



FLAGSTAFF METROPOLITAN PLANNING ORGANIZATION

CITY OF FLAGSTAFF ♦ COCONINO COUNTY ♦ ARIZONA DOT

Office: 100 West Birch Avenue ♦ Flagstaff, Arizona 86001

Mail: 211 West Aspen Avenue ♦ Flagstaff, Arizona 86001

Phone: (928) 226-4849 ♦ Fax: (928) 213-4825

www.flagstaffmpo.org

Revised A G E N D A Executive Board

8:00 a.m. – 10:00 a.m. – Wednesday, March 25, 2009

Flagstaff City Hall, 2nd Floor Staff Conference Room,
211 W. Aspen Avenue, Flagstaff, AZ 86001

Regular meetings and work sessions are open to the public. Persons with a disability may request a reasonable accommodation by contacting the Clerk of the Board of Supervisors Office at 928-779-6693. Requests should be made as early as possible to allow time to arrange the accommodation. **A quorum of the FMPO Technical Advisory Committee may be present.**

CALL TO ORDER

BOARD MEMBERS:

Scott Overton, Chair

Matt Ryan, Vice-chair

Carl Taylor

Mayor Sara Presler

Robert "Bob" Montoya

Coral Evans

FMPO STAFF

David Wessel, FMPO Manager

Martin Ince, Multimodal Planner

Meg Roederer, Administrative Specialist

I. PRELIMINARY GENERAL BUSINESS

A. PUBLIC COMMENT

(At this time, any member of the public may address the Committee on any subject within their jurisdiction that is not scheduled before the Committee on that day. Due to Open Meeting Laws, the Committee cannot discuss or act on items presented during this portion of the agenda. To address the Board on an item that is on the agenda, please wait for the Chair to call for Public Comment at the time the item is heard.)

B. ANNOUNCEMENTS

(Reconsiderations, Changes to the Agenda, and other Preliminary Announcements)

C. APPROVAL of MINUTES.

Pages 4-7

1) Meeting of January 28, 2009

2) Meeting of February 25, 2009

II. OLD BUSINESS (Continued, postponed, and tabled items.)

1. **Federal Highway Bill Authorization and Stimulus Package** **Pages 8-14**

FMPO Staff: David Wessel, FMPO Manager
REQUESTED ACTION: Discussion

Staff will debrief the Executive Board on recent Arizona State Transportation Board decisions.

RECOMMENDED ACTION: Discussion only

2. **Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) Update** **Pages 15-17**

FMPO Staff: David Wessel, FMPO Manager
REQUESTED ACTION: Discussion

Staff will update the Executive Board on recent progress.

RECOMMENDED ACTION: Discussion only

III. NEW BUSINESS

1. **FMPO Calendar** **Page 18**

FMPO Staff: David Wessel, FMPO Manager
REQUESTED ACTION: Discussion

RECOMMENDED ACTION: Discussion only

2. **FMPO Information Brochure** **Page 19-21**

FMPO Staff: David Wessel, FMPO Manager
REQUESTED ACTION: Possible action

Staff will review a draft brochure with the Board and seek approval for its production and distribution.

RECOMMENDED ACTION: Approve draft brochure

3. **Board Member Washington, D.C. trip Reports** **Page (none)**

FMPO Staff: David Wessel, FMPO Manager
REQUESTED ACTION: Possible action

Board members will report on their respective trips to Washington, D.C. and provide direction on possible supportive actions by the Board or staff.

RECOMMENDED ACTION: follow board direction

4. **FMPO 2009-2013 Transportation Improvement Program Amendment**

Page (none)

FMPO Staff: David Wessel, FMPO Manager
REQUESTED ACTION: Possible action

Given only \$960,000 in local highway stimulus money, staff recommends the funds be used solely on the County W. Route 66. Any clarification on transit stimulus program will be presented, too.

RECOMMENDED ACTION: Approve TIP amendment.

IV. CONCLUDING GENERAL BUSINESS

Pages 22-23

D. **REPORTS**

- 1) Technical Advisory Committee:
 - Action Summary March 5, 2009
- 2) Staff Reports:

E. **ANNOUNCEMENTS**

(Informal Announcements, Future Agenda Items, and Next Meeting Date)

Executive Board	April 22, 2009 City Hall, 2 nd Floor Staff Conference
TAC	April 2, 2009

Management Committee:

Annual ASTB Dinner

Annual ASTB Hearings

County, 1st Floor Board of Supervisor Room

April 9, 2009

County, 2nd Conference Room

May 14, 2009

(Location TBD)

May 15, 2009

City Hall Council Chambers

ADJOURNMENT

CERTIFICATION OF POSTING OF NOTICE

The undersigned hereby certifies that a copy of the foregoing notice was duly posted at Flagstaff City Hall on _____, at _____ a.m./p.m. in accordance with the statement filed by the Recording Secretary with the City Clerk.

Dated this _____ day of _____, 2009.



FLAGSTAFF METROPOLITAN
PLANNING ORGANIZATION
CITY OF FLAGSTAFF ♦ COCONINO COUNTY ♦ ARIZONA DOT
Office: 100 West Birch Avenue ♦ Flagstaff, Arizona 86001
Mail: 211 West Aspen Avenue ♦ Flagstaff, Arizona 86001
Phone: (928) 226-4849 ♦ Fax: (928) 213-4825
www.flagstaffmpo.org

Draft Minutes EXECUTIVE BOARD MEETING 8:00 a.m. – 10:00 a.m., January 28, 2009

Flagstaff City Hall, 2nd Floor Staff Conference Room,
211 W. Aspen Avenue, Flagstaff, AZ 86001

I. CALL TO ORDER

Chair Overton called the meeting to order at 8:19 a.m.

