



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 ♦ fmpo@flagstaffaz.gov

Approved Minutes **Special Executive Board** 2:00 p.m. to 4:00 p.m., Monday, May 16, 2011

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

Chair Overton called the meeting to order at 2:03 p.m.

Roll Call.

Present: Chair Scott Overton, Councilmember City of Flagstaff; Vice Chair John Harper (designated alternate), Arizona Department of Transportation; Carl Taylor, Supervisor Coconino County; Art Babbott, Councilmember City of Flagstaff

Excused Absent:

Vice Chair Hank Rogers, Arizona Department of Transportation; Matt Ryan, Supervisor Coconino County; Coral Evans, Councilmember City of Flagstaff

Others Present:

David Wessel, FMPO Manager; Martin Ince, FMPO Multimodal Planner; Meg Roederer, FMPO Administrative Specialist; Jeff Meilbeck, NAIPTA General Manager

I. PRELIMINARY GENERAL BUSINESS

A. PUBLIC COMMENT

None

B. ANNOUNCEMENTS

None

C. APPROVAL of MINUTES.

Mr. Taylor made a motion to approve the Minutes of April 27, 2011 and Mr. Babbott seconded. Mr. Harper mentioned the following three corrections to the Minutes. The Minutes of April 27, 2011 were approved with the corrections, which passed unanimously.

1) Add more information to the second sentence of Item 6: FMPO FY 2012-16 Transportation Improvement Program (TIP).

2) Correct last sentence the funding was received for ADOT not Mohave County on item 3: ADOT 5-Year Construction Program.

3) Remove 1:44 tape reference on item 5: FMPO FY 2012 Unified Planning Work Program.

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

1. Legislative and Regulatory Update and Review

Mr. Wessel stated there was a discussion for a letter on reauthorization to be sent from the MPO but the state is not in session and there is not a lot on the federal level. Mr. Wessel stated he received notice last week that the balance of fiscal year 11 federal transportation funding is being placed in

discretionary grants of approximately \$430 million across ten programs and we do not qualify for some like ferry boats. Mr. Wessel stated there is a meeting tomorrow (5-17-11) at 11 a.m. on grants that we may pursue. Mr. Wessel stated this does not affect the \$400,000 in STP distribution or money that is already programmed such as 89A/John Wesley Powell and this is an opportunity to compete for new projects and he will work with our partners to see what to pursue. Mr. Wessel stated it is similar to ARRA in the recovery act funding and because of ARRA we do not have a lot of them and the general guidance of \$430 million across 330 million people is not a lot of money. Chair Overton asked if it was going through the Department of Transportation or Congressional Authorization. Mr. Wessel stated it is through the Department of Transportation and will be working on it because the due date is June 3, 2011. Chair Overton mentioned the RTAC legislative update from Kevin Adam is timely and it should be forwarded on to the Board members. Mr. Wessel stated he will include the RTAC update with the Board packet or as an attachment with the Board email on a regular basis.

