

**MINUTES OF THE
MARICOPA ASSOCIATION OF GOVERNMENTS
REGIONAL GOVERNANCE TASK FORCE MEETING**

October 10, 2001
MAG Office, Saguaro Room
Phoenix, Arizona

MEMBERS ATTENDING

Mayor Skip Rimsza, Phoenix, Chairman	Mayor Keno Hawker, Mesa
* Mayor Ron Drake, Avondale	Tom Martinsen, Paradise Valley
Mayor Roy Delgado, El Mirage	Mayor Wendy Feldman-Kerr, Queen Creek
* Ed Beasley, Glendale	Jan Dolan, Scottsdale
Stephen Cleveland, Goodyear	* Bill Pupo, Surprise
Mayor J. Woodfin Thomas, Litchfield Park	

*Not present.

1. Call to Order

The meeting of the Regional Governance Task Force was called to order by Chairman Skip Rimsza at 11:43 a.m.

2. Approval of September 13, 2001 Meeting Minutes

Chairman Rimsza asked for a motion to approve the September 13, 2001 meeting minutes. Mayor J. Woodfin Thomas moved, Mayor Wendy Feldman-Kerr seconded, and the motion carried unanimously.

3. Review of Draft Options

James M. Bourey stated that staff drafted options for the five general issues of governance. He stated that the options were mailed after review by city staff. Mr. Bourey added that this meeting was to review the alternatives and determine what will be discussed with the Advisory Committee at the joint meeting on October 22, 2001.

Chairman Rimsza asked if Task Force members requested that any of the options be withheld. No requests were noted.

John Parr reviewed the major issues identified, including 1) Issue of accountability of the Regional Council. Issue of parochialism in making regional decisions. Issue of clear identity and public understanding of MAG. 2) Need for additional connection of local governments' land use decisions to the availability of adequate regional public facilities. 3) Need for integration of all modes of transportation with funding, planning, and operations. 4) Need for improved and complete communication on issues which cross jurisdictional boundaries. Mr. Parr stated that the goal of the meeting was not to evaluate the strengths and weaknesses of the options, but to clarify issues so the Advisory Committee can get their arms around them.

Mr. Parr asked about the No Change Membership Option. Stephen Cleveland stated that we need to be reminded that the audience reading the document may not necessarily be familiar with MAG terminology. He stated that the word “proposed” in the first paragraph should be changed to “suggested,” in referring to the directly elected board. Mr. Cleveland stated that clarification needs to be added to reflect that an empowered Executive Committee would be a smaller group than the Regional Council body. For the fourth bullet, a list of regional agencies is needed. He stated that a lot of people don’t know what RPTA is. Mr. Cleveland suggested adding a paragraph to the introduction to clarify representation requirements of a newly formed MPO. Mr. Parr noted that there were no changes to Option #1 - No Change.

Mr. Parr asked members if they had changes to Option #2 - Town Hall Type Mechanism. Mayor Feldman-Kerr stated that she was not sure of the frequency of the event, but the description was all right.

Mr. Parr noted that no changes were noted for Option #3 - Consolidate Regional Transportation Agencies with a Separate Operations Board.

Mr. Parr asked if there were comments to Option #4, Expand the Regional Council - Designate More Responsibility for an Expanded Executive Committee. Mr. Martinsen stated that this might be a viable option, but he believed that the Regional Council needs to be maintained as a governmental body. Some actions it takes are appropriate for government bodies only. Setting aside transportation issues where you could infuse other groups might be okay. Mr. Martinsen indicated that there should be a separate Regional Council that manages many MAG issues. He stated that he was not in favor of expanding the Regional Council, and was not opposed to forming an expanded Executive Committee of some type. Mr. Martinsen stated that this could simplify the process.

Mr. Bourey stated that an additional option, #6, had been drafted based on discussions with Mr. Martinsen. He noted that Option #6 was at each place.

Mayor Thomas stated that if all options are presented then all could be weighed together. He added that he was not in favor of Option #4.

