

MEETING SUMMARY NOTES

WMYA Long Range Transportation Plan Steering Team Meeting #1 June 15, 2010; ADOT – Phoenix, AZ

Meeting was called to order at 1:05 p.m. The meeting was held at ADOT and via a video conference.

I. Introductions – Jim Zumpf

Jim Zumpf, Project Manager gave an overview of using the video conferencing.

Jennifer Toth, Steering Team Chair, introduced herself and introduced Jim Zumpf who is the ADOT Project Manager for the Long Range Transportation Plan (LRTP) known as *What Moves You Arizona* (WMYA). She thanked everyone for taking the time to be a part of the Steering Team. She had everyone introduce themselves. See Appendix for participant list.

Jennifer provided an overview of the webinar procedures and encouraged everyone to participate. Everyone should have received and have three handouts for use during the meeting – Meeting Agenda, Outreach and Involvement Timeline, and Goals, Objectives, and Performance Measures. These handouts were e-mailed in advance of the meeting.

Jennifer gave a brief overview of the Steering Team role which is to provide input throughout the process in a technical role. As a second role, this team is responsible for managing the Plan's process and overseeing the process goals to ensure that we reach consensus. It is important that everyone come prepared, ready to ask the tough questions, and take responsibility for ensuring that the project is successful. She stressed the importance of good communications with colleagues and bringing those comments forward. It is important for the Team members communicate within their area as well as get actively involved in the discussions about long range transportation choices. Jennifer mentioned that Kristin Bornstein will go into more detail about all of the committees when she presents about the outreach effort.

Transportation planning is all about making choices and understanding the potential consequences of choices to transportation conditions, mobility, access, the economy, quality of life, and other considerations, Jennifer explained. This process outcome will define the transportation choices Arizonans want to make and how they would like to invest the limited future transportation resource. Through this process, expectations and implications of decisions have on transportation system performance will be debated.

Jennifer mentioned that the product of this process will be "Recommended Investment Choice for the 25-year timeframe with Associated Performance Measures." The focus of this process is on the state system. The Plan will provide ADOT and the Arizona transportation community a roadmap for making future transportation investment decisions, not just for new highway projects but for multimodal improvements as well as preservation of current infrastructure. The outcomes will identify the state's relative priorities for different types of transportation improvements, which in turn will influence resource allocation and project selection decisions through capital programming. The performance measures will provide a means for describing the anticipated consequences of the Recommended Investment Choice, as well as facilitate the

tracking and reporting the plan's implementation. It identifies the state's priorities in terms of investment choices within the 25-year timeframe.

She said that Dale Janik, Project Manager for the Wilbur Smith Associates team, will go in more detail about the WMYA Plan process.

At this time, Jennifer referred to the PowerPoint Presentation and provided an overview of the Steering Team meeting agenda. The PowerPoint Presentation will be on the project website www.whatmovesyouarizona.gov. She said that today's presentations are meant to provide information that will prompt discussion about the process, schedule, and goals, objectives and performance measures. We will take pauses during the presentation for participants to ask questions and provide input. Jennifer also mentioned that the Steering Team will receive an electronic questionnaire following the meeting that all are asked to complete. The purpose is to receive specific information about the meeting and planning process as well as gathering specific comments on the technical information presented.

II. Comments from ADOT Management – Jennifer Toth

Jennifer Toth, Director of ADOT Multimodal Planning Division, using the PowerPoint presentation, said that the agency is committed to long range transportation planning and to developing a Long Range Transportation Plan that will guide decision-making relative to capital improvements. Specifically, it will provide direction to how the agency is going to invest its money and translate the vision and goals into the programming process. This will influence the allocation of resources.

Jennifer said that there is commitment from the top and through the agency to the focus on multimodal transportation opportunities. We are working on how we are going to address this at the state level and push this focus all the way through the organization.

BQAZ is what we are building upon for this study. We have heard a tremendous amount from the public through the bqAZ process that we can use in developing goals and transportation recommendations. She said that it is interesting that the U.S. DOT just distributed their strategic plan for review and many of the types of vision components and goals we developed during bqAZ and being presented here today are being discussed at the national level too. It will be critical for us to make the transition effectively taking what we heard and translating those ideas into the LRTP and ultimately in the investment choices.