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

1. FMPO FY 2012 Unified Planning Work Program

Mr. Wessel stated this is a formal action and adoption of the budget work program and a (federal) requirement. He stated there were some minor edits from the TAC to the TAC membership. Mr. Wessel mentioned the general program is with the Regional Plan 2012 and to finish the US 180 Study with new efforts going toward the Trip Diary Study and Transit Plan Update. Mr. Wessel stated the FY12 Work Program was out for public comment and no public comment was received. Mr. Babbott commented on the budget summary tables and suggested historical data of the previous fiscal year funding level to see how it tracks. Mr. Babbott commented if STP funds were received it would go to fiscal year 2012. Mr. Wessel clarified that STP is construction money and based on a per capita formula of \$9.3 million which the state has set aside for that purpose. Mr. Wessel stated occasionally we take those construction dollars and program them for planning efforts and that is when they appear in the budget table. Mr. Wessel addressed Mr. Babbott's suggestion for the history and stated that he is happy to do it and suggested doing it as funding sources because it would be the most clear. Mr. Wessel mentioned sometimes we bring in STP money and sometimes we do not; for example, this year we cooperated with ADOT on \$75,000 for the US 180 Study and there can be big one time monies but those can be broken out. Mr. Babbott stated he is trying to see a general trend and it would be helpful. Mr. Taylor commented on work element 900 environmental overview and livability principles and if the Work Program has the capacity to do that. Mr. Taylor stated one is to promote equitable and affordable housing and the second is to enhance economic competitiveness. Mr. Taylor suggested if those are not things we can do we should acknowledge we cannot do them and there is not a direct response to either of those. Mr. Wessel responded in general terms and stated the format of the Work Program has been standardized across all mpos and cogs regardless of size; for example, Maricopa Association of Governments or Pima Association of Governments has the ability to influence those things. Mr. Wessel explained in the economic development piece he is constantly looking for tools to address that piece and in the regional plan 2012 process we are working hard to do a fiscal analysis against the various land use scenarios and trying to grasp what they would do to the economy. Mr. Wessel mentioned a website the feds are developing based on case studies that provide a range of jobs and economic impacts, which are tools we are becoming aware of and this is an interest to a lot of people and mentioned Dennis Smith of MAG. Mr. Taylor stated as we look at projects the livability principles could be a screen for projects and it would be very interesting. Mr. Taylor stated we should state if we cannot do affordable housing remove it but believes we can look at investment and maybe the regional plan is the vehicle. Mr. Babbott made a motion to adopt the FY 2012 Unified Planning Work Program as recommended and Mr. Taylor seconded, which passed unanimously.

2. FMPO FY 2011-2015 Transportation Improvement Program

Mr. Wessel apologized for having to come back to the Board with another safety TIP Amendment but as the State and Feds worked through their backlog of review, it was determined the Kona Trail Sidewalk project in Kachina Village was ineligible due to a benefit cost. Mr. Wessel stated the other aspect of the program is the \$600,000 use it or lose it policy and wanted to take the \$160,000 for design of the sidewalk project and re-program it. Mr. Wessel stated there have been conversations

with the county public works department about this and will put \$80,000 each to the City of Flagstaff Guardrail project and City Intersection design project. Mr. Wessel stated there is action tomorrow for the City Council for all the JPAs and those have been changed accordingly. Mr. Wessel stated there is \$450,000 programmed for the construction of the sidewalk that needs to be addressed and ideally if we work through the eligibility issues maybe we can still deliver the project but for now we will need to reallocate the \$450,000 over the next several years. Mr. Wessel stated we need to work on the FY11 money. Chair Overton clarified the guardrail and intersection are both design projects. Mr. Babbott made a motion to amend the TIP as requested and Mr. Taylor seconded, which passed unanimously.

3. Reauthorization: A FMPO Position

Chair Overton adjusted the agenda to discuss Item 5 Reauthorization: A FMPO Position next as Item 3. Mr. Wessel stated he is recommending the Board authorize the Chair to send a letter on two issues.

- 1) Grandfathering of the MPO with the population of 50,000 with information on the value the MPO adds to the region and state.
- 2) Address funding issues in terms of needs, starting with the indexing of the gas tax.

