



# 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) ♦ [fmpo@flagstaffaz.gov](mailto:fmpo@flagstaffaz.gov)

## AGENDA Executive Board

8:00 a.m. – 10:00 – Wednesday, February 24, 2010

---

Coconino County 2<sup>nd</sup> Floor Conference Room,  
219 E. Cherry 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 City of Flagstaff City Clerk's Office at 928-779-7607. Requests should be made as early as possible to allow time to arrange the accommodation. ***A quorum of the TAC may be present.***

### CALL TO ORDER

#### EXECUTIVE BOARD MEMBERS

Matt Ryan, Chair

Robert "Bob" Montoya, Vice-Chair

Carl Taylor

Mayor Sara Presler

Scott Overton

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.

1) Meeting of January 27, 2010

**Pages 3-6**

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

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

FMPO Staff:

REQUESTED ACTION:

Staff will distribute the finished plan!

RECOMMENDED ACTION: Discussion only

**Handout/Verbal**

David Wessel, FMPO Manager

Discussion only

**III. NEW BUSINESS (Continued, postponed, and tabled items.)**

**2. FY 2010-2014 Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) Pages 7-8**

FMPO Staff: David Wessel, FMPO Manager  
REQUESTED ACTION: Discussion and Possible Action

Staff will discuss potential amendments to current TIP related to safety funding and a prospective round of stimulus funding

RECOMMENDED ACTION: Discussion only

**3. SAFETEA-LU Reauthorization Pages 9-13**

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

Staff will present the status of this federal bill, concern from interest groups across the nation, and, with Kevin Adam of the Rural Transportation Advocacy Council, identify issue pertinent to Arizona and the FMPO.

RECOMMENDED ACTION: Discussion and staff direction

**4. NAIPTA-FMPO Transit Planning MOU Pages 14-16**

FMPO Staff: David Wessel, FMPO Manager  
REQUESTED ACTION: Discussion and Possible Action

Staff will present a draft memorandum of understanding to the TAC and seek their support in recommending it to the Board.

RECOMMENDED ACTION: Recommend the draft MOU to the Board.

**5. MPO Calendar Page 17**

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

Staff will review the calendar with the Board.

RECOMMENDED ACTION: Discussion only

**IV. CONCLUDING GENERAL BUSINESS**

**D. REPORTS Pages 18-21**

- 1) Technical Advisory Committee:  
Action Summary February 4, 2010
- 2) Staff Reports:

**E. ANNOUNCEMENTS**

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

TAC	March 4, 2010 County, Human Resources
Management Committee	March 11, 2010 County, 2 <sup>nd</sup> Floor Conference Room
Executive Board	March 24, 2010 County, 2 <sup>nd</sup> Floor Conference Room

**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 \_\_\_\_\_, 2010.



# 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) ♦ [fmpo@flagstaffaz.gov](mailto:fmpo@flagstaffaz.gov)

## Draft Minutes Executive Board

8:00 a.m. – 10:00 – Wednesday, January 27, 2010

---

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; Robert (Bob) Montoya, Arizona Department of Transportation; Scott Overton, Councilmember City of Flagstaff; Coral Evans, Councilmember City of Flagstaff; Carl Taylor, Supervisor Coconino County

**Absent/Excused:** Sara Presler, Mayor City of Flagstaff;

**Others Present:** David Wessel, FMPO Manager; Meg Roederer, FMPO Administrative Specialist; Kevin Adam, RTAC

### I. PRELIMINARY GENERAL BUSINESS

#### A. PUBLIC COMMENT

None

#### B. ANNOUNCEMENTS

None

#### C. APPROVAL of MINUTES.

Mr. Overton made a motion to approve the December 16, 2009 Special Executive Board meeting minutes and Mr. Montoya seconded, which passed unanimously.

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

#### 1. FY 2010 Unified Planning Work Program

Mr. Wessel referred to the staff report and requested guidance on the Work Program from the Board. Mr. Wessel explained the changes such as travel decrease, training increase and the Milton Road Corridor Study. Mr. Wessel stated the TAC recommended the Milton project should begin to move forward and to implement it to avoid the possibility of a loss of funding. Vice Chair Montoya suggested the Lone Tree Corridor with an overpass as a project instead of the Milton Road Corridor Study. Mr. Overton stated the concern that there may be an \$800,000 study with a \$60 million solution for Milton, which will not be able to be funded. Mr. Montoya concurred with Mr. Overton. Mr. Taylor suggested an alternative of a special district idea and to build incremental funding and think in terms of enhancements and targeted areas with long term funding. Ms. Evans commented on the fourth street corridor study that business owners need a price tag and disagrees with studies. Mr. Overton inquired if Milton is

