

## MEETING SUMMARY NOTES

### WMYA Long Range Transportation Plan Steering Team Meeting #2 July 20, 2010; ADOT – Phoenix, AZ

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

#### **I. Introductions**

Tom Warne, welcomed everyone and thanked them for their participation and being an important partner in the LRTP. He went over the agenda and provided an overview of meeting expectations. The goal for today's meeting is to understand how best to present information presented today to the Policy Committee. The intent of the meeting is to be interactive. Tom had everyone introduce themselves. See Appendix for participant list.

#### **II. Comments from ADOT Management**

Jennifer Toth, Steering Team Chair, said that the Steering Team provided direction at its last meeting to outline the roles for ADOT related to the goals and objectives. She said those roles have now been included and will be discussed today. Jennifer said that it is very important for the Steering Team to provide specific direction and changes so that the Goals and Objectives, Multimodal Needs/Gaps, and Baseline Revenue Projections can move forward to the Policy Committee. An important discussion at today's meeting is the scope of the infrastructure statewide. The presentation will include the technical analysis around the state of the infrastructure needs and the baseline revenues will present how much revenues will be available to address these needs. Teresa Welborn will provide an overview of the upcoming outreach effort. She said that it is important to actively engage in today's discussion. There is a lot of information that will be presented today that will lead to a lively dialogue. We need to understand from you if this information is good to present at the August 3<sup>rd</sup> Policy Committee meeting.

#### **III. WMYA Goals and Objectives Status – Janet D'Ignazio**

Janet D'Ignazio of the Wilbur Smith Team provided an overview of the WMYA Goals and Objectives via telephone using the PowerPoint presentation. A revised Goals and Objectives (July 20, 2010) and Goals and Objectives Comments Summary (Status as of July 15, 2010) handouts were distributed. This summary outlines the comments received and how they were addressed in the revised Goals and Objectives.

Janet reiterated that the goals and objectives build upon past efforts, such as bqAZ. She 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.

Jennifer Toth highlighted that the roles outlined for the goal and objectives indicated where ADOT wants to be over the next 25 years; this is where ADOT sees its role in the future. It is

important to note that the agency will achieve some of these goals and objectives in less than the 25 years but all of these roles will be developed within a 25-year timeframe.

Floyd Roehrich, ADOT, stated that it is important that these goals and objectives or roles and responsibilities should not paint ADOT into a decision-making process “corner”. We need to have some discretion. These need to be viewed as one of the pieces in the decision-making process.

Dave Wessel, FMPO, asked if we have a definition of ADOT’s role today. Jennifer Toth explained that the agency sees its role as an owner/operator of the highway system. But as ADOT moves into the transit and rail arena in the future there is a potential that the role might change. Aviation is another example where our role might change. For example, the agency owns the Grand Canyon Airport and ADOT has been trying to get rid of that responsibility for some time.

Tom Warne asked Jennifer if she thought the agency is an advocate on some of these things. Jennifer Toth responded yes the agency is playing a more advocacy role.

Kevin Adam said that it appears that the linkage between transit and land use is included in the goals and objectives but is the linkage between the modes doesn’t seem to be included. I believe that this should also be taken into consideration.

Floyd Roehrich commented that the Plan should address not just what is on the state system but the linkage between local modes with the state system. The cross jurisdictional boundaries as well as mode boundaries should be addressed. That interface and collaboration will be important. It will take that partnership to a new level.

Dave Wessel asked to see the phrase “context sensitive” be included and use the transportation industry vernacular definition. Janet D’Ignazio clarified and provided the definition for context sensitivity as a way of embedding in the decision-making process a way of looking at projects and plans that fit within the environment and context of the location. She said that context sensitive addresses the surrounding landscape and physical environment as well as meeting the transportation needs. She said that it represents a three-legged stool and addresses projects from planning to construction maintenance/operation.

Floyd Roehrich, ADOT, asked Dave Wessel, FMPO how he was suggesting that the term be used. Dave Wessel responded that the FHWA definition should be used. This information could be added into the “Partnership” goal and objective. Janet D’Ignazio responded that she will revise the partnership goal to include context sensitive solutions using the transportation vernacular.

Floyd Roehrich, ADOT, replied that he has some concerns because people tend to interpret context sensitivity differently from community to community. It is important to clearly define how it is used. Some people think if they are not getting their way on a project then it is not context sensitive. Context sensitive solutions balance between what the locals want and what is need to be done to meet the project’s objective.