Mr. Wessel stated the proposal from staff is to send a more full evaluation on reauthorization next month or a reaction to bills. Mr. Wessel stated according to Kevin Adam at RTAC that a Bill would be coming out of the committees by Memorial Day and the House will come out with a draft Bill and the Senate later. Mr. Wessel stated there is some debate on a mystery Bill attributed to the Administration (a leaked version) and they are backing away from it and stating it was an early draft and not pertinent to current discussions. Mr. Wessel stated although it is essentially what they propose for FY12 and it mirrors almost exactly what is in the FY12-16 Bill. Mr. Wessel commented on national organizations such as AMPO (Association of MPOs), National Association Council, ASHTO and transportation officials stating items of interest are system preservation, commerce, congestion, mobility and the idea of streamline and delivery. Mr. Wessel stated if it is ASHTO the state runs the program and if it is MPO then they run the program. Mr. Wessel stated another variation is on the role and definition of major metropolitan areas. Mr. Wessel mentioned ASHTO and AMPO advocated for the standard role or focus for major metropolitan areas and NARC and the National Association of Development organizations looked at balancing across a range of jurisdictions. Mr. Wessel stated from the federal program their focus is similar but a key difference is a focus on high speed rail and we are not on any federally recognized high speed rail corridor and advocating for state involvement. Mr. Wessel mentioned they propose a national infrastructure bank, which has been in past legislation and are looking at streamlining the programs with more flexibility. Mr. Wessel stated how that influences funding and how it would be applied to the votes will translate to a much more competitive model for funding. Mr. Taylor commented on a County budget briefing and their consultant stated establishing a percentage on gasoline was more effective than indexing. Chair Overton stated it is not a per gallon tax. Mr. Taylor inquired if there has been a discussion on percentage vs. indexing. Mr. Wessel stated there has not been a dialog on the issue and it would be almost like a sales tax. Mr. Taylor stated if we send a letter do we want to provide for an either/or situation for percentage and indexing. Mr. Taylor stated the consultant was adamant about percentage over indexing. Chair Overton stated his concern is if the price drops lower than the .23 and the other alternative is what industry may be impacted when it is a percentage and what does the difference look like with the different formula. Mr. Wessel stated he would frame it as a sales tax on gasoline and it has been discussed but doesn't recall the strengths and weaknesses. Mr. Wessel stated similar to indexing there is still a situation when fuel efficiencies continue to go up and sales gallons go down there is the same problem. Mr. Taylor stated we need to do something. Chair Overton suggested the letter have broad language with formulas more equitable for today's economic condition. Mr. Taylor stated he will look at language the county's budget consultant may have to contribute to the letter. Mr. Babbott made a motion to authorize the Chair to sign a letter and copy the Board and Mr. Taylor seconded, which passed unanimously.

4. Flagstaff Regional Human Services Transportation Coordination Plan

Mr. Ince explained the updated Flagstaff Regional Human Services Transportation Coordination Plan to the Board. Mr. Ince stated the Plan is an annual update to a mandate from the Federal Surface Transportation Act (SAFTEA-LU). Mr. Ince stated beginning in 2007 funding for the FMPO region for

three transportation grant programs are contingent on three transportation grant programs are contingent upon on preparing and annually updating this plan. Mr. Ince stated the three grants are the following:

- 1) 5310 provides vans for elderly and disabled individuals.
- 2) 5316 job access reverse commute, which is a focus on transportation projects for job access for low income areas.
- 3) 5317 is New Freedom for transportation services for people with disabilities.

Mr. Ince stated the FMPO is not a direct recipient of these grant funds and the funds typically go to local human service providers as well as NAIPTA. Mr. Ince stated a requirement that all agencies that apply for the grant programs have to participate in preparation of the Plan and be included in the Plan. Mr. Ince stated in 2007 ADOT public transportation division assisted all the local cogs and mpos on the first plan and since 2008 the FMPO has prepared the annual updates. Mr. Ince stated the Plan must address an inventory of current transportation providers and mentioned it also include human service providers that provide transportation to their clients. Mr. Ince stated the Plan needs to include an assessment of transportation needs for the target populations, and strategies and activities to address those needs. Mr. Ince mentioned in regard to community involvement for the past several years NACOG, FMPO and ADOT have held a joint coordination meeting every year in January in advance of the update to the Plan and last January it was attended by about 40 agencies. Mr. Ince stated looking forward NAIPTA and NACOG are developing a position for a mobility manager, which will deal directly with this and in the future there should be a more robust Plan and better implementation of the activities and strategies to meet our regional needs. Mr. Taylor commented on the page six of the Plan regarding the term Baderville because it should be Fort Valley. Mr. Taylor requested more information on the page sixteen references to ABRIO, a family service and support group. Mr. Ince stated the information came from a survey and they participated in an early workshop and thinks NAIPTA helps them coordinate their transportation services. Mr. Meilbeck stated he is familiar with ABRIO as an agency but NAIPTA does not provide them transportation directly. Mr. Taylor stated to leave the group out of the Plan. Mr. Ince stated he will find out more information on the group and if there is not sufficient information it will be removed. Mr. Meilbeck speculated it is probably 5310 funding that ABRIO gets which is a van or two to transport their clients and they do it on their own - NAIPTA does not coordinate it. Chair Overton stated they may not be participating but are still using the service. Mr. Ince agreed with the Chair. Mr. Taylor made a motion to adopt the Flagstaff Regional Human Services Transportation Coordination Plan with the condition to edit page six of the Plan and change the term "Baderville" to the term "Fort Valley" and Mr. Babbott seconded, which passed unanimously.