deferred what the other likely construction projects are. Mr. Wessel stated safety areas would be high on the list. Mr. Overton preferred construction activity instead of study activity. Chair Ryan commented on safety projects and enhancements on the corridor and to focus on the incremental instead of a large study, which results in a price that is not affordable. Mr. Taylor commented that if a "study sits on shelf" it does not keep the public engaged as well as it may be a policy if a study is done there should be small things done such as signage in order to keep people engaged. Mr. Wessel summarized that the Board comments on the Work Program to put funds toward projects and he will work with City of Flagstaff Capital and ADOT such as Milton, Beulah and University sections.

Ms. Evans stressed balance between vehicle and pedestrian projects for safety along Milton especially near the Overpass. Mr. Wessel commented on the safety issues near the stairs on Milton by the "I DO-I DO" business and that there is a proposal to place an ADA sidewalk. The Board recommended reworking the funding. Mr. Wessel will follow-up with ADOT funding requirements and deadlines.

Mr. Wessel discussed the Camp Navajo topic with the Board as well as the I-40 DCR and widening of I-40. He stated a viable developer was acquired by Camp Navajo, *Bostonia*, which is an equity firm that can invest immediately. Mr. Wessel mentioned the Freight Study was completed a few years ago with recommendations:

- 1) Assist with a Freight Advisory Board
- 2) Initiate a Shippers Association (non-profit group) that can collectively negotiate
- 3) Port Authority similar to the MPO and may influence type of development and utilization of an intermodal yard

Mr. Wessel stated the importance of Camp Navajo because of the I-40 DCR. The I-40 DCR preliminary recommendations are to widen the I-40 interstate and part of that decision comes from the modeling results the MPO has done, which shows aggressive growth and an influence of more freight from California growth. Mr. Wessel stressed the importance of monitoring the situation due to the different land use that will attract workers. Mr. Wessel stated the fiscal impacts to the region may be that potential tax base impacts could be out of reach from a sales and property perspective. The recommendation from staff is to monitor the situation as well as put a Freight Advisory Board together to achieve the strategic objectives and utilize them to determine if the next options of the Shippers Association and Port Authority are necessary. Mr. Overton inquired if a Port Authority has the ability to tax and Mr. Wessel responded that they do not. Mr. Wessel mentioned the commander stated that in February the developer and Corp could unveil the draft business plan. Mr. Taylor understood it would confirm the fundamental agreement. Mr. Wessel stated it may move forward in nine months. Mr. Montoya commented on "big players" coming to town and it not developing such as Sawmill that is a "ghost town" and that the City is committed. Mr. Montoya mentioned if there will be stimulus money and how we are going to handle it. Mr. Montoya mentioned as drivers of the community we need to ask many questions and stated Flagstaff is a service orientated community and he is conservative with the issue and sensitive to our image as a community for example the empty parcels on McMillan Mesa. Mr. Wessel stated before a lot of time and money is invested into Camp Navajo be sure there is money, experience, substance and concept plan. Mr. Taylor commented on the need for a coordinated community with a strategic voice and vision. He suggested a Port Authority is a great idea but it should encompass a larger game plan because there are too many small groups and we need to do better. Mr. Taylor does not want to lose an opportunity. Ms. Evans suggested a freight advisory group be global and not just focus on Belmont. Chair Ryan posed the issue to the Board to support the development of a Freight Advisory Board. The Board agreed to support a Freight Advisory Board and Mr. Wessel will work

with Mr. Taylor regarding the unified position of the group concept.

*Ms. Evans departed the meeting at 8:55 am a quorum was maintained.*

Mr. Wessel explained the snow play areas regarding transportation related issues such as safety, capacity, lanes, costs, transit (shuttle.) Mr. Wessel stated many interested parties/stakeholders (AZ Snowbowl, hotels...) may be interested in funding a study. Mr. Taylor mentioned the February 10, 2010 from 10a-3p a snowplay steering committee meeting and the need to develop a game plan and layout a process and recommended FMPO and ADOT attend. Mr. Overton agrees with the proposal of involving the stakeholders and MPO involvement. Mr. Montoya and Chair Ryan also concur with the MPO snowplay transportation involvement. The Board recommended MPO involvement.

