



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](http://www.flagstaffmpo.org)

# Fall Retreat

September 23, 2009

*“Partners in Transportation Enhancing Our Community”*





# 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](http://www.flagstaffmpo.org)

## **Retreat Agenda**

September 23, 2009 8:00 a.m. to 12 p.m.

Thornager's on Kiltie Lane

2640 W. Kiltie Lane

**A quorum of the FMPO Executive Board and TAC will be present.**

### **I. Welcome, Introductions & Meeting Purpose**

### **II. 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. Approval of Minutes**

Executive Board Minutes of August 26, 2009

### **III. Year in Review**

### **IV. Regional Transportation Plan**

#### **1) Policy direction discussion – Investment Priorities**

#### **BREAK**

#### **2) Review of the Regional Transportation Plan & Release for Public Review Period – discussion and possible action**

#### **3) Strategic actions culminating from the RTP discussion**

### **V. Concluding General Business**

#### **1) Calendar**

#### **2) Reports**

#### **3) Announcements**

### **VI. Wrap-Up & Adjourn**



# 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**

**8:00 a.m. – 10:00 a.m. –Wednesday, August 26, 2009**

---

Coconino County 2<sup>nd</sup> Floor Conference Room,  
219 E. Cherry Avenue, Flagstaff, AZ 86001

Chair Ryan called the meeting to order at 8:04 a.m.

### **Roll Call.**

**Present:** Matt Ryan, Supervisor Coconino County; Carl Taylor, Supervisor Coconino County; Scott Overton, Councilmember City of Flagstaff; Robert (Bob) Montoya, Arizona Department of Transportation; Mandy Metzger, Designated Alternate Supervisor Coconino County

**Absent/Excused:** Sara Presler, Mayor City of Flagstaff; Coral Evans, Councilmember City of Flagstaff.

**Others Present:** David Wessel, FMPO Manager; Meg Roederer, FMPO Administrative Specialist; Jim Cronk, City of Flagstaff; John McGee, ADOT; James Zumpf, ADOT; Teresa Welborn, ADOT; Amy Rosar, KDA Creative; Laurel Parker, AECOM; Brent Cain, HDR; Dexter Albert, Intrinsic

## **I. PRELIMINARY GENERAL BUSINESS**

### **A. PUBLIC COMMENT**

Mr. Albert (14 W. Forest, Flagstaff, AZ 86001) announced an invitation to the Board to attend a public meeting on September 2, 2009 at Killip Elementary School to discuss the Fourth Street Corridor from 6-8 p.m.

### **B. ANNOUNCEMENTS**

There were no announcements.

### **C. APPROVAL OF MINUTES**

Mr. Overton made a motion to approve the June 24, 2009 Executive Board meeting minutes and Mr. Taylor seconded, which passed unanimously.

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

### **1. Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) Update**

Mr. Wessel presented the RTP draft document to the Executive Board explaining the policy foundation, tables and maps. Mr. Wessel reviewed the RTP schedule and mentioned the July 22, 2009 TAC RTP Retreat was productive and endorsed the RTP format. Mr. Wessel stated the RTP is scheduled for the Executive Board and TAC to release it to for public comment in September and approval in October. The schedule has been deferred because of coordination with the Regional Plan 2010 effort. He stated there is a Regional Plan Town Hall on October 21, 2009. Mr. Wessel stated

much has been done such as future land use and various tools. He explained that policy is fairly well complete and is reflected in the tables and maps, which had a good amount of community engagement. Mr. Wessel stated it is in the review and refinement stage with cost and revenue as the next step. Mr. Wessel stated the comments on existing conditions are not yet complete but have vision and principles. Mr. Wessel mentioned the RTP is being developed to help practitioners as well.

Mr. Wessel explained the plan is straightforward with three parts. He stated it is setting policy upfront with the foundation statement and transportation purposes. Additionally, the context of the land use of the area will define the mix of transportation services needed and design of the services. Mr. Wessel stated in setting the context, one of the goals was to integrate land use and transportation into community character. He mentioned with the area type and activity centers defined for the future, it helps us understand if an area is urban, suburban or rural and the scale of the activity center, thus helping to determine the right mix of transportation facilities.

