

**South Mountain Citizens Advisory Team Meeting Agenda
April 26, 2007 5:30 PM – 8:30 PM**

Location – ADOT Boardroom - 206 S. 17th Ave, Phoenix

Agenda Topic	Discussion Lead(s)	Expected Outcome(s)	Action Item(s)	Time
Check-In & dinner				5:30 PM
Welcome & introductions	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Tom Keller 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Introductions of all new participants (if any) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • N/A 	6:00 PM
Review of SMCAT charter document draft with template items from March 22, 2007 meeting	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • All 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Review, revise, and adopt SMCAT operating agreement 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Print and distribute adopted SMCAT operating agreement 	6:10 PM
New member discussion	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • All 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Finalized SMCAT membership list 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Update membership list and distribute 	7:10 PM
Break	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • All 			7:30 PM
Public involvement update	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Timothy Tait 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Knowledge of 2007 public involvement activities 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Schedule meetings with SMCAT member organizations 	7:45 PM
Review of potential meeting topic(s) & schedule	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Timothy Tait • Amy Edwards 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Knowledge of 2007 meeting schedule 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Printing & distribution of 2007 meeting schedule 	7:55 PM
Next SMCAT meeting discussion	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • All 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Consensus on agenda topics for May • Information request(s) • Date, time & location confirmation • Assignments: TBD 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Develop and distribute agenda • Prepare and distribute information requests 	8:10 PM
Session feedback forms and adjourn	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Tom Keller 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • TBD 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • TBD 	8:25 PM



South Mountain Corridor Study

Citizens Advisory Team

Meeting Summary

Date: April 26, 2007
Time: 5:30 p.m.
Location: ADOT Board Room

CAT Members Attending:

Ahwatukee Village Planning Committee, Laurel Arendt
City of Avondale, Jim McDonald
City of Tolleson, David Lafferty
Estrella Village Planning Committee, Peggy Eastburn
Kyrene Elementary School District, Terry Tatterfield
Lakewood HOA, John Rodriguez
Maricopa County Farm Bureau, Clayton Danzeisen
Phoenix Mountains Preservation Council, Michael Goodman
Sierra Club, Sandy Bahr
South Mountain/Laveen Chamber of Commerce, Lisa Bray
Southwest Valley Chamber of Commerce, Don Jones
Valley Forward, Dave Olney

CAT Members Absent:

Arizona Trucking Association, Dave Williams
Foothills HOA, Chad Blostone
Gila River Indian Community, Allison LaQuinta
Laveen Citizens for Responsible Development, Laurie Prendergast
Laveen Village Planning Committee, Michael Norton
Pecos Road/I-10 Landowners Association, Nathaniel Percharo
South Mountain Village Planning Committee, Pamela Daniels

Staff and Consultants

Tom Keller, KCA
Fred Erickson, KCA
Matt Burdick, ADOT
Sally Stewart, ADOT
Timothy Tait, ADOT
Doug Nintzel, ADOT
Mike Bruder, ADOT
Mark Hollowell, ADOT
Dan Lance, ADOT

Bill Vachon, FHWA
 Ken Davis, FHWA
 John Roberts, GRIC DOT
 Amy Edwards, HDR
 Michael Book, HDR
 Ron Ober, PDG
 Dean Howard, PDG
 Joy Butler, PDG
 Emily Bittner, CPR

Citizens:

Jim Jochim
 Doug Murphy
 Jack Sellers

Action Items

Task/Activity	Who	When
Provide finalized CAT Operating Policies to CAT members	KCA	
Provide May CAT meeting agenda	KCA	
Provide information about potential new members to CAT team	CAT members	

Welcome and Introductions:

Tom Keller, Knowledge Capital Alliance, welcomed the Citizens Advisory Team (CAT) members and citizens to the meeting at 6 p.m.

He introduced special guest Alexis Tameron, a representative of Congressman Harry Mitchell.

Alexis Tameron: I am here to hear everyone’s concerns regarding the project. I will leave my contact information for anyone who needs to contact me. (Ms. Tameron, district director for Congressman Mitchell, can be contacted at 480-946-2411 or alexis.tameron@mail.house.gov.)

Introductions were then done by all of the CAT members in attendance (refer to sign-in sheet).

Tom Keller: There are three members present who were not in attendance at the last CAT meeting. They are Terry Tatterfield, David Lafferty and Lisa Bray. We have created packets for you to hold the information that you compile from these meetings. The packets already contain the March 22 meeting agenda and summary and tonight’s meeting agenda. Please review the materials and let me know if you have any corrections.

CAT Member Comment: There should be a future discussion about logical termini. ADOT should review how other states have addressed this issue.

CAT Member Comment: I would like to receive upcoming agendas and other information prior to the meeting.

Tom Keller: Tonight's agenda was posted on the project Web site yesterday. Tonight we will discuss the timeframe that future agendas will be sent and the method in which CAT members will receive them. We will also discuss the charter document, and inviting new members. Timothy Tait with ADOT's Communication and Community Partnership group will update public involvement activities. We will also discuss the CAT meeting schedule and topics.

Right now, it is anticipated that the next CAT meeting, to be held in May, will consist of two parts. First, all CAT members will review general project background, including the selection of 55th Avenue and the upcoming CAT schedule. The second part of the meeting will be for the new CAT members and any other members who would like a full update and project background.

CAT Member Comment: Could we have a standing section on the agenda to ask questions about newspaper articles, activities of other groups and general information? We could have it at the beginning or end of the discussion.

CAT Operating Agreement

Tom Keller led the discussion to finalize the CAT charter document. The document was first reviewed at the March meeting.

After considering CAT comments at the March meeting, ADOT representatives thought it was best to create a parallel ADOT document. Since the March meeting, CAT members have submitted comments about the document. The operating agreement was posted on a large screen at the front of the room. CAT members' comments and suggestions for changes were posted on the document and shown on the screen.

ADOT also made a decision to create a joint operating agreement covering several common topics. Tom Keller explained that the operating agreement will help guide the CAT as they go forward in weeks ahead, provide them with guiding principles and decision-making mechanisms in the "decision process" section of the agreement.

Tom Keller suggested that the CAT first review the "decision process" section of the draft operating agreement.

CAT members agreed that a majority opinion would be sufficient criterion for decision-making.

CAT Member Comment: This is an OK way to make decisions. Another method that has worked well in other groups I've served on was noting the vote outcome when we made our recommendation. We defined consensus as no one objecting.

Tom Keller: We've seen minority reporting as a successful tool in the past. It allows people who don't agree to include their opinions.

CAT Member Comment: In our previous recommendation, on the western section, we made a footnote.

Tom Keller: Should we include language in the operating agreement to accommodate the minority report and represent the percentage vote?

CAT Member Comment: I don't think consensus is 51 percent. To me it means everyone in agreement.

Tom Keller: We also need to define what a quorum is for this group. In current literature, the definition is all over the map. One definition that we used is 51 percent of members of the current roster.

CAT Member Comment: I don't want a quorum to mean 51 percent of members.

CAT Member Comment: That would mean that we would need to have 16 people to have a quorum. You could have people with biased interests use that to miss meetings so they could manipulate the process of the CAT recommendation. We also need to nail down what our true membership would be.