On roll call, the following were present:

Scott Overton, Chair
Matt Ryan, Vice Chair
Mayor Sara Presler, (excused absent)
Coral Evans
Bob Montoya
Carl Taylor, (excused absent)

The following FMPO staff was present:

David Wessel, FMPO Manager
Meg Roederer, Administrative Specialist

Others Present:

John Harper, ADOT District Engineer
Kevin Adams, RTAC
Kevin Burke, City Manager

II. PRELIMINARY GENERAL BUSINESS

A. PUBLIC COMMENT

There was no public comment.

B. ANNOUNCEMENTS

Mr. Ryan explained instead of Ms. Archulta, Mr. Taylor will be the Board member assigned to the FMPO and a designated alternate from County is in progress.

C. APPROVAL of MINUTES.

Mr. Ryan made a motion to approve the December 17, 2008 Minutes and Mr. Montoya seconded, which passed unanimously.

I. OLD BUSINESS (Continued, postponed, and tabled items.)

1. Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) Update

Mr. Wessel provided an RTP update to the Executive Board. The Board discussed the weighting criteria and RTP long range plan alternate and options. The Board

deferred adoption of the Evaluation Criteria Weighting to the next meeting. There was discussion only and no action.

2. Federal Highway Bill Authorization and Stimulus Package

The Chair adjusted the agenda to discuss this as Item 2. Mr. Wessel and Mr. Adams (RTAC) explained the Federal Highway Bill Authorization and Stimulus Package to the Board. There was discussion only.

Mr. Wessel reviewed American Recovery and Reinvestment Act of 2009 Resolution Number 2009-01 with the Board. The Board recommended the Resolution, which is in support of the stimulus package, include a reference to jobs and the economy, \$60,000,000 should be \$60,000,000,000, and under Chairman signature. Mr. Ryan made a motion to adopt the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act of 2009 Resolution Number 2009-01 with the recommended changes. Mr. Montoya seconded, which passed unanimously.

3. FMPO FY 2010 Work Program

There was no discussion.

II. NEW BUSINESS

4. FMPO FY 2009-2013 Transportation Improvement Program Amendments

Mr. Wessel explained the FMPO FY 2009-2013 Transportation Improvement Program Amendments including pavement preservation on an 89 project at \$8 million, an enhancement project, changing sponsorship, and stimulus projects.

Mr. Ryan made a motion to amend the TIP with staff recommendations and authorize staff to make administrative changes under Chairman signature. Ms. Evans seconded, which carried unanimously.

Mr. Wessel mentioned he will attend the City of Flagstaff Capital Improvements meeting at 10 a.m. today to discuss the item.

4. FMPO Calendar

There was no discussion.

III. CONCLUDING GENERAL BUSINESS

D. REPORTS

- 1) Technical Advisory Committee:
There was no discussion.
- 2) Management Committee Report:
There was no discussion.
- 3) Staff Reports:
There was no discussion.

E. ANNOUNCEMENTS

Mr. Wessel announced Bob Holmes, City of Flagstaff Lobbyist, will be in Flagstaff on 2/2/09 and the delegation to Washington DC departs on 2/11/09 for the Bill approval on 2/13/09.

ADJOURNMENT

Chair Overton adjourned the meeting at 9:33 a.m.



FLAGSTAFF METROPOLITAN
PLANNING ORGANIZATION
CITY OF FLAGSTAFF ♦ COCONINO COUNTY ♦ ARIZONA DOT
Office: 100 West Birch Avenue ♦ Flagstaff, Arizona 86001
Mail: 211 West Aspen Avenue ♦ Flagstaff, Arizona 86001
Phone: (928) 226-4849 ♦ Fax: (928) 213-4825
www.flagstaffmpo.org

Draft Minutes Executive Board: Wednesday, February 25, 2009 8:00 a.m. – 10:00 a.m.

Flagstaff City Hall, 2nd Floor Staff Conference Room,
211 W. Aspen Avenue, Flagstaff, AZ 86001

Chair Overton called the meeting to order at 8:07 a.m.

On roll call, the following Executive Board members were present:

Scott Overton, Chair
Mayor Sara Presler
Matt Ryan, Vice-chair
Bob Montoya (telephonically)
Carl Taylor, excused absent
Coral Evans, excused absent

The following FMPO staff was present:

David Wessel, FMPO Manager
Meg Roederer, Administrative Specialist

I. PRELIMINARY GENERAL BUSINESS

A. PUBLIC COMMENT

There was no public comment.

B. ANNOUNCEMENTS

There were no announcements.

C. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Mayor Presler made a motion to approve the February 11, 2009 Special Executive Board meeting minutes and Mr. Ryan seconded, which passed unanimously.

II. OLD BUSINESS

1. Federal Highway Bill Authorization and Stimulus Package

Mr. Wessel debriefed the Executive Board on recent Arizona State Transportation Board action from a meeting he attended on February 20, 2009.

Mr. Wessel stated the letter to the Governor states we support the State Transportation Board and seeks local authorization of projects.