Dennis Smith, MAG, asked if there are any goals that get us out of the silo of transportation and aligning transportation goals with economic development goals. There are very limited funds and they should be allocated in such a way that assists Arizona in creating jobs and economic

diversification. It is important to cast the net further. Goals & Objectives Comment #13 gets closest to this but it doesn't go to the economic development organizations as full partners and ensuring that the transportation improvements achieve economic development goals. He said that his common complaint is that the business community or their interests are not represented at the transportation table. He mentioned that the Governor has a new economic development group that is private sector focused and he suggested that they get involved. Dennis mentioned that this approach has worked well for MAG.

### **III. Multimodal Needs/Gaps – Don Vary**

Dale Janik, Wilbur Smith, said that the next presentation goes into detail about the needs assessment and baseline revenue projections. The topics are the same from the TAC meeting that was recently held but the information is different based on the input from the TAC and ongoing conversations with ADOT. The baseline forecast has been updated since the last TAC meeting. This is an example of the strength of the WMYA committee structure and COG/MPO partnership where everyone is actively reviewing the information prior to meetings and providing specific comments. He stressed that the value of receiving this input and the Team makes changes based on that input.

Don Vary, Wilbur Smith Team, provided an overview of the multimodal needs and gap using the PowerPoint presentation. The purpose of the Multimodal Needs Analysis is to understand what the comprehensive needs are on the statewide system over the next 25 years.

Multimodal Needs This analysis produced 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 are 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 focuses on infrastructure elements that are ADOT's responsibility and/or other modes included in WMYA Goals and Objectives.

The purpose of this exercise is to understand the elements of the funding estimate that will be used to develop alternative investment choices. To determine the needs analysis, ADOT staff provided information on minimum tolerable conditions and how the facility should be improved, this information and various existing ADOT databases were used to determine the 25-year highway and bridge needs.

The Needs Summary is that \$51.7 B is the “outer limit” to build an effective system. Within this summary, we have preservation, modernization, and expansion needs within this bottom line number

Charlene FitzGerald, YMPO, asked about the bridge information and if included information from the federal bridge program (STRAHNET system). She said that it was her understanding that TEA-21 required bridges to be widened. Don Vary responded that he was not sure but the team has been working very closely with ADOT’s bridge engineers. Don reiterated that all state system bridges were analyzed.

Charlene FitzGerald asked if all COG/MPO long range transportation plans were included in this analysis; particularly if the YMPO Plan included. Jim Zumpf, ADOT, responded that it will be included but because it is so new it is not included in these numbers. She said it would be good to see a checklist to ensure that all LRTP are included.

Scott Omer asked if only the needs on the state system included. Don Vary responded that yes that is correct.

Charlene FitzGerald stressed the importance of having this information about the bridges and the STRAHNET system because the YMPO policy committee representative will bring this issue up at the meeting.

Mike Normand, ADOT, asked if the information includes operating costs for transit. Don Vary said that it includes only intercity transit capital needs, not operations. It does not include capital needs for local transit. It includes only intercity capital needs (i.e. transit to connect major activity centers statewide).

Kevin Adam stated that it would be helpful to have a short descriptive narrative at the end that would explain what the state would do if it received an additional \$52m for infrastructure. Don Vary said that we will be sure to add that. He said that most of the bqAZ projects for expansion and to make the statewide system safe were included.

Dennis Smith, MAG, stated that there are a couple of places where “rural and urban” is referred to and he wanted to understand what the definition was for those terms. Was it based on rural and urban as defined today or 25 years from now? Don Vary said that the needs utilized the current definition of rural and urban.

Dennis Smith, MAG, asked what will be ADOT’s approach working with the Policy Committee. My Policy Committee representative is going to ask me if I have reviewed all of the background or supporting information. He asked if the Steering Team can receive the working paper that includes the assumptions that the materials were based upon. He asked if the TAC reviewed the background information. Jennifer Toth responded that the working papers are in a draft format and the TAC did not see the working papers. She said that the background information will be distributed.

Dennis Smith, MAG asked if the commuter rail and high speed rail as well as the Hassayampa Freeway work get into the analysis. While the plan is not project-specific, the needs assessment includes investments in commuter rail services and new freeways on new rights-of-way to serve future growth. The assessment does not include inter-state investments in high-speed rail within the 25-year timeframe of the plan.