After bqAZ Jennifer said that the team interviewed all the COG/MPOs to develop the decision-making structure and process for the LRTP. Jennifer gave an overview of the Committee structure and said that they are complimentary committees with the key decisions being made at the Policy Committee level. The Steering Team is both responsible for technical review as well as process review to ensure that the process meets everyone's expectations. She stressed that this process is being done in a very collaborative way with all of us being responsible for the success. It is a consensus-based process. If consensus cannot be met than it gets escalated to the ADOT Director to make a decision. This process is truly collaborative and we will be working toward that consensus.

III. WMYA Overview - Dale Janik

Thank you for taking time out of your day to participate in this important project for Arizona. The Project Management Team (PMT) comprised of ADOT staff and consultants have been looking forward to this meeting for a long time. Using the PowerPoint Presentation, Dale gave an overview of the WMYA process.

The LRTP is more than just a document. It is a process built upon a number of building blocks. One of the building blocks is the bqAZ process. He said that if you can't measure the outcomes of your efforts you don't know if you are being successful in moving the state toward its transportation vision. This is why performance measures are critical. It is also important to understand the transportation needs and the projected revenues. This 25-year planning effort is cost-constrained, while the bqAZ process was unconstrained and a longer term timeframe. The plan will match investments against the choices and at the end of the day the outcome will be the "Recommended Investment Choice."

There are some planning parameters that this process will follow. There are federal requirements/guidelines that will guide what we are doing. These requirements will be coupled with input from planning partners and state requirements. It is an "Integrated Process" that will take the requirements, add the interaction with the committee structure and outreach efforts to develop the key outcomes that will include the preferences, needs, and goals/objectives/performance measures.

Dale mentioned that the first product is called *Transportation in Arizona Report*. It is now posted to the project website. He explained that the process is at the end of the first three major task areas shown on a graphic in the PowerPoint. The planning effort will end about this time next year.

Our goal is to implement and refine the bqAZ vision. The planning effort will move from an unconstrained 2050 vision to a 25-year plan that is fiscally constrained.

Dale explained the following key components of the planning process.

Performance Measurement is how we define success; it identifies the outcomes of investing resources, which, impacts the quality of life as well as the performance of the system. If the measures are done right the process is transparent and guides future decisions.

Needs Analyses are the technical process that quantifies the existing and future conditions of the transportation system. This analysis determines how the state system functions and how it should be enhanced. This analysis includes evaluation of the needs for preservation, modernization and expansion of the system which are directly related to needed safety improvements. It will address all modes. The analysis will address access management, adding more capacity or building new roadways. We will describe all of these needs now (backlog) and in the future (accruing). We will also quantify how much it will cost to address these needs.

Revenue Forecasts are critical to understanding how much revenue will be available to address transportation needs. The team will produce the "baseline" forecast, which is basically if we don't change anything (discounted for inflation) and represents the status quo. A key outcome is a gap analysis of the needs against the revenues forecast. The same kind of choices each of us

faces at home we face with addressing transportation desires. The gap is between our desire and the reality of how much money we have.

Financial Analysis is another aspect of the funding picture that will be addressed. There is no state that is satisfied with the baseline forecast revenues; so we need to examine what improvements/initiatives we would like to undertake (and how much does it cost). The team will also identify potential sources for revenues.

Alternative Investment Choices are the tools that take all of the analysis or information inputs just discussed to understand transportation choices and the consequences of those choices. It includes defining the needs and all of the costs associated with them. Alternative investment choices provide an array of all the potential choices and consequences for each of the choices. So if you want to put more money into rail it has consequences elsewhere. By using the performance measures we will be able to compare against the choices. It is important to recognize that the outcome is not specific projects or a list of projects. This planning process is designed to create a blueprint of what can happen.

Ultimate Plan Outcome is a Recommended Investment Choice that includes a description of the system and how it will perform over the 25-year horizon. It will include how it will influence capital programming will be the process outcome. This linkage is critical.

