a family's tight budget.

CONS: The marketing and education regarding EITC would take some time and thought for each local planning area to determine what support could be lent to the efforts.

## **ACTION NEEDED:**

Information, discussion and comment.

## **PRIOR COMMITTEE ACTIONS:**

Joint meeting of Human Services Coordinating and Technical Committees: On October 9, 2003, a consensus was reached that supported the recommendations of the Human Services Technical Committee was reached.

### TECHNICAL COMMITTEE MEMBERS

#### ATTENDING

- Sandra Reagan, Southwest Community Network, Chairman
- Judy Bowden, Mesa United Way
- \* Joan Ellis, RIS Blind Services
- Moises Gallegos, City of Phoenix
- Steve Wise for Kate Hanley, Tempe Community Council
- + Carl Harris-Morgan, Town of Gilbert
- Sandra Holt, DES/AAA
- Connie James, City of Scottsdale
- Mindy Wakefield for Jeannie Jertson, Human Services Department
- \* Mary Lynn Kasunic, Area Agency on Aging
- Jim Knaut, Area Agency on Aging
- Barbara Knox, DES/RSA
- \* Ramon Leon, El Mirage Community Service Program
- John Paul Lopez, City of Tolleson
- Joyce Lopez-Powell, VSUW
- \* Dan Lundberg, City of Surprise
- \* Doris Marshall, City of Phoenix
- Jose Mercado, City of Phoenix
- Kyle Moore, DES/ACYF
- \* Susan Neidlinger, DES/DDD
- Sylvia Sheffield, City of Avondale
- Rex Critchfield for Mary Jo Swartz, DES/CSA
- \* Paige Thomas, Glendale Human Services Council
- Wayne Tormala, City of Phoenix
- \* Margaret Trujillo, Value Options
- \* Patrick Tyrrell, City of Chandler
- Neal Young, City of Phoenix

### COORDINATING COMMITTEE MEMBERS

#### ATTENDING

- \* Rob Antoniak, City of Goodyear
- \* Dennis Cahill, City of Tempe, Chair
- Kyle Jones, City of Mesa
- \* Doug Lingner, City of Phoenix
- Marie Lopez-Rogers, City of Avondale
- \* Linda Huff Redman, Tempe Community Council
- \* Manuel Martinez, City of Glendale
- \* Jim McCabe, Area Agency on Aging
- \* Larry Morrison, Town of Gilbert
- \* Joan Shafer, City of Surprise
- Phillip Westbrooks, City of Chandler
- \* Mary Rose Wilcox, Maricopa County

+Those members present by audio/videoconferencing

\*Those members neither present not represented by proxy.

MAG Human Services Technical Committee: On September 18, 2003, the Human Services Technical Committee reviewed the ranking and recommendations from the July 17, 2003 Human Services Advance. The Committee recommended that the priorities outlined during the discussion of the Advance ranking be maintained, that new initiatives be reviewed with human services transportation as a priority for discussion, and that MAG take on the EITC initiative as a regional issue.

### MEMBERS ATTENDING

Sandra Reagan, Southwest Community Network, Chairman  
Judy Bowden, Mesa United Way  
\*Joan Ellis, Rehabilitation Services Admin  
Diane Janovich for Moises Gallegos, City of Phoenix  
Steve Wise for Kate Hanley, Tempe Community Council  
+Carl Harris-Morgan, Town of Gilbert  
Sue Zevan for Sandra Holt, DES/AAA  
Connie James, City of Scottsdale  
Margarita Leyras for Jeannie Jertson, Human Services Department  
Barbara Knox, DES/RSA  
\*Ramon Leon, El Mirage Community Service Program  
John Paul Lopez, City of Tolleson  
Joyce Lopez-Powell, Valley of the Sun United Way

\*Dan Lundberg, City of Surprise  
\*Doris Marshall, City of Phoenix  
Jose Mercado, City of Phoenix  
\*Kyle Moore, DES/ACYF  
Susan Neidlinger, DES/DDD  
Sylvia Sheffield, City of Avondale  
Linda Snidecore, City of Goodyear  
Mark Ludwig for Mary Jo Swartz, DES/CSA  
\*Paige Thomas, Glendale Human Services Council  
Wayne Tormala, City of Phoenix  
\*Margaret Trujillo, Value Options  
Patrick Tyrrell, City of Chandler  
\*Neal Young, City of Phoenix

+Those member present by audio or videoconference.

\*Those members neither present not represented by proxy.

### **CONTACT PERSON:**

Debra Determan, Human Services Manager, 602-254-6300.

# **MARICOPA ASSOCIATION OF GOVERNMENTS**

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

**DATE:**

October 28, 2003

**SUBJECT:**

Status Update on the June 30, 2003 Single Audit and Management Letter Comments, MAG's Comprehensive Annual Financial Report (CAFR) and OMB Circular A-133 Reports (i.e., "Single Audit") for the Fiscal Year Ended June 30, 2003

**SUMMARY:**

The public accounting firm of Deloitte & Touche LLP is in the process of completing the audit of MAG's Comprehensive Annual Financial Report (CAFR) and Single Audit for the fiscal year ended June 30, 2003. For Fiscal Year 2003, MAG implemented Governmental Accounting Standard Board Statement #34. We are awaiting an audit opinion from Deloitte & Touche and expect that one will be issued no later than mid-November. To date there has been no discussion regarding reportable conditions or instances of noncompliance.

The CAFR financial statements and related footnotes were prepared in accordance with the Government Finance Officers Association's (GFOA) standards for the Certificate of Achievement for Excellence in Financial Reporting awards program. Management intends to submit the June 30, 2003 CAFR to the GFOA awards program for review. If awarded the certificate for the June 30, 2003 CAFR, this would be the agency's sixth consecutive award. Additionally, MAG is one of only 10 Councils of Governments (COGs) currently holding this award out of approximately 500 Councils of Governments nationwide. The final CAFR is currently in the production stage and awaiting the auditor opinion and will be provided to members when completed.

**PUBLIC INPUT:**

No public input has been received.

**PROS & CONS:**

**PROS:** MAG is required by its By-laws and federal regulations to have an audit performed for all major federal programs on an annual basis. The audit must be performed in compliance with the provisions described in the U.S. Office of Management and Budget ("OMB") Circular A-133, Audits of States, Local Governments, and Non-Profit Organizations.

**CONS:** None.

**TECHNICAL & POLICY IMPLICATIONS:**

**TECHNICAL:** Deloitte & Touche LLP conducted the audit in accordance with Generally Accepted Auditing Standards (GAAS), and the standards applicable to financial audits contained in the Government Audit Standards, issued by the Comptroller General of the United States and the provisions of OMB Circular A-133. MAG is awaiting the final audit opinion.

**POLICY:** Pursuant to Article 12, Section 5 of the MAG By-laws, the annual audit must be presented to the Regional Council.

**ACTION NEEDED:**

Information and discussion.

**PRIOR COMMITTEE ACTIONS:**

None.

**CONTACT PERSON:**

Rebecca Kimbrough, MAG, (602) 254-6300.