Mr. Wessel explained the RTP maps to the Board that define services for the various modes and show the expected level of service across the region. He stated the first five pages of the RTP is information the Board has already seen and includes the foundation statement and primary objectives that highlight safety, community character, environment, integration of land use and transportation in regional planning. Mr. Wessel said that the strategies that help us obtain these things are context, complete streets and idea of connectivity. Mr. Taylor recommended each bullet could be shorter on transportation strategies and believes it is good information. Mr. Wessel replied a glossary or appendix may be appropriate. Chair Ryan agreed an appendix would be appropriate for those that want greater detail. Mr. Wessel explained after public involvement there were eight broad criteria identified and went through the constant sum comparison process with the stakeholders and Board which provided the weights. He stated following that are the transportation system purposes with the three broad categories of the economy, environment and community character. Mr. Wessel paused for questions or comments and there were none.

Mr. Wessel continued and stressed he will not go into great detail because the Board has seen the information before. Mr. Wessel discussed the introduction to the Plan and set-up, as well as, transportation mobility and land use guidance. Mr. Wessel stated based on the policy and existing Regional Land Use and Transportation Plan there was considerable discussion and policy basis for the idea of transportation districts and activity centers. He stated the districts have "gone by the way side" but helped identify the activity centers. The activity centers play a central role in setting up the documents and achieving many of the objectives in the current Regional Land Use and Transportation Plan, as well as, fulfilling the criteria such as community character, mode choice and economic development. Mr. Wessel explained the activity centers in regard to size and type (special, industrial centers, medical center, Camp Navajo) and it is clear in the policy that there is a trend toward a more urban state. Mr. Wessel stated as we look at investment and level of service (LOS) to keep in mind density threshold and other factors such as schools or parks and perhaps consider a higher LOS. Mr. Wessel described a description of area type stating it is divided into urban, suburban and rural. The two urban clusters was a focus on downtown and fourth street corridor with the suburban area within the current urban growth boundary and rural was the balance of the area in region. Mr. Wessel noted that in this RTP, neighborhood centers and crossroads are not included because of the small scale and that we were not directly engaged with them. He stated neighborhood centers and crossroads are encouraged and still achieve mixed use trip reduction

mode shift objectives but are not dealing with them at the planning level. Mr. Wessel mentioned there are examples of each district, community, regional and institutional special districts provided in the RTP to help readers understand. Mr. Wessel stated there is an overlap between centers. Mr. Wessel stated a recent addition to the RTP is the special districts and cited the explicit usage and type of services. He mentioned the idea of community character is addressed in the tables in terms of urban form, land use, mix and density. Mr. Wessel stated the tool used was the traffic analysis zones (TAZs) for mapping the area types and activity centers as well as prescribed service levels. Then they were able to integrate the traffic modeling and 3D model and stated it is close in addressing density, diversity and design to estimate walk, bike and transit trips coming out of the various TAZs and next create an index. Additionally, TAZs have been used for cost estimating by varying right of way widths based on area type and activity center, as well as, function of class and number of lanes and receive estimates for enhancement costs (ie: special street lights, landscaping, and special paving) and by tying everything to the TAZs they have a vary integrated tool across all aspects of the RTP. Chair Ryan stated it is both on a technical and policy basis.