Mr. Wessel discussed Work Program Task 4 Long Range Planning. He stated Mountain Links project is on-going, transit research for 2012 and providing a support role on City and County update of regional plan, transportation analysis. Mr. Wessel explained the ASU Decision Theatre proposal and City staff is requesting \$40,000 with the FMPO to match it. The City is also looking at grants. He mentioned there is also \$30,000 to assist with an on call consultant for the regional plan process.

## **2. FY 2011-2015 Transportation Improvement Program (TIP)**

Mr. Wessel explained with the TIP and the need to be aware of the census and the formula. He stated currently there is \$9 million divided on a per capita basis amongst the non major metro counties with the cogs and mpos and we should expect (due to slow growth compared to Yuma, Mohave and Bisbee) our percent share to decrease about \$20,000-30,000 from the full amount of the \$400,000-\$500,000. He stated there is a Jobs Bill with Stimulus Round Two funds. ADOT is anticipating the same amount as last year. He mentioned the general consensus of the TAC is that the County received it last year and the City should have it this year. The City is looking at Southside improvement projects and he is working closely with City project management staff. Mr. Wessel stated the Appropriations Bill for FY11 is approaching with a survey from Kirpatrick office going out with rough guidelines of \$500,000 and typically transportation is selected. He stated additionally he is working with Kirkpatrick's office regarding \$3 million reserved in the TIP for the last five years dedicated to high priority projects on the bridges of Aspen, Birch and Cherry North related to Rio de Flag. He stated at the time they were bridges over an open channel and now it is a closed channel and is unsure when the Rio de Flag project may happen and is now looking at securing the money and assigning to the Corp and naming it as a match from the City to reduce the City burden. Mr. Wessel stated if the project happens the money is transferred and all is fine if not then the money is gone.

Mr. Taylor commented on levies and dams. Mr. Wessel will generalize the language on the project description and it must be transportation related.

Mr. Adam addressed the Stimulus and Reauthorization issues providing the Board an update. Mr. Adam suggested being proactive. Mr. Montoya commented on pavement preservation. Mr. Montoya stated it is unfortunate airport T-I and Lone Tree are not ready. Mr. Taylor commented on the need to hire local contractors. He suggested bundling pavement preservation projects for an ability for local contractors to handle projects and a balance needs to be worked out. Mr. Adam recommended the TIP and STIP and to be aware of cost and scope regarding local contractors. Mr. Wessel suggested the City have a JPA (joint project agreement) accelerated process. Mr. Montoya supported the Lone Tree T-I as a possible backup project to the Rio de Flag.

**3. Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) Update**

There was no discussion.

**III. NEW BUSINESS (Continued, postponed, and tabled items.)**

**1. FMPO Calendar**

There was no discussion.

**IV. CONCLUDING GENERAL BUSINESS**

**D. REPORTS**

Provided and no discussion.

**E. ANNOUNCEMENTS**

There were no announcements.

**ADJOURNMENT**

Mr. Montoya departed the meeting due to an emergency phone call. The meeting ended due to lack of a quorum and was Chair Ryan adjourned the meeting immediately at 9:47 am.

# FLAGSTAFF METROPOLITAN PLANNING ORGANIZATION STAFF SUMMARY REPORT



**To:** FMPO Executive Board  
**From:** David Wessel, FMPO Manager  
**Date:** February 17, 2010  
**Meeting Date:** February 24, 2010

**Title:** FY 2010 – 2014 Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) Amendment

**Recommended Actions:** Adopt amendments to the FY10-14 TIP to account for potential safety and stimulus funds.

**ACTION SUMMARY:** It will enable the expenditure of FY 10 funds in a timely manner.

## DISCUSSION:

### Background/History:

- TIP is an annual federal requirement
- TIP should support the newly adopted Regional Transportation Plan
- FMPO worked with City staff to identify candidate projects.

### Key Considerations:

- A federal jobs bill passed in the House is under development by the Senate and is urged by the President. Funds may be \$950,000 or less. Funds must be under contract within 90 days of the bill's passage. Current deadline estimate is June 1, with delays possible July 1, for contract award.
- First round of stimulus spent on county project. General consensus that second round should go to city.
- \$600,000 in funds also allocated to FMPO for a Safety project should be spent this fiscal year.
- Funds not spent on time will lapse or be spent by another agency.
- Based on discussions to date it appears that a signal at Sparrow/4<sup>th</sup> qualifies for ARRA II funds but not safety funds.