Discussions

Question: Lisa Danka referred to Slide 23 and asked what are the strategies for investment and how do you define the “mix? What are the components of that mix and how are investments going to be evaluated? Do you have information related to the impact on businesses? Dale Janik explained that “Preservation” strategies such as resurfacing or rehabilitation. Modernization improves system functionality and includes improvements like widening narrow lanes and safety. Adding capacity is another area that will be examined. Each has an impact on how the system performs and how fast it deteriorates for example. We are using ADOT data and standards for the model. The model will tell us what is efficient to do now and over the next 25 years. Dale said that this will tell us about where we should invest in the next years and it will tell us where we need to make investments. Or said another way it will direct us toward investments.

Shannon Scutari asked if the four sustainability/livability principles are addressed in the performance measures. How are these going to be integrated? Jennifer Toth said that the impact to the business community is much harder to quantify. Janet D’Ignazio will go into the performance measures in more detail.

David Wessel said that we see the measures on the handout distributed but the real question is how you are going to specifically measure them? If you don’t have projects how are you going to really evaluate the investment choices without projects? How are you going to apply the performance measures? Dale Janik responded that to an extent you are correct. If you choose to widen and add lanes in a particular area the model will improve lanes that are in the worse condition. The model does go in and replicate those improvements to specific projects.

Shannon Scutari asked how close this process will get to scenario planning. Jennifer Toth responded that is exactly what we are getting to.

Shannon Scutari followed up with a clarifying comment by saying that if we tweak the land use we might get a different outcome. This will bring a comprehensive piece to the long range planning. Jennifer Toth said that the impact to the business community is much harder to quantify. Janet D'Ignazio will go into the performance measures in more detail. Dale Janik said that we are dealing with the transportation system only. To bring in those other functions it depends on the data that ADOT has.

Lisa Danka asked what model is being used. Dale Janik responded that two models are being used. HERS-ST evaluates roadway segments using basic data against department targets (minimum tolerable conditions). The model can determine how many miles are deficient now, how many will become deficient in the future, and quantifies improvement costs. It is customized for Arizona. The other model is NBIAS that will be used for bridges.

IV. WMYA Goals & Objectives - Janet D'Ignazio

Janet said that the handout distributed is our first stab at the goals and objectives that will guide the transportation decisions. She said that the presentation is not going to walk you through the handout but will focus on how we got to this place. We have said that we want to build upon past efforts such as bqAZ because it had extensive involvement in the creation of the long term vision. That is exactly what was done. The goals and objectives help us link back to what we heard during bqAZ. They describe ADOT's commitment to the total vision of bqAZ; this is what ADOT will be doing to support their part of the implementation process. One way to ensure accountability is through the performance measures.

Janet explained that the sources used to develop the goals, objectives and performance measures were both primary and secondary sources. It is important to remember that we are moving into a fiscally constrained environment. The basic concepts of the bqAZ guiding principals were re-focused to support the plan's goals.

There are three goals that were added that were not explicitly included in bqAZ:

1. Maintenance is a fundamental function of ADOT so we added it as a goal.
2. Strengthen partnership was added because it is important to address how ADOT will partner with others to implement bqAZ.
3. Fiscal stewardship was added because there is not enough money to do all of the desires or needs. We have to be very protective of the infrastructure we have today while we are looking creatively at new revenue sources.

There are a couple of key areas to think about when reviewing the objectives. There are outcome and process-based objectives identified. There were a number of initiatives that were identified in bqAZ that are difficult to evaluate objectively such as processes. Also, it is important to recognize that objectives are not broken out by every mode; they are multimodal. If an objective is different because of a certain mode, then we identified a different objective. The most critical thing is that these objectives represent the role ADOT anticipates to play over the next 25 years. It represents the different role for ADOT over the plan's timeframe.

