



FLAGSTAFF METROPOLITAN  
PLANNING ORGANIZATION  
CITY OF FLAGSTAFF ♦ COCONINO COUNTY ♦ ARIZONA DOT  
Office: 211 West Aspen Avenue ♦ Flagstaff, Arizona 86001  
Phone: (928) 213-2651  
[www.flagstaffmpo.org](http://www.flagstaffmpo.org) ♦ [mpo@flagstaffaz.gov](mailto:mpo@flagstaffaz.gov)

## *Approved Minutes* **Executive Board**

**8:00 a.m. to 10:00 a.m., Wednesday, June 27, 2012**

---

Arizona Department of Transportation – Flagstaff District Conference Room  
1801 South Milton Road, Flagstaff, AZ 86001

Vice Chair Ryan called the meeting to order at 8:12 a.m.

### **Roll Call**

**Present:** Vice Chair Matt Ryan, Supervisor Coconino County; John Harper (designated alternate), Arizona Department of Transportation; Scott Overton, Councilmember City of Flagstaff; Mark Woodson, Councilmember City of Flagstaff; Mandy Metzger, Supervisor Coconino County; Coral Evans, Councilmember City of Flagstaff

### **Excused Absent:**

Chair Hank Rogers, Arizona Department of Transportation

### **Others Present:**

David Wessel, FMPO Manager; Justine Otto, FMPO Administrative Specialist Temp; Diane Lenz

## **I. PRELIMINARY GENERAL BUSINESS**

### **A. PUBLIC COMMENT**

None.

### **B. ANNOUNCEMENTS**

None.

### **C. APPROVAL of MINUTES.**

Ms. Metzger made a motion to approve the Minutes of June 18, 2012 and Mr. Woodson seconded, motion passed unanimously.

## **II. EXECUTIVE SESSION**

### **1. FMPO Manager Annual Personnel Review**

Executive Session was not formally entered. Vice Chair Ryan inquired if it was necessary to enter Executive Session, Mr. Wessel replied that as they had held a Special Executive Session the prior week it may not be necessary unless so requested by board members who may have been absent from the prior meeting. Ms. Evans inquired if entering Executive Session was required to make a comment; Vice Chair Ryan replied that it was not if the comment was appropriate for the general public, rather than addressing an internal issue. Ms. Evans complimented Mr. Wessel's management. Mr. Woodson made a motion to approve the evaluation as presented, Ms. Metzger seconded, and the motion passed unanimously.

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

#### **1. Legislative and Regulatory Update and Review**

Mr. Wessel stated that there was nothing new to add to the update, aside from mentioning that the current extension of the highway bill would expire on June 30<sup>th</sup> and that it seemed as though an agreement was close. Vice Chair Ryan confirmed that he attended RTAC and that based on discussion there, if it moved to committee he believed that they would have a bill within 49 days. Vice Chair Ryan said that they had chosen to keep Kevin, and that RTAC had voted to remain neutral in the initiative to renew the state's temporary sales tax in support of schools and transportation. Mr. Wessel interjected that the Secretary of State had ruled the petition and signatures for the initiative invalid. There was discussion only.

#### **2. Transportation Summit Follow Up**

Mr. Wessel presented information on the Transportation Summit and re-stated the need to get more involvement from the private sector. He outlined the next steps, including keeping the board apprised of current and future projects, including the Lone Tree traffic interchange, the DCRs, and possibly creating a Railroad 101 course for local businesses with the VNSF. Mr. Wessel briefly mentioned "the bus port idea as an enhanced bus terminal where we can bring all the modes together," and that it was being addressed in the scope of the PARA Grant Study. He stated that the idea of creating an action team through ECoNA, staffed by people from across the region and from different interest groups, had been brought up. He also mentioned the expiration of the transportation tax in 2020 and the need to find funding, for which ECoNA may be a good venue for discussion. Ms. Metzger brought up the I-40 corridor and Mr. Wessel mentioned the idea of an I-40 Coalition similar to others that are legislatively based. Mr. Woodson suggested merging the idea with the railway corridor. Ms. Metzger stressed the need for attention to the project due to the development of the Turquoise Ranch area. Mr. Harper suggested that if Floyd Roehrich were possibly included in place of Hank Rogers, he be brought up to date with the idea of the coalition. Mr. Harper also suggested enlisting Julian Avila's help with getting more local involvement in the next Transportation Summit. Mr. Wessel stated that he would meet with Rich Bowen to determine ECoNA's future role, Mr. Woodson confirmed that they were an important element to consider.