Mayor Hawker stated that he liked the concept of Option #4. With an expanded Executive Committee, subcommittees would need to be empowered more, similar to what his city does with their Planning and Zoning committee. He stated that the City Council can override their recommendations, but it is difficult to do. If someone from the business community served on a subcommittee, they would have influence on up. Mr. Bourey noted that Option #4 included business representation on the Regional Council and Executive Committee. Mayor Hawker stated that if the Executive Committee ignored the recommendations of a subcommittee, there should be a price to be paid. A mechanism to do that is needed. Dennis Smith commented that the freight community could be represented on the Transportation Subcommittee and feed up to the Executive Committee. Mayor Hawker expressed that there is concern that if the business community served on a subcommittee level, their recommendations could be ignored. Mr. Bourey stated that a section on subcommittees could be added.

Chairman Rimsza stated that having a weighted vote based on population, a business seat, and an ADOT seat at the Executive Committee level, would still provide cities with substantial control but would be giving the business community a seat at the table. The real issue is making the best argument

for managing the half cent sales tax. Chairman Rimsza stated that at some point, the line needs to be drawn to balance to a new level and not be a mayor's club. Chairman Rimsza explained that at the Executive Committee level, ADOT and the business community would each have just one vote; a small city and the City of Phoenix would each have their own vote; and they would have the ability to have their votes weighted.

Chairman Rimsza stated that the concern about adding more members to the Regional Council really shouldn't be a concern. He commented that an ADOT or business community member would only have one vote, and each a seat at the table. Chairman Rimsza indicated that he was leaning toward option #4, not having seen option #6.

Mr. Cleveland stated that he liked the attributes of Option #4, which provides for mixed interest in the participation role. They will come if they have a vote.

Mr. Parr commented on adding language for weighted voting to Option #4. Chairman Rimsza stated that it could be called Option #4A.

Mr. Parr asked if additional language was needed on how the Executive Committee is appointed? Mayor Thomas remarked that he was under the impression that this would be hammered out at the joint meeting on October 22nd. Mr. Parr commented that clarifying details today could eliminate potential conflict at the joint meeting.

Mr. Cleveland stated that one approach, in each instance where the Regional Council expanded, then each respective category would elect who will represent them on the Executive Committee.

Mayor Thomas asked for clarification on the population splits. Smaller cities together may outnumber the larger cities. Mr. Bourey explained that the Executive Committee would be closer to the population of cities under this configuration. He noted that 18 members of MAG represent five percent of the population in the region. Mr. Bourey stated that this changes that dynamic somewhat. All cities would be represented, but larger cities would get more certain representation on the Executive Committee from a numbers perspective.

Jan Dolan stated that because this is a sales tax driven issue, the option could go with who is generating the money. Maybe how much a city generates per capita should be examined. Ms. Dolan stated that she would like to see what that looks like. Chairman Rimsza stated that this could be problematic, because the issue would be residents of one city spending money in another. Does it put us more at each other's throats when it comes to a regional mall? Ms. Dolan stated that she was not advocating this option, but would like to see an analysis. Chairman Rimsza stated that he thought the results would be about the same. He questioned whether the Task Force would want to pursue that philosophy. Ms. Dolan commented that if this was a traditional one person, one vote process, and because this issue is sales tax driven, she would like to see the results of an analysis. Mr. Bourey explained that this was not precisely a one person, one vote option, but has a little more weight to it. It would provide more significance for larger jurisdictions. Mr. Parr commented that MAG uses more than sales tax funds. Ms. Dolan replied that the sales tax is what is driving this discussion. She stated that the option needs to work with all of the responsibilities MAG has.

Mr. Parr asked for discussion of Option #5 - Urban Regional Transportation District, proposed by the Governor's Transportation Vision 21 Task Force. Mr. Cleveland commented on sentence #3. He asked does it presume a similar planning model prescribed for the other options? He commented that this is the first time this has been articulated as a service function. Mr. Cleveland asked if this statement should be articulated in all the other options as well. He stated that the differences need to be articulated and the options examined. Mr. Bourey noted that operational is not a part of the transportation section. Mr. Parr asked if the option should have a brief implementation sentence added. Mr. Cleveland replied that it would be helpful.

Ms. Dolan stated that she had an additional comment for Option #4. The option states that the Executive Committee could be elected and chosen in a number of ways. Ms. Dolan stated that she would like to leave open which business interests could be represented. She indicated that there are three suggestions but there may be another way to choose who sits if this model is used. She requested keeping the discussion open to other ideas.