Another thing that is important to recognize when reviewing the objectives is that it represents ADOT's role will be in the future. You have to look behind the words to understand the changes. We have categorized the role as owner/operator, partnership, and advocate. The "Owner/Operator" is self explanatory. "Partnership" respects the fact that ADOT will have a

programmatic role in the future for example in transit, rail, commuter rail, and bike/pedestrians. The “Advocate” role represents complimentary and opportunistic roles. For example, there might be opportunities for ADOT to make investments in partnership with some other entity and ADOT doesn’t expect to be driving the decision-making.

V. Performance Measures – Craig Secret

Craig Secret began by providing a definition of the purpose of the performance measures. He said they play three basic roles. The first one is to support the scenario analysis process. As we are going through a fiscally constrained pot of money, performance measures provide a means to quantify the outcomes from the scenarios and it helps to inform the decision making process. The second role they play is after the plan is completed. The performance measures have a life after the planning process because they hold the department accountable. It provides a means that allows the department to report on achievements. The third role that performance measures play is that they influence programming and project selection. The department will use the performance measures in a “predictive fashion” in how you allocate funding and then examining specific projects to determine the impact of a particular project. If you use performance measures in programming it is important to understand that it is just one tool within the mix. There are other things that come into the decision making process. Several inputs that go into performance measures process are in statutes and relationship to what ADOT planning partners use. The performance measures are not all the same for the different goal areas.

Craig Secret said that it is important to note that the performance measures that are used to evaluate the scenarios might be different than those you use for programming. There are a lot of interrelationship between the goals, objectives and performance measures.

Using the PowerPoint presentation, Craig Secret provided an overview of the performance measures. One main purpose of developing performance measures is to evaluate the scenarios but they also have other purposes – explore outcomes from the different investment approaches, they provides ways to track success, and provides the linkage between the LRTP and programming, and performance measure can use them to fund capital projects.

Craig Secret said that the team is trying to build the performance measures from what ADOT has in terms of data so that ADOT doesn’t have to create new data sources. There are well established measurement areas that we have included such as:

Congestion – looking at the level of service or what percent of population lives within a certain miles of the highway system.

System preservation – we can give the state a grade because of ADOT’s state of the art system to determine the “state of good repair” of the system.

Safety and security – measuring fatalities and crashes but also preparedness (security or threat assessment); how well the state is doing in relationship to preparedness; is the state making progress in implementing; how well is the state doing in relationship to safety laws.

Craig said that there are also “Indirect Measurement Areas” that must be addressed and these become more difficult to measure objectively. They are a bit softer in terms of evaluation. These include:

Economic Development – it is difficult how to measure the impact that transportation is having on promoting economic development.

Environment and natural resources – we might measure the number of acres that are impacted for example

Transportation and Land Use – important to address though more difficult to measure

Craig Secrest mentioned that there are also “Implementation Measures” that we probably won’t have specific performance measures but they will describe how ADOT will implement the LRTP. It is difficult to measure implementation.

Dave Wessel asked - Should we consider putting land use, economic development and transportation together as one goal? He said that the MPO, County and ADOT District are working together on incorporating land use and the economic development into transportation issues such access management. They really tie together with the planning process. By doing this it gives the land use planners the ability to work with ADOT closely to tell the developer up front what is expected. Craig Secrest responded that how the goals were developed came directly out of the bqAZ process

Floyd Roerich said that we are not a land planning organization. There are going to be some conflicts between various goals and objectives because of multijurisdictional issues. This should be explored as part of this study on how these multijurisdictional issues will play out.

Dave Wessel said that there are a lot of implications related to cross jurisdictional issues. Is there an opportunity within the partnership for performance measures to reflect what member agencies have established? Maybe they can be included in the collaborative goals. It is important to recognize that what gets measured gets managed. It is important that they get tailored to the specific regions and that context is provided. Janet D’Ignazio said that we have not attempted to define any performance measures specifically yet. It is those nuances between the jurisdictional lines that are important for people to get all on the same page.

Shannon Scutari mentioned that a lot of communities in Pinal County are going through their updates to their community plans to accommodate for multi-modes. They want to make sure they are more successful. How does what we are doing change or impact land use patterns? Janet D’Ignazio said that Arizona has invested in the bqAZ vision. That is where the common ground exists. If all the jurisdictions look back to that effort, it establishes the common ground. We can identify objectives that will help the department on how they will work with the agencies as the communities begin to make changes. Take a look at the goals objectives and performance measures in light of that effort and let us know what changes or additions should be made.