### Community Involvement:

- None to date. TAC and Executive Board meetings open to the public.

### Alternatives/Consequences:

- Recommended alternative for ARRA II highway funds.
  - \$700,000 for pavement preservation
  - \$250,000 for the signal at Sparrow/4<sup>th</sup>
    - **Contingency** – spend all the funds on a large pavement preservation project in the event the signal is not ready. OR. Spend the fund on multiple signals.

- **Benefits** – supports HURF program at the city and meets a need communicated by the public at 4<sup>th</sup>/Sparrow.
- Recommended alternative for ARRA II transit funds
  - \$100,000 for improvements to the administrative building
  - \$balance on hybrid bus replacement
    - **Contingency/Benefit** – No contingencies as the expenditures are easy to meet. Current fleet is in need of replacement.
- Recommended alternative for Safety funds
  - \$300,000 for signal at Zuni/Lone Tree
  - \$100,000 for sign and other facility inventory
  - \$200,000 for sign replacement
    - **Contingency** – Spend money on design. OR. “Swap” expiring funds with another agency for later funds.
    - **Benefits** – Meets known safety need at Zuni. Meets federal mandate for sign management and replacement to meet new standards.
- Other possibilities – in the event that the city is unable to meet deadlines, the County is prepared for a pavement preservation job on Townsend-Winona Road or the State is may have a right-turn lane project at Route 66/Steves ready to go.

**Attachments/Exhibits:**

None

# FLAGSTAFF METROPOLITAN PLANNING ORGANIZATION STAFF SUMMARY REPORT



**To:** FMPO Executive Board

**From:** David Wessel, FMPO Manager

**Date:** February 17, 2010

**Meeting Date:** February 24, 2010

**Title:** Federal and State Legislative Update

Recommended Actions: Consider actions ahead of or in reaction to legislative action at the State and Federal level.

**ACTION SUMMARY:** At the Federal level clean air, livable communities, and highway reauthorization have passed or are in the works. At the state level several bills have been signed by the Governor. This assessment permits the FMPO and local governments to prepare or respond accordingly.

## DISCUSSION:

### Background/History:

- SAFETEA-LU Reauthorization -- little change in positions over the last 9-months
  - Administration priorities: cost-benefit analysis to drive decision-making, shifting investments to metropolitan areas, promoting livability; restoring the highway trust fund to solvency, and opposed to a gas tax increase at this time.
  - House Transportation & Infrastructure Committee (see attachment)
  - Impact/Action: May put small MPO's within Arizona at risk, so work with Governor's office now to project FMPO value. Increases funding does not suballocate, so work with ADOT, allies to arrive at equitable distribution and track and support funding solutions.
- HIRE bill (US Senate) may extend for 12 months
- 

### Key Considerations:

- Raising size requirements of MPO's to 100,000 may put FMPO at risk. Other small MPO's in Arizona have reached that threshold.
  - Effect would be to return FMPO area to NACOG.
  - Loss of \$250,000 in annual planning funds and \$450,000 per year in dedicated construction funds. Flagstaff area would compete with others statewide or at NACOG for that money.
- Focus on Major Metropolitan Areas – there is a distinct need to have the tide float all boats. Otherwise, major metro areas may receive a greater share of funding.

- FMPO Regional Transportation Plan and plans from city and county closely align with most administration goals and many of the goals from national organizations (see below).
- FMPO Staff Actions
  - Monitor federal actions through National Association of Regional Councils and Association of Metropolitan Planning Organizations. Monitor state actions through the Regional Transportation Advocacy Council.
- Overview from National Organizations
  - American Association of State Highway and Transportation Official (AASHTO) – Increase funding to \$545 billion for investment in passenger and freight rail, focus on metro areas, and maintenance of programs for safety, enhancement, and research.
  - Association of Metropolitan Planning Organizations (AMPO) – Increase funding. Focus on metropolitan areas. Work to achieve energy independence.
  - National Association of Regional Councils (NARC) – Protection and strength of regions of all sizes. Simplified and flexible funding down to regional and local level. Freight. Expanded financing.
  - American Public Transit Association (APTA) – Expand transit funding. Strengthen transit's role in regions. High Speed Rail. Expand incentives for transit. Consider impact to transit from other programs like congestion pricing.

**Community Benefits and Considerations:**

- Protects local interests.

**Community Involvement:**

- Limited to open meetings

**Financial Implications:**

- Staff time and resources
- Potential influence on federal funding levels

**Options and Alternatives:**

- Monitor only.