Mr. Martinsen reviewed Option #6. He stated that the model was a Consolidated Regional Model. He explained that on the second page was a graphic that illustrated the option. Mr. Martinsen explained that in a previous position, he had the job of combining regional agencies. He stated that if you try to force people and ideas into a single board as a Regional Council, you may be alienating instead of supporting. The complexities of government today cannot be solved with a 19th century model. Mr. Martinsen stated that the consolidated regional approach would preserve the Regional Council and RPTA boards. The option would have the Executive Committee as a steering committee. There could be a tax oversight committee to offer feedback on the expenditure of the sales tax. Mr. Martinsen stated that his idea was to consolidate all staff of MAG and RPTA into a single organization. He stated his support for preserving the Regional Council and RPTA boards, the Executive Committee and other committees. Mr. Martinsen stated that the key is to clearly define at the outset the responsibilities of each group so that there are no overlap and no conflict. Mr. Martinsen stated that representation to the General Assembly would be drawn from MAG member agencies and private groups that may be named. The Regional Council would be one of the boards this group would support. Intentionally, the organization would not be called MAG anymore. Mr. Smith commented that this structure is similar to the Pinnacle West/APS structure.

Mayor Thomas asked if staff would have to go through the Executive Committee to get to the General Assembly? Mayor Thomas suggested drawing a separate line from the General Assembly to staff. Chairman Rimsza expressed that the tax oversight committee could be turned into the Governor's Task Force five member board. Mr. Martinsen stated that the board could be created however MAG wants it to be. Chairman Rimsza stated that he thought this could become out of our control. There are already the Regional Council, the Executive Committee, and the RPTA. It would add another layer of government, which is what the Vision 21 Task Force wants to add. The Tax Oversight Committee would be them and that is what MAG is trying to avoid. Mr. Martinsen stated that if this is the concern, don't give the group the authority. Chairman Rimsza stated that the Legislature could create this body to administer the tax and could be named the Tax Oversight Committee. Mr. Martinsen commented that the Legislature could do that anyway. Chairman Rimsza expressed his concurrence with Mr. Martinsen's statement and added that MAG needs to recognize what it has done successfully for over 20 years. He stated that his sense was that if MAG doesn't change, there could be a battle with the Legislature. He indicated that he wanted to give some decent argument and defense to having that executed upon us. Chairman Rimsza commented that business has indicated that they do not want to be in a battle with the cities, but may want to work with MAG if we change a little.

Mayor Feldman-Kerr stated that when she looked at this option, she saw it as an expansion of MAG. The other roles MAG has would be accomplished through MAG itself. Mayor Feldman-Kerr stated that she didn't think the Tax Advisory Committee was a good idea. She expressed a preference for the idea of having a town hall type of structure. The Executive Committee could deal with transportation and MAG could deal with other issues. The perception of those that do think we do a good job, is that the board could become so wieldy that there is not effective communication.

Chairman Rimsza stated that reason that the City of Phoenix is close to winning the Civic Plaza election is because Phoenix spends a lot of time courting GPL, the Chamber, etc. and they participate in the discussion. This has helped the City move forward. The organizations then are a part of the process and there will not be a problem with them coming back and saying it's a mayor's club. This is going to come back over and over if we don't have them on the committee. Chairman Rimsza suggested getting them on in a way all are comfortable with. Ms. Dolan stated that she understood getting business behind a project and not wanting them to oppose it. However, they haven't asked to sit on City Councils to spend the money. Chairman Rimsza stated that business sits on the Civic Plaza Board, and they can block action in several ways.

Ms. Dolan stated that they can block, but they do not have the authority to approve. She stated that she was not advocating a position, but that their role needs to be established so they are not in opposition and will support the measure. Ms. Dolan asked if they needed to be in an advisory or in a decision making authority role? Where do they belong? Do we stick with one city, one vote or a more proportional system? Chairman Rimsza stated they are participants in this if they have a role.

Mayor Feldman-Kerr stated that people vote for a candidate because they think the candidate is honest. She expressed caution for the perception of graft. If the board is sitting next to business, does that make it look like they have the board in their pocket? Mayor Feldman-Kerr stated that those on the MAG board are there because they have been elected to the position.