The topic turned to commercial air transportation. Vice Chair Ryan mentioned the funding of the Grand Canyon airport, the role of the regional airport, and the need to coordinate between the two. Ms. Evans expressed concerns of the local hotels about the Grand Canyon regional airport impacting local transportation to and from the Grand Canyon, and the effects it would have on local economies. She stated that the TSA made security requirements of airports that house over a certain number and type of commercial aircrafts, and how if the Grand Canyon airport continued its plans to expand, then travelers may bypass the Flagstaff area entirely and simply fly straight to the Canyon. The possible redundancy and competition factor between two regional airlines within 80 miles of each other was also brought up. Mr. Wessel said he would communicate with City Hall regarding the impact on community relations. Ms. Evans also mentioned that in a prior meeting, while discussing the economic impact, a representative of the Grand Canyon airport stated that they were considering including car rental companies in their expansion so people would be able to travel down to the Flagstaff area, but later stated that the expansion of their airport would cut down on car traffic. Mr. Harper suggested people Mr. Wessel could contact on the subject. Ms. Metzger recalled a meeting where all the Chambers convened, and said that that group may have some facts pertaining to the subject. Mr. Overton cautioned against getting ground transportation and air transportation mixed and inadvertently entering a dispute. The board discussed educating the public to direct their concerns to the appropriate departments and encouraging communication regarding this and similar issues. There was discussion only.

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

#### **1. FY 2013-17 Transportation Improvement Program**

Mr. Wessel presented the 2013-2017 TIP and the projects it would include. He stated that the Beulah Boulevard Project extension has three proposals under review, and that funding for the Lone Tree Traffic Interchange Project had been held for the time being. The third project discussed was the upgrading of the street lights to LED. He confirmed that it was not traffic signals being converted, only street lights, and outlined the benefits of switching, among them the low costs and keeping the City Dark-Sky compliant. Mr. Wessel also spoke about the project to widen the shoulders of the Stardust Trail. Mr. Overton brought up the JW Powell piece and asked if it was ready to go forward, emphasizing the importance of not getting hung up in the design phase. Mr. Woodson inquired where the City stood on the extension of JWP to Lake Mary Road, Mr. Overton replied with a rough estimate of 2020-2023. Vice Chair Ryan inquired about the delay in the Lone Tree Interchange, Mr. Wessel replied it seemed that the Interchange Project was out of the community's ability to fund, but that cost estimates may be high and were being looked into. Mr. Wessel also detailed some issues run into with the potential braided ramp addition. Mr. Woodson made a motion to approve the TIP as presented, Ms. Evans seconded, and the motion passed unanimously.

## **2. Transportation Improvement Program Process Update**

Mr. Woodson left due to time constraints, quorum was maintained. Mr. Wessel gave an overview of the updated TIP process. He stated that the new process would be more rigorous in keeping projects moving and monitoring their progress, and detailed how the process would affect projects down the line, particularly with prioritization and scoring. Vice Chair Ryan inquired where the process came from, and Mr. Wessel confirmed that it was the board itself that recognized the need for a more solid process. Mr. Wessel agreed to distribute a hard copy draft of the updated process once he incorporated recommendations from the TAC. There was discussion only.

## **3. Benefit Cost Assessment**

Mr. Wessel presented the Benefit Cost Assessment as "our primary effort for the coming year" and outlined its importance to both analyzing costs against returns on investments and to applying for grants. Mr. Wessel stated that he would use the Lone Tree Interchange as an example of how