

MEETING SUMMARY NOTES

WMYA Long Range Transportation Plan

Policy Committee Meeting #1

August 3, 2010; 1:00 – 3:00 PM

Transportation Board Room – Phoenix, AZ

Meeting was called to order at 1:05 p.m. The meeting was held in the ADOT Transportation Board Room and via webinar.

I. Introduction – Tom Warne (Facilitator, Wilbur Smith Associates Team)

Tom Warne introduced himself and thanked participants for their time and attendance at the first Policy Committee Meeting for the state Long Range Transportation Plan (LRTP). He provided a brief overview of the meeting agenda and asked participants to introduce themselves.

II. Opening Remarks and Overview of LRTP – Director John Halikowski

John Halikowski thanked participants for their time and attendance. He explained that Building a Quality Arizona (bqAZ) set the long term transportation vision in 2009. The LRTP focuses the vision by creating goals and objectives to guide the development of investment choices. Performance measures will be a means of verifying that the goals and objectives are met and used in the capitol programming process.

The LRTP will be fiscally constrained and performance based. It is a 25-year multimodal transportation plan that will result in the prioritization of investment choices, but will not identify specific projects. By law ADOT is constrained by revenues. The current funding picture will not answer the needs for Arizonans in the future. The gap between the vision and what is fiscally constrained needs to be recognized and filled. As this planning process continues, a decision needs to be made as to the future needs of the state and what can be funded.

Identifying the state's priorities for different transportation investments will be important when ADOT chooses how to spend money. In turn, this will influence the resource allocation and project selections decisions, such as capital programming. The LRTP will focus on the state system and explore the role ADOT will play implementing the statewide vision. Statewide expectations for the performance of these multimodal systems will be established.

The Policy Committee (PC) is one of the three stakeholder committees advocating and monitoring the LRTP. The PC includes elected officials and executive directors of key local, state, and federal organizations. Input from this committee will be critical as ADOT considers the policy implications of this plan for the future.

The project team is currently in phase one of three in the planning process; today is intended to focus on goals and objectives.

III. Overview of Long-Range Transportation Plan – Scott Omer

Scott Omer, ADOT Director of Planning and Programming, began by explaining that the webinar portion of the meeting was malfunctioning. He explained that the problem was being addressed and would be corrected soon.

The Policy Committee is a critical element of the LRTP decision-making structure and its role is to reach consensus on key components so that the process can move forward. ADOT wants your input. Today is one of those points for reaching consensus on the Goals and Objectives.

We will make a brief presentation to give you an overview of the LRTP process to date and the background on how the Goals and Objectives were developed and how they will be used to guide the Plan. We hope you have had a chance to read them prior to coming today and we hope to receive your reaction and comments related to them. Tom Warne will facilitate a dialogue to help us reach consensus on the Goals and Objectives.

Based upon outreach with stakeholders and committee discussions to date a number of “Policy Issues” have been expressed that the PC needs to discuss and provide feedback.

Federal and state law requires that states examine forecasted revenues and develop a performance-based process to determine the state’s transportation investment priorities over the next 25 years. According to Arizona law, the LRTP is updated every five years, and the next adoption is scheduled for July 1, 2011. The current LRTP effort is an update to the MoveAZ Long-Range Transportation Plan completed in September 2004. Although Arizona law requires an update every five years, the State chose to take an extra two years between updates to develop the long-term vision that would provide a solid foundation for future LRTPs and capital programming. ADOT Multimodal Planning Division (MPD) intends to use this update of the LRTP as a starting point to streamline future updates, and also link the LRTP to the annually updated State Transportation Improvement Program (STIP).

The LRTP will guide transportation decisions and investments to enhance the state’s economy, strengthen Arizona communities, and protect the valued environment. It is a cooperative effort with the state’s regional transportation planning agencies and federal partners. It is multimodal, addressing transit, rail, aviation, bicycle and pedestrians. The presentation today will provide you the historical context that is the foundation for the LRTP, discuss how the state transportation vision embodied in bqAZ is being used to inform the LRTP, and discuss the various components of the LRTP.