Floyd Roehrich, ADOT, said that he agreed with Dennis Smith and the Steering Team needs to see the specifics because the Policy Committee will want to know what you get.

Mike Normand said that he understands that intercity transit services are included but transit seems not to be on the list. He said that it should be included in some way.

Scott Omer, ADOT, asked that since the COG/MPO plans are being examined could the transit capital needs be included in the bottom line. Don Vary responded no, it is currently not in the bottom line but that is something that can be included.

Tom Warne asked if this could be an ADOT advocacy role. Jennifer Toth responded yes.

Charlene FitzGerald, YMPO, stated that how Arizona grows will impact how transportation is provided or needed. If only intercity rail is included then once a passenger gets to where they are going another mode must be there to take them to their destination. Additionally, ADOT approves the funding for transit that goes to rural Arizona. Because of how the state grows in the future may determine that ADOT needs to take a larger role and interest in transit as we move from a highway department to a truly multimodal agency.

Jennifer Toth, ADOT said that these are all good comments and we need to address them.

Dave Wessel, FMPO said that playing the devil's advocate ADOT's role will transition out of the urban arterial management system in the 25-year timeframe and have a significant role in transit particularly at that interface point. Floyd Roehrich, ADOT, responded that there are those jurisdictional boundaries. There needs to be an interface point absolutely.

Don Vary stated that the question that needs to be answered is "Has the right system that is within the state responsibility been defined in order to provide the basis for funding over the next 20 years?"

Charlene FitzGerald, YMPO, reminded everyone that many of the state highways operate as Main Streets and there will transit operating on them. Somehow there is a need for interconnection and ADOT needs to define its role regarding transit.

Mike Normand, ADOT, said that the policy question is "should ADOT have a role in providing a statewide funding source for transit?" Should this funding be something similar to aviation funds he asked? Jennifer Toth, ADOT, said that yes this is something the Policy Committee should tackle.

Scott Omer, ADOT, stated that there will be a bucket of money that is limited and how the bucket is divided between highway and transit is the policy issue.

Tom Warne said that there is a policy question regarding the transfer of highways from the state's jurisdiction to local jurisdiction. Jennifer Toth, ADOT, mentioned that the agency is embarking on a comprehensive study of route transfers.

Don Vary said that for the purpose of this exercise the Team tried to look objectively about system ownership and the dollars required.

Don Vary identified a mistake in the PowerPoint – the information is expressed in 2009 dollars and not 2008 as shown in the PowerPoint.

Charlene FitzGerald, YMPO, stated that the role ADOT has in transit along the state highway if state transfers occur must be addressed.

#### **IV. Baseline Revenue Projection – John Carr & Michelle Maggiore**

The purpose of the Baseline Revenue Forecast is to estimate the projected future revenues that Arizona will have and the projected discretionary funding that ADOT will have available to them in the 25-year timeframe. The revenue gap is very large. John Carr and Michelle Maggiore provided an overview of the baseline revenue projections using the PowerPoint presentation.

##### **Discussion –**

Dennis Smith, MAG, asked about RARF (slide #30) and stated that there are RARF categories that are statutorily allocated such as 10.5% are for local arterials. This is money that cannot be spent on the state system. John Carr said that RARF for freeways includes the monies that come into ADOT and then go out to urban areas for the state system within the urban area. They are being added to the revenue stream.

Dennis Smith, MAG, asked about the color codes in slide #30. Michelle Maggiore responded that numbers in red reflect transportation funds dedicated for modes and/or programs outside of ADOT's responsibility; numbers in black reflect funds available to ADOT for investment on the state highway and bridge system.

Dennis Smith, MAG, asked how the CMAQ funds are identified. Michelle Maggiore responded that CMAQ monies were not separated. All monies are in for long term investment and are included in the bottom line.

John Carr, WSA, said that CMAQ money is about 5% of all federal monies that come to Arizona. From a state perspective over the next 25-year timeframe the program is going to change (i.e. how the money can be spent and how it will come back).

Dennis Smith, MAG, stated that it shows the CMAQ funds as discretionary. There is a federal formula on how it can be distributed to Arizona. John Carr responded that yes it is indicated as discretionary. Dennis Smith stated that MAG is counting on these funds in the region's environmental plan and regional plan. If there is now a different assumption than it will have a great impact on MAG's planning. Jennifer Toth responded that there is not a different assumption. What is being illustrated is how the federal funds are rolled into one. The future federal program over the long term cannot be determined and how funds will be allocated per category is undetermined. It was an attempt to show broader categories instead of every specific funding category.