5. NAIPTA/FMPO Merger Assessment

Mr. Wessel stated the respective Managers of FMPO and NAIPTA have been exploring the possibility of a merger and the benefits it may bring. Mr. Wessel introduced Mr. Meilbeck, NAIPTA General Manager, who updated the Board with a PowerPoint presentation explaining information from stakeholder interviews and legal research to date. Mr. Meilbeck addressed the Board and stated "a good question asked is half answered." Mr. Meilbeck stated he and Mr. Wessel have asked many questions in stakeholder interviews to generate a response if a merger is the answer and stated we don't know. Mr. Meilbeck stated the stakeholder interviews conducted is to further the dialog and not to make recommendation or request action. Mr. Meilbeck stated the concept origin came from the NAIPTA mission of "getting you where you want to go" and not "getting you where you want to go by bus." Mr. Meilbeck referenced the Tom Peters book [In Search of Excellence](#) and what business we are in and there are other ways of getting people where they want to go other than bus. Mr. Meilbeck stated under state law NAIPTA is a transportation authority not a transit authority and the values the organization has established and has reaffirmed in the past five years is showing initiative, imagination, and creativity and that is what asking these questions is all about. Mr. Meilbeck explained that they clearly collaborate to enhance service delivery across the region and does it make sense to collaborate with another planning government while striving for continuing improvement and putting the customer first to serve our citizens. Mr. Wessel stated from the FMPO side the mission "partners in transportation enhancing our community" are key values to provide a forum to discuss issues, set priorities, innovation, employ best practices, and pursue funding and the political avenues necessary to advance

funding. Mr. Wessel stated at the retreat there was a discussion about the makeup of the FMPO that might position us better to pursue funding and strengthen our political position, which supports this discussion. Mr. Meilbeck continued with the PowerPoint presentation slide four: Do Flagstaff and Verde Valley have a compelling transportation connection today? In the future? Is either region (Verde Valley and Flagstaff) truly served by a merger? What Strategic interests exist for considering a merger at Flagstaff level? Mr. Meilbeck stated arguably these questions should be answered first. Mr. Meilbeck continued with the PowerPoint presentation slides on the perceived compatibility, perceived differences, and tough questions. Mr. Meilbeck stated the question what is the risk and the desired balance and that answer comes from the Board not the general manager or FMPO manager. Mr. Meilbeck continued with the PowerPoint presentation on the mutual interests, perceived clout on positive comments and perceived clout on words of caution. Mr. Taylor commented on clout and was unsure of clout with whom and we need to be clear if the discussion moves forward on who is it that is responding to the clout. Mr. Meilbeck continued with the PowerPoint presentation slides reviewing the board make up and the general comments. Mr. Babbott stated that he understands the Verde Valley MPO does not meet the critical thresholds regarding density. Mr. Wessel stated there is a core urbanized area of 50,000 and spoke with the Cottonwood City Manager and Clarkdale, Cottonwood, Camp Verde, Sedona, Lake Montezuma and Cornville could get 65,000 people but they are all over the place with significant breaks between communities. Mr. Wessel stated size wise and population they are almost comparable to our region but in numbers we are one plus the county and they are six or seven plus part of their county and even though there is the Verde Valley Transportation Planning Organization that meets monthly with ADOT and Forest Service it seems to be a status meeting and do not talk transit. Mr. Babbott stated he does think Verde Valley has the characteristics required to form a MPO. Mr. Meilbeck stated a clear message is if a merger does happen the Board should be smaller not a simple lumping together of all Boards. Mr. Meilbeck continued with the PowerPoint presentation on the slides Board efficiency and effectiveness, staff efficiencies, staff effectiveness, open questions, preliminary leanings – Flagstaff, preliminary leanings – Verde and suggested next steps. Mr. Meilbeck concluded with a statement regarding the future and stated in fifty years as population increases Flagstaff will want to be and by default be the academic, business and cultural hub and want all those people in Flagstaff but do you want all the cars? And maybe it does make sense to merge with NAIPTA but that is something the FMPO Board needs to decide.