Dave Wessel commented that how many of the partners statewide are entering into this planning using the outcomes of bqAZ? Maybe there is a role for ADOT to be bringing that statewide vision into the conversation.

Dave Wessel said that ADOT has always been a highway oriented organization. If ADOT is not the owner and operator of transit or bike/pedestrian facilities for inter-regional facilities for example, who are you passing that responsibility to? The projection of ADOT’s roles seems to

look a lot like the role they play today. Who's going to fill the vacuum? Craig Secrest responded that part of looking at scenarios is looking at other scenarios beyond the status quo. We look at alternatives that will put more into transit, etc. The investment choice that comes back will guide the decision-making about the role ADOT plays.

Floyd Roerich said that it might not be much different than today when ADOT comes and does improvements within cities on a state highway. ADOT is not going to put the pedestrian facility in that will be the responsibility of the local government as well as maintaining the facility. I see this happening into the future. I don't want to be responsible for taking care of local streets. That is where the cross-jurisdictional and cooperation has to occur.

Shannon Scutari said what you describe is the traditional role that ADOT has established. We have an opportunity to do something more creative through this process.

Floyd Roerich said that if we are going to change the role it is important to consider it early.

Shannon Scutari said that it is important not to box ADOT into only traditional roles by these goals, objectives and performance measures. It is important to have flexibility to allow an evolution of roles.

Scott Omer said that the bqAZ process was truly visionary and looked well out into the future. The LRTP will identify the means and identify the investment choices as we transition to a truly multimodal agency. It might identify areas where we have not been involved in the past and we need to plan for the new roles.

Floyd Roerich cautioned that what we might be talking about is not just policy. These new roles might require statutory changes.

Doug Williams said that his issue with this is showing ADOT as the owner/operator for the state system only seems to box ADOT in. There are places that we have rail and there will be opportunities for new rail lines that ADOT will be owner/operator.

Janet D'Ignazio discussed some of the nuances of ADOT's role in the objectives.

Doug Williams asked if there is an examination of other states with different roles such as rail owners and operators and how the DOTs fit within the different roles. There are roles for partnering but there are areas that ADOT can step in and play a larger role. Craig Secrest responded that there has been a lot of DOTs that have changed their name but only in name. There are a few like Maryland that are organized similar to the USDOT. It is tough to draw a clean lesson to be learned. Washington and New Jersey are good examples of agencies that are set up as multimodal agencies. There are lessons to be learned but how do we translate that lesson to the Arizona experience.

Janet D'Ignazio said that what is presented today is based on a conversation that we had with the ADOT executive team. The executive team needs your feedback. If you believe ADOT should have a stronger role in different areas we need to hear about it.

Dave Wessel said that from a role perspective, he would assume to tag this as a discussion for the policy committee and then onto the Transportation Board. We need to frame it for them so

they can make a decision. It would be best to have some mediation so that we don't spend a lot of time hammering out policy that is outside our responsibility as a Team.

Janet D'Ignazio stressed that she would like to get feedback on the partnership objectives specifically. They were drawn from bqAZ but there was not a lot of discussion. If we are going to move forward, we need further clarification.

Doug Williams said that over time how will you review these goals, objectives and performance measures? What if we have new transportation authorization passed next year, how will it impact the performance measures? Is there some flexibility that allows ADOT five years down the road to drop some of these off if they are heading state in the wrong direction? Jennifer Toth said that statutorily ADOT is required to update the LRTP every five years. However because it is tied to programming the agency will be evaluating it annually.

Craig Secrest said that it is important to think about the goals and objectives being more directional in nature and therefore probably don't change that often. When you get in to the programming process it gets more specific.

Doug Williams asked what ADOT is looking from us related to the goals, objectives and performance measures review. Jennifer Toth responded that the TAC provided their input. What we are seeking is your determination if these the right set of goals, objectives and performance measures and are they driving us to the right outcomes for the transportation system we are looking for. We will be providing you a survey following this meeting to provide us your input.