In 2008 and 2009, ADOT worked with people and organizations throughout the state to develop the bqAZ Statewide Transportation Planning Framework, a shared vision for Arizona’s transportation future (visit www.bqaz.gov for more information). Arizonans looked farther into the future than ever before - 40 years - to create the long-term vision.

bqAZ Transportation Future Scenarios

Scenarios express different philosophies and are composed of transportation investments to achieve those assumptions. Elements of all three scenarios (seen below), based on statewide

input and technical analysis, will form a recommended scenario to guide long-range transportation planning.

- Scenario A: Personal Vehicle Mobility
- Scenario B: Transit Mobility, and
- Scenario C: Focused Growth

Scott then discussed outreach and participation throughout bqAZ which included:

Focus Groups--33 focus groups held statewide, plus 8 common interest workshops

Stakeholder Interviews--120 stakeholder interviews held statewide

Community Workshops--25 community workshops held statewide

Online Workshops

Attendance at Community Events

Focus Groups – 241

Community Workshops – 701

Regional and Rail Technical Advisory Teams

As stated before, the statewide transportation vision (bqAZ) is not fiscally constrained. It outlines transportation needs and desires as well as anticipating how Arizona will grow over the next 40 years without regard to funding availability. It examined various growth scenarios and discussed these alternatives statewide with extensive public and stakeholder outreach that crafted and fine-tuned the vision and preferred scenario. The visioning effort without regard to “how do we pay for this” was allowed to focus on the “perfect desired system” and to gain a true comprehensive view of how Arizonans want to move far into the future, provides a solid foundation for fiscally constrained planning and programming. “Fiscal constraint” means the LRTP must reflect revenues expected to be available over the next 25 years. The LRTP focuses the vision within those parameters. Additionally, the LRTP is not project specific but emphasizes what “Investment Choices” Arizona should make over the next 25 years in a multimodal transportation system. It is also performance-based meaning that we must be able to “keep score” or measure how well the system is performing in relation to the goals and objectives.

We have a statewide vision as a basis, and the LRTP will identify “where we want to go” (goals and objectives), “how to measure success” (performance measures), what “potential futures” might look like (revenue forecasts), and what our priorities will be (alternative investment choices).

There are many anticipated impacts to Arizona’s transportation future:

- Transportation accounts for 74% of the forecast increase in U.S. petroleum consumption for the next 20 years
- Nationwide, families with incomes of \$20,000-\$50,000 often spend more on transportation than housing
- More than 2/3 of Arizona’s energy expenditures leave the state
- Transportation is Arizona’s largest generator of greenhouse gases (39% of total)
- Arizona’s increase in average annual temperature is expected to be higher than any other state’s
- Growth in VMT is outpacing reductions in tailpipe emission rates

The focus of the LRTP is the state system. In other words the Plan focused on the infrastructure that Arizona is responsible for today as well as the current and anticipated role the agency will have over the next 25 years. The focus of the LRTP will be on “Investment Choices” – where should Arizona invest its resources over the 25-year timeframe. The planning process is a collaborative process working in concert with its regional, local, and federal partners. Existing agreements like the Casa Grande Accords will be honored as a fundamental guiding principle of the LRTP. The LRTP is being developed to meet federal and state requirements but it goes well beyond just an exercise to meet the requirements. It will become a fundamental guiding document for how the agency does long range planning and capital improvement programming.

The ultimate products of the LRTP will be a Recommended Investment Choice and associated performance measures, which will provide ADOT and the Arizona transportation community with a guide for making future transportation investment decisions. In particular, the outcomes will identify the state’s relative priorities for different types of transportation investments, which in turn will heavily influence resource allocation and project selection decisions (i.e., capital programming). The performance measures will provide a means for describing the anticipated consequences of the Recommended Investment Choice, as well as facilitate tracking and reporting of the plan implementation.

The process for determining LRTP outcomes and ultimately, the *Recommended Investment Choice* will center on the establishment and analysis of *Alternative Investment Choices (AICs)*. The AICs are essentially different ways of allocating resources to different investment types over the 25-year life of the plan, with the consequences of the choices for the transportation system defined through the application of performance measures.

What goes into developing AICs?

