

## MEETING SUMMARY NOTES

### WMYA Long Range Transportation Plan Technical Advisory Committee Meeting #1 May 26, 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 – Scott Omer

Scott Omer introduced himself and said that he was stepping in for Jim Zumpf who is the ADOT Project Manager for the Long Range Transportation Plan (LRTP) known as *What Moves You Arizona* (WMYA). He thanked everyone for taking the time to be a part of the Technical Advisory Committee (TAC). He had everyone introduce themselves. See Appendix for participant list.

Scott 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 mailed in advance of the meeting. Scott apologized if some members did not receive an invite directly. The invitations were sent directly to the Executive Directors and some did not distribute them to the appropriate TAC members.

Scott gave a brief overview of the TAC role which is to review and provide technical input throughout the process. It is important that everyone come prepared and ready to ask the tough questions and take responsibility for ensuring that the project is successful. He stressed the importance of good communications with colleagues and bringing those comments forward. Scott 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, Scot 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.

Scott 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 road 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 heavily 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.

He 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, Scott referred to the PowerPoint Presentation and provided an overview of the TAC meeting agenda. The PowerPoint Presentation will be on the project website [www.whatmovesyouarizona.gov](http://www.whatmovesyouarizona.gov). He 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. Scott also mentioned that the TAC members 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**

Scott introduced Jennifer Toth, Director of ADOT Multimodal Planning Division. Using the PowerPoint presentation, she 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.

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. She stressed that this process is being done in a very collaborative way with all of us being responsible for the success.

## **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.

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 Choices.”

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 in final review, which is called *Transportation in Arizona Report*. It will be posted to the project website as soon as it is finalized. 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 50-year 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. Access management, adding more capacity or building a new roadways are all considered. 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.

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 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. 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 project s or a list of projects. This planning process is designed to create a blueprint of what can happen.

Ultimate Plan Outcome a description of the system and how it will perform over the 25 year horizon and how it will influence capital programming will be the process outcome. This linkage is critical.

#### **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 Secrest**

Using the PowerPoint presentation, Craig provided an overview of the performance measures. One main purpose of developing performance measures is to evaluate the scenarios but they

also have two other purposes – explore outcomes out from the different investment approaches, provides ways to track success, provides the linkage between the LRTP and programming, and performance measure can use them to fund capital projects.

Craig 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 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.

## **BREAK**

### Discussion

Scott Omer asked for comments or questions about the process presented.

Comment - Bob Hazlett, MAG, asked a question regarding slide 29 about ADOT's role as owner/operator. ADOT is a big partner on the local and regional system. ADOT and local governments are working together on the RARF projects and partner on the local highway system. In relationship to this what outcome should we want ADOT to be held accountable for? It is important to define ADOT's role in relationship to local roads. Is it a partnership role so as streamlining the environmental side?

Comment - Slide 29 may be incorrect - the state does own the Grand Canyon airport and this slide might need to change to reflect this.

Response - What we heard from the department that over the next 25 years they don't anticipate to own the airport.

Scott Omer asked if these are the right goals, objectives and performance measures.

Comment - Eric Anderson, MAG, said that they seem slanted toward capital projects. This urban area is going to take a larger role. The operational strategies are going to get a lot more important. We can get more capacity if we do a better job at operations. This needs to be included. Related performance measure is “incidence clearance times” – we don’t monitor these. I did not see anything addressing Title VI. I believe it is a requirement particularly for the Tribal communities in this state. I am not certain how to do this but it should be explored. Both are related to WMYA but also in how you implement the plan.

Question – Are the financial projections and revenues something that WSA is doing separate from what ADOT Financial Management does?

Response – No, Dale Janik said. The only revenue projection that has been developed is the baseline and it has been developed arm-in-arm with ADOT.

Question – Regarding the Air Performance Measure, do you mean with scheduled air service? You may need to tighten them up and need to make them distinguishable.

Question - How are you going to handle transit related to investment opportunities? Are you going to make some assumptions about new revenues sources?

Response – Dale Janik said stay tuned and keep coming to the meetings. The alternative investment choices will make some assumptions and then we will need to decide if we can afford it.

Comment – Eric Anderson, MAG said there are restrictions on how monies can be used; this must be addressed or it becomes an empty exercise; at some point in this process we need to develop criteria.

Comment - Mike Normand, ADOT said if we are designing a plan that will take us into the future; maybe the way we fund the system will have to change; it becomes a policy discussion

Comment - Mike Normand, ADOT said that reauthorization is going to influence how much money is out there and how it is used. We are hearing a lot about “state of good repair” and this will influence the focus on maintaining the system before building new.