Mr. Parr stated that Option #4 offers that two at-large seats could be leaders in the community who are not necessarily business leaders.

Mayor Hawker stated that Option #6B could be drafted so that only transportation gets changed. The Executive Committee would be similar to Option #4, but MAG would keep the same structure for activities outside of transportation. Then cities would have full participation outside of transportation. Mayor Thomas stated that leaving in Option #6 would stimulate discussion.

Mr. Martinsen stated that the Tax Oversight Committee could be called the Transportation Advisory Committee or something similar, or be eliminated. He stated that the function could be added into the Executive Committee, as suggested by Mayor Hawker and Mayor Feldman-Kerr.

Chairman Rimsza stated that he would like to leave out discussion of the RPTA board. Mayor Hawker stated that it needs to be left in because of the criticism for having too many boards. He commented that this may be a part of the vote. Chairman Rimsza suggested leaving out reference to a specific organization and call it a transit board.

Mr. Cleveland commented on keeping the perspective that we are going to take these suggestions and ask the Advisory Committee who should be responsible for tasks, which one can help MAG overcome

identity, accountability, parochial issues. The discussion seemed to be about crafting structure when it should be about framing issues for which the Advisory Committee can provide feedback.

Chairman Rimsza stated that it is important to get comment from them, but not a recommendation. Mr. Cleveland stated that it comes back to the issue of parochialism and accountability. Chairman Rimsza questioned whether we were setting ourselves up for them to say a five member board would be good.

Mayor Hawker suggested showing that the five member board would be political, with Phoenix in control, and east side/west side issues. Will it be an improvement? Do people realize what they are voting for? Mr. Bourey commented on putting in a Transit District. He asked if members wanted to discuss this on October 22nd. Mayor Hawker stated that it will be brought up anyway.

Mr. Cleveland stated that one suggestion as accountability is addressed, is to have a forum, similar to a commission. The members would elect individuals such as a department head who is responsible for the work going on below. In turn, they feed into a regional/executive body that feeds to the general body. Each commissioner would be assigned a specific component versus all having general responsibilities. Mr. Cleveland commented that this would mean more work for Regional Council members.

Mayor Hawker stated that for the Executive Committee, part of the assignment could be sections, similar to a district system within the Executive body.

Mr. Cleveland stated that staff could have one person who is the liaison to the Executive Committee. Transit would speak through one person, air quality through another, etc. Chairman Rimsza clarified that this would be more of a topical than a geographic assignment. He expressed that he liked this idea and it could be Option #7.

Chairman Rimsza asked members how many felt no change was a serious option? Mayor Thomas stated that MAG is beyond no change. The others agreed. If there were no change, some would feel the fix was in from the beginning.

Mr. Parr asked for discussion of Land Use Integration Options. Mayor Thomas requested clarification of how the figure of 13 million people projected for the region was developed for the Regional Council retreat. Mr. Bourey explained that the figure was derived by adding all of the people allowed in present comprehensive plans. Mayor Thomas requested a concept map showing gradient of density, if possible. Mr. Bourey clarified that it was not definite that the population would reach this level, but it is a possibility. Mayor Thomas expressed concern with how facilities in the region have been impacted by decisions made to date. What must be done to accommodate a growth in population?

Chairman Rimsza asked how important the land use planning option is if comprehensive plans have been approved to accommodate 13 million? Mr. Bourey replied that they are in different levels of approval, not zoned.

Mr. Martinsen stated that there is not a lot to gain, but a lot to lose by bringing this up with an expanded group. He stated that he would rather see what the organization would look like first. More would be lost by making this an issue. Mr. Martinsen stated that he saw limited value to the first two options, #4 would be a no, and did not understand #3 too well.

Mr. Cleveland indicated that he disagreed. He stated that he thought MAG will continue to do what they do in land use decisions. At least the information will be out there at the local level, strictly as information in a city's decision making process, not mandating. There are millions of dollars in infrastructure waiting to be built. If the level of discussion is not raised into a public discussion, citizens will end up taxing themselves to death to provide the very infrastructure the development community should have had to share. Anthem should have had to address traffic impacts, so now the region will have to construct, after the fact, the lanes that should have been built by the developer.