- **Highway Needs Assessment** – engineering-based estimate of preservation, modernization, expansion and other types of investments needs to achieve & maintain desired physical condition
- **Multimodal Needs Assessment** – investment needs for transit, aviation & other modes based on previous studies and/or additional needs analysis
- **Baseline Financial Projection** – forecast of anticipated revenues under current law that will be available for investment
- **System Performance Measurement**
- **Public/Stakeholder Input** – to determine how transportation revenues should be spent
- **Strategic Framework** – vision and guiding principles adopted by ADOT

The development of the AICs will build from a combination of technical activities and will be shaped by policy direction, much like you are doing today, and from ADOT staff and public stakeholders.

These are the various steps to the development of the LRTP. We are early in the process with you helping us finalize the Goals and Objectives which have been through the two other committees twice, have been discussed in eight special interest groups, and continue to be reviewed by the public via the website and “Meeting in the Box” activities. We are currently working to develop the performance measures that will be reviewed by the PC in the near future as well as the Financial Projections and Multimodal Needs. This information is being

worked at the Steering Team, Technical Advisory Committee, and ADOT staff level now. All of this work will guide in the development of the *Alternative Investment Choices* leading us to the *Recommended Investment Choice*. As mentioned earlier, the Plan will provide a direct link to the annual programming process where projects get funded. Lastly, like the bqAZ process, the LRTP has extensive public and stakeholder outreach to inform the planning process at key milestones.

We are in Phase 1: Goals and Objectives of the study. We also call this phase “Refining the Vision” because the Goals and Objectives are a direct outgrowth of the vision developed in 2008 and 2009 as a result of bqAZ. Phase 2 will happen this fall, and will include the evaluation of Alternative Investment Choices and the development, through stakeholder and public input, of a Recommended Investment Choice. Phase 3 will occur next spring and will include approval by the State Transportation Board targeted for the end of this FY.

Scott then turned the floor over to Tom Warne to open the floor for a brief question and comment period.

Tom asked the participants for their reactions, concerns, and feedback.

Matt Ryan: What is the definition of “stakeholders” in Phase 2 – Investment Strategies? The involvement with the business community is a critical element.

Scott Omer: We have included the business community as well as eight other stakeholder groups including Development Community, Natural Resources, Resource Agencies, Tribal Communities, Major Freight Users, Underserved Populations, Economic Development, and Sustainable Planning Professionals. We have tried to include as many common interest groups as possible in both the bqAZ process as well as the LRTP. These common interest groups are valuable stakeholders and have provided input.

Tom continued by asking participants if they had any reaction to the process or the plan?

Matt Burdick: We talk about how to measure success. How will this Policy Committee measure success? It is a critical part of what we are trying to accomplish.

Kristin Bornstein: A link to a survey will be distributed electronically to all of the committee members to ask for input.

Tom then asked Janet D’Ignazio to provide an overview of the Goals and Objectives.

IV. Overview of Goals and Objectives – Janet D’Ignazio (WSA Team)

Janet D’Ignazio introduced herself and described how she was leading the goals and objectives portion of the study. There are three items to pay attention to in regards to Goals and Objectives.

1. What slice of bqAZ does ADOT believe it’s responsible for implementing?
2. Are the outcomes defined by the objectives the outcomes that ADOT desires? Will ADOT be held accountable for the outcomes?

3. What types of non highway modes does ADOT believe they should invest in and what decision making abilities should they hold?

bqAZ is fabulous process for developing a consensus based vision for the state's transportation vision. However, it was never meant to be an ADOT vision but a statewide vision including the state's partners. Is the LRTP ADOT's role in implementing ADOT's bqAZ or is there another role?

The foundation of the LRTP is rooted to bqAZ and thus the Goals and Objectives are derived from bqAZ. The language is similar and consistent; however, three additional goals were added for the LRTP.

1. *Preserve and Maintain the System* – this is a core responsibility for ADOT and there was input that suggested a need for this goal to be added.
2. *Strengthen Partnerships* – bqAZ could not go on without ADOT and ADOT's partners.
3. *Fiscal Stewardship* – There is a recognition that ADOT owns the state's most expensive capitol asset and as such needs to be fiscally sound in its decision making.

Janet continued with an overview of the Goals and Objectives, which had been emailed to the Committee members prior to the meeting. There are two types of objectives (a) outcome and (b) process. Outcome objectives are those that are measurable and for which ADOT is expected to be held accountable. Process objectives represent Guiding Principles from bqAZ that reflect partnerships that ADOT knew they needed to change. These are not measurable. Today we will focus on outcome objectives.