Fred Erickson: Right now there are 20 people on the roster.

Tom Keller: What has attendance been in the past?

CAT Member Comment: Some groups stopped showing up after a while. Also in the past, we've typically had to make two types of decisions. There have been minor ones, like setting an agenda or deciding the next meeting topic. But if we're talking about when we get to a real decision - say about which route we'll choose - we might want to get a little more serious. If people haven't been showing up, they're not going to come in and vote at the end.

CAT Member Comment: The City of Tolleson wants to stay involved through the whole process and will continue to have a representative here to participate in the discussion. For me, personally, it depends which night of the week we're going to do this. If I can't make it, the city will replace me. But we need to lock in our day of the week. If we decide Wednesday night, I will have to go back to the city and tell them to find someone else.

Tom Keller: That brings up the issue of what happens when a person can't attend a meeting.

CAT Member Comment: Even the legislature only has to have a simple majority of the members of a committee to have a quorum. We ought to have a majority quorum requirement. Without it, we will have no credibility.

CAT Member Comment: The CAT is small enough that if we set it up so that a quorum is 51 percent of the group and then 51 percent of the people attending make a decision, you could have six people speaking for all of us. That should put pressure on everyone to be here to be represented. By having a small amount, we'll make a decision whether or not you'll be here.

CAT Member Comment: The converse issue is that you've got people who have already made up their mind and they only come to the last meeting. We should have a rule that if you don't come to the meetings, you should be voted off.

CAT Member Comment: I think facilitator can enforce that so we don't have to.

Tom Keller: If you recall from last month, we talked about putting enforcement language into the operating agreement document. Do you want that in the verbiage in your document so it can be enforced? For instance, something along the lines of "If a member misses x number of meetings?" Where do we leave the quorum issue?

CAT Member Comment: Are we going to have a rolling quorum? Maybe if you're regularly missing meetings, if you don't meet 70 percent attendance, you're not able to vote. That way we avoid the problem of people cherry-picking when they want to come to avoid a quorum.

Tom Keller: What has been your past experience? Tonight there are 13 in attendance, with 20 on the roster. Is this typical?

CAT Member Comment: Yes, it's about average. The majority of the people tend to show up. Since agendas will be sent out, people will know when they want to show up. In the end, does our vote matter? It's the input we put in. Like the presidential election. The voting to me is not as important as the input.

CAT Member Comment: The people who you have here tonight is the group who shows up on a regular basis.

Tom Keller: You all represent groups. What is their expectation of you in terms of your attendance? Is there an expectation from your group that you attend? If there is a reason you can't attend, do you have a backup who can come in your stead?

CAT Member Comment: That's why the process of having a backup is so important. My organization wants someone to be here and participate in the entire process.

CAT Member Comment: In every committee I sit on, you have to have 50 percent of the members present.

CAT Member Comment: Can you vote absentee?

CAT Member Comment: Are we expecting to be voting every week on something? Or are we just going to have comments like we did the other four years? Why focus so much on the voting process? Let's move on. It's not like we're a voice that is going to put out a public presentation every week after a meeting.

CAT Member Comment: It's about decision-making, not just voting. Like if six of us think that something needs to be presented on the next agenda, and seven don't. I think that's all we're trying to put our arms around.

Tom Keller: There will be times when we will have a discussion and will need to move on. For instance, when we start recommending new members. There are likely to be few times when we're taking a good, hard vote.

CAT Member Comment: Let's vote on it.

Tom Keller: Intel uses a discuss, debate, decide model. Let's discuss the operating agreement.

CAT Member Comment: Consensus should mean general agreement.

Tom Keller: You also want to capture a bullet on minority report, correct?

The CAT generally agrees with both of those points.

CAT Member Comment: Can we agree not to wordsmith this document by committee?

Tom Keller: Fred and I will incorporate these changes and circulate them to the group after the meeting. Let's move our discussion on to the next topic, then. We'll return to the beginning of document and work our way through. I want to reiterate our promise, throughout this process, to get you out of here on time. And give you a break.

CAT Member Comment: Will there be a decision about which night we're going to hold the meeting?

Tom Keller: We'll discuss topics and schedule around 7:55 p.m., as shown on the agenda.

Fred Erickson explained the notes feature from Microsoft Word that the facilitators are using on the document. He also asked whether formulating a project plan would be valuable for the team.

CAT Member Comment: No. I think some of these issues in the comment are addressed later on in the document.

CAT Member Comment: The first comment doesn't belong in the purpose statement. I do have a comment, though. I'm sorry I didn't mention this before. I think that the document should not refer to the "development" of the South Mountain Freeway. I suggest instead that we say "the proposed South Mountain Freeway."

No one objected.

Tom Keller: Let's discuss the section dealing with the role of ADOT and FHWA.

CAT Member Comment: Can we go back to the previous section? I didn't understand the last bullet point on the first section about maintaining confidentiality.

Timothy Tait: ADOT will brief interested members of the media members before CAT meetings. But we're providing you with information in advance of the public getting it. We want to maintain an environment where we can have open, frank discussions and not have to battle headlines at the same time. We're trying to establish some expectation that you won't share that information with members of the media.

CAT Member Comment: If you give out information to the media first, they will call to ask us if it's accurate.

Timothy Tait: You'll have the information before the media does. You'll get the packets at least a week before the CAT meeting. We'll brief reporters the afternoon before the CAT meetings. We want you to have the information before the media does. Our objective is for that information not to be public until it's discussed in the meeting.

CAT Member Comment: That's standard procedure for all public meetings, not to go out and shout about it to everyone else. I don't have a problem with it.

CAT Member Comment: I would hate to see something go out to the media before we've had a chance to discuss it. Like what happened with the cost figures for the 55 and 101. We were never given a chance to say whether we agreed or not.

CAT Member Comment: That was information that the reporter dug up.

Timothy Tait: If we provide information to the media that would be of interest to the group, could we also send you that information by e-mail? So that you don't have to read it in the paper before we tell you? If we're doing something formal with the media, we don't want you to be surprised by headlines.

CAT Member Comment: If we're going to fulfill our responsibility to represent an organization, I'm not going to be the only one looking at the materials. If a document needs to be marked confidential, the onus needs to be on the agency for making its confidentiality case. I'm not going to run out to the media, but I am going to share it with members of my organization. The people I work with are all volunteers. I'm not going to

try to commit them to this confidentiality statement. We've only done it during consent decrees. I don't think there should be a blanket statement.

CAT Member Comment: I also have to share information with the group I represent, because I have to find out from people in my Village about what they would support and get their feedback.

Timothy Tait: Our intent is not to keep you from being able to consult with your organizations. We just don't want to try to have our discussions via the media. Let's wordsmith the language for the draft operating agreement.

CAT Member Comment: Confidentiality is the problem word.

CAT Member Comment: Why don't we say something like: "don't forward or share the briefing packets with the media until after the briefing session."

CAT Member Comment: Yes, the evil empire.

Timothy Tait: If it becomes an issue, it could change the agency's philosophy about how information is provided and when it is provided.

CAT Member Comment: Basically we're trying to say don't take information we have been given and give it to the press.

CAT Member Comment: I think confidentiality is a good word.