David Wessel said that context sensitivity really needs to be integrated throughout the goals, objectives, and performance measures. We need to be very aware of the different context. On the partnership side livability and viability there is a partnership role for the region. Janet D'Ignazio asked that when you provide comment please provide specific examples.

Lisa Danka stated that you asked for us to look at the partnerships piece. In terms of place sensitive context the current economic base and employment must be considered. Each of the regions has a certain economic picture and their plans tackle that. The LRTP must be respectful of that. She suggests taking a look at the global business economic trends that will impact Arizona. For example Lisa mentioned that the Arizona Department of Commerce is working on a grant related to green jobs. The study is looking at various locations and determining the type of green jobs that should be developed. Lisa said that in relationship to the performance measures there is a symbiotic relationship between what ADOT is working on and the local communities particularly in my situation with good communication and data sharing.

Janet D'Ignazio said that what she heard is that we cannot preclude ADOT's future roles and the ability to respond to new global trends as they are recognized at the state level. It is important that the goals, objectives and performance measures are not limiting ADOT's overall goals such as sustainability. We need to make sure partnerships include sharing of information and data to support everyone's implementation of bqAZ. Honoring the sense of place should be imbedded into the goals, objectives and performance measures.

Craig Secrest added that he thought you were also saying is what ADOT does has to be done in the context of the region and local level need to be considered in this process; need to address how does it trickle down.

Ken Sweet noted that the Grand Canyon Airport was owned by ADOT. Craig Secrest said that yes they understand that ADOT owns that facility and it will be addressed.

VI. Public Participation Plan – Kristin Bornstein

Kristin Bornstein provided an overview of the outreach effort using the PowerPoint presentation and the handout. She said that the Steering Team will receive an electronic survey following this meeting that will seek their input on the information presented at this meeting. You will have a week to complete and in addition you can mail any questions to Jim Zumpf.

She said that as you remember the Participation Plan was developed about a year ago and was distributed statewide for comments. We received 32 comments and only seven were specifically related to the plan and the rest were related to other projects or general comments. Those comments will be part of the updated plan. The updated plan will be available within the next couple of weeks for review.

ADOT has worked closely with the COGs and MPOs in fine-tuning the project process. On March 16th at the COG/MPO meeting you look at the timeline (handout was distributed prior to the meeting) and you provided input. The COGs/MPOs indicated their desire to help implement the Participation Plan. Each COG/MPO agreed to appoint a “point of contact.” Kristin said that she will be setting up a meeting soon with those folks.

Kristin gave an overview of the Committees. She said watch your email for setting dates for upcoming meetings. The Steering Team will meet in coordination with the COG/MPO monthly meetings. They are responsible for providing content and process input. The Policy Committee will only meet at key decision points in the process.

Kristin stressed that we have so much public input gathered during bqAZ which allows us to build upon for use in this process. Therefore, public meetings outreach is geared toward the Investment Choices phase which will be in the fall. We will be working with our planning partners to design and organize those events.

Kristin mentioned that we had a Communications Conference Call between ADOT and COG/MPO representatives. The purpose of the call is to get feedback into the first round of outreach process and they agreed to the approach. She gave an overview of the upcoming activities that include the following:

- Webinars with elected officials
- Stakeholder webinars
- Meeting in the box
- Electronic newsletters and survey
- Special interest group workshops (planned for July)
- Local/regional events – Kristin reminded the planning partners to be our eyes and ears around the state and determine what regional events might be good for presentations about the project. It will be up to our planning partners to let ADOT know of these events.

Kristin said that the project website has been up for awhile and we are in the process of updating it. We are about to really launch this website to drive people to it.

Kristin mentioned the survey that will be distributed to the Steering Team after this meeting. All comments should be provided via the survey so that we have the comments in one location.

TAC survey was completed and we received 14 surveys. They were generally positive. The TAC felt they had a good understanding of the bqAZ process and how it relates to the LRTP effort. The survey also included specific comments on goals, objectives and performance measures.