The Goals and Objectives define a role for ADOT that does not exist today, but is anticipated to exist in 2035 – the planning horizon. Every outcome based objective will have a performance measure developed for it, which will be the accountability portion. The performance measures are being developed and will consider input from both the Technical Advisory Team (TAC) and Steering Team (ST). The Policy Committee will have the opportunity to review those performance measures once completed.

Let's focus on the outcomes. What is it that ADOT expects to be held accountable for within each of the following outcomes?

Improve Mobility and Accessibility (across all modes)

- Capacity – this also includes the amount of vehicles and passengers within the existing footprint.
- Reliability
- Accessibility
- Connectivity

Preserve and Maintain the System

- Utility and serviceability – how long will the system last?
- Life-cycle costs
- Conditions
- Safety

Support Economic Development – there are many people and factors involved when considering economic development. The following are items that a transportation agency can somewhat control.

- System and freight corridor reliability
- System connectivity
- Transit accessibility
- Encourage public and private investments in air and rail – these are not modes that ADOT directly control but are supportive.

Link Transportation and Land Use – this is an area where ADOT's control is limited

- Protecting state system mobility corridors – protect the ADOT investment

Protect Environment and Natural Resources

- Fulfill environmental commitments
- Increasing greenhouse gas emissions
- ADOT use of renewable energy sources

Safety and Security

- Reduced crashes, injuries, and fatalities

The final column on the handout is the ADOT role. The roles were developed in a workshop held with ADOT leadership. They represent a multimodal agency and what ADOT expects its role to be in the year 2035. Roles are defined by two factors: (1) Will there be state investment available (2) With that investment will ADOT have decision making abilities? Roles are also differentiated by the goals area. ADOT may be one role to support mobility and accessibility but a different role to support land use.

The owner/operator role is that ADOT is responsible for maintaining, operating, and enhancing infrastructure to achieve the goals and objectives. The partner role is defined as ADOT may be a partner with a role in funding and decision making to achieve the goals and objectives. The Advocate role is that ADOT may be a partner by providing complementary and opportunistic funding when it will advance ADOT's goals and objectives. Finally None, which is no participation in funding or decision-making.

Janet then described the Role/Goal and Mode chart. Freight, rail, and air are private industries and ADOT will have little decision-making ability; however, they can hold the advocate role to help fund projects that will achieve ADOT's goals. Another example is bike/ped. ADOT feels they have a strong role in creating complete streets; however, they do not anticipate assuming the role of maintenance.

Janet then opened the floor for questions.

V. Open Discussion

John Halikowski: According to the draft Goals and Objectives, and Advocate states that ADOT "may" be a partner to advance ADOT's goals. To look at it from another angle,

wouldn't it be better to say that the department may be a partner when it advances the goals and objectives of the LRTP?

Janet D'Ignazio: This does refer to the plan's Goals and Objectives. I will make that more clear.

Tom Warne asked if anyone else had a reaction to the goals. The goals are the foundation for moving forward with the rest of the plan.

Matt Ryan: This is a lot to think about. As I read through the outline it looks great in terms of the initial read. Establishing the parameters, do we fall back on do we really invest in that area or do we work towards integration? It sounds like it should be a tool to advance the partnerships. I'm cautious that we will fall back into the mindset that the department is only responsible for highways. It should be a systems approach. ADOT should be in a leadership role when communicating with other communities.

Janet D'Ignazio: I spent no time discussing the process based objectives to save time. These are very important when it comes to ADOT and planning with other agencies. I ask you to take another look at those objectives.

Tom Warne: Now would be a good time discuss the leadership role of the department.

John Halikowski: Used to be called the Highway Department until 1974. In 1974 the legislature decided to make it Arizona Department of Transportation and encompassed a number of functions within the department. Primarily the agency has been focused on highways and planning. As we move forward, the federal partners are asking us to do more as we move into the future and look at issues of livability, sustainability, and land use. The department's role in the future is a partner or advocate to function and assist in a leadership or partnership role as we develop a transportation system. It's obvious from discussions among many forums that just going out and placing pavement is not enough to make us economically viable but to satisfy the taxpayers. They want more and at many different levels. We need to find how the department fits into this slice working with our partners to ensure the state's transportation system is soundly engineering and meets the standards of the tax payers.