The Board suggested the following updates to the letter

- Use a colon after the Governor's name

- Emphasize rural areas receive additional funds/support and poor condition of state highways
- Send to the following recipients:
 - Governor Jan Brewer
 - John Halikowski, Interim Director Arizona Department of Transportation
Copy letter to Floyd Roehrich, State Engineer
 - Delbert Householder, Chair Arizona State Transportation Board
Copy letter to Bob Montoya
- Send cover letter and the letter to the Governor:
 - Congresswoman Ann Kirkpatrick, U.S. House of Representatives*
 - Senator Steve Pierce, District 1*
 - Senator Albert Hale, District 2*
 - Representative Tom Chabin, District 2*
 - Representative Lucy Mason, District 1*
 - Representative Andy Tobin, Majority Whip, District 1*
 - Representative Christopher Deschene, District 2*

Mayor Presler made a motion to authorize the Chairman to send the letter to the Governor, Arizona State Transportation Board, ADOT director and the additional people identified with the understanding the statement being issued is on behalf of the FMPO. Mr. Ryan seconded, which passed unanimously.

III. NEW BUSINESS

2. Regional Transportation Plan Update

Mr. Wessel requested a no cost extension on the contract till June 30, 2009 for the Regional Transportation Plan for the following three reasons.

- 1) Tool development
- 2) Manager's attention on the stimulus and not on the RTP
- 3) Consultant health issues forced delays

Chair Overton stated it needs to remain in alignment with the Regional Plan Update.

Mr. Ryan made a motion to approve the time extension and Mayor Presler seconded, which carried unanimously.

D. ANNOUNCEMENTS

Chair Overton announced the next meeting, Mayor Presler thanked the staff, Mr. Wessel stated thanks to the Executive Board for meeting on short notice and Mr. Ryan stated he is traveling to DC for RTAC. Chair Overton and others are also going to DC. Mr. Montoya suggested those going to DC make it point to discuss relaxing federal guidelines to administer projects so there is not a risk of losing funding. Those going to DC will make it point to discuss with the delegates. Mr. Wessel stated it is in-line with his conversations with the state engineer (Floyd Roehrich) as well. Mr. Montoya suggested assuring the state engineer by Mr. Wessel providing the qualifications and standards that match the state in order to stress the case of not hiring consultants and keeping the money in local communities.

ADJOURNMENT

Chair Overton adjourned the meeting at 8:30 a.m.

FLAGSTAFF METROPOLITAN PLANNING ORGANIZATION STAFF SUMMARY REPORT



To: FMPO Executive Board
From: David Wessel, FMPO Manager
Date: March 15, 2009
Meeting Date: March 25, 2009

Title: Federal Stimulus Package Update

Recommended Actions: Monitor the legislature and protect the Arizona State Transportation Board decision as needed.

ACTION SUMMARYDISCUSSION:

Background/History:

- The American Recovery and Reinvestment Act, signed into law on February 17, 2009.
- Includes roughly \$27.5 billion in highway funds and \$8 billion in transit funds.
- It is estimated that \$527 million will be apportioned to Arizona and of that, \$156 million suballocated to other areas of the state. An official FHWA website indicates that \$110 million will go to areas over 200,000 in population, \$35 million to areas between 5,000 and 200,000 and \$11 million to areas less than 5,000. More current information indicates approximately \$900,000 for the FMPO region. This is lower than the rough staff estimate of the FMPO share is \$2.7 million. \$
- On February 20, 2009 the Arizona State Transportation Board met to discuss the stimulus package. Key points:
 - Any funds within the State's discretion should be distributed per the Resource Allocation Advisory Committee (RAAC) formula of 50% to the rurals, 37% to Maricopa governments and 13% to Pima governments.
 - RAAC formula will apply to the 70% of funds going to the state and, to the extent permitted by FHWA, to the 30% suballocated funds, too.
 - Project selection is up to local jurisdictions through their respective Council of Government (COG) or Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO) process.
 - Project administration and construction management is expected to be handled by the State except in the few cases where a local government is certified by FHWA and ADOT to administer federal projects. **Flagstaff and Coconino County are not certified.**
- On March 13, 2009 Director Halikowski informed the State Transportation Board that the director, by law, has discretionary authority over the distribution of the 30% suballocated funds and that his intent is to distribute those per the 2008 distribution percentages. Because this places many Maricopa and Pima County communities within the same pool of funds as Flagstaff and many other rural cities and towns, the amount of funds available outside of Maricopa and Pima is greatly reduced.
- No other MPO or COG members are expressing a desire or need to manage projects locally.

Key Considerations:

- The RAAC formula supports a balanced distribution of funds across the system and recognizes that the major metropolitan areas have an economic dependence on the rural highway system.
- HDR, Inc. has been in contact with governments in local Arizona regarding project readiness. HDR will assess which projects can be made ready and provide necessary assistance. FMPO staff understands that funding for HDR will be extracted from local stimulus funds.
- FHWA guidance on the bill is that local funds will be subjected to a **1-YEAR** time frame for obligation.
- Staff worked unsuccessfully to date with the State Engineer's office and colleagues at Northern Arizona Council of Governments and elsewhere to develop a concept for more local control of stimulus projects. Based on the lack of a broader constituency and lower funding estimates, staff recommends no longer pursuing this course of action.
- Staff recommends against lobbying Director Halikowski or the Governor for a larger share of suballocated funds. First, the increase is likely to be modest and after distribution across many communities result in only small gains. Second, the application of the RAAC formula to the \$350 million is significant in and of itself.