Response – This is where we will have a public policy debate.

Comment – David Wessel, FMPO – ADOT should be proud of their work in mitigating wildlife interactions and their work in Arizona Game & Fish Department. The number of wildlife collisions might be a performance measure.

Response – Janet D’Ignazio said that they will add a performance measure around wildlife crashes for the environmental objective.

Comment – Marwan Aouad, ADOT-Maintenance – Please clarify performance measures. Will you have specific numbers or percentages? To have it mean something you have to have it tied to a specific number; to ensure a meaningful performance measure.

Response – Craig Secrest said we are using the performance measure to understand where the system is now against where the goal is; where Arizona is now against the costs to get you where you want to go.

Comment – Marwan Aouad, ADOT-Maintenance - Since we are dealing with such a limited amount of funding, it makes it difficult to allocate your funding resources; a specific number for the performance measure is extremely important.

Response – Craig Secrest said that the objective of the performance measure is to turn it around and put a target to it.

Dale Janik also responded that it is important to make sure that we are creating targets and performance measures that we have data to support. We don't want to create measures that ADOT does not support. Through this conversation we will be developing targets around some but not all objectives; some are soft that can't have hard numbers.

Comment - Jim Delton – ADOT-Materials – The utility function should be part of asset management. How do we measure trade offs in terms of competing goals? How is this going to be addressed? There is a benefit of each but there are limited dollars. How do you trade off two different benefits? That has always been a problem with an asset management system. How do you balance a safety improvement vs. making the roadway smoother so people are happier even though there will be more accidents as a result? I have not heard how we are going to make these trade offs?

Response – Dale Janik said that is why we need to roll up our sleeves and get into this question during this process. We need to listen to this group, all of the committees and the public to understand priorities.

Craig Secrest also responded that you can't put safety and preservation on the even playing field. How do you interpret what is best? It is an iterative process; part art, part politics; part policy. It is much more than just a formula.

Comment – Eric Anderson – It is important that you make sure that you are identifying performance measures that ADOT can do anything about. For example: transit within this region. ADOT provides a real benefit for transit in rural areas and you need to be careful how you include the urban areas because it might skew the rest of the state. I think the performance measures need to be tightened up to determine how they will be applied.

Response – Janet D'Ignazio said that the goal is to determine what ADOT will be held accountable for and we need you to highlight where we missed the mark.

Comment - Mike Normand, ADOT – I agree with Eric Anderson that there are differences between urban and rural areas. We could spread bus service all over the state but it might be really bad service. We need to focus more on connectivity and develop performance measures around connectivity. It is important to focus a performance measure around connectivity instead of transit within a certain mile from people.

Response – Janet D'Ignazio said that we took a lot of the information from existing plans and we need to hear from you what has changed.

Comment - Mike Normand, ADOT – This is an example of a very common performance measure but is it really getting the state where we want to go. It is spreading transit very widely and not effectively.

Response – Janet D'Ignazio said that as you go back to review these goal, objectives, and performance measures determine if they are we driving us to the right outcomes.

Comment – Sara Allred, ADOT MPD-Rail – On rail there were not a lot of rail plans to get performance measures from. This one of the challenge we have freight. The measurements that

are here are for a developed freight system; this is probably not the right approach. We need more interim measures as we developed the freight system, maybe similar to transit performance measures. Right of way is a desirable outcome but it might not be the best measurement. Maybe the amount carried by freight would make more sense. Maybe some of these would be good if we have a built passenger system. We need more output measures on an interim basis.

Comment - Diane Kresich, ADOT – What ADOT has control over and doesn't is critical to address. And just to reiterate that these are also for ADOT's future role. Maybe we need to anticipate a potential future role when reviewing these performance measures.

Response – Janet D'Ignazio said that if you have a question about the performance measure go back to look at the objective because it reflects ADOT's future anticipated roles.

Comment – Muhammad Al Zubi, ADOT-Operations – Concerned about the performance measures around safety. Actually the total number of fatalities should be the performance measure instead of just the weighted. Need to use an absolute number. Now it is relevant to traffic volumes and it should be an absolute number.

Comment – Dave Wessell, FMPO – We just received the Public Private Partnership presentation by Deb Sydenham at FMPO. Is there some measurement for private dollars brought into the system?

Response – yes as part of the fiscal objective.

Comment – Sara Allred, ADOT MPD-Rail - That is a good freight rail tie in because it would require partnerships. A performance measure should be developed to measure how well we bring in new revenues.

Comment – Muhammad Al Zubi, ADOT-Operations - Safety measurements nationally state that any number greater than 0 is not acceptable.

Comment - Bob Hazlett, MAG – The performance measurements need to be realistic.