CAT Member Comment: I won't agree with confidentiality. One of the problems with this group has been the transparency of the process and the public getting adequate information.

CAT Member Comment: If you can agree to confidentiality within my group, then we'll probably get packets in advance. I would like that.

CAT Member Comment: Just what is in these packets that makes them so sensitive?

Fred Erickson: What if we use the word indirectly in this bullet point?

CAT Member Comment: The way he reworded the bullet point, with indirectly, is fine with me.

General CAT agreement on the new wording for the bullet point.

CAT Member Comment: On the bullet point to formulate recommendation for the South Mountain Freeway, I don't understand the use of the word formulate. Does that mean a computer system? What is our process? Shouldn't we define how we're going to come to a decision at the end?

Tom Keller: Our intent was however you formulate your recommendation will be a decision that the CAT makes together.

CAT Member Comment: At some point, we will need to decide how we're going to do it.

Fred Erickson: Let's move on to discuss the role of ADOT and FHWA.

The CAT discussed additional comments to the documents that were incorporated in other sections of the document. The CAT rejected the several additional suggested comments in this section on that basis.

CAT Member Comment: There has to be a timeline. This could go on for four years, like last time. We need to be able to keep the timeline moving.

CAT Member Comment: ADOT obviously doesn't have control over that timeline right now. We can ask for the timeline. They've asked us for timelines and had to back off. Maybe we want to ask for a short-term timeline as it regards our meetings. Clearly asking us to review three technical reports at one meeting is too burdensome.

CAT Member Comment: When the committee asks for certain information, we can't wait for four months and then have one week and have to look over all the reports.

CAT Member Comment: Maybe we're talking about more of a timing issue than a timeline issue.

Dan Lance: Even though the CAT might be requesting information, from an ADOT and FHWA perspective, during technical and legal sufficiency review, certain information cannot be shared. It has not been approved for public release yet.

Tom Keller: If some information flows quickly after being stopped up for a while, how does that work?

CAT Member Comment: Can ADOT look at the complexity of the reports and look at whether you can combine some meetings? Last time we got some reports that were more simple and others that needs more technical discussion. Perhaps a little bit more consideration needs to be given about what community is interested in. For instance, archeology vs. hydrology; soil vs. air quality.

Tom Keller: There has to be some kind of balance here about which reports we'll review when. Realistic expectations need to be set.

Fred Erickson: I remember someone saying that the end of the process last time, ADOT accelerated the process. That's where I thought this comment came from.

CAT Member Comment: ADOT has cried wolf to us three times. There is a real issue of trying to understand what it is you want out of us. They can't say it's our fault that we're not reviewing them fast enough when it takes so long to get them to us. I think it's driven by how they're able to turn out documents. I understand that. But having some information is better than having no information. I don't want documents to be dumped on us.

CAT Member Comment: Is there anything ADOT can share ahead of the final report coming out? Maybe that goes back to the confidentiality issue.

CAT Member Comment: We know what we need the information on. It shouldn't be hard for ADOT to set their timeline. We can set committee meetings as the reports come forward.

Tom Keller: That brings us to how we set the schedule going on. Should we set it based on when information is likely to be available? We can't control, from the ADOT side, just when that is going to be available.

CAT Member Comment: I think we can't set a concrete timeline.

Tom Keller: How about we incorporate wording such as both parties make good faith efforts to make information available as soon as possible and for the committee to respond as quickly as possible?

CAT Member Comment: I also want to point out that not all technical material was brought to the meetings. Sometimes we would only get summary statements and would have to make an appointment to come down to this building to see the entire packet. The entire document should be there if we have a question about it. That's not an unfair expectation, to bring the full report.

CAT Member Comment: ADOT did better at the end, bringing the people who authored the report.

Dan Lance: From ADOT's perspective, bringing the reports will be OK if they're ready to be released from a technical and legal sufficiency standpoint.

Fred Erickson: We have a comment that documents need to be sent out more than five to seven days in advance of the meeting.

CAT Member Comment: I have no problem with five to seven days.

CAT Member Comment: For something like tonight's meeting, five to seven days is fine. On some reports, some of them are quite detailed. A week is not a lot of time. It depends on what we're talking about.

Tom Keller: What I'm hearing is that, depending on the materials, the amounts of times would vary. How about we use wording that ADOT makes its best efforts to get it to you in advance?

CAT Member Comment: Again, five to seven days for most days is fine. With my organization, if I have concerns about information, I just call them and I'll be in there that afternoon. If it's important, my group can make time for it.

CAT Member Comment: I remember that we had this conversation last time, about saying that the meeting doesn't need to be every four weeks. If you guys are going to turn over three reports to us, then four weeks isn't enough. I would recommend that we don't try to cram new reports into the four weeks. Some technical reports require some running around and phone calling to understand. It's really contextual as to what's coming out.

Tom Keller: Let's address the issue with regard to the nature of the documents.

Fred Erickson: Here's a comment that there should be a transcriber for the meeting and a tape recorder.

CAT Member Comment: Reading the previous transcripts, I felt like the questions were cherry-picked and the answers seemed inadequate, like everyone was perfectly satisfied with the answers. The document of these proceedings that is included in the EIS will make it seem like everyone was completely happy with it. That's going to go into the EIS and is an inaccurate reflection of the discussion.

Fred Erickson: Was the March meeting summary all right with you?

CAT Member Comment: I want the summary to reflect the names of people who ask questions and the names of people answering them.

Tom Keller: What is the feeling of the rest of the body?

CAT Member Comment: In the past, if I hadn't been at the meeting and used the meeting summary, I wouldn't have known what was going on. If it's a three-hour discussion, you can't capture every word. But the minutes should be a document you can read and understand what happened. If that's what goes forward, that's what goes forward. The verbiage should be there of what was discussed.

Tom Keller: Can I suggest that you look at the meeting summary for this meeting and the previous meeting, identifying if whether the actual issues were captured. You can make notations of what was not properly recorded.

CAT Member Comment: That burden should fall on the agency, not the CAT. ADOT should hire someone who can listen to the notes. We don't want three hours of transcribed discussions. We do want something better than cherry-picked questions and one-line answers. It should be recorded properly. I can't think of a better way to have it

recorded properly than to have a transcript. I'm very disturbed that we had four years of meetings and people just looking at it from the meeting notes wouldn't understand the jist of those questions and what was discussed there.

CAT Member Comment: I'll second her opinion and make the recommendation that we have a transcript of the meetings.

CAT Member Comment: I'm fine with recording the meeting. I see that with other groups I'm involved in. I hate to use the legislature as an example, again, but if you read their committee meeting minutes vs. listening to the tape, the discussions are very different.

Tom Keller: Were there ever discussions about whose responsibility this is?

CAT Member Comment: I don't know. But my philosophy is that I should be able to miss a meeting, sit down, read the summary and understand the meeting. I don't care how you do it.

Fred Erickson: Did you read the summary of the last meeting?

CAT Member Comment: The meeting was very general and simple. And very boring. I should be able to, whether we decide to leave the meeting early or can't make it to the meeting at all, I should know all the questions that were asked by the committee and understand the complete answers to that question.

Tom Keller: Let's make a decision about meeting summaries.

CAT Member Comment: If it's a good summarization, it doesn't matter to me how it's done.