VII. Topics for the Next Meeting

Jennifer Toth gave an overview of the topics for the next meeting using the PowerPoint presentation. He said that the next meeting will focus on the Baseline Revenue Projections and Multimodal Needs. She said that information will be sent to the Steering Team prior to the meeting and it is expected that everyone come prepared to discuss the information and provide feedback.

Baseline Revenue Projections This is a critical component of developing the LRTP. It entails estimating the amount of funding/revenues (federal, state, and local) ADOT expects to be available over the 25-year planning horizon under several circumstances:

Baseline Forecast – a long term estimate of transportation revenues assuming no increase in fee rates and no additional revenue sources are introduced; basically “Status Quo” projection.

Financial Alternative Scenarios – based on the plan’s goals, statewide transportation plans often identified desired multimodal improvements; in order for these improvements to be implemented, additional revenues will most likely be required. Under this circumstance, several financial projections are prepared that assume new revenues, increased existing revenues, or both. These scenarios sometimes identify potential sources for new funding.

Multimodal Needs This analysis will produce a cost estimate to address anticipated modal deficiencies, such as freight and passenger rail, bicycle and pedestrian systems, and aviation over the 25 year timeframe. Modal needs will be documented by improvement category (preservation, modernization, expansion) and time of need (backlog or accruing) in base year 2009 dollars.

Definitions:

Preservation improvements are activities/treatments that protect the infrastructure and extend service life to attain a system-wide state of good repair (i.e., roadway resurfacing, bridge rehabilitation, bus replacement, rail track replacement).

Modernization involves upgrading a facility to improve safety and functionality (i.e., pavement reconstruction, safety improvement, bridge widening, airport lighting).

Expansion is new construction or providing additional capacity (i.e., more highway lanes, new bicycle lanes, runway extensions).

Backlog needs are those that should be addressed now (existing needs).

Accruing needs are deficiencies that will require improvement sometime during the Plan’s 25-year time period (future needs).

Modal need focus includes the state highway system, statewide freight and intercity passenger rail systems, aviation, bicycle and pedestrian systems, and public transportation systems. Multimodal needs estimate will focus on infrastructure elements that are ADOT’s responsibility and/or other modes included in WMYA Goals and Objectives.

VIII. Items from the Floor

Jennifer Toth asked the participants if there was anything else we can do to improve these meetings.

Jennifer Toth said that she hoped the Team walked away with a good understanding about the LRTP process and your role in the process, a broad overview of the goals, objectives and performance measures. She wanted to remind everyone that they will be receiving a questionnaire asking for your specific feedback on the materials presented today. She also hoped that they had a better understanding the plan's outcome and how it will be connected to programming and influence how dollars are spent.

IX. Adjourn

Jennifer Toth thanked everyone for attending. The next Steering Team meeting is scheduled for July 20, 2010.

Adjourn 3:10 PM

Appendix

Steering Team Participants

Jennifer Toth, ADOT-MPD, Chair
Scott Omer, ADOT-MPD
Mark Hodges, ADOT-MPD Data Mgmt.
Misty Dayzie, ADOT-MPD Tribal Planning
Shannon Scutari, ADOT-MPD Rail
Ken Sweet, NACOG
Floyd Roehrich, ADOT-State Engineer
Lisa Danka, ADOT-Chief Financial Officer
Todd Williams, ADOT-Environmental
Sally Stewart, ADOT-CCP

Jim Zumpf, ADOT-MPD, Project Manager
Don Mauller, ADOT-MPD Programming
Teri Kennedy, ADOT-MPD Transit
Lisa Danka, ADOT-Financial Services
Teresa Welborn, ADOT-CCP
Dave Wessel, FMPO
Justin Feek, ADOT
Keith Kilough, ADOT
Teri Kennedy, ADOT-Transit
Rob Samour, ADOT – Deputy State Engineer,
Valley

Video Conference

Charlene FitzGerald, YMPO

Chris Bridges, CYMPO

Consultant Team

Dale Janik
Janet D'Ignazio
Peggy Fiandaca

Craig Secrest
Kristin Bornstein