Mr. Taylor mentioned the previous plan showed an intersection of Snowbowl and Highway 180 identified as an activity center and on this map it is not shown, was there a change? Mr. Wessel replied "no" and stated he needs to do a TAZ of the area to represent it and has been working with it at the TAC graphically and when it went to the consultant it was provided as text not a graphic and therefore not on the map. He stated that County staff also brought it to his attention and it is addressed on the modal tables with LOS. Mr. Taylor commented on traffic jams from winter recreation on Highway 180. Mr. Wessel mentioned the City of Flagstaff hired Opticoast to work on the updated Land Development Code Zoning Re-write and a number of maps and there is a strong correlation to our approach and their findings. He stated that the RTP, Regional Plan 2012 and zoning re-write will all be delivered at approximately the same time. Mr. Wessel explained the modal tables to the Board. Mr. Wessel stated a roadway not recommended by staff in the RTP is a Highway 180 Bypass between Woody Mountain and Hidden Hollow primarily because of the Open Space expectations outlined in the Regional Plan. Mr. Taylor added it is a wildlife corridor as well and it would be severed with a bypass. Mr. Wessel mentioned public comment was received against such a facility. Mr. Wessel also received comment that a bypass may address snowplay and safety issues with large scale evacuations. Mr. Taylor stated a snowplay issue can be handled problematically with a collector area for vehicles and a bus snow transit system on a seasonal basis. Mr. Wessel paused for questions regarding maps and tables. Chair Ryan recommended activity center projections and application of the 3Ds as a development tool, how will it be utilized? Mr. Wessel provided an example such as a developer could use the maps to determine if there was a future transit system in an activity center and plan accordingly. Mr. Cronk explained the baseline conditions and expected or desired conditions for a developer to meet and the RTP provides a hierarchy, so as we negotiate with developers it sets up a potential relationship for implementation and he is excited about it.

Mr. Wessel stated the modal tables provided great detail and was almost an engineering sheet. Mr. Wessel stated a high LOS is different between rural and suburban, and to respect the needs of our member agencies in terms of developing the engineering standards because they are not universal and are context sensitive. Mr. Taylor commented on the summer seasonal traffic and activity on Lake Mary Road suggesting a vehicle fleet providing transportation services. Mr. Overton recognized the recreational activities in that area may not be conducive to a transit mode. Mr.

Wessel mentioned if NAIPTA were to run a transit system would need capital for Snowbowl in the winter and Lake Mary in the summer. Mr. Wessel continued to explain the pedestrian, bicycle and transit tables and maps to the Board and stated the same format is carried throughout the RTP in regard to Urban, Suburban, Rural and LOS. Mr. Taylor inquired about an overlay with the FUTS to show connectivity. Mr. Wessel will add the FUTS map to the document. Mr. Montoya commented on the multi-use of FUTS. Mr. Wessel explained the bike system and trail system plans, he stated the County recommended we should target the arterial and collector systems since so many streets are private and unpaved and it was difficult to dictate policy. Mr. Wessel stated he will check the functional class of the Fort Valley area. Mr. Wessel mentioned with the RTP there is now a policy basis for transit, peds and bikes in dealing with roadways. Mr. Wessel explained road project selection process for the RTP.

Mr. Taylor recommended instead of the term signalized intersection in the RTP use a different term to allow for roundabouts or other options such as a controlled intersection. Mr. Wessel will make the change in the document. Mr. Wessel described the maps in regard to the 89 Bypass, Clay extension, Rain Valley and other road projects and facilities. He stated the 89 Bypass and Pipe Line Roadway were removed because of the controversial matter. Mr. Wessel paused for questions. Mr. Taylor commented on "less bad" traffic and to remind the public there is "no silver bullet." Mr. Wessel explained the Fourth Street Traffic Interchange is the baseline as an excellent project and proceeded to explain project scoring from 3 to -3 to the Board. Mr. Wessel stated even though some projects scored poorly they were still kept in the plan to reflect future growth. Mr. Wessel stated they calibrated estimates against engineering estimates and were within 5-10%, so the cost estimating tool is working very well. He showed the Plan reflected conditional or recommended projects. Mr. Cronk asked if right of way costs were including in the Plan. Mr. Wessel stated the cost does not include right of way and he is in the process of coming up with a total cost estimate and devising a tool in order of magnitude on right of way. Mr. Wessel explained the financials in regard to funding revenues and expenditures. Chair Ryan stated the RTP discussion will be continued at the retreat. Mr. Wessel stated a Regional Plan workshop will be October 21, 2009. Mr. Cronk mentioned City of Flagstaff City Fest will be Tuesday, September 22, 2009.

### **III. NEW BUSINESS**

#### **2. bqAZ Statewide Planning Framework Update**

Mr. Zumpf presented a PowerPoint presentation to the Board on the recent activities and updates of the state regarding the bqAZ project. Mr. Zumpf announced a bqAZ meeting with NACOG will be August 27, 2009 from 1-3 pm at the Radisson Hotel. There was discussion only.