Mr. Taylor commented on the Charlier report that laid out legal obstacles in regard to the charters of the two organizations and found the analysis somewhat negative and it may have shaped his perception. Mr. Taylor stated he and Ms. Metzger are in agreement that the only idea attractive to them was a much broader region. Mr. Taylor stated it seemed arbitrary that it didn't include Page, Tuba City or Winslow and their interest in a merged organization would be a true regional capacity and are not particularly interested in a merger model that took the two current footprints and stretched one to match the other. Mr. Wessel responded by mentioning corridor coalitions that raise the same questions regarding strategic alliances. Mr. Wessel mentioned the interview with Chair Overton and Mr. Burke on port authority and the best organization to advance them if it is a single organization or a collection of several and stated the strategic interests are not defined and more strategy discussions need to take place. Chair Overton mentioned he had legal questions and political questions on if it is an application or what it looks like. Mr. Wessel stated improved transit planning does not require a merger. Chair Overton stated you have shown strategic action as Managers and after the stakeholder interviews you both are in a better position "to connect some dots" and applauds their efforts to further the dialog and will be curious on the formal recommendation. Mr. Meilbeck stated he will mention to his Board that he does not see the Verde Valley fitting in with the FMPO boundary at all. Mr. Meilbeck addressed Mr. Taylor's comment on if it seemed arbitrary and stated it is because of transit service and that a planning boundary does not make sense. Mr. Meilbeck stated his preliminary leanings as more Flagstaff centric and that there needs to be a clearer sense of Flagstaff's transportation future before talking about a merger and the Verde Valley needs to develop their own future to stand independently. Mr. Babbott mentioned a comment from his stakeholder interview that from a conceptual point of view it should not be about expanding boundaries but making a boundary that makes sense and adjusting to that boundary, which may mean a new relationship between Verde Valley and NAIPTA. Mr. Babbott

stated the future has question marks on federal and state funding and is the FMPO at risk of being marginalized and irrelevant if the funding realities come to lack of fruition. Mr. Babbott stated that is what he liked about the merger regarding strength in the diversities of missions. Mr. Babbott mentioned he tries not to be a policy maker based on worst case scenarios but believes it is important to recognize the potential for radical revision in capital projects. Mr. Babbott added the commonality of redistricting if Verde Valley and Flagstaff are put together that may make more sense but if there is "angst" on the merger we should look at the alternative of pulling back. Mr. Meilbeck stated the reason NAIPTA exists in the Verde Valley is because it is in Flagstaff and the Verde Valleys best transit interest and there is an economy of scale and Flagstaff costs are decreased because the Verde valley pays 25% of major salary and overhead costs and the Verde Valley gets more expertise than could afford otherwise. Mr. Meilbeck stated it is working quite well and if we were to pull back then Flagstaff's transit costs would go up or the capacity to deliver would go down because we would need to reduce staff. Mr. Harper inquired if the model has been done anywhere else. Mr. Taylor stated Las Vegas and Mr. Wessel stated Albuquerque. Mr. Taylor commented on a bus system and transportation planning system and could imagine a redefined region and there is opportunity to move people and goods. Mr. Taylor commented on SEDI work in Verde Valley and regional foods sufficiency with the Verde Valley having more potential and in terms of a sustainable regional economy there is a lot of synergy and opportunity with collaboration and economic cooperation between the two regions. Mr. Wessel stated he appreciated Mr. Taylor's comments and that there is a role in understanding the broader strategic perspectives. Mr. Harper asked how the topic on the NAIPTA/FMPO Merger discussion originated. Mr. Wessel explained it was a tangent off of the retreat and that there is a planning position at NAIPTA that has been vacant and the idea of how the two organizations can work together came up and this has been helpful.