Tom Warner: Any other comments or reactions? Are there any goals that have been overlooked to help map out future?

John Halikowski: As reauthorization is kicked around at the federal level, it seems clear that Congress wants performance measures. They want states to track progress for their investment. As those things change, how do we begin to incorporate those into the LRTP or have we given ourselves a broad enough perspective that we already covered that.

Bob Hollis: I wish I had the answer. I would say from my perspective and experience you really have to think about planning as a dynamic fluid process. Not once you adopt it, its stuck and you can't change it. To the extent that there is federal

legislation or reauthorization that might lead you to a path where you perceive a great need to adjust your plan is recommended. Whether it's needed in the next five years is unknown. But it is expected to take that into account and make those adjustments.

Janet D'Ignazio: As your technical team we are aware that we are working in an environment where things can change and are aware of the proposals out there. We are trying to define how performance measurement accountability will be integrated into planning. We are trying to position you so that you only have minimal adjustments to make.

John Halikowski: This group is going to have an ongoing role given the dynamics or planning in the future. We're going to want to meet periodically because legislation changes on both the federal and state levels.

Tom Warne: When you bring performance measures to the table there is a collateral accountability that goes with it which is what you are referring to.

John McGee: Looking through the Goals and Objectives they all seem to be focused on what we do with our money. Are we missing a major piece on the funding side? We said that moving from bqAZ to LRTP is going from fiscally unconstrained vision to a fiscally constrained vision. Is there a role for ADOT to look at various strategies to increase the level of resources to support the plan? Not necessarily tax increases. Anything from education (large portion) to advocacy for tools like Public Private Partnerships laws to working with local elected officials who see transportation needs other don't to working with federal partners to develop greater flexibility to use federal funds. Is that a part that should be included in this plan?

John Halikowski: You have to recognize significant investments and decisions have been made at regional levels and local levels. As we move forward, to assist with the idea that we have to add more to the pie. The pie is finite and we have sliced it as many ways as we can. We need to preserve and honor the investments we've made, and need to move forward with new funding sources.

Floyd Roerich: There are going to be different levels of whether we are going to be an advocate or a partner. You hit on a point regionally when you look at MAG and PAG who stepped up and voter initiatives developed funding resources. As other regions emerge and develop funding sources we need to adapt the plan to work with that. It may lead to a great prioritization level, in which we can develop funding sources. We will have different roles in regards to working with partners if they take action.

Tom Schoaf: I've heard from ADOT when you look forward there is not enough funding to maintain what you already have. As a local tax payer how do we look to ADOT as a partner for anything?

John Halikowski: There a number of ways. That depends on what you mean by local. You have the MAG region which is a great concern in the question you ask. Then you look at the surrounding regions, CAAG or PAG. If you look at those three together it's a local entity. If there is planning assistance needed the department can help. If it's advocacy with funding, a structural governance group, or ensuring connectivity it depends on what the funding is for and how the region will use it. We together need to make sure that plans affecting statewide transportation all work together.

Tom Schoaf: The problem is MAG, PAG, and CAAG are moving forward with joint planning. What role does ADOT see for itself when it comes to those counties that make up a spine of Tucson to Phoenix? How will ADOT fit into the process when it's not ADOT money that is used to develop these plans?

John Halikowski: It's premature to make that distinction. When you put together your RTP here in Maricopa county plan you used a variety of funding sources and would think you would do the same with the three entities. If the project is a P3 project you may ask the department's assistance in using their P3 resources. Local funding may pay for maintenance and preservation.

Tom Schoar: I would like to understand how we get money to build the capital structure. When there are fiscal constraints how is maintenance on these systems funded?

John Halikowski: According to the Goals and Objectives, it doesn't show ADOT having a large role in maintaining systems.

Janet D'Ignazio: Operations and maintenance of highway system is a significant portion of the ADOT budget. To John McGee's point, there will be a discussion in the future of this planning process regarding the funding gap.

Scott Omer: In the horizon year 2035 as ADOT takes a more active role in multimodal where transit is included, you're not going to see an ADOT bus on the street. The operation and maintenance would not necessary be all ADOT funds but there would be funding allocated to maintain and operate the transit system.