**Attachments/Exhibits:**

- See attachments on referenced legislation.

**Metropolitan Planning Provisions in the Blueprint released by House Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, June 18, 2009****THE SURFACE TRANSPORTATION AUTHORIZATION ACT OF 2009****Metropolitan Planning**

The Surface Transportation Authorization Act maintains and strengthens the metropolitan and statewide transportation planning requirements. The Act includes a number of reforms that will increase the ability of metropolitan and local governments to access and benefit from both sub-allocated STP funding and transportation enhancement funds. The Act:

### **Reforms the MPO process**

- Increases the population threshold for mandatory MPO creation to 100,000, up from the current requirement that all areas with a population of at least 50,000 create MPOs, but allows those existing MPOs in smaller areas to remain in existence under the previous program requirements;
- Ensures increased participation by public transit officials in all MPOs; and
- Reforms the MPO certification process by requiring proportional voting on MPO boards as well as performance targets, and applies certification requirements to all MPOs serving areas with a population of more than 100,000.

### **Establishes new performance targets**

- Creates a national MPO database at DOT to collect information on MPO performance;
- Requires DOT to set transportation planning performance measures for MPOs;
- Sets minimum requirements for MPOs' performance measures;
- Requires MPOs to develop performance targets to meet the performance measures;
- Requires annual reporting documenting the degree to which MPOs are meeting performance targets; and
- Links performance management to MPO certification process.

### **Strengthens the planning process for the largest metropolitan areas**

- Requires "Blueprint" alternative scenario planning for metropolitan planning areas with populations of more than one million (or more than 500,000 for metropolitan areas wishing to receive MMA funding); and
- Blueprint planning techniques include, at a minimum, an assessment of the following:
  - land use patterns that support improved mobility and reduced dependency on single-occupant vehicle trips;
  - an adequate supply of housing for all income levels;
  - limited impacts on valuable farmland, natural resources, and air quality;
  - a reduction in greenhouse gas emissions;
  - an increase in water and energy conservation and efficiency; and
  - an increase in livable communities.

### **Strengthens the role of rural agencies in the statewide process**

- Recognizes RPOs that currently exist within the States;
- Directs States to coordinate with existing RPOs and local officials in the statewide transportation planning process; and

- Removes the provision added in the Transportation Equity Act for the 21st Century (P.L. 105-178) (TEA 21) prohibiting DOT from reviewing the rural consultation process.

#### **Establishes new performance targets**

- Requires DOT to set transportation planning performance targets for States;
  - Sets minimum requirements for States' performance targets;
  - Requires States to develop performance targets to meet the performance targets;
  - Requires annual reporting documenting the degree to which States are meeting performance targets; and
  - Links performance management to statewide planning funds.

#### **Expands Scope of Planning Process (includes emissions reductions and linkage to climate change)**

- Includes new statements of general policy affirming that it is in the national interest to:
  - Reduce fuel consumption, reliance on foreign oil, impacts on the environment and greenhouse gas emissions; and
  - Encourage livability, sustainability, coordination, and connectivity.
  - Expands the scope of the planning processes to require consideration of projects and strategies that will:
    - Increase sustainability, connectivity, and livability;
    - Reduce transportation-related greenhouse gas emissions, reliance on foreign oil, and the impacts of climate change;
    - Improve public health; and
    - Promote consistency among transportation, housing, and land use patterns.

#### **Creates an emissions reduction process that**

- Requires the Environmental Protection Agency and DOT to set national emissions reduction goals, as well as standardized models and methodologies for use in developing emissions reduction targets;
- Requires States and MPOs to develop emissions reduction targets and strategies designed to meet national goals as part of the transportation planning process;
- Sets minimum requirements for States' and MPOs' emissions reduction targets and strategies; and
- Links the emissions reduction requirements to performance measures and MPO certification.

#### **STP Funds**

Maintains STP largely in its current form, making no changes to either the formula by which funding is apportioned to States or the types of projects on which States may spend STP funding. The Act does, however, include a number of reforms to increase the ability of metropolitan and local governments to access and benefit from both suballocated STP funding and TE funds. The Act:

**Allows metropolitan areas to use their suballocated STP funds as easily as States**

- Provides major metropolitan areas with a more predictable stream of obligation limitation, increasing their ability to plan and implement their priorities on a predictable and timely basis.