CAT Member Comment: I have to leave to pick up a child in about half an hour. I'm sorry.

CAT Member Comment: I want more detailed minutes.

CAT Member Comment: I would like to give you a chance to give us the summarizations and readdress this at a later date. We haven't given you a chance, we're just talking about previous meetings. Let's table this decision until later and evaluate at that time.

CAT Member Comment: I'd rather not have to readdress it again, so we don't have to go through process issues at every meeting.

CAT Member Comment: Let's allow ourselves the chance to readdress it if it doesn't meet our satisfaction.

Tom Keller: We'll produce a meeting summary and let's evaluate it after you've seen it.

CAT Member Comment: Another CAT member should be able to read those minutes after they've left and understand what happened.

CAT Member Comment: Is it a big deal to bring someone in to record it, so if something happens, at least someone can listen to a tape?

Tom Keller: Is it the will of this body that you want all of your discussions taped?

Non-verbal reaction was mixed to the suggestion.

CAT Member Comment: Let's see how you do it.

Fred Erickson: Several additional comments were rejected because they were already addressed.

Tom Keller: Let's move on to the new member conversation. I believe that we discussed last time that the request for new members would come from the CAT to ADOT.

CAT Member Comment: I have a question on membership. If I remember right, when we defined who could be on this committee when we started, we decided that people representing governmental agencies shouldn't be part of this group because they had their own way of input through other methods. Some people here are representing governmental agencies. Can you clarify this?

Tom Keller: We weren't here then.

CAT Member Comment: Is another CAT member officially representing the city or is he here as a citizen?

Tom Keller: My impression is you were representing other constituent groups, that people weren't representing themselves.

CAT Member Comment: No one in this group should be representing a government.

CAT Member Comment: My recollection is that we decided that CAT members shouldn't hold elected office and serve on the CAT.

Fred Erickson: The original document doesn't address this issue.

CAT Member Comment: We were just saying CAT members couldn't be an official representative of that government agency in that there was other facilitation that ADOT does with government representatives.

Tom Keller: Of those people who seem to be representing government agencies, are they not officials of government agencies?

CAT Member Comment: I'm representing the City of Tolleson, but I'm here as a citizen, not an elected official.

CAT Member Comment: Why is there a person representing the planning department of the City of Phoenix? Don Herp attends these meetings as a representative from the City of Phoenix transportation department, but he's not a CAT member.

Dean Howard: I believe you may be referring to the member who represents the South Mountain Village Planning Committee. There was some confusion about that initially, but we will make sure the correct identification is listed on the team roster.

Fred Erickson: We have a request that the document say that CAT membership be broadened to include affected surrounding communities.

Tom Keller: Does anyone have a major issue with this?

CAT Member Comment: It makes sense to me.

Fred Erickson: We have a comment about the meeting schedule.

Tom Keller: At the last meeting, we discussed the idea that meetings would be scheduled when information is available, sort of on a per-topic basis, with the idea that there might have to be some changes to those dates.

The comment is accepted.

Tom Keller: Let's talk about the requirements for attendance and permanent replacements.

Fred Erickson: This comment says that a 65 percent attendance level should be attained and addressed retrospectively. The CAT member doesn't want members in question to have a voice in decision-making if they have missed meetings.

CAT Member Comment: The meaning of attendance on a consistent basis is open to a lot of speculation.

CAT Member Comment: What if we define it as three unexcused absences within a year would subject you to removal?

Fred Erickson: How would you like it worded? Something specific?

CAT Member Comment: I like how it was worded in the comment, with 65 percent attendance and requiring the member to aggressively recruit a replacement.

CAT Member Comment: For some people, if they don't show up for three meetings, it may just be a timing thing. For instance, if meetings vary and aren't always on Thursdays, that will make it hard for me to be here. If we have adequate minutes, I can understand what's going on every time I miss a meeting.

Tom Keller: As facilitators, we will follow up if people miss meetings. In the case where we aren't getting responses from an individual, we can bring that information to the team to determine whether that person needs to be removed.

CAT Member Comment: It's up to you, as facilitators, to contact the absentees, and then bring the information you learn to our attention.

CAT Member Comment: I think we need to come up with a number that will determine if attendance is an issue.

CAT Member Comment: I like the number about 65 percent attendance, it's clear and doesn't look arbitrary. That way we won't be accused of favoritism for people whose viewpoints are more appreciated than those of others. It doesn't put the facilitator in a weird position, either.

Tom Keller: We could always bring the CAT member's issues back to you and say what the extraneous issues might be.

CAT Member Comment: I like that we have the numbers. If we want to say that out of five meetings, if you've missed three, I'm comfortable with that metric.

Tom Keller: That is all logical to the facilitators, but it is ultimately up to you.

CAT Member Comment: Let's leave it at 65 percent.

CAT took a 10-minute break.

Tom Keller: Now we're on the meeting protocol section of the operating agreement. Let's go through this section relatively quickly. Does the agenda format work for you?

CAT members affirm that it does.

Tom Keller: We've addressed the quorum, and spent quite a bit of time on it. One of the reasons we exceeded the time guidelines for this issue was because this document was so important. In the future, we will make sure that timekeeping is an absolute standard. The discussion, debate, decide model seems to be working well for us thus far. We will have a break each time. What other protocol issues are there?

Fred Erickson: One comment on the protocol section suggests we have an executive session and then an open session like a city or state meeting.

CAT Member Comment: That comment was from me. Sometimes I feel like we could do things more quickly if we went to executive committee. It could be five-minute executive session. We should have the availability to request it, or discuss something within ourselves only.

CAT Member Comment: I can't think of any reason for this group to have an executive session. We may be quicker, but that's we have an open meeting law to govern public entities. There are very strict rules for what you can do in executive session. I don't see anything we're doing meeting those criteria. We shouldn't do it.

CAT Member Comment: All meetings should be open to the public.

Fred Erickson: There is a comment that all meetings should meet the spirit of the open meetings law.

CAT Member Comment: That's a good thing. I think we should make it clear to the public that there's every intent to make these meetings as public as possible, even though it's not required.

CAT members accept the change.

Fred Erickson: In the past, the CAT has handled public comments through written submissions and the appropriate response from a project team member if time allows. We have a comment that the public should be allowed to speak at meeting during last half hour. Speaker time limits may be imposed.

Tom Keller: Has it been your preference in the past that questions can be brought to this body by members of the public in a written way, not necessarily at a microphone? Is that correct?

CAT Member Comment: That was how the process developed and was one of the reasons that the organization I represent stepped down from participation in the CAT.

CAT Member Comment: The meetings got to the point where we were staying until 10 at night for all the letters to be read and people to be responded to. It got to the point where we got to as many as possible, then made sure they were all written in answered forms. There were too many people making redundant comments.

CAT Member Comment: that's why I suggested the last half hour be available for the public to speak. It makes it clear we're doing the public's business.

CAT Member Comment: I understand the point. But the public will never be satisfied. We are the public, trying to be voices for them about what we feel is right. It's not that the public can't talk, but we're not elected officials.

Tom Keller: It's my understanding that the public has other forums for questions and answers. Did the public ask questions of you?

CAT Member Comment: No.