Tom Schoaf: It would be bad state policy for ADOT to make investments of capital money in transit without realizing that there is a need for an analysis to make sure there is operating money there long term. Part of the policy should include a requirement that if you make an investment in transit you need to add provisions to operate it.

Mike Normand: Good point. The FTA is requiring a larger emphasis on the MPOs and ADOT demonstrating fiscal constraint in the five year plans. If they ask to build a facility they have to prove that they have the funds to maintain that system.

Matt Ryan: Do we define ourselves in traditional roles? We are going to hit capacity levels which will redirect community plans. In the future there will be a need for alternative transportation modes besides just highways.

Tom Warne: The dynamics of the discussions are different today. We need to see the future differently. Let's focus the discussion on linking transportation land use, the environment, and economic development. The LRTP will be influenced by those factors.

Bob Hollis: The roles and divisions shown in matrix related to land use show ADOT has no role in that particular area. It seems that there at least needs to be an advocate, not necessarily in all areas, but maybe the transit area and those which affect the urban environment. ADOT is at the table in the planning process and has state owned facilities in the urban environment. It seems like there are some interests there.

Tom Schoaf: The state has designated that land use planning is done at the local level. Land use planning is the community's decision and need to be pushed as low as possible on the government tree.

John Halikowski: How do we ensure we maximize a good marriage between transportation planning and state land?

Vanessa Hickman: Arizona State Land Department (ASLD) suffers from lack of resources and a lot of land. ADOT should work with the department and look at some land in rural areas where planning efforts, where long term transportation planning could help access those lands. We could use help with planning.

John Halikowski: We have to deliver the LRTP to the legislature. In 2002, state land use planning should have been included. The problem is this statute is dated. The world ten years ago is dated and we are now more fiscally constrained. What people want to see is a good plan, which may not be fiscally constrained, but what will these improvements cost.

Scott Omer: ADOT has a role in transportation land use today. Across Arizona, counties and cities update transportation plans and often come to ADOT for input into transportation plan. This is the local responsibility and we do have that involvement with land use planning and the ties to transportation system. This is the minimal ADOT involvement. If there was an expansion of that role there would need to be an invitation. Working with ASLD is a great opportunity to develop the rural portions of the state, but there are rural communities that are already asking.

Janet D'Ignazio: On this chart you see only the roles in which ADOT is accountable for an outcome.

Lillian Moodey: ASLD is actively participating in a partnership with ADOT now and sharing information so that everybody will know up front what's happening so we can participate at a higher level. At ASLD we prepare conceptual plans with local communities and incorporate them with comprehensive and general plans. We are trying to catch it from all sides.

Tom Schoaf: Each jurisdiction has a local plan which includes a transportation element. ADOT plays a role because they generally site state highways. We try not to plan communities which could be bisected by state highways.

Lillian Moodey: ASLD is in the same position which is the reason we are trying to create this partnership with ADOT.

Scott Overton(Webinar Question) – As to state lands, we, the city, have very limited control as to the timing of the release and sale in the rural boundary. Could a predictable time line of land disposition be established?

Vanessa Hickman: ASLD is working on the five year plan per statutory obligations and working on finalizing that right now. We will be sending to counties and municipalities for their comments as soon as its completed.

Jim Adams: The Five Year Plan will be going out within the next two or three weeks. This is the local entities opportunities to make their comments for the near and long term visions.

Scott Overton: Thanks we will look forward to it.

Tom Warne: How do you link economic development into the LRTP process?

John Halikowski: You can't have economic development without transportation links. You have to have roads and other modes to move and transport goods and services quickly. Arizona has a lot of freight moving from the ports in California and Mexico. The question becomes, we have the cargo moving, how do you create the employment centers where the goods stop and value added to the area? There are a number of things to look at that transportation is the spine or the backbone for the economic development. You need to have the plan in place to attract the businesses.

Vanessa Hickman: From the ASLD perspective we see the value that ADOT could provide to our planning process.

Stephanie: The general theme from a legislative standpoint has been to narrow local government's ability to generate development for the long term. Local government has played a significant role, but the overall goal in transportation needs to be advocacy to legislative. We need to lobby it together.