Comment – Diane Kresich, ADOT – Can we affect the safety rate? No the rate will go down. We need something we can affect and 0 fatalities isn't something we can affect.

Response – Dale Janik - Some of these answers will be made by others. Now this is one of the specific areas; might be a policy issue that may not be solved today.

Comment – Sara Allred, ADOT-MPD-Rail – Remember the numbers can be used for example the suicides on rail is not tracked.

Response – Janet D'Ignazio responded that there are some sets of data that are not complete. Sara gave an example of this. Data protocols will be important that explain how these numbers will be used to influence decision-making.

Comment – Craig Secrest said that there needs to be recognition that performance measures are used for different things.

**Wrap Up this Discussion** Scott Omer asked the group if the goals, objectives and performance measures are headed in the right direction. And the group provided a general “yes” reply. Scott introduced Kristin Bornstein, Project Involvement and Communication Consultant.

## **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 TAC members 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 comments to Scott Omer.

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 16<sup>th</sup> 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 Committee 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 gave an overview of the upcoming activities that include the following:

- Webinars with elected officials
- Stakeholder webinars
- Meeting in the box
- 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 mentioned that back in March we talked about having communication points of contact at all COGs/MPOs. Kristin will be following up with you soon to determine who that contact might be.

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.

Comment - Bob Hazlett, MAG – Regarding the website do we have a link from bqaz.gov?

Response - Kristin said Yes.

Bob Hazlett said that MAG will reciprocate with a link on the MAG website.

## VII. Topics for the Next Meeting

Scott Omer 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. Scott said that information will be sent to the TAC 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.

Comment - David Wessel, FMPO – Reauthorization is coming up – are the revenue projections you are working on be done in a timely manner that we can include them in the reauthorization discussion?

Response - Dale Janik replied that the baseline financial projection is both state and federal resources over the next 25 years developed in conjunction with ADOT folks. We are taking that and extending it farther out.

Comment – We are currently in discussions with ADOT about route transfers where ADOT gets out of the urban arterial management. It is good for aligning missions but I am wondering what that means for bicycle and pedestrian facilities if ADOT becomes a rural highway operator. Response - Scott Omer said that it is our goal to be multimodal and implement a complete street concept. Part of that discussion is how those modes are incorporated into the system; how we incorporate and fund them over time.

## **VIII. Items from the Floor**

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

Comment – It might be nice to have the PowerPoint available so that we can follow along better. Also, add slide numbers to make it easier to follow. Send the slide show as a PDF before the meeting so we can review the slides.

Scott Omer said that I hope you walk 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. I want to remind you that you will be receiving a questionnaire asking for your specific feedback on the materials presented today. I also hope you understand the plan's outcome and how it will be connected to programming and influence how dollars are spent.

## **IX. Adjourn**

Scott thanked everyone for attending. The next TAC meeting is scheduled for July. Scott reminded the participants that we need the names for the Policy Committee representatives.

Adjourn 3:30 PM

## Appendix

### TAC Participants

Dianne Kresich, ADOT	Don Mauller, ADOT-MPD Programming
Mark Hodges, ADOT-MPD Data Mgmt.	Teri Kennedy, ADOT-MPD Transit
Misty Dayzie, ADOT-MPD Tribal Planning	Mike Sanders, ADOT-MPD Bike/Ped.
Sara Allred, ADOT-MPD Rail	Audra Merrick, ADOT-Engineering Districts
Thor Anderson, ADOT-Environmental	Teresa Welborn, ADOT-CCP
Jodi Rooney, ADOT-Local Government	Vince Li, ADOT-Statewide Project Mgmt.
Jim Delton, ADOT-Materials Group	Mike Manthey, ADOT-Traffic Group
Muhammad Al Zubi, ADOT-Traffic Operations	Marwan Aouad, ADOT-Maintenance
Bill Leister, CAAG	Dave Wessel, FMPO
Bob Hazlett, MAG	Eric Anderson, MAG
Cherie Campbell, PAG	Ken Davis, FHWA
Ken Potts, ADOT-Aeronautics	Pe-Shen Yang, ADOT Bridge Group
Ed Stillings, FHWA	Mike Normand, ADOT-Transit
Shelly Kreger, YMPO	Charles Gutierrez, YMPO
Chris Fetzer, NACOG	Sharon Mitchell, SEAGO
Scott Omer, ADOT-MPD	Jeff Carol
Letia Warnick for Scott Nodes, ADOT	

### Consultant Team

Dale Janik	Craig Secrest
Janet D'Ignazio	Kristin Bornstein
Don Vary	Peggy Fiandaca