CAT Member Comment: It wasn't a good process. People who tried to participate had a bad experience. We thought it was so bad that we had to step down.

Tom Keller: Why wouldn't they be asking questions of this body?

CAT Member Comment: The facilitator would point to the appropriate person on the project team to answer questions.

Tom Keller: Why are members of the public asking questions of people other than the CAT members if they have another venue to ask questions of ADOT?

CAT Member Comment: I understand the frustration as a member of the audience if something isn't clear and you just want it clarified. I have found when I'm sitting on a committee, there are questions that help me understand something. If a public comment period is well-structured, I've never seen it drag out. When it started getting redundant, that was when people were getting frustrated with our tight rules.

Tom Keller: Does it concern you that a member of the public could walk out the door and associate an answer with the CAT group and not ADOT?

CAT Member Comment: Why can't we say that the public has to ask questions of us, as CAT members? Not of ADOT?

CAT Member Comment: Then we'd just point to the right ADOT person.

CAT Member Comment: Let's have a half-hour without restrictions open to the public, without putting our own ideas into what someone else might have.

CAT Member Comment: You can't choreograph things. You have a half hour available for public comment or questions. Just because someone asks something doesn't mean they'll get an answer. Maybe you say each person has three minutes. Maybe they'll say they read research from Oregon about how bad freeways are next to residential areas. Maybe someone here is unaware of it. I think it's important for this process to have credibility and make it clear we are serving the public.

Tom Keller: Let me be a devil's advocate. Let's say a citizen asks a question and one of you feels compelled to make a response. Are you representing your organization?

CAT Member Comment: Yes.

Fred Erickson: Should we make that a process that is variable from meeting to meeting?

CAT Member Comment: Consistency is important. I just want to have a half hour.

CAT Member Comment: This is my first meeting. Are there not other public meetings that are held for the public to discuss some of these questions? My understanding is that the committee is an advisory team. It seems like there are more appropriate venues for ADOT to take in public comment.

CAT Member Comment: For example, the South Mountain Freeway is on my organization's agenda and people can bring their questions forward to my body. I take my book and my maps and all the latest information so that anyone can go through the book.

CAT Member Comment: You have a seat at the table, and so does your organization and so do I. There are a lot of people who have a seat at the table. But if you're an organization that feels unrepresented, you should have a voice at the CAT. It bothers me that people are so worried about it. Why is it so frightening?

CAT Member Comment: If we want to set a certain amount of time for a public question and answer period, that's fine. That can be adjusted as time goes by.

CAT Member Comment: If the question is left unanswered, I think that I'd be fairly angry if I were a member of the public. On the other hand, if you have 25 people who want to ask questions and 24 show up with the same question, that's a waste of everyone's time. And that's how the meetings used to be.

Tom Keller: We can have cards filled out by a certain time during the session. We can do it from that perspective, and screen for repetitive questions.

CAT Member Comment: Most people will understand if you tell them about the time limit. And they will understand about not asking questions that have already been asked.

Tom Keller: We can make stipulations about a time period and not asking previously asked questions.

CAT Member Comment: In the past, the decorum of those who didn't get the answer they didn't want to hear was very frustrating to me. That's especially true for the later meetings. That's what makes my hair stand up a little bit. Also, for the early meetings, no one is going to be here. When we discuss all these things, we will have a good discussion. The people who cause difficulty are the ones who come at the last minute and don't have information about the process. This is a working committee, we're not public officials. We have to have some way of limiting what members of the public can say. The blue card is a very good way.

CAT Member Comment: I agree with the 30 minutes. We can decide the blue card later.

Tom Keller: The issues of behavior are the responsibility of the facilitator. It's our job at the beginning of each session to set the guidelines for behavior for team members and the audience. We can put verbiage in there and you can hold us responsible to your standards.

CAT members are comfortable with the behavior section.

Fred Erickson: How do you feel about the liability section?

CAT Member Comment: I put that it's inappropriate to even mention liability. It raises an issue that I believe is not an issue.

Tom Keller: Can anyone give us some history on this?

CAT Member Comment: There were some discussions, but I don't remember anything in particular about it.

Tom Keller: How are you covered on behalf of your representation?

CAT Member Comment: If someone files a suit against me, my organization will defend me. Provided I was acting responsibly.

Matt Burdick: Perhaps we should change the heading from liability to advisory?

CAT Member Comment: That's already in the purpose statement. I would just take the section out entirely.

CAT members agree to remove the section.

CAT Member Comment: Will there be a section on the next agenda for public comments and questions?

Tom Keller: That's what you agreed to, right?

CAT Member Comment: I just wanted to make sure.

Tom Keller: Are you willing to adopt the operating agreement?

CAT agrees to adopt the operating agreement.

Fred Erickson: We'll incorporate the changes that we agreed to in this meeting and provide a final draft for everyone.

Tom Keller: Thank you for taking the extra time to get it done.

Public involvement update

Timothy Tait: To briefly reiterate what we discussed at the last meeting, ADOT representatives want to get in front of all your organizations. We want to update them on the status of the study and answer any questions on the process and timeline. We want to have these meetings on the calendar by the end of May and want to give the presentations during the summer, ideally June, July and August. We want to meet with all the organizations you represent. If you can start working with your organizations to identify specific dates, please coordinate that with me. Timothy provided his phone number: (602) 712-7070 and his e-mail address: ttait@azdot.gov. He said the presentation can be tailored to each group's needs, but ADOT needs about 20 minutes to do it justice. In the meantime, meetings and outreach all over the Valley are ongoing.

CAT Member Comment: I don't watch a lot of news or read papers, but I'm hoping to get some direct information from ADOT on one item I feel a little naïve about. Where are ADOT and the state with the Indian community? I learned a lot about their process of things and how they have to have their own meetings. I wish that, in our updates, we knew exactly what was going on with the Indian community.

Timothy Tait: Any information we provide you is information we have to provide any member of the community.

CAT Member Comment: I would like to know when GRIC meetings are. It's imperative we know something.

Timothy Tait: The GRIC have not changed their formal position. ADOT is in ongoing discussions with the GRIC on a variety of transportation topics.

CAT Member Comment: There were people who were here last time from the GRIC. It would be nice for us to know about anything happening with the GRIC before the public knows.

Timothy Tait: If news breaks, we would rather you hear it from us.

CAT Member Comment: An *Arizona Republic* article has me confused. The headline was that ADOT's five-year spending plan includes \$6 billion for the Valley. One of the expenses that was listed was the South Mountain segment of Loop 202, for construction, design and right of way. If the decision hasn't even been made about the freeway, how can you be scheduling construction and acquisition?

Timothy Tait: We need to divide the project in two processes. Those of us here in this room are engaged in the study process. Then, simultaneously is MAG's process to adopt a schedule for transportation funding. What does that mean for the study process? Nothing, from where we stand today. We don't have a record of decision. Until we do, any money that's been allocated for construction can't be spent. Don't look at the funding process as preeminent decision-making, it's just budgeting.

Doug Nintzel: The transportation board didn't take action, they held a public hearing. Their decision will likely come in June, prior to the fiscal year.

New member discussion

Tom Keller: Do any of you have recommendations beyond what is listed?