**Ensures local access to transportation enhancement funds**

- Broadens the distribution of TE funds by replacing the "off-the-top" 10 percent TE set-aside with a rule that when States distribute TE funds throughout the State based on population, 10 percent of such funds in each area must be spent on TEs.

**Requires broader consultation prior to spending STP funds in non-urbanized areas**

- Requires States to consult with rural planning organizations prior to using suballocated STP funds in areas that such organizations represent.

**CMAQ**

Reforms the CMAQ program by distributing CMAQ funds according to needs by targeting CMAQ funding at nonattainment and maintenance areas

- Continues to provide funding to States based on population and in relation to air quality challenges;
- Requires States to invest their CMAQ funds proportionally in relation to emissions and air quality challenges within the State; and
- Provides for the suballocation of CMAQ funds to large metropolitan areas that are classified as nonattainment and maintenance areas.
- Continues to provide significant flexibility in project selection, recognizing that different regions have different challenges and needs to address; and

Removes a provision requiring that priority be placed on diesel retrofit projects.

-----

# FLAGSTAFF METROPOLITAN PLANNING ORGANIZATION STAFF SUMMARY REPORT



**To:** FMPO Executive Board  
**From:** David Wessel, FMPO Manager  
**Date:** February 17, 2010  
**Meeting Date:** February 24, 2010

---

**Title:** NAIPTA-FMPO Memorandum of Understanding

**Recommended Actions:** Authorize the Manager to sign the MOU

---

**ACTION SUMMARY:** The MOU defines roles and responsibilities between NAIPTA and the FMPO for transit programming and planning and meets a federal requirement for such an agreement.

## DISCUSSION:

### Background/History:

- The managers of the respective agencies signed an MOU in 2008.
- The new FTA regional planner recommends changes and wants those changes adopted by the April Intermodal Planning Group meeting.

### Key Considerations:

- All roles and responsibilities are adequately addressed.
- The MOU “codifies” a solid working relationship that has existed for more than 10 years.
- Reviewed and recommended by the Technical Advisory Committee
- Reviewed and recommended by the NAIPTA Board

### Community Involvement:

- The UPWP and occasionally TIP reflect interaction between the agencies.

### Alternatives/Consequences:

- Failure to meet the requirement could affect transit planning and programming funds.

### Attachments/Exhibits:

- Draft MOU



## MEMORANDUM OF UNDERSTANDING

**By and Between**  
**The Northern Arizona Intergovernmental Public Transit Authority**  
**And**  
**The Flagstaff Metropolitan Planning Organization**

*Regarding*  
*Ongoing transit planning for the purpose of programming federal transit funding*

The purpose of the memorandum of understanding is to define the roles and responsibilities for transit planning within the planning boundaries of the Flagstaff Metropolitan Planning Organization (FMPO) as exercised by the (FMPO) and the Northern Arizona Intergovernmental Public Transportation Authority (NAIPTA). This MOU supersedes the MOU signed between the agencies in 2008. This MOU is intended to achieve compliance with 23 CFR 450.310.

### Section 1 – Communication

NAIPTA and FMPO enjoy and rely upon a cooperative relationship at the staff, management, and policy levels to achieve successful planning, programming and operations for transit services in the region. The managers of these respective organizations accept responsibility for fostering the communications essential to this relationship. Such communications result in the effective use of taxpayer resources in delivering the service they expect.

### Section 2 – Transit Planning

Generally speaking, the FMPO will be responsible for long-range planning and NAIPTA for short-range planning. Long-range is understood to mean those periods beyond 10 years away. Short-range is understood to mean the next 5-Year period. Mid-term planning, between 5 and 10 years will largely be a cooperative venture.

*Long Range Planning* - Generally speaking, the FMPO will be responsible for coordination of transportation with local land use general plans and with statewide planning efforts conducted by the Arizona Department of Transportation. FMPO will be responsible for delivering a federally compliant regional transportation plan. This includes the understanding and projection of population and employment conditions, urban form, and their interrelation with transportation. The FMPO will be responsible for development of the general policies and programs that develop the appropriate transportation systems, including transit, to properly respond to future land use conditions. This will include general recommendations on the type of transit service (e.g., express, fixed route, circulator) and frequency (e.g., high, medium, low) that will support the desired land use policies and the pedestrian, bicycle and roadway developments required by such service. NAIPTA is a stakeholder in these processes, a participant in the FMPO board and committee structures and will be regularly consulted.