#### **3. Retreat Planning**

Chair Ryan suggested comments be submitted to David Wessel by phone or email regarding retreat topics for the September 23, 2009 Annual FMPO Retreat. There was no discussion.

#### **4. Legislative Update – State and Federal Activity**

Mr. Wessel stated the Legislation as benign the Item will be addressed at the Retreat and there was discussion only.

#### **5. FMPO Calendar**

Mr. Wessel announced the retreat date as September 23, 2009.

#### **IV. CONCLUDING GENERAL BUSINESS**

##### **D. REPORTS**

Provided and no discussion.

##### **E. ANNOUNCEMENTS**

Chair Ryan announced Mr. Wessel's recent national award from AMPO for Outstanding Leadership. Chair Ryan addressed issue of the meeting room regarding its location/size for future Executive Board meetings and the Board responded that it was fine and did not need to move locations.

#### **ADJOURNMENT**

Chair Ryan adjourned the meeting at 10:09 a.m.



### ITEM III. Year in Review

#### FMPO 2008 Retreat Action Evaluation Prepared for FMPO Annual Fall Retreat September 23, 2009

##### Summary Recommendations from 2008 with Summary Actions to date

- The FMPO should pursue more strategic activities with the executive board taking the lead for accomplishing strategic activities.
  - The RTP – identified at the retreat as our most strategic document – has been the center of our work program and is very innovative. Public involvement and outreach successfully engaged more than 1000 people and informed many times more than that.
  - FMPO played a central role in coordinating transportation stimulus, worked with City and County on reauthorization applications, and is working with the City and ADOT on a local issue to prioritize investments.
  - FMPO is working with a retired NAU professor to better understand distinctions between policies and programs and related staff reporting
  - FMPO management needs to more successfully facilitate engagement between Executive Board members and larger stakeholders
  
- The size of the FMPO should remain the same while tasks and responsibilities can be redistributed to other committee members.
  - FMPO is taking a secondary, supportive role in studies such as the Fourth Street corridor studies, Lone Tree Overpass study and ADOT's I-40 and I-17 DCRs.
  - FMPO is evaluating the Multimodal Transportation Planner position and redefining its roles and responsibilities to better support the Manager, thereby creating more time for strategic activities
  - FMPO Manager is working through RTAC and COG/MPO Director's Organization to engage ADOT on additional funding needs. Manager has expressed these needs to the ADOT Director and executive staff.
  
- Work Program Status Report will be distributed at the Retreat

# FLAGSTAFF METROPOLITAN PLANNING ORGANIZATION STAFF SUMMARY REPORT



**To:** FMPO Executive Board and Retreat

**From:** David Wessel, FMPO Manager

**Date:** September 16, 2009

**Meeting Date:** September 23, 2009

**Title:** Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) Release for Public Comment Period

Recommended Actions: Release the RTP for public comment.

**ACTION SUMMARY:** Pending Board review and discussion at the retreat, staff seeks Board action to release the plan for a public comment period.

**DISCUSSION:**

### **Background/History:**

- Charlier, consultant. Project start October 2007. Conclusion September 2009.

### **Key Considerations:**

- **Project Schedule** – Staff seeks to have the Board release the plan for public comment on September 23, TAC recommend adoption on 10/1 and Board adoption on 10/28.
- **NOTE: AS OF 9/14 THE TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE HAS NOT RECOMMENDED RELEASE OF THE DOCUMENT. STAFF WILL WORK WITH THE COMMITTEE TO RESOLVE REMAINING TECHNICAL ISSUES AND HAVE A COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION BY THE TIME OF THE RETREAT.**

### **RETREAT POLICY POINT DISCUSSIONS**

- **Major Policy Implications/Pending Decisions – Most of the recommendations are or will be reflected in the final RTP.**
  - **Transportation Facility Mix**
    - Background/Problem Statement – The RTP should support the land use objectives of the community broadly stated as compact, infill development that creates a healthy economy, mixed use neighborhoods and activity centers and preserves open space. What is the best mix of transportation facilities to support those objectives?
    - Alternatives/Implications
      - **Street and Highways Only or Predominantly:** Addresses majority of trips; in-line with traditional funding streams; could address more high accident locations; new roads or widened roads are difficult and costly; roads – particularly larger ones, do not serve activity centers well