Community Benefits and Considerations:

- Optimizes federal stimulus funds to local communities.

Community Involvement:

- Open meetings to discuss stimulus bill and transportation improvement program.

Financial Implications:

- Approximately \$900,000 in spending on local project(s) and \$20,000,000 in state projects.

Options and Alternatives:

- Continue to seek more local control of stimulus projects
- More aggressively defend the ASTB decision
- Seek to influence Director Halikowski to direct more suballocated funds to rural Arizona

Attachments/Exhibits:

- Rural Transportation Advocacy Council information on stimulus and funding distribution

DISTRIBUTION OF THE ARRA SUBALLOCATION FUNDING TALKING POINTS

- After various discussions with FHwA and ADOT staff, it has become clear that no further guidance on the distribution of the suballocated funding will be coming from FHwA.
- Both FHwA and ADOT staff have indicated that there is no state discretion for the funding allocated to areas above 200,000 in population. Of the \$156 Million total suballocated funding for Arizona, the federal law requires \$89 Million or 57% to be distributed to the Phoenix-Mesa area and \$22 Million or 14% to be distributed to the Tucson area. This mandate alone guarantees that the Phoenix and Tucson areas will receive at least 71% of the suballocated funding.
- The remaining balance is \$46 Million or 29% of the total. This is divided into two pots of money, \$35 Million for areas between 200,000 and 5,000 and \$11 Million for areas under 5,000. According to FHwA, the state has considerable discretion in how this funding is distributed.
- All indications are that the ADOT Administration will continue to propose that substantial portions of the \$46 Million also be distributed within the MAG and PAG regions in addition to the funding that they will already receive from the over 200,000 allocation. At the Bullhead City Board meeting, ADOT recommended that MAG receive an additional \$16 Million from that \$46 Million pot and that PAG receive an additional \$14 Million. This leaves a total of \$15 Million for the 13 other counties.
- Based on the above, including ADOT’s recommendations for the discretionary \$46 Million, the entire \$156 Million of suballocated funding would be distributed as follows:

MAG	\$105 Million	67%
PAG	\$36 Million	23%
TOC	\$15 Million	10%

- The thirteen other counties would receive 10% of the funding and have roughly 25% of the population.
- It appears that ADOT’s rationale will be that this is consistent with previous allocations of federal STP funding that was factored into the setting of the RAAC formula.
- While the stimulus package essentially uses the STP formula as the basis for distributing the suballocated funding, the intended use of the funding is different. While STP traditionally enables state’s to retain significant portions of the funding, the clear intent of Congress was for this money to be used for local transportation projects. As this is

considerably different than the historical use of STP funding, one could argue that previous distributions of STP funding should not apply to the stimulus funding.

- As roughly \$110 Million of the \$156 Million is already mandated to go to MAG and PAG, there is not enough remaining suballocated funding to bring the rurals up to 50% of the total.
- For the suballocated funding, the rurals can do no better than 29% which would require the full discretionary \$46 Million being allocated to the rurals.
- To bring the rural portion up to at least their percentage of the state population (estimated at 25%) would require roughly \$39 Million of the discretionary \$46 Million being allocated to the rurals.
- Either one of those levels is within your discretion to allocate and would be far greater than the level currently proposed for rurals which is \$15 Million or 10% of the funding.
- As the rural level for the state project funding (\$176 Million of the \$350 Million) is already set at 50%, rurals will receive less than 50% of the total stimulus package highway funding as they can do no better than 29% of the suballocated funding. They would obviously need half of that pot to make the overall total 50%.
- While not a highway issue, you may wish to link the transit funding to the discussion as there will be a great disparity in stimulus funding allocations for transit. Of the \$95 Million provided to Arizona for transit, I believe the rural allocation is around \$7 Million.

CASA GRANDE VERSUS STAN FUNDING FORMULAS

- Historically, there has been much disagreement and dispute concerning the distribution of highway funding in Arizona. The metropolitan areas have a majority of the population and generate most of the revenue while rural areas have a much larger land mass and contain the majority of lane miles on the state system.
- The 2007 State Highway System Length and Travel Statistics indicate that the thirteen counties other than Maricopa and Pima contain 82.5% of the state system route miles and 76% of the lane miles.
- In addition, the thirteen other counties experience 44.5% of the daily vehicle miles traveled. When compared to Maricopa County at 46.7%, the difference between the two is just over 2%.
- In 1999, transportation officials from across Arizona met in Casa Grande as part of a deliberative, cooperative effort to develop an equitable distribution formula that considered the vast geographic territory and purposes served by the state highway system, including interstate and intrastate commerce, goods movement and recreational travel. The Casa Grande Resolves were established and have been the basis for distributing discretionary highway funding ever since. The formula distributes discretionary funding in the following manner:

37%	MAG (Maricopa)
13%	PAG (Pima)
50%	TOC (thirteen other counties)

- The Statewide Transportation Acceleration Needs (STAN) formula was created to provide additional funding to accelerate the construction of highway projects. While other funding sources are authorized and have been used, such as the State Highway Fund, STAN has received most of its funding as an appropriation from the State Legislature and allocates funding in the following manner:

60%	MAG (Maricopa)
16%	PAG (Pima)
24%	TOC (thirteen other counties)