*Short Range Planning* - Generally speaking, NAIPTA will be responsible for operations and financial planning for the transit system. This will take place in regular updates to the 5-Year Transit Plan. The 5-Year Transit Plan will be consistent with the FMPO Regional Transportation Plan. It will include, but is not limited to, ultimate route frequency (e.g., 15 minutes, etc.), stop frequency, type of bus, bus stop, and final route-path details. It also includes estimating federal revenue, local revenue, fair box recovery and other sources of revenue. Secondly, NAIPTA financial plans will be reflected in the annual FMPO Transportation Improvement Program that is compliant with relevant federal regulations. FMPO is a stakeholder in these processes and will be regularly consulted.

NAIPTA and FMPO will actively participate in each other’s respective planning efforts. This includes participation or representation on boards and committees that may be achieved through participation by respective member agencies. This includes regular staff briefings and staff representation on respective project study teams. It is understood that FMPO staff will serve as liaison between NAIPTA and City of Flagstaff current planning and capital planning and programming processes, but this does not preclude NAIPTA staff from direct communications with the City.

*Cooperative Funding* - NAIPTA and FMPO may share planning funds on an as-needed basis. The primary factor determining allocation of funds is whether the region is engaged in a short-term or long-term planning effort. This determination will be made in the FMPO annual work program. Other factors include availability of staffing resources.

Section 3 – Transit Fund Programming

*Programming Criteria* – NAIPTA and FMPO will cooperatively develop programming criteria that reflect the policy expectations of the short and long range plans. The criteria will be identified in the transportation improvement program (TIP).

*Federal Grant Applications* – NAIPTA will prepare applications for federal transit funds and FMPO will be responsible for assuring their compliance with plans and the TIP.

*Transportation Improvement Program* - NAIPTA will be responsible for preparing the annual listing of transit programs, drafting the “sixth” year of the five-year TIP, and presenting and defending those before the FMPO board and committees. FMPO will be responsible for publishing the annual listing, assuring plan compliance, and processing any necessary amendments to the TIP.

Section 4 – MOU Amendment and Termination

This MOU may be amended only by mutual agreement between the parties. This MOU may be terminated by either party with a 30-day written notice to the other party.

\_\_\_\_\_ Date \_\_\_\_\_ Date \_\_\_\_\_  
David Wessel, FMPO Manager Jeff Meilbeck, NAIPTA General Manager

# 2010

## FLAGSTAFF METROPOLITAN PLANNING ORGANIZATION

### JANUARY 2010

S	M	T	W	T	F	S
					★	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						

### 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	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			

### JULY 2010

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 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				

### SEPTEMBER 2010

S	M	T	W	T	F	S
			1	2	3	4
5	★	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 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						

### NOVEMBER 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	★	26	27
28	29	30				

### DECEMBER 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	★
26	27	28	29	30	31	

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 Board Dinner Tentative 6/17/10  
 Annual FMPO Retreat Tentative 9/22/10  
 Annual Work Program Approval May 2010  
 Annual TIP Approval May or June 2010

Note: Executive Board Meetings in November & December are combined due to Holidays Date TBD

- 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](http://www.flagstaffmpo.org) ♦ [fmpo@flagstaffaz.gov](mailto:fmpo@flagstaffaz.gov)

***Action Summary***  
**Technical Advisory Committee**  
**10:00 a.m. – Noon – Thursday, February 4, 2010**

---

Coconino County Human Resources Building  
420 N. San Francisco Street, Flagstaff, AZ 86001

**CALL TO ORDER**

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

**TAC COMMITTEE MEMBERS PRESENT**

Bill Towler, Coconino County Community Development Director, Chair  
Justin Feek, ADOT Senior Transportation Planner, Vice-Chair  
Audra Merrick, ADOT, Flagstaff District Development Engineer  
Jeff Bauman, City of Flagstaff Transportation Manager  
Heather Dalmolin, Sr. Manager Internal Services NAIPTA  
Dale Wegner, Designated Alternate County Engineer

**EXCUSED ABSENCE**

Jim Cronk, Flagstaff Development Services Director  
John Harper, ADOT Flagstaff District Engineer  
Rick Barrett, City of Flagstaff Engineer  
Andy Bertelsen, Coconino County Public Works Director

**FMPO STAFF**

David Wessel, FMPO Manager  
Meg Roederer, Administrative Specialist

**OTHERS PRESENT**

Jim Wagner, NAIPTA

**I. PRELIMINARY GENERAL BUSINESS**

**A. PUBLIC COMMENT**

None

**B. ANNOUNCEMENTS**

Mr. Wessel announced adjustments to the agenda and re-ordered the Items and began with New Business Item FY 2010-2014 TIP Amendment.