- Pedestrian/Bicycle/Transit Only or Predominantly: Addresses activity center focus and growing segment of trips; more likely to assist low-to-moderate income households; in line with environmental goals; in line with objectives of federal administration; does not address full circulation needs and impact of future development
  - Operations, Maintenance & Safety Focus: Identifies known issues and works to correct them and maintains facilities at a higher level. Delivers quality and protects investment. Does not actively influence private investment decisions or prepare for future growth impacts.
  - Balanced Mix: Recognizes land use objectives of the community and diverse needs of the populace; creates opportunity for “place making,” compatible with environmental goals; “Complete Streets” combined with access management principles can still address many safety concerns.
- Recommendation – The Balanced Mix is the best fit with current land use goals. It is supported by public input received. Recognizes need for roadways to carry many of the other modes.
- **Transportation Investment Location Priorities**
  - Background/Problem Statement – Over time, the community will be asked to partner with private development in transportation projects. These are unpredictable in their timing, location, and scale.
  - Alternatives/Implications
    - Activity-Center Based: The region may decide to invest limited resources in key activity centers. This supports both infill and redevelopment objectives and the commensurate mode shift objectives. It is also more predictable. Development trends toward green field opportunities so such a strategy may discourage or at least not support new construction and the jobs and tax base that go with it.
    - Development Reactive: The region may decide to reserve funds to support growth and public-private partnerships in green field settings. This may assist in short term returns from construction jobs and related taxes and mid-term growth in population. It defers investment in central activity centers perhaps until green field land supply is short enough to drive reinvestment. Without a reserve, the implications of supporting such a development are to alter the capital program. This may violate expectations within the community based on published budgets, plans and programs.
    - Hybrid – Develop a strong, centrally focused capital program with criteria for exceptions. Criteria may be tied to new activity center development or support for regional transportation improvements benefiting all areas.
  - Recommendation – a hybrid approach may encourage infill and redevelopment and put the region in a better negotiating position with green field development.

#### **Community Benefits and Considerations:**

- No update

#### **Community Involvement:**

- See notes above

**Financial Implications:**

- \$239,000 in FMPO funding plus \$31,500 in change order.