- The development of the STAN formula was not a collaborative effort. It clearly was not as deliberative or as inclusive as the process that developed the Casa Grande formula. It was essentially a relatively quick inclusion in a state budget that provided little time for deliberation at a time when legislators and other public officials had a multitude of other budget-related issues to consider.
- The STAN formula cut the rural allocation in half from 50% to 24%. In addition, for the initial STAN funding, the entire 24% for the rurals was dedicated to Interstate 10 improvements between Marana and Picacho Peak. While technically in Pinal County and clearly a needed state priority, these projects provide far greater benefit to the urban areas yet accounted for the entire rural allocation of the funding.
- When determining the appropriate allocation percentages, the Casa Grande participants factored in nondiscretionary federal funding (CMAQ and STP) that the state also receives but has no control over where it is spent. STAN did not, and instead, took the very narrow approach of only considering the discretionary funding. This greatly skews the allocation percentages.
- The Maricopa region receives substantial amounts of federal Congestion Mitigation Air Quality (CMAQ) funding for transportation projects while the rural areas receive none. Rurals contribute revenue to CMAQ but receive no direct return.

- The larger urbanized areas (MAG and PAG) also receive a much higher proportion of federal Surface Transportation Program (STP) funding. Based on ADOT's current interpretation of the STP formula allocations for the stimulus package, the rurals only receive 10% of the state's share of STP funding.
- According to ADOT, when the discretionary and nondiscretionary funding are combined, MAG receives roughly 55% of the total highway funding, only about a 5% difference from their percentage of the state's population.
- The 37% MAG allocation in the Casa Grande formula is very misleading unless you also factor in the very large amounts of nondiscretionary highway funding that MAG also receives which brings the MAG total to 55%.
- While subsidy is often the word used to describe the difference between the percentages of population and highway funding received by the MAG region, subsidy would only be an accurate term if that Maricopa population was not using the highways outside of its region.
- The Maricopa and Pima regions place tremendous impacts on the rural sections of the state highway system. In addition to business travel and recreation, the metropolitan areas rely heavily on the rural infrastructure for the movement of goods and produce. In fact, virtually everything that everyone eats every day in metropolitan areas is either trucked or railed into their region through the rural areas.
- Relying purely on population to distribute discretionary highway funding, as directed by the STAN formula, will not address system-wide needs and will ultimately result in statewide infrastructure deficiencies that will impact rurals and urbans alike. If the rural areas of the highway system are neglected, the impact on the movement of goods will impact the economic development and quality of life in urban areas.
- Also, basing the funding distribution purely on population is overly simplistic and creates many inequities described in the following bullet points
- The vast majority of rural segments on the highway system do not benefit the movement of local traffic. For instance, virtually no one lives near Interstate 10 between Buckeye and Quartzsite (almost the entire distance between the Phoenix metropolitan area and the California border) yet funding to improve and maintain that length of Interstate 10 counts against the rural population's allocation of highway funding.
- The interstates handle a considerable amount of freight traffic particularly from the Los Angeles and Long Beach ports. Much of this traffic does not start or stop in Arizona. Maintenance impacts from this non-Arizona traffic are predominantly covered by rural Arizona's allocation of highway funding. In fact, all of the costs associated with maintaining Interstates 8 and 40 are taken from the rural share of funding.
- The international ports of entry also generate a considerable amount of non-local traffic that impact rural transportation infrastructure and are also covered by the rural allocation of highway funding. As with the freight traffic, rural Arizonans aren't the primary beneficiary of these projects yet they count against their allocation.

**CY 2007 STATE HIGHWAY SYSTEM
LENGTH AND TRAVEL STATISTICS*
MAG, PAG and "The Other 13 Counties"
By Rural/Urban Designation**

SIGNED HIGHWAY TYPE / GEOGRAPHIC AREA	ROUTE MILES	LANE MILES	DVMT (000's)
Rural	403	1,254	4,931
Small Urban Places	18	63	734
Small Urbanized Areas (Avondale)	15	60	1,265
Large Urbanized Areas (Phoenix-Mesa)	267	1,773	30,327
TOTAL - MAG REGION (all of Maricopa County)	703	3,150	37,257

Rural	283	661	2,117
Small Urban Places	16	63	431
Small Urbanized Areas (None)	0	0	0
Large Urbanized Areas (Tucson)	69	334	4,174
TOTAL - PAG REGION (all of Pima County)	368	1,058	6,722

Rural	4,751	11,970	29,261
Small Urban Places	242	853	4,072
Small Urbanized Areas (Flagstaff, Prescott, Yuma)	89	334	2,108
Large Urbanized Areas (Apache Jct in metro Phoenix)	13	42	281
TOTAL - OTHER 13 COUNTIES	5,082	13,157	35,441

Rural (includes cities and towns under 5,000)	5,437	13,885	36,309
Small Urban Places (5,000 to 50,000)	276	979	5,237
Small Urbanized Areas (50,000 to 200,000)	104	394	3,373
Large Urbanized Areas (over 200,000)	349	2,149	34,782
STATEWIDE TOTAL	6,166	17,407	79,701

DVMT = Daily vehicle-miles of travel

* - Excludes freeway frontage roads and ramps

Source: Arizona HPMS database, CY 2007

FLAGSTAFF METROPOLITAN PLANNING ORGANIZATION STAFF SUMMARY REPORT



To: FMPO Executive Board

From: David Wessel, FMPO Manager

Date: March 15, 2009

Meeting Date: March 25, 2009

Title: Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) Update

Recommended Actions: Accept Technical Advisory Committee recommendations on plan process priorities and staff recommendations on Evaluation Criteria weighting.