Chairman Rimsza expressed concern with discussing this issue in the midst of other issues. He commented that it is worth discussing, but whether it is discussed now is the question. Chairman Rimsza stated that although Anthem was large, it has been noted that they were responsible for only an additional 1/100th of a lane.

Mr. Cleveland stated that he would like to have the feedback from the Advisory Committee on Land Use Options. Strategy of implementation might be something in Phase II. Mr. Cleveland stated that he would like this to be on the table to continue this dialogue. Mr. Cleveland stated that the City of Goodyear wanted MAG staff to do a review of going from 20,000 people to 400,000. He cautioned that if this is not done, his city could be the next Anthem.

Mayor Feldman-Kerr stated that she would like the input from the Advisory Committee. Would they be willing to take this on as an administrative responsibility of MAG? That would help determine structure.

Mayor Hawker stated that the strongest argument for keeping this within MAG is the land use component and its tie into transportation. He stated that he wanted to tie them together and not consider them separately. Mayor Hawker stated that he felt the biggest fault of the Governor's Task Force was ignoring land use. He stated that it sells stronger if done in parallel.

Mr. Parr asked how would other Regional Council members feel about this? Chairman Rimsza stated that depended on present buildout and how much approval would be necessary at this level, maybe not formal, but perceived. The developers will hate it, and the business community would be neutral. Cities vary on present buildout. Tempe would not be impacted be at all. Mr. Bourey added that MAG is working on reviewing comprehensive plans with cities. He provided an example that the Buckeye Comprehensive Plan will generate enough development for 19 new freeway lanes.

Mr. Cleveland stated that this has regional implications. To sustain mayoral decision making authority is another input tool to make a better decision.

Ms. Dolan stated that land use and transportation are tightly linked. But the structure and role for MAG as a governing body are what are being discussed today. A governing body would not deal with this issue, it is a staff issue—a day to day operation. If you take land use into the governance forum, you will have land use governance. Ms. Dolan commented on the option for MAG staff level analysis. Mr. Bourey noted that none of the alternatives has MAG as controlling land use decisions. Ms. Dolan asked why bring this issue to Governance? Mr. Bourey explained that land use was included because it was a part of the motion to form the Governance Task Force to look at roles and responsibilities. Ms. Dolan stated that MAG would not have to change to make these changes dealing with land use. She stated that she thought the Task Force would be examining the roles and responsibilities as a governing body, and other discussion was background information.

Chairman Rimsza stated that this would come up with the Advisory Committee, anyway. He commented on the need to show that MAG leaves land use decisions at a local level. Ms. Dolan stated she did not support the options. MAG should be at some kind of minimum role in gathering and distributing information on growth. Mayor Thomas stated that it is foresighted to have facilities. Hopefully, industry will be a part of this analysis. Part of the analysis should include the onus on the developer to describe what his market is.

Ms. Dolan stated that the main goal of the Task Force is to create a governance structure that works. Too much detail on land use may not be wanted. Mr. Parr noted that the Advisory Committee brought up this issue.

Chairman Rimsza commented on leaving out specifics. The Task Force could determine the appropriate level of information to bring to the Advisory Committee. Show the analytical role of MAG to provide to cities. Mayor Hawker commented that he did think it was strong enough. Chairman Rimsza commented on pushing for a proportional share and empowering people with good information.

Mr. Bourey stated that the Regional Council members have the authority to approve the TIP. Without their approval of the traffic interchanges, it would have been hard for Anthem to proceed. Mr. Bourey added that the 208 Plan allowed Anthem to build a sewer that was approved by the Regional Council. Mr. Bourey explained that the Regional Council has the power and dimension to stop certain approvals. He stated that under analysis, all could have been aware of the implications.

Chairman Rimsza asked if MAG had ever assessed what the impact and responsibilities of Anthem would be. Mr. Bourey replied that no assessments of impacts had been done. Chairman Rimsza stated that if you look at the total traffic count on I-17, the impact is not significant. However, if analysis information had been available, there may have been a different reaction.

Mayor Feldman-Kerr stated that if all are in agreement that an analysis would be good to have, she would be comfortable with bringing it to the Regional Council.