Scott Omer: Communication is key. When there's opportunity for economic development we need to take advantage of it before it leaves and ADOT needs to be included in the process to develop transportation plans.

Mike Willett: Economic development goes hand in hand with land use. In Yavapai County there is a pilot program integrating public works and working with the city's economic development departments. For example in Chino Valley ADOT introduced an access controlled roadway to a town that did not have one before. Economic development is following because of this improvement. We have been working with both local governments and ADOT and providing the opportunities for economic development.

Matt Ryan: Rural communities are Main Street communities. The state system can make or break these communities. When do you have separation of modes to get to the nodes? It is definitely multimodal.

Dennis Smith: To what end do you do a transportation plan? It's apparent that we've gone from number one in jobs to 44th in the nation with 53,000 foreclosures. We need to focus on how to stimulate the economy. How do you get the funding to make the investment to get the return on investment, to improve the economy? This LRTP addresses investment choices not projects. Does that mean that one investment choice is to fund maintenance because we already have a large system? How do you tell the public "this is what we need", if we make this investment then this will bring development? How do we get where we need to go? What is going to encourage people to find the investments?

Scott Omer: At the next meeting we will discuss the needs and revenue projections. The needs are based on projects in bqAZ and local long range plans. The revenue projections are the funds we have today and what we expect to have in the future.

John Halikowski: There needs to be legislation change to get people find investments. What is in the statute now will not make this happen. We need to rework legislation to get what we need today – instead of where we were in 2002.

John McGee: This LRTP will be fiscally constrained, but are we also going to look at alternative scenarios?

Scott Omer: The baseline will look at where we think we are today, then we will look at other scenarios in case more funding becomes available in the future.

John Halikowski: You have fiscally constrained plan on one end and bqAZ on the other end, but in the middle there needs to be something for economic development and attract people to the state. We may need to do some more leg work to get there.

Scott Omer: The final recommended choice will be somewhere in the middle where we will try and close the gap between the two.

Tom Warne: This is an ongoing process in which we would like to continue to have your participation. A lot of people around the country want to emulate Arizona's transportation system. Are there any final comments?

John Halikowski: This is the beginning. We have to put the pieces together and work through it. I hope that you continue to come to these meetings and stay involved and thank you for your time today.

VI. Adjourn

The meeting was adjourned at 3:10 p.m.

Policy Committee Participants

Dianne Kresich, ADOT MPD

John Bogert, ADOT Director of Operations

John Halikowski, ADOT Director

Matt Burdick, ADOT Communication and Community Partnerships Director

John McGee, ADOT Executive Director

Jim Zumpf, ADOT MPD Project Manager

Scott Omer, ADOT Director of Planning and Programming

Justin Feek, ADOT MPD

John Fink, ADOT Chief Financial Officer

Don Mauller, ADOT Assistant Director of Programming

Dianne Kresich, ADOT MPD

Kevin Biesty, ADOT Director Government Relations

Keith Dahl, ADOT Travel Demand Modeler

Mike Normand, ADOT Multimodal Planning Transit Division

Floyd Roerich, ADOT Assistant Director

Audra Merrick, ADOT Flagstaff District on behalf of John Harper

Kerry Ballard, Chairman of NACOG Transportation Committee/Vice Mayor of Snowflake

Matt Ryan Coconino County Supervisor, FMPO, NACOG, and NAIPTA

Stephanie, on behalf of Ken Strobeck, Arizona League of Cities and Towns

Tom Schoaf, Mayor Litchfield Park, Chairman of MAG

Mike Willett, behalf of Yavapai County Supervisor Carol Springer/CYMPO Board Member

Bob Hollis, FHWA Division Administrator Arizona

Cherie Campbell, PAG

Maxine Brown, CAAG

Dennis Smith, MAG

Chris Bridges, CYMPO

Jim Adams, ASLD Director Real Estate

Vanessa Hickman, ASLD Deputy State Land Commissioner

Lillian Moody, ASLD

Tim Daligowski, Coconino County

Craig Sullivan, County Supervisors Association

Scott Overton, Flagstaff City Council/FMPO

Consultant Team

What Moves You Arizona | let's talk. let's listen. let's decide.

Amy Rosar
Dale Janik
Don Vary
Janet D'Ignazio
John Carr
Kristin Bornstein