CAT Member Comment: I'm surprised that Chandler is not represented on the CAT. The East Valley Partnership should also be represented since they've been active in transportation issues since the mid-'80s. The Chandler Chamber of Commerce is important, especially since the city is such a high-tech center. There's a broader stakeholder group to be considered here.

CAT Member Comment: I have recommended the public health association and the Maricopa County Asthma Association. I think it would be very beneficial to have representatives who understand the public health implications of more freeways and more cars and putting more pollution into the air.

Tom Keller: We've had suggestions for medical representatives, additional HOAs in Laveen and major businesses.

CAT Member Comment: I'm a 22 year resident of Laveen. I think it's an excellent recommendation to bring more Laveen HOAs into the process. There are several new HOAs that will be impacted.

Tom Keller: Have any of these organizations been requested to participate in the past?

CAT Member Comment: It would be nice to have an Arizona public health person who can explain reports and be part of this organization, rather than have sterile reports from some office far away, like Chicago. I think we need someone in general who knows about the public health.

Tom Keller: To be consistent with the process in the past, these should be organizations represented, not individuals.

CAT Member Comment: About the HOAs, there has been tremendous growth in Laveen since we started this process. There are probably some new HOAs on the Ahwatukee side since we've started, too. One of them may have requested to be part of this group. As for the Chandler groups, I can see one group representing Chandler. All three might be overkill, from my personal opinion.

Fred Erickson: Is one of these groups a superset for the others?

CAT Member Comment: The East Valley Partnership would be good.

CAT Member Comment: Roc Arnett used to be on this committee.

<<**Technical Correction:** Roc Arnett was not a CAT member; rather, it was Rock Argabright who formally served on the team, representing the Ahwatukee Foothills Chamber of Commerce. Mr. Arnett is a member of the Citizen's Transportation Oversight Committee. – T. Tait>>

CAT Member Comment: I think they're a high-value stakeholder.

CAT Member Comment: I think a medical representative, maybe a pulmonologist, someone who understands that aspect of medicine would be good. They would have their own pertinent questions about reports.

Tom Keller: What about having a medical expert address the issue as a panelist, not as a member?

CAT Member Comment: As a member, they would ask questions we wouldn't think of.

CAT Member Comment: You could have them as an advisor or consultant. It's not in the same vein as an HOA.

Tom Keller: How many medical experts would there be within their own specialty issues?

CAT Member Comment: There are already two big groups from Laveen on the CAT.

CAT Member Comment: What establishes the threshold for an HOA for us to bring them in? 150 homes? 200 homes? Or in my case, 3,000 homes?

CAT Member Comment: I don't know if we could put this question off for another meeting, but could someone get us a map that shows us where the HOAs are and their approximate size?

CAT Member Comment: We should find out which HOAs are interested and then see how many homes are part of those HOAs. We may only get one HOA that cares about sitting on the committee.

CAT Member Comment: Maybe one way to deal with the Laveen HOAs is to see if the existing groups represent them already. I was just looking at the geographic representation. You need balance between the areas. I'm fine with inviting additional people from HOAs.

CAT Member Comment: There are no Laveen HOAs on the CAT now and there would be some pretty major impacts to homes in that area.

Tom Keller: Let's make this a topic of next month's meeting. We obviously need more information.

The CAT members agree.

Tom Keller: I know there's a desire to get this done quickly. But let's get some specifics about the groups that you are considering inviting.

CAT Member Comment: Let's find out who is interested.

Tom Keller: Those of you who have made these recommendations should bring information to the rest of the group so you can all make these decisions. We'll organize it and get it back out to you.

CAT Member Comment: We may encourage Doug Murphy (of the Ahwatukee Foothills News) to make an announcement to the public that we're soliciting requests for organizations that are interested in becoming involved in the process.

CAT Member Comment: With the HOAs in Laveen, I would also like to include the ones in Ahwatukee. The other area, sort of between the mountain, in the valleys between the South Mountain Peaks where the freeway is going to go through, on the east side of the power line... Maybe we should invite someone from that area, too.

CAT Member Comment: That's Dusty Lane, it's behind Carver Mountain. They don't have a formal group.

CAT Member Comment: That area will be coming up in this section of discussions. I know some of them were at some of our meetings.

Tom Keller: Perhaps people from that area can provide some of that information to us.

CAT Member Comment: Is Laveen Citizens for Responsible Development a non-profit?

CAT Member Comment: Yes. That representative was at the last CAT meeting.

Meeting topics and schedule

Timothy Tait: Our intent for the May meeting had been to incorporate new members that the group had decided on. We also wanted to review the 55th Avenue decision and provide an overview of the project history to get all new and continuing members all on same page. Given our meeting today, I'm not sure what we'll be discussing at the May meeting without the new members. We don't want to have a review for folks who don't need it and then not have review for those who do need it. And let's answer a basic question: Is there a need to add additional groups? If the consensus is that this group is sufficient, that can change what our May meeting will be.

CAT Member Comment: We need an East Valley presence. If we don't have one more HOA come in, that's not a big deal. If businesses don't already know, from the past four years about where this thing has gone, that's their decision. I don't care about the major businesses. The public health thing, whichever way we do it, we need someone to help us understand what we're doing, regardless of how we do it. To me, the East Valley thing is the only thing we need.

CAT Member Comment: Should we contact the Chandler Chamber of Commerce, East Valley Partnership and asthma association and see if they want to participate?

Timothy Tait: We would want the group to agree that whichever organizations you invite would be welcome as part of the team. Also understand that there is a danger if you open the door to new members, there are a lot of HOAs that may want to participate. A map showing the HOAs may not be available, but when you start talking about a comprehensive list of HOAs, that data doesn't always exist.

CAT Member Comment: Practically every subdivision that's out there is an HOA. That's just a given these days. But if we start extending invitations to one, we might have to expand it a lot more.

Timothy Tait: This group will have to decide where to draw the line. If you want to add groups, you need to tell us specifically which ones you want to add. We don't want to pick and choose for you. We will strong-arm them if we need to get them here.

CAT Member Comment: Can we get consensus on those three? The Chandler Chamber, the East Valley Partnership and the asthma association?

CAT Member Comment: I think that we should delay the decision and revisit it next month.

Timothy Tait: Based on our discussions from last month, there is a strong desire from ADOT to have a hybrid meeting in May. Here was the concept: the first half would involve all CAT members. We would review the 55th Avenue decision because there seemed to be some issues there. Maybe we wouldn't resolve those issues, but we could talk about them. Then we would have a break and veterans could have a cookie and leave. If we want to delay the membership discussion, we're OK with that. What we do need to decide is when our next meeting will be held and what topics will be discussed.

CAT Member Comment: The City of Chandler is eastside representation. As far as HOAs and cracking the door, Laveen is already covered. Drawing the line is a problem. Someone from the East Valley should be the only person we invite.

Tom Keller: Is it our desire to make a decision now?

The CAT decides to postpone the new member decision.

CAT Member Comment: We could get started with these. It doesn't mean we end it with these. Why do we have to put it off?

CAT Member Comment: I'm not convinced you need both the Chandler Chamber and the East Valley Partnership.

Tom Keller: Do you want to make this decision tonight or another point? Let's get on with it because it's getting late.