Mr. Smith commented on providing updates to member agency planning directors. He stated that what he was hearing was the Task Force say they are comfortable with this analysis. It would be similar to enhanced notification procedures—cities would totally control the process. With open space planning, the analysis would be put into principles all could agree on.

Ms. Dolan stated that if the Task Force is comfortable with MAG having an analytical role, it can be done under the current MAG structure, and would not need to be taken to the Advisory Committee. She stated that the blessing of the Regional Council and the cooperation of cities are needed. Chairman Rimsza asked if this should be shared with the Advisory Committee. Ms. Dolan expressed that she thought it should be shared.

Mayor Feldman-Kerr stated that she liked the principles of regional accountability. She stated that her city would like to be able to ask developers and other cities to cite the impacts of their development projects. Mayor Feldman-Kerr added that she actually liked a combination of Option #3 and Option #4. Mr. Parr commented on getting additional TIP points if the principles are followed.

Mr. Cleveland stated that the Governance Task Force is now on chapter 15 of 30 chapters. The Task Force needs to start thinking of tools to bring the conversation back to the Regional Council and craft an approach on how this could work without infringing on local control.

Mayor Thomas stated that cities are looking for strength when they make decisions. The analysis recommended by staff would give them that strength. Mr. Bourey mentioned that as part of the analysis, staff could provide information, but cities would have to make the approvals.

Mr. Parr asked for comments on Option #1 under Transit Integration Options. Chairman Rimsza stated that the Phoenix City Council would never support relinquishing control over their locally generated revenue. Mr. Smith stated that Federal law requires that an agency be designated to dispense the Federal Transit Administration Urbanized Area Formula Program funds attributable to Transportation Management Areas. This agency is referred to as the Designated Recipient. The recipient must be a public body and has the legal authority to receive and dispense federal funds in the urbanized area. The Governor, responsible local officials and publicly owned operators of transit services are required to designate a recipient to apply for, receive and dispense funds for the TMA. An amendment or rescission of the Designated Recipient requires concurrence from the Governor and a certified resolution from the MPO concurring in the designation. On February 26, 1975, the Regional Council approved the City of Phoenix request to be the Designated Recipient. Ms. Dolan asked if the designated recipient functioned similar to a bank. Mr. Smith replied that they disperse funds. He explained the cooperative process for deciding transit projects, which must be in the TIP. Mr. Cleveland asked which transit option in the document was the current process. Mr. Smith replied that none of the options represents the current process.

Ms. Dolan asked for clarification that Phoenix, as the designated recipient, does not have decision-making authority. Mr. Smith replied that the decisions for determining projects are made through the cooperatively developed TIP.

Mr. Cleveland asked who performs transit planning today? Mr. Smith replied that MAG performs transit planning as the MPO and subcontracts a portion of the transit planning to the RPTA.

Chairman Rimsza noted that there are two sources of funding, 5307 funds for transit capital and operating expenses and 5309 for new rail starts, rail modernization, bus and bus facilities.

Mr. Smith discussed an option to consolidate more of the multi-modal planning at MAG and have RPTA more focused on operations. He explained that RPTA receives \$7 million per year. Mr. Smith then discussed how transit projects are sent to MAG. These projects are considered by the Valley Metro Operating Staff (VMOS), which is a group of transit professionals primarily from the membership of the Regional Public Transportation Authority. The VMOS ranks the projects, and the rankings are provided to MAG for consideration by the Transportation Review Committee before being recommended for approval in the MAG Transportation Improvement Program.

Chairman Rimsza asked why does the line have to be between transit operations and transit planning? Why not give RPTA funding to do planning? Mr. Bourey explained that there has not previously been integration between transit planning and transportation planning. He added that in the decision making process, the MPO is responsible for where federal money is spent. The federal dollars coming in go to all transportation planning, whether to roads, transit, pedestrian, etc. There have been difficulties encountered as to whether the money will go to transit or roadways. To separate them

becomes problematic. How do you integrate the decision making process in where to put the investment on a policy level? This is a method to invest appropriately in the future.

Mayor Feldman-Kerr asked if RPTA had provided feedback? Mr. Smith replied that he had provided the options to the RPTA to ensure the accuracy of the material.