Scott Omer, ADOT, explained that all the statutes were reviewed to ensure that there was a clear understanding.

Charlene FitzGerald, YMPO, stated that it is not prudent for any plan to change any long term agreements on how funds are allocated. Jennifer Toth, ADOT reiterated that it is not the intent

to do that. The intent was to try and condense categories from the approximate 120 federal categories down to a more useful list.

Charlene FitzGerald, YMPO, suggested that this type of information related to honoring long standing agreements should be included in the working paper. Jennifer Toth, ADOT said that a clarifying statement will be included.

John Carr said that in the full working paper there is documentation of how all of the funds are allocated for 2009 but not in the future because the future is unknown.

Charlene FitzGerald, YMPO, stated that the long term policy agreements between the COG/MPOs and ADOT should be respected. These assumptions should not be changed unless discussed and agreed upon by all parties. Jennifer Toth, ADOT, said that information will be included to clarify the categories. However, it is important to remember that if reauthorization happens, there might be some impact on the local agreements. The intent was to condense these categories because the estimated 120 federal categories would be too many to list.

Charlene FitzGerald, YMPO, mentioned the example of Pinal County now being designated as a non-attainment and the new bill that might make the entire state non-attainment. What happens at that point might need to be addressed. But it is important to come together, discuss, and agree upon any changes to these existing agreements. John Carr said that these agreements will be respected and that this point will be clarified in the baseline study.

Scott Omer, ADOT, asked if in slide #30 (Forecast Summary) is it just the revenue forecast and not a budget illustrated? Michelle Maggiore said yes.

Kevin Adam asked if the last line about the discretionary number is this before or after the legislative action. Michelle Maggiore said that it is after the legislative action and it was included.

Charlene FitzGerald, YMPO, said that revenue gap must relate to all statewide needs and should add back in aviation and transit. John Carr said that the information is broken out by modes and this information can be included. Jennifer Toth, ADOT, said that transit and aviation gaps would be good to add.

Charlene FitzGerald, YMPO, stated that ADOT is stressing that the agency is not a highway planning organization but this whole document seems slanted toward highways. Jennifer Toth, ADOT, said that this is an important policy discussion (i.e. ADOT's transit role in the future) that the Policy Committee should discuss. Charlene FitzGerald, YMPO, said that this discussion should be expanded so that it doesn't look so slanted toward highways. If ADOT is truly going to be multimodal this plan should reflect all modes..

Dennis Smith, MAG, stated that it appears that ADOT wants to narrow this down to a plan for ADOT only. Maybe ADOT will do their piece but if the purpose of this exercise is to go to the Legislature for funding this might be a limited view. He suggested that maybe another group will have to do the broader perspective. This seems to be a limited plan.

Scott Omer, ADOT, stated that bqAZ provided the broader vision of how the state was going to grow and the transportation system that was desired. The purpose of bqAZ was to ask those questions. Transit was a big part of that. bqAZ was the first exercise. This is narrowing down from the vision.

Mike Normand, ADOT, agreed that bqAZ discussed how Arizona wanted to grow. The LRTP is financially constrained; but it is a plan to help move the state toward that vision. For transit; the policy question is does ADOT want to play a role in funding transit?

Jennifer Toth, ADOT, agreed that how Arizona grows was the discussion that occurred during the bqAZ process. The question during the LRTP should be focused on how Arizona will make transportation investment choices.

Tom Warne said that so much of what is being discussed today is going to evolve over the next 25-years and it should be included here.

Charlene FitzGerald, YMPO, suggested that information about what bqAZ said about how we are going to grow should be presented to the Policy Committee so they have that background for their discussions.

Mike Normand, ADOT, said that bqAZ laid out a multimodal vision and these revenues projections state where Arizona stands today.

Jennifer Toth, ADOT, said that the LRTP will examine various scenarios related to revenue projections during the investment choice phase.

## **V. Public Participation Plan – Teresa Welborn**

Teresa Welborn provided an overview of the outreach effort using the PowerPoint presentation. She said that there are eight Common Interest Groups being held this week. Additionally the project e-newsletter was distributed today with a link to a public survey. Follow up media releases are also being distributed. Stakeholder and elected official webinars are being planned. She asked for the COG/MPO assistance in promoting the webinars. Teresa mentioned the website [www.whatmovesyourarizona.gov](http://www.whatmovesyourarizona.gov) and the “Library” section where project information can be located.