**C. APPROVAL of MINUTES.**

Mr. Wegner made a motion to approve the January 7, 2010 Minutes and Mr. Bauman seconded, which passed unanimously.

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

### 1. **FY 2010-2014 Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) amendment**

Mr. Wessel presented this item first before Old Business as agreed under announcements. The TAC discussed potential amendments to the current TIP related to safety funding and a prospective round of stimulus funding.

Mr. Wessel explained and presented TIP FY10 scenario options to the TAC. Mr. Wessel explained the situation regarding Stimulus dollars and Safety funds and the urgency to obligate the funds prior to the Federal fiscal deadline of September 30, 2010. Mr. Wessel encouraged following the June 30<sup>th</sup> fiscal year deadline.

The TAC moves to amend the FY 2010-2014 Transportation Improvement Program as follows:

- Defer the Steves right turn lane to FY 11
- Provide for a Stimulus Round II program under the following alternatives and conditions

1. Pavement preservation for the City in the amount up to \$1,000,000 provided the City receives self-administration and all clearances

**OR**

2. Pavement preservation for the City up to \$1,000,000 under state administration AND the City accepts a program for collectors and arterials only

**AND**

\$600,000 in FY 10 safety funds spent on sign program and Zuni/Lone Tree signal

**AND**

Transit stimulus funds are spent on hybrid buses and no more than \$100,000 on the Kaspar Street Admin Building

**OR**

1. Stimulus money for Sign Management and Replacement Program in the amount of \$350,000 and two temporary signals at Zuni/Lone Tree and 4<sup>th</sup>/Sparrow for a total of \$600,000 provided the sign management is self-administered

**AND**

2. Transit Stimulus funds are spent on hybrid buses and no more than \$100,000 on the Kaspar Street Admin Building

**AND**

\$600,000 in FY10 safety funds are spent on

1. Design for one or more projects to be constructed in FY11

**OR**

2. Exchanged with another agency for FY 11 funds

**OR**

3. Expand the sign program

**OR**

1. Stimulus Money for Pavement Preservation for Coconino County on Townsend-Winona up to \$1,000,000 provided the City cannot meet any conditions for spending stimulus dollars.

**AND**

2. Transit Stimulus funds are spent on hybrid buses and no more than \$100,000 on the Kaspar Street Admin Building

**AND**

\$600,000 in FY10 safety funds are spent on

1. Design for one or more projects to be constructed in FY11

**OR**

2. Exchanged with another agency for FY 11 funds

**OR**

3. Sign and Zuni signal

**OR**

1. Stimulus money = Steves + 4<sup>th</sup>/Sparrow signal + sign program (management then replacement)

**AND**

2. Transit Stimulus funds are spent on hybrid buses and no more than \$100,000 on the Kaspar Street Admin Building

**AND**

\$600,000 in FY10 safety funds are spent on

1. Design for one or more projects to be constructed in FY11

**OR**

2. Exchanged with another agency for FY 11 funds

**OR**

3. Sign and Zuni signal

Mr. Bauman made a motion to amend the FY 2010-2014 TIP with the conditions as indicated above and Ms. Dalmolin seconded, which passed unanimously.

### **III. OLD BUSINESS**

1. **FY 2011-2015 Transportation Improvement Program (TIP)**  
The agenda was adjusted to discuss this Item prior to FY 2011 Unified Planning Work Program. There was discussion only.
2. **TIP FY 2011 Unified Planning Work Program**  
There was discussion only.

### **IV. NEW BUSINESS (Continued, postponed, and tabled items.)**

2. **NAIPTA-FMPO Transit Planning MOU**  
Mr. Wessel explained the draft memorandum of understanding to the TAC and requested their support in recommending it to the Board. Mr. Wegner made a motion to recommend the draft MOU to the Board and Mr. Bauman seconded, which

passed unanimously.

**3. Downtown Transfer Center Alternative Site Evaluation**

Mr. Wessel presented several sites for a downtown transit transfer combined with a parking garage and requested TAC support for a recommended site. There was discussion only and no action.

**5. FMPO Calendar**

There was no discussion

**CONCLUDING GENERAL BUSINESS**

**C. REPORTS**

There was no discussion

**E. ANNOUNCEMENTS**

There were no announcements.

**ADJOURNMENT**

Chair Towler adjourned the meeting at 12:10 p.m.