6. US 180 Winter Congestion Study

Mr. Wessel stated the US 180 Study methodology HDR wants to employ is to develop a model to help assess the impact and provide a solution. Mr. Wessel mentioned the MPO pursued blue tooth data as part of a traveler information system and has since learned that there is cell phone data possibly available for \$9000 from Sprint. Mr. Wessel stated one of the conditions is if the data is worth collecting from Sprint due to market saturation and geographic integrity. Mr. Wessel explained the geographic integrity is a triangulation from cell phone towers as opposed to satellite positioning. Mr. Wessel clarified the relevance of cell phone travel time data is to understand how fast the cell phone moved down the highway. Mr. Wessel stated the procedural change is an amendment to the current Work Program that needs ADOT permission before the Work Program can be amended. Chair Overton stated we have already paid for blue tooth data and this is additional data that is cell phone driven with Sprint as the carrier. Mr. Wessel explained the blue tooth data is very thin with low volume and few hits taking place and the technology was developed on testing I-95 in Washington DC with a 5% coverage rate with data points. Mr. Wessel stated it is statistically challenging to manipulate the blue tooth data especially with how the blue tooth vendors deal with it. Mr. Wessel stated the \$9000 will purchase three months of cell phone data for the past two years. Chair Overton expressed he was hopeful the blue tooth data would give a good picture (of the wait times on highway 180) if they are perceived or actual. Mr. Taylor stated it is immaterial in his mind if it is a three or two hour delay because he has personally observed the delays as a resident in Fort Valley. Mr. Taylor mentioned he does not want to see a lot of resources on data collecting when we basically know there is a problem on long holiday weekends that coincide with snow events. Mr. Taylor wants to avoid "falling into the data trap." Mr. Wessel acknowledged Mr. Taylor's point. Mr. Wessel stated he will talk to the consultant again to evaluate the confidence in the model and quantify the impact in terms of the benefit cost assessment at a planning level. Mr. Taylor stated if it helps with modeling that is no problem but if it is to simply verifying we have a problem we don't need to spend \$9000. Mr. Wessel stated the \$9000 will help us calibrate the travel time with a better model and provide dates from this season and last season from mid-December to mid-February with the three peak weekends providing two sets of data. Mr. Harper stated the study should wrap up end of this year. Mr. Wessel stated by November. Mr. Taylor inquired why Sprint is charging for the data because it should be public domain information. Mr. Wessel stated it is post process from AirSage. Mr. Babbott stated he is disappointed the blue tooth

data did not perform because the consultant explained that this is the appropriate methodology. Mr. Babbott does not have a high propensity to support this because Sprint is not the right carrier for this area and we are at risk of using bad data (blue tooth) with less than adequate data (Sprint.) Mr. Wessel explained there was an exercise with NAU to see if the blue tooth data would work and there was uncertainty at the beginning and if we rented the units that lowered the cost and we would have the chance of using them in the field and potentially getting the data. Mr. Wessel stated at the time of award of the 180 Study the question was asked by Ms. Brewster if we would have the data and he responded that we should but there was always a chance to proceed with the 180 Study without any data. Mr. Wessel stated we believe we will have some data and NAU is in the process of pulling out tracking a single blue tooth address from each point so we have the true floating car time. Mr. Wessel stated we will not have a rich data set and part of it is the conditions because this season there was not a bad situation of total gridlock. Mr. Wessel suggested purchasing \$4500 for this year to help strengthen the model. Mr. Babbott commented on the purpose of the data with some mitigation strategies to employ for example staggered closing times of the facilities discussed with the appropriate stakeholders. Mr. Babbott stressed he does not support spending \$9000 on data that is not meaningful. Mr. Harper inquired if Verizon is an option. Mr. Wessel stated AirSage only works with Sprint right now. Chair Overton suggested completing the Study and if necessary purchase the data after the Study and to have that conversation with the consultant. Mr. Wessel stated we are also collecting peripheral data such as attendance records and Grand Canyon visitation to give us a sense of the accuracy of the model. Chair Overton made a motion to table the item to allow Mr. Wessel to research the benefits, providers and options. Mr. Babbott seconded, which passed unanimously.

Item TABLED.

7. City (on behalf of FMPO) and ADOT Joint Project Agreement

Mr. Wessel stated the City Attorney has reviewed the agreement. Mr. Wessel explained it is a service agreement that states as the FMPO receives planning funds these are the things that will be done relative to auditing, invoicing, work program development and amendment. Mr. Wessel stated the work program is referenced in the document, as well as, how to terminate our relationship if we should want to. Mr. Wessel stated the City (host agent) will be adopting this and FMPO Staff and City Staff (legal, purchasing, grants management, risk management) have reviewed and approved the document. Mr. Babbott made a motion to endorse City approval of the JPA and Mr. Taylor seconded, which passed unanimously.