CAT Member Comment: I agree it would be good to have a Laveen HOA on here, but it would make sense to invite the most affected.

CAT Member Comment: The most affected communities are near the Bougainvillea Golf Course and the Cotton Fields Community. Going west, there are about 400 horse properties right along southern avenue.

CAT Member Comment: Along Dusty Trail Avenue.

CAT Member Comment: We're being very redundant in that Laveen Village Planning Committee is already on there. There are avenues for all of these people to express their voices. We're already over our time because of the number of members we have. That's why it's easier to have someone from a larger body so it can be taken out to the larger public.

Fred Erickson: Someone asked whether we could invite one or two groups from this proposed list and table the others.

CAT Member Comment: I would be happy to talk to all of those Chandler organizations.

Tom Keller: It sounds to me like you don't know who you want to invite.

The CAT agrees .

Tom Keller: Let's talk about the next meeting, then. What will we talk about?

CAT Member Comment: Why can't we have that review of what you're saying, in May's meeting?

Timothy Tait: ADOT wants to avoid a situation like that. We want to let the team form a team and then move forward together as a group.

CAT Member Comment: New people will need to get briefed. We could have individual briefings for them.

Timothy Tait: I foresee that only when an organization will need to change its representative. It's critical to moving forward that we not piecemeal organizations into the process. Do we need an abbreviated May meeting just for the purpose of a new member discussion? Then we can decide when we schedule the review/history discussion?

CAT Member Comment: Let's finish up our membership discussion at next meeting.

Timothy Tait: I propose May 24, in this room, at 5:30 p.m. We'll plan on being done by 7. Is an hour long enough to talk membership?

CAT Member Comment: If you have information out ahead of time, then everyone will come here informed.

Tom Keller: Let me ask that those of you who are bringing information about potential new members do so in a timely manner so we can distribute it. Please also attend the meeting with the expectation that we're voting on new members.

CAT Member Comment: I also want to talk about meeting topics in May.

Tom Keller: We might as well do that.

Timothy Tait: Let's be prepared, too, to discuss times and locations that work well for the community for the meetings going into the future.

CAT Member Comment: How about the South Mountain Environmental Center, off of Central Avenue, that was eliminated before? It's at the north base of South Mountain. Someone was looking into whether that was even possible.

Timothy Tait: We'll check on it.

Tom Keller: We'll distribute an agenda for the May meeting recapping this discussion.

CAT Member Comment: Can we make this decision on membership over e-mail or on the phone?

Timothy Tait: That is not ADOT's preference.

Tom Keller: Any other questions?

CAT Member Comment: If I have any questions about HOAs is there someone at ADOT I can contact?

Dean Howard: The problem with HOAs is that no one keeps complete lists and there are registered and non-registered HOAs.

Timothy Tait: We will help you hunt it down, but we don't want to do heavy research on this stuff. It's the CAT's responsibility to determine which new members you want to add.

Tom Keller: Any members of the public can leave a question with the blue card. To remind the CAT, the session evaluation form is in the last page of your binder. Please send it to Fred or leave it for us tonight.

The meeting ended at 9 p.m.

South Mountain Citizens Advisory Team

DRAFT - OPERATING AGREEMENT

PURPOSE

The South Mountain Citizens Advisory Team (SMCAT) will provide a forum for communication between the Arizona Department of Transportation (ADOT), Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) and the local community regarding the development of the South Mountain Freeway. The SMCAT is a voluntary advisory team and not a decision-making body, and it will not be responsible for decisions made by the State of Arizona or the FHWA. The SMCAT will meet regularly to review project status and provide input on issues that are relevant to the project.

SMCAT ROLES & RESPONSIBILITIES

The SMCAT will:

- Provide advice and input to the ADOT public involvement and project teams.
- Act as a conduit of information between ADOT, FHWA and their constituent groups and the public.
- Provide advice on public meeting formats, locations and agendas, along with the contents of the information to be distributed to the public.
- Report to respective community organizations on a regular basis with the intent of consensus building within the community organization, inform the ADOT Public Involvement Team of issues, concerns and opportunities that result from communications with respective community organizations and the public.
- Review technical and environmental drafts and conclusions reached by ADOT and the consulting team and responses to issues identified during public meetings.
- Review Project Team recommendations on alternatives along with supporting rationale for the recommendation
- Review draft EIS concurrent with the public review (specifically to identify potential follow up issues, review mitigation strategies, and provide feedback on document content and readability)
- Review the contents of the final EIS.
- Maintain confidentiality of the meeting briefing packets until after the media briefing sessions.



- Formulate the SMCAT's recommendation for the South Mountain Freeway.
- The SMCAT may be asked to formulate suggested strategies and/or solutions relative to project issues, concerns, and opportunities that may arise during the project.

ROLE OF ADOT & FHWA

Objective

ADOT & FHWA will provide information, documents, materials and meeting support to the SMCAT to aid it in formulating its recommendations.

ADOT & FHWA will:

- Evaluate SMCAT recommendations wherever appropriate within the parameters of the project and provide feedback.
- Provide subject-matter experts for meetings as requested by the SMCAT
- Extend invitations to prospective new members as requested
-  Provide the SMCAT briefing packets a minimum of five to seven days in advance of the scheduled SMCAT meeting
-  Provide a draft of the previous meeting summaries to the facilitators prior to the next meeting for distribution and approval by the SMCAT
- Provide the schedule based on the most current information
- Work with the SMCAT and the facilitators to identify topics for scheduled meetings
- Provide a calendar of all public involvement activities associated with the South Mountain Freeway project
- Provide a summary to SMCAT of all public involvement activities associated with the South Mountain Freeway project
- Hold individual briefing meetings with local media prior to scheduled SMCAT meetings
- SMCAT meeting summaries will be posted to the website
- Agendas for SMCAT meetings will be posted to the website.

ROLE OF THE FACILITATORS

Objective

The facilitators will provide third-party facilitation of the SMCAT meetings to assure the open exchange of information & ideas related to the South Mountain Freeway project.

The facilitators will:

- Act as the SMCAT's advocate in the study process
- Work with the SMCAT and ADOT to provide detailed meeting agendas
- Facilitate SMCAT meetings
- Manage the meeting schedule and the recommendation process for the SMCAT to coincide with the overall project plan
- Forward questions from the media or public to ADOT or the SMCAT as appropriate
- Distribute meeting summaries & agendas, information requests to the appropriate parties, requested information and briefing packets
- Compile the SMCAT meeting summaries in final form. The SMCAT meeting summary will be distributed prior to the next meeting.
- Manage the behavior of all parties in the meetings consistent with the standards established by the team
- Forward requests for subject matter experts from the SMCAT to ADOT

MEMBERSHIP

The SMCAT may consist of up to 30 members.

- SMCAT members will be selected to reflect a broad range of community interests within the project area.
- Typical SMCAT members will include local residents representing homeowners associations, civic organizations, environmental groups, education institutions, business associations, industry, and other community stakeholders.
- Members will serve until completion of the project.
- Substitutions at SMCAT meetings are permitted by a member of the same stakeholder organization.
- The current membership roster is attached in appendix A.
- SMCAT will determine if new or replacement organizations should be included in

the membership.