**Options and Alternatives: see policy discussion above**

**Attachments/Exhibits:**

- RTP Draft Document Distributed Separately

# FISCAL 2009-2010

## FLAGSTAFF METROPOLITAN PLANNING ORGANIZATION

### JULY 2009

S	M	T	W	T	F	S
			1	2	3	★
5	6	7	8	9	10	11
12	13	14	15	16	17	18
19	20	21	22	23	24	25
26	27	28	29	30	31	

### AUGUST 2009

S	M	T	W	T	F	S
						1
2	3	4	5	6	7	8
9	10	11	12	13	14	15
16	17	18	19	20	21	22
23	24	25	26	27	28	29
30	31					

### SEPTEMBER 2009

S	M	T	W	T	F	S
	1	2	3	4	5	
6	7	8	9	10	11	12
13	14	15	16	17	18	19
20	21	22	23	24	25	26
27	28	29	30			

### OCTOBER 2009

S	M	T	W	T	F	S
			1	2	3	
4	5	6	7	8	9	10
11	12	13	14	15	16	17
18	19	20	21	22	23	24
25	26	27	28	29	30	31

### NOVEMBER 2009

S	M	T	W	T	F	S
1	2	3	4	5	6	7
8	9	10	11	12	13	14
15	16	17	18	19	20	21
22	23	24	25	26	27	28
29	30					

### DECEMBER 2009

S	M	T	W	T	F	S
			1	2	3	4
6	7	8	9	10	11	12
13	14	15	16	17	18	19
20	21	22	23	24	25	26
27	28	29	30	31		

### JANUARY 2010

S	M	T	W	T	F	S
						1
3	4	5	6	7	8	9
10	11	12	13	14	15	16
17	18	19	20	21	22	23
24	25	26	27	28	29	30
31						

### FEBRUARY 2010

S	M	T	W	T	F	S
	1	2	3	4	5	6
7	8	9	10	11	12	13
14	15	16	17	18	19	20
21	22	23	24	25	26	27
28						

### MARCH 2010

S	M	T	W	T	F	S
	1	2	3	4	5	6
7	8	9	10	11	12	13
14	15	16	17	18	19	20
21	22	23	24	25	26	27
28	29	30	31			

### APRIL 2010

S	M	T	W	T	F	S
				1	2	3
4	5	6	7	8	9	10
11	12	13	14	15	16	17
18	19	20	21	22	23	24
25	26	27	28	29	30	

### MAY 2010

S	M	T	W	T	F	S
						1
2	3	4	5	6	7	8
9	10	11	12	13	14	15
16	17	18	19	20	21	22
23	24	25	26	27	28	29
30						

### JUNE 2010

S	M	T	W	T	F	S
			1	2	3	4
6	7	8	9	10	11	12
13	14	15	16	17	18	19
20	21	22	23	24	25	26
27	28	29	30			

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

#### Important Dates

Annual FMPO Retreat Confirmed 9/23/09  
 Annual Board Dinner Tentative 5/13/10  
 Annual Work Program Process May 2010  
 Annual TIP Approval Process June 2010  
 Note: Special Executive Board Meeting typically in  
 in early-mid December due to Holiday Conflicts

- TAC
- Management Committee
- ◇ Executive Board
- ★ Holiday





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, September 3, 2009

---

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

### CALL TO ORDER

Chair Barrett called the meeting to order at 10:04 a.m.

### TAC COMMITTEE MEMBERS PRESENT

Rick Barrett, City of Flagstaff Engineer, Chair  
Dale Wegner, Designated Alternate County Engineer  
Jim Cronk, Flagstaff Development Services Director  
Jeff Bauman, Transportation Manager  
John Harper, ADOT, Flagstaff District Director  
Ron Knights, Planning Director, NAIPTA  
Don Mauller, ADOT Assistant Director of Transportation Planning  
Andy Bertelsen, Coconino County Public Works Director

### Excused Absence

Bill Towler, Coconino County Community Development Director, Vice-Chair  
Audra Merrick, ADOT, Flagstaff District Development Engineer

### FMPO STAFF

David Wessel, FMPO Manager  
Martin Ince, Multi-Modal Planner  
Meg Roederer, Administrative Specialist

### OTHERS PRESENT

Justin Feek, ADOT Planner

## I. PRELIMINARY GENERAL BUSINESS

### A. PUBLIC COMMENT

None

### B. ANNOUNCEMENTS

Mr. Harper announced congratulations to David Wessel for receiving an AMPO award.  
Chair Barrett adjusted the agenda.

### C. APPROVAL of MINUTES.

There were no Minutes to approve.

## **II. OLD BUSINESS**

### **1. Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) Update**

Mr. Wessel presented the RTP update to the TAC. The TAC made comment and suggestion. There was discussion only and no action.

### **2. September Retreat Preparation**

There was no discussion.

## **III. NEW BUSINESS**

### **1. Rotation of Officers**

Chair Barrett adjusted the agenda to discuss this Item first. Mr. Wessel explained the Rotation of Officers process, therefore the County will be Chair (Mr. Bill Towler) and ADOT as Vice Chair (Mr. Don Mauller). Mr. Knights made a motion to approve the Rotation of Officers effective next TAC meeting and Mr. Cronk seconded, which passed unanimously.

### **2. FMPO Calendar**

Mr. Wessel announced the Retreat on Wednesday, September 23, 2009 from 8a-Noon at the Kilted Cat.

## **IV. CONCLUDING GENERAL BUSINESS**

### **D. REPORTS**

Provided and there was no discussion.

### **E. ANNOUNCEMENTS**

None

## **ADJOURNMENT**

Chair Barrett adjourned the meeting at 12:25 p.m.