Kevin Adam asked if there was good geographic representation at the upcoming interest group meetings. Kristin Bornstein responded that yes representation was good but there have been inquiries received about participating remotely. These individuals will be invited to the webinars.

## **VI. Discussion**

Tom Warne asked “How can we package this information for the Policy Committee presentation?” and the following were identified.

- Linking bqAZ to the information being presented
- Within the revenue forecasts and needs, expand the columns to include transit and aviation; include all modes in the overall discussion
- Explain the purpose of the LRTP better and at every meeting (recap the process)
- Emphasis should be provided that the needs assessment and revenue projections are draft and comments are encouraged
- Explain ADOT’s role or what ADOT can deliver on up front; those are the type of policy decisions that the Policy Committee would like to weigh in on
- Explain where this planning effort is taking us that is different than the past efforts.

- How are we using the Goals and Objectives? Need to explain the linkages.
- In the Policy Committee presentation, make sure we define what is needed from this committee
  - Recommendation needed
  - Providing a recommendation

Mike Normand, ADOT, commented that bqAZ presents a vision of multimodal. The LRTP must outline how an agency can be created that represents the vision and identifies who the partners are to deliver what is laid out in bqAZ.

Dennis Smith, MAG gave an example of APL Limited in Scottsdale which is the second largest shipper on the UP. They are going to help with the MAG freight study now. It is important that people understand that in order to grow the economy it is about Arizona versus the rest of the world. We need to drop some of the fences and build the economy collaboratively. If you can communicate some of these economic messages; ADOT will come across like the agency understands these trends. This whole vision of CANAMEX is big. We need to get people focused on what could be. It is bigger than any one agency like MAG.

Maxine Brown, CAAG, suggested discussing some of these things earlier in the discussion to get people engaged.

Randy Heiss, SEAGO, said that he agreed with Dennis Smith, MAG, about thinking more strategically about how transportation can support Arizona's economic development. He suggested that Arizona is missing an opportunity with transit by not maximizing school buses. He suggested that it is important to break down these barriers.

Charlene FitzGerald, YMPO, said that it is important to be very clear with the Policy Committee of what are the expectations (i.e. discussion or decision).

Dennis Smith, MAG, said that it is important to clarify what the end product of the LRTP is and the greater purpose should be explained. That is what elected officials want to know.

## **VII. Topics for Future Meeting**

Jim Zumpf, ADOT said that the August 17<sup>th</sup> meeting is probably going to be canceled but he stressed to keep it on your calendar and it will be confirmed after the Policy Committee meeting on August 3<sup>rd</sup>.

Jennifer Toth, ADOT thanked everyone for their input and the ideas received today will help to clarify the presentation for the Policy Committee meeting.

## **VIII. Adjourn**

Jennifer Toth, ADOT thanked everyone for attending.

Adjourn 3:45 PM

## Appendix

### Steering Team Participants

Jennifer Toth, ADOT-MPD, Chair  
Scott Omer, ADOT-MPD  
Rob Samour, ADOT Deputy State Engineer  
Mark Hodges, ADOT-MPD Data Mgmt.  
Mike Normand, ADOT-MPD-Transit  
Chris Bridges, CYMPO  
Ken Sweet, NACOG  
Keith Killough, ADOT-Assistant Director  
Charlene FitzGerald, YMPO

Jim Zumpf, ADOT-MPD, Project Manager  
Floyd Roehrich, Jr., ADOT State Engineer  
Thor Anderson, ADOT-Environmental Services  
Teri Kennedy, ADOT-MPD Transit  
Maxine Brown, CAAG  
Teresa Welborn, ADOT-CCP  
Dennis Smith, MAG  
Randy Heiss, SEAGO

### Video Conference

Dave Wessel, FMPO

### Others Attending

Kevin Adam, Rural Transportation Liaison

Dianne Kresich, ADOT

### Consultant Team

Dale Janik, Wilbur Smith  
Janet D'Ignazio (via telephone)  
Peggy Fiandaca, PSA  
Don Vary, Wilbur Smith  
Jeff Carroll, Wilbur Smith

Craig Secrest (via telephone)  
Kristin Bornstein, KDA  
John Carr, Wilbur Smith  
Michelle Maggiore, Wilbur Smith