CONSENSUS PROCESS

- Consensus is defined as fifty one percent (51%) or more of the SMCAT members in attendance as long as a quorum is achieved.
- A quorum is defined as fifty one percent (51%) or more of the current SMCAT membership roster.


COMPENSATION

- Membership on the SMCAT is entirely voluntary.
- SMCAT members will not be compensated for their service.

SCHEDULE OF MEETINGS

-  CAT meetings will be held on a schedule agreed to by the SMCAT.

MEETING ATTENDANCE

- SMCAT members are expected to attend the scheduled meetings and arrange for substitutes when absent.
-  CAT members who cannot attend meetings on a consistent basis are encouraged to identify a permanent replacement from their organization.

MEETING PROTOCOL

- Agendas
- Establish quorum
- Timekeeping
- Standards for behavior
- Visitors from the public
- Discussion, debate, recommend
- Parking lot (issues)
- Breaks

VISITORS

- SMCAT meetings, and issue-specific committee meetings, are not subject to open meeting laws, however, meetings will generally be open to the public.
- SMCAT membership will determine to what extent the public is involved in the meeting. Currently, the public can provide written questions to the facilitator who, with time permitting at the end of the meeting, will have the appropriate Project Team member respond.

BEHAVIOR

- SMCAT members are expected to treat each other with mutual courtesy, respect and dignity.
- Since the SMCAT is a voluntary, advisory team, it is important that individual SMCAT members abide by accepted standards of behavior.
- Unacceptable or disruptive behavior will not be tolerated and will be grounds for exclusion from further participation in SMCAT activities.
- SMCAT member who acts disrespectfully toward other members, disrupts the SMCAT process, or is unable to attend meetings on a consistent basis may be required by the third party facilitator, the ADOT public involvement team, or a majority of the other SMCAT members to leave or resign from the SMCAT.

LIABILITY

- SMCAT members act in an advisory capacity to the ADOT Project Team.
- ADOT and FHWA are not bound by the recommendations of this group.
- SMCAT members are not liable for ADOT actions.

Appendix A

SMCAT Roster

Organization Name	Member Name
Ahwatukee Foothills Chamber of Commerce	Carola Tamarkin
Ahwatukee Foothills HOA	Chad Blostone
Ahwatukee Village Planning Committee	Laurel Arndt
AMTA	Dave Williams
City of Avondale	Jim McDonald
City of Phoenix Planning Dept	Pamela Daniels
City of Tolleson	David Lafferty
Estrella Village Planning Committee	Peggy Eastburn
Gila River Indian Community - District 4	LaQuinta Allison
Kyrene Elementary District	Terry Tatterfield
Lakewood HOA	John Rodriguez
Laveen Citizens for Responsible Development	Laura Prendergast
Laveen Village Planning Committee	Michael Norton
Maricopa County Farm Bureau	Clayton Danzeisen
Pecos Road/I-10 Landowners Association	Nathaniel Percharo
Phoenix Mountains Preservation Council	Michael Goodman
Sierra Club	Sandy Bahr
South Mountain/Laveen Chamber of Commerce	Lisa Bray
Southwest Valley Chamber of Commerce	Don Jones
Valley Forward	Dave Olney



South Mountain Freeway Study

April 26, 2007
Citizens Advisory Team Meeting

ADOT Board Room

1



Agenda

Agenda Topic	Discussion Lead(s)	Expected Outcome(s)	Action Item(s)	Time
Check-In & dinner				5:30 PM
Welcome & introductions	• Tom Keller	• Introductions of all new participants (if any)	• N/A	6:00 PM
Review of SMCAT charter document draft with template items from March 22, 2007 meeting	• All	• Review, revise, and adopt SMCAT operating agreement	• Print and distribute adopted SMCAT operating agreement	6:10 PM
New member discussion	• All	• Finalized SMCAT membership list	• Update membership list and distribute	7:10 PM
Break	• All			7:30 PM
Public involvement update	• Timothy Tait	• Knowledge of 2007 public involvement activities	• Schedule meetings with SMCAT member organizations	7:45 PM
Review of potential meeting topic(s) & schedule	• Timothy Tait • Amy Edwards	• Knowledge of 2007 meeting schedule	• Printing & distribution of 2007 meeting schedule	7:55 PM
Next SMCAT meeting discussion	• All	• Consensus on agenda topics for May • Information request(s) • Date, time & location confirmation • Assignments: TBD	• Develop and distribute agenda • Prepare and distribute information requests	8:10 PM
Session feedback forms and adjourn	• Tom Keller	• TBD	• TBD	8:25 PM

2



Welcome & Introductions

- Tom Keller, Fred Erickson – KCA


3



SMCAT Charter Review

- Purpose
- SMCAT Roles And Responsibilities
- Role of ADOT & FHWA
- Role of the Facilitators
- Membership
- Decision Process
- Compensation
- Schedule of Meetings
- Meeting Attendance
- Meeting Protocol
- Visitors
- Behavior
- Liability

4



SMCAT Membership

Organization Name	Member Name	Status
Ahwatukee Foothills Chamber of Commerce	Carola Tamarkin	New Member
Ahwatukee Village Planning Committee	Laurel Arndt	Current Member
Arizona Trucking Association (ATA)	Dave Williams	Current Member
City of Avondale	Jim McDonald	Current Member
City of Phoenix Planning Dept	Pamela Daniels	Current Member
City of Tolleson	David Lafferty	Current Member
Estrella Village Planning Committee	Peggy Eastburn	Current Member
Gila River Indian Community - District 4	LaQuinta Allison	Current Member
Kyrene Elementary District	Terry Tatterfield	New Member
Lakewood HOA	John Rodriguez	Current Member
Laveen Citizens for Responsible Development	Laura Prendergast	Current Member
Laveen Village Planning Committee	Michael Norton	New Member
Maricopa County Farm Bureau	Clayton Danzeisen	Current Member
Pecos Road/I-10 Landowners Association	Nathaniel Percharo	Current Member
Phoenix Mountains Preservation Council	Michael Goodman	Current Member
Sierra Club	Sandy Bahr	Current Member
South Mountain/Laveen Chamber of Commerce	Lisa Bray	New Member
Southwest Valley Chamber of Commerce	Don Jones	Current Member
The Foothills HOA	Chad Blostone	New Member
Valley Forward	Dave Olney	New Member

5

- 
- ## SMCAT Membership Recommendations
- Chandler Chamber of Commerce
 - City of Chandler
 - East Valley Partnership
 - Medical representatives
 - Arizona Public Health Association
 - Maricopa County Asthma Association
 - Additional HOAs in Laveen
 - Major businesses/employers
- 6

Break

7

Public Involvement Update

Timothy Tait
ADOT

8



Potential Meeting Topics

- Review of Western Section Preliminary Preferred Alternative Selection - W55 Alternative
 - Southwest Valley Regional Traffic Study by MAG
- W55 Alternative Realignment at Fuel Tank Farm
- Profile Options Considered in Eastern Section
 - Open-Cut, Tunnels and Bridges at South Mountain Ridges
 - Drainage Considerations
- Air Quality Panel Discussion
- Others...?

9



Session Feedback Forms & Questions from the Public (time permitting)

SMCAT Members: Please complete & submit the Session Feedback forms

Thank You

10