ACTION SUMMARY: Budget and time are winding down and staff seeks to optimize efforts on the most important tasks remaining.

DISCUSSION:

Background/History:

- Charlier, consultant, started the project October 2007 and will conclude April 2009.

Key Considerations:

- **Project Schedule** - The Executive Board authorized staff to pursue a no-cost extension of the RTP through the end of the fiscal year. Longer than expected tool development and staff focus on the federal economic stimulus program are explanations for the extension.
- **Project Budget** – Approximately 80% of the funds have been expended. In view of work to be done, opportunities and requirements to coordinate with the Regional Plan effort and the LDC effort, staff recommends shifting funds from the public participation and urban design subconsultants into the prime and modeling subconsultant line items.
 - Several changes have occurred that negatively impact the project budget. Several tasks pursued in good faith have not borne fruit – such as technical, policy, and logistical coordination with the City’s Character District Study and with ADOT’s “bqAZ” process, the entire scope and timing of both projects having changed during the RTP process. The traffic model presented a time-consuming opportunity to make a long-term fix for land use data collection. The future land use update, to be completed by other entities, fell to the RTP Update process with limited budget and significant schedule disruption. Significant time and resources have been expended on unanticipated tasks not within the original project scope to accomplish agreed-upon project objectives, such as the online and other survey work to supplement the initial community engagement process that had yielded underwhelming results.

FMPO TAC, staff and its consulting team recommend the following major critical path tasks to complete the RTP process, meet SAFETEA-LU requirements, and strategically position FMPO staff to shift to the General Plan Update:

- Complete the updated 2007 traffic model and basic multimodal modeling capabilities. **Enhanced effort to support general plan update.**
 - Complete the identification and costing of projects by travel mode. **Standard effort.**
 - Solicit public and stakeholder input on prioritizing candidate projects based on their ability to comply with and address existing land use policy and the RTP policy foundation reflecting community engagement to date. **Minimize effort and coordinate with general plan update. Staff is working with ADOT to try to redirect the phone survey funds to support public involvement efforts.**
 - Complete the FLU forecasts, test candidate projects with the horizon year traffic model, and evaluate/prioritize the projects based on the performance measures and community/stakeholder guidance. **Minimize effort.**
 - Match available revenues against prioritized project costs to develop a “cost feasible” plan per SAFETEA-LU requirements. **Standard effort.**
 - Complete the RTP Update Final Report for action by the FMPO Board and its advisory committees. **Standard effort.**
- **Evaluation Criteria** – Executive Board members completed their submittals. The telephone survey is not going to take place. Staff recommends using the average between the Board and the stakeholders.

Executive Board member results

	TOTAL SCORE	Normalized Score	Rank
Economic Development	376	1.4	2
Community Character	376	1.4	2
Environment	319	1.2	7
Reduce Number of Trips	330	1.3	6
Reduce Duration of Trips	260	1.0	8
Expand Mode Choices	337	1.3	5
Increase Safety	349	1.3	4
Road Maintenance & Operations	402	1.5	1

Stakeholder Results

	Normalized Score	Rank	Difference	average	rank
Economic Development	1.24	7	-5	4.5	4
Community Character	1.37	4	-2	3	3
Environment	1.44	3	4	5	6
Reduce Number of Trips	1.24	6	0	6	7
Reduce Duration of Trips	1.00	8	0	8	8
Expand Mode Choices	1.26	5	0	5	5
Increase Safety	1.67	1	3	2.5	2
Road Maintenance & Operations	1.47	2	-1	1.5	1

- **Cost Estimation Tool** – Cost elements for enhancements, trails, and transit still need to be added.
- **Land Use Forecast Model** – Land Use Plan geodatabase is cleaned up in GIS and ready for use. Analytical tools based on development attractiveness factors are being built by City GIS staff. Staff may elect to use a consensus method to develop forecasts.

- **Transportation Model** – Traffic Analysis Zones have been revised to work better with the land use model and to coordinate more closely with the Districts and Activity Centers. Final calibration is near complete for the traffic aspect of the model. Further improvement is expected with the addition of the 3-D model that could start development next week. Staff developed a pedestrian and bicycle volume data set from turn movement counts to be used for calibration.

Community Benefits and Considerations:

- No update

Community Involvement:

- See notes above

Financial Implications:

- \$239,000 in FMPO funding.

Options and Alternatives:

- Use the Executive Board weighting instead of the average.