Chairman Rimsza stated that primary funding for the RPTA will expire in 2005 and the RPTA only manages \$7 million per year. The rest is cooperatively run through the system. He commented that work is continuing on figuring out the future of the RPTA, and now there is discussion about rail governance.

Mayor Feldman-Kerr asked what will happen to RPTA when the tax expires in 2005? Chairman Rimsza replied that RPTA staff is vitally needed in some way. He stated that the structure is what is in question.

Mr. Cleveland commented on the transportation and transit planning split. He stated that the document alludes to transportation and transit integration, but does not explain it. Mr. Cleveland commented that the planning and implementation options are confusing.

Mr. Martinsen stated that the consolidated regional approach, Option #6, pulls these together into one entity—RPTA and MAG would be joined in a new organization. Mr. Cleveland indicated that a statement that the consolidated regional approach brings all functions together is needed. Articulation of the integration of planning and integration elements is needed.

Mr. Smith stated that a County proposal is being discussed, which would assume the functions of the RPTA. Presently, we wrestle with the process for programming transit at MAG. MAG does not have a transit committee. MAG receives transit projects from member agencies, submits them to RPTA, which then go to VMOS, which reaches a consensus, then send back to MAG for inclusion in the TIP. Many communities are not at the table. Chairman Rimsza noted that not all communities are at the table because they choose not to dedicate funding for transit. Mr. Smith stated that RPTA recommends federal dollars be spent on the purchase of buses. Chairman Rimsza stated that a local match is needed to do this. He explained how the City of Phoenix dedicates \$25 million per year from its general fund, plus local match, for transit.

Mr. Cleveland stated that maybe a structural change should be made to improve our transit planning processes. He stated that there is no planning model for all interests. On the implementation side, how do you get the job done? Mr. Bourey stated that the process needs to be re-fashioned, whether it is consolidated or not. Mr. Cleveland stated that one option is leaving the structure as is. It is a question of operational implementation. They should be under the same umbrella.

Mr. Smith stated that the question is how much broad based input do you want? The bottom line is that everything has to come through the TIP and Plan. Do you want participation at lower levels?

Mr. Parr asked if there were any comments on the Organizational Name. Mayor Feldman-Kerr suggested that this not be brought up until we decide who we are.

Mr. Parr asked if there were comments on the Geographic Extent of Region. Mr. Cleveland suggested letting the Advisory Committee comment on the options. He stated that he felt if a jurisdiction was at the table, they should be allowed to vote.

Mayor Hawker asked how do you tie this into funding? There is a problem with a vote if there is not financial stake in it. Mr. Bourey stated that there are two different issues of funding: federal and sales tax. If the region expanded, those areas could be included in funding. Chairman Rimsza stated that by adding communities, MAG could be better.

Mayor Feldman-Kerr asked how this could affect CAAG? Mr. Smith explained that there is concern in Pinal County because of the joint area studies. In the case of boundary expansion, the Governor would need to be involved. Mr. Smith noted that MAG is a voluntary organization. He commented that MAG is not trying to take over Pinal County, but rather inviting them to participate. Mayor Hawker commented that if they wanted to become more than participants, they would need to put their sales tax into the pot. Chairman Rimsza stated that if we get enabling legislation, Pinal could spend their collected money, if Maricopa County collects, they spend. They could vote together as two counties.

Mayor Hawker asked what do we want and what do we walk away with after the October 22nd meeting? He stated that input, not rankings, is needed from the Advisory Committee. The Governance Task Force will make the final recommendations to the Regional Council.

Mr. Smith asked about sending the Land Use Options with the October 22nd agenda. Chairman Rimsza commented on sending the options as a recommendation to the Regional Council to see what they want to do. Mr. Cleveland suggested developing a package to connect land use and transportation. He stated that he was willing to work with staff on drafting this. Mr. Smith asked the Task Force if they agreed to blend Option #3 and Option #4, but not for comment by the Advisory Committee. Mayor Hawker commented on bringing the revised options to the Advisory Committee to let them know what was decided. Mayor Hawker stated that what needs to be brought to the forefront is that transportation planning should stay with MAG because MAG is doing land use planning.

There being no further business, the meeting adjourned at 1:45 p.m.

Chairman

Secretary