8. Corridor Coalitions: Information and Strategy Discussion

Chair Overton moved this agenda item 4: Corridor Coalitions: Information and Strategy Discussion to discuss after the item: City (on behalf of FMPO) and ADOT Joint Project Agreement. Mr. Wessel presented the Corridor Coalitions PowerPoint to the Board providing information on existing coalitions in the state and across the country and led a discussion on the potential for FMPO to join or initiate a coalition. Mr. Wessel stated there are two key corridors with I-40 and I-17. Mr. Wessel thanked Mr. Harper for raising the issue of forming or joining a coalition to help us strategically. Mr. Wessel stated corridor coalitions look at economic development, improved operations, incident management and funding improvements collectively. Mr. Wessel mentioned the freight study, I-15 coalition and potential of an I-11 coalition with Phoenix, Las Vegas and Seattle. Mr. Wessel mentioned the driver was the federal program *Corridors for the Future* setup by SAFETEA-LU. Mr. Wessel explained how corridor coalitions are formed mentioning I-95 and I-10. Mr. Wessel stated there are six million people on the I-40 corridor. Mr. Wessel reviewed the truck freight flow and rail maps. Mr. Wessel stated do we want to consider a flow coalition instead of a facility coalition. Mr. Wessel commented on the idea of strategic discussions and maybe growing out of the Regional Plan as we identify needs and bring together partners on meeting the needs. Mr. Wessel mentioned Camp Navajo intermodal yard is moving forward again and to look at private partners. Chair Overton asked if Mr. Wessel attended the Rail Conference and if more trend patterns were available. Mr. Wessel stated he did not attend the Rail Conference. Mr. Taylor if this is initiating with us or if others are involved with I-40. Mr. Wessel stated there is regional interest. Mr. Taylor stated there is infrastructure that needs to be addressed and suggested a combo of

a rail and freight coalition. Mr. Wessel stated he will look into it and suggested identifying the MPOs on the I-40 corridor and sending them a short questionnaire. Mr. Harper asked if *Corridors for the Future* is still active. Mr. Wessel stated it is still active under the current program but with reauthorization it is uncertain. Mr. Babbott commented on potential opportunity on the rail side and mentioned the I-40 DCR money that has been spent. Mr. Wessel suggested taking the initiative to send a courtesy letter to the MPOs regarding interest in a multistate I-40 coalition. Mr. Taylor suggested the letter come from the Governor's office. Mr. Harper suggested Mr. Wessel talk to Ms. Toth. Mr. Wessel will do more research and contact Ms. Toth. Mr. Harper stated not to lose sight of I-17 as a major corridor for tourism with bottlenecks on the corridor with a coalition between Flagstaff and Phoenix. Mr. Babbott commented on if I-11 goes up 93 could have potential negative consequences. Mr. Wessel mentioned the freight traffic on an I-11 could be in our strategic interest because from an economic base with truck and access to markets could be good for Flagstaff. The Board suggested a letter of inquiry (after more research) on corridor coalitions go through Governor Brewer. Mr. Wessel will draft a letter and work with ADOT (following up with Ms. Toth), in order to move a letter up to the Governor's Office.

9. Annual State Transportation Board Dinner Presentation Review

Chair Overton moved this agenda item 3: Annual State Transportation Board Dinner Presentation Review to discuss after the item 4: Corridor Coalitions: Information and Strategy Discussion. Mr. Wessel reviewed the Annual State Transportation Board Dinner PowerPoint Presentation with the Board. Chair Overton suggested adding a bullet on dependability of the system. Mr. Taylor asked what idea the attendees should leave the dinner with. Mr. Wessel stated there is a broad array of education, needs and funding ideas. Mr. Taylor suggested showing the impact of HURF. Chair Overton suggested removing the slides on basic mobility and to focus on economics of transportation, safety of transportation, highlight a few projects and show critical challenges of our region. Mr. Babbott stated in the presentation to identify problems but do not end on problems but offer solutions. Mr. Wessel will rework the PowerPoint presentation for the dinner to address the Board suggestions.

10. FMPO Calendar

There was no discussion.

IV. CONCLUDING GENERAL BUSINESS

D. REPORTS

There was no discussion.

E. ANNOUNCEMENTS

There were no announcements.

ADJOURNMENT

Chair Overton adjourned the meeting at 4:11 p.m.