Attachments/Exhibits:

- none



Flagstaff Metropolitan Planning Organization Calendar January 2009 – December 2009

January 2009

1/1 TAC: Canceled.
1/8 Management Committee: RTP update, Re-Authorization, Work Program
1/28 Executive Board: [Reauthorization position](#)

February 2009

2/5 TAC: Federal Stimulus bill planning
2/12 Management Committee: cancelled due to budget retreat.
2/25 Executive Board (combined with Management Committee): [Federal Stimulus Plan](#)

March 2009

3/5 TAC: RTP update, Federal Stimulus program delivery
3/12 Management Committee: cancelled
3/25 Executive Board: [Federal stimulus update](#), [RTP update](#), [draft brochure review](#)

April 2009

4/2 TAC: FY 2010-2014 Transportation Improvement Program. RTP project review and ranking. RTP Model review and approval.
4/9 Management Committee: FY 2010 Work Program
4/22 Executive Board: [ADOT Dinner Preparation – strategic points](#)

May 2009

5/7 TAC: RTP Draft Review. FY 2010-2014 Transportation Improvement Program. FY 2010 Work Program
5/14 Management Committee:
5/27 Executive Board: [RTP Draft Review](#). FY 2010 Work Program adoption
[5/14 Annual Arizona State Transportation Board Dinner \(Location TBD\)](#)
[5/15 Annual Arizona State Transportation Board Hearings \(City Hall Council Chambers\)](#)

June 2009

6/4 TAC: RTP Recommendation. FY 2010-2014 Transportation Improvement Program
6/11 Management Committee:
6/24 Executive Board: RTP Adoption. FY 2010-2014 Transportation Improvement Program
[Annual Manager Evaluation Process](#)

July 2009

7/2 TAC:
7/9 Management Committee:
7/22 Executive Board:

August 2009

8/6 TAC:
8/13 Management Committee:
8/26 Executive Board:

September 2009

9/3 TAC:
9/10 Management Committee:
9/23 Executive Board:

October 2009

10/1 TAC: RTP
10/8 Management Committee:
10/28 Executive Board:

November 2009

11/5 TAC:
11/12 Management Committee:
11/25 Executive Board:

December 2009

12/3 TAC:
12/10 Management Committee:
12/23 Executive Board:

FLAGSTAFF METROPOLITAN PLANNING ORGANIZATION STAFF SUMMARY REPORT



To: FMPO Executive Board
From: David Wessel, FMPO Manager
Date: March 16, 2009
Meeting Date: March 25, 2009

Title: FMPO Informational Brochure

Recommended Actions: Provide input on the FMPO draft informational brochure and approve production and distribution.

ACTION SUMMARY: Staff seeks approval of brochure for production and distribution as an informational community outreach tool.

DISCUSSION:

Background/History:

- Communicate, promote and explain the role and function of the FMPO to the public.

Key Considerations:

- **Community Outreach** – The brochure located at key locations in the City, available on our website to download, and available for our Executive Board/TAC/Management Committee and staff will provide a good tool to encourage public involvement and educate our community about the FMPO.
- **Budget** – Budget available and not to exceed \$1,000.

Community Benefits and Considerations:

- Increase FMPO awareness

Community Involvement:

- Improve public participation

Financial Implications:

- Account 080-1401-554-3805 Copy/Printing

Options and Alternatives:

- Brochure available on-line and do not print.

Attachments/Exhibits:

- Draft brochure

Flagstaff's Transportation...What do you think?

Return comment card to the FMPO office

1. What are the three most important transportation-related issues facing our region?

Issue 1: _____

Issue 2: _____

Issue 3: _____

2. Please identify three solutions that you would support:

Issue 1: _____

Issue 2: _____

Issue 3: _____

3. What community, town, or neighborhood do you live in?



Name _____

Phone _____

Email _____

Yes, please email me FMPO information and quarterly e-newsletter

No, thanks

Flagstaff Metropolitan Planning Organization

Office: 100 W. Birch Avenue
Mail: 211 W. Aspen Ave
Flagstaff, AZ 86001

Phone: 928-226-4849
Fax: 928-213-4825

Website: www.flagstaffmpo.org

What is an MPO?

- ◆ A Metropolitan Planning Organization or MPO is a transportation policy-making and planning body with representatives of local, state & federal government and transportation authorities.
- ◆ An MPO is required in urbanized areas of 50,000+ population.
- ◆ An MPO ensures federal spending on transportation occurs through a comprehensive, cooperative and continuing (3-C) process.



Who is the FMPO?

- ◆ The Flagstaff Metropolitan Planning Organization (FMPO) is the leader for coordinating regional transportation and land use planning with innovative communication and solutions.
- ◆ We plan, coordinate, and integrate activities necessary to maintain a comprehensive, cooperative, and continuing multi-agency transportation planning program.
- ◆ Jurisdictions that make up the FMPO are the City of Flagstaff, Coconino County, and the Arizona Department of Transportation (ADOT) operating as "Partners in Transportation Enhancing Our Community."

Stay Informed & Subscribe
to the **FMPO Connection**
E-newsletter at www.flagstaffmpo.org



Flagstaff Metropolitan Planning Organization



Transportation
Planning for our
Northern Arizona
Community



FMPO Your Transportation Connection

The Flagstaff MPO...get involved

As a resident or visitor in northern Arizona you may drive, walk, ride the bus or bike to your destination and we want to hear from you! What do you think of our trails, roads and highways? Are we keeping up with community transportation demands for improved and expanded travel options?

Come be a part of the planning process and attend FMPO Executive Board and Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) meetings. Learn and comment on planning and federal money



Plan Flagstaff's transportation future

Join Us

Executive Board

Fourth Wednesday of the month

*City of Flagstaff City Hall (211 W. Aspen Ave.)

8:00 am-10:00 am

Technical Advisory Committee

First Thursday of the month

*Coconino County Admin. Bldg. (219 E. Cherry)

10:00 am-Noon

- ◆ Meetings open to the public
- ◆ *Location subject to change, verify on agenda
- ◆ Agenda packets available at www.flagstaffmpo.org
- ◆ Board, Committee and staff contact information at www.flagstaffmpo.org

Executive Board

Executive Board Membership:

Six elected or appointed officials:

- ◆ Flagstaff City Council (3)
- ◆ Coconino County Board of Supervisors (2)
- ◆ ADOT State Transportation Board (1)
- ◆ Ex-officio non-voting representative (1) each from the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA), the Federal Transit Administration (FTA) and Northern Arizona University (NAU)

Executive Board Function:

- ◆ Act as a policy body coordinating and directing transportation planning, implementation thereof (as authorized by the Executive Board), and related activities within the overall regional comprehensive planning process.

Technical Advisory Committee (TAC)

TAC Membership:

Technical and/or managerial staff representatives from each of the participating agencies and there may be one or more ex-officio non-voting representative each from the FHWA, FTA, NAIPTA and Northern Arizona University (NAU).

TAC Function:

- ◆ Conduct technical reviews and analysis regarding all work activities of the *Unified Planning Work Program and Budget* (UPWP)
- ◆ Any related issues as specified by the FMPO's Executive Board
- ◆ Working closely with the FMPO staff, providing guidance and direction
- ◆ Formulating and forwarding policies that match Board priorities that are technically sound or can be made, compatible with the policies of each member agency
- ◆ Reviewing work produced by and for the FMPO and making technical recommendations to improve its quality and compatibility with current or future policy.



Studies & Reports

Download studies, reports, maps and more at www.flagstaffmpo.org or contact the FMPO office for more information.

- ◆ Safety Study Report
- ◆ Trip Diary Survey
- ◆ Transportation Modeling
- ◆ Regional Transportation Plan (RTP)



- ◆ Route Transfer Study
- ◆ Townsend-Winona Corridor Study
- ◆ Flagstaff Urban Mobility Study
- ◆ Northern Arizona Freight Analysis Study
- ◆ Pedestrian and Bicycle Design Guide
- ◆ Flagstaff Urban Trail System Map (FUTS)
- ◆ Transit Plan Synthesis
- ◆ Lone Tree Corridor Report
- ◆ I-40 and I-17 Coordination
- ◆ Traffic Count Program
- ◆ Fourth Street Bridge
- ◆ Transportation Improvement Program (TIP)
- ◆ Unified Planning Work Program (UPWP)

Flagstaff MPO Area



FMPO Executive Board Agenda Packet
March 25, 2009 / Page 21 of 23



FLAGSTAFF METROPOLITAN
PLANNING ORGANIZATION
CITY OF FLAGSTAFF ♦ COCONINO COUNTY ♦ ARIZONA DOT
Office: 100 West Birch Avenue ♦ Flagstaff, Arizona 86001
Mail: 211 West Aspen Avenue ♦ Flagstaff, Arizona 86001
Phone: (928) 226-4849 ♦ Fax: (928) 213-4825
www.flagstaffmpo.org

Action Summary
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
10:00 a.m. – Noon –Thursday, March 5, 2009

Coconino County Board of Supervisors Chambers,
219 E. Cherry Avenue, Flagstaff, AZ 86001

CALL TO ORDER

Vice Chair Towler called the meeting to order at 10:03 am

TAC COMMITTEE MEMBERS PRESENT

Rick Barrett, Flagstaff Community Improvements Director, Chair
Jeff Bauman, Transportation Manager
James Zumpf, ADOT Planning Supervisor
Dale Wegner, County Engineer
Bill Towler, Coconino County Community Development Director, Vice-Chair
Audra Merrick, ADOT, Flagstaff District Development Engineer
Ron Knights, Planning Director, NAIPTA
Andy Bertelsen, Coconino County Public Works Director
Jim Cronk, Flagstaff Development Services Director

FMPO STAFF

David Wessel, FMPO Manager
Meg Roederer, Administrative Specialist

OTHERS PRESENT

Jacob Riger, Project Manager Charlier Associates
Gerry Craig

I. PRELIMINARY GENERAL BUSINESS

B. PUBLIC COMMENT

There was no public comment.

C. ANNOUNCEMENTS

There were no announcements.

D. APPROVAL of MINUTES.

Mr. Wegner moved to approve the meeting minutes of February 5, 2009. Ms. Merrick seconded, this carried unanimously.

II. OLD BUSINESS

1. Federal Highway Bill Authorization and Stimulus Package

Chair Barrett continued the TAC meeting. Mr. Wessel debriefed the TAC on recent Arizona State Transportation Board action and Executive Board letter to the Governor supporting the State Board and local authorization of projects. There was discussion only.

2. Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) Update

Mr. Wessel and Mr. Riger updated the TAC on recent RTP progress. Mr. Wessel explained the project extension to the end of fiscal year and that it will not impact the Regional Plan or Lone Tree. The TAC commented on the RTP direction and remaining tasks. There was discussion only.

III. NEW BUSINESS

1. FMPO Calendar

There was discussion only.

IV. CONCLUDING GENERAL BUSINESS

D. REPORTS

There was no discussion.

E. ANNOUNCEMENTS

Chair Barrett announced the meeting schedule.

ADJOURNMENT

Chair Barrett adjourned the meeting at 11:58 a.m.

CERTIFICATION OF POSTING OF NOTICE

The undersigned hereby certifies that a copy of the foregoing notice was duly posted at Flagstaff City Hall on _____, at _____ a.m./p.m. in accordance with the statement filed by the Recording Secretary with the City Clerk.

Dated this _____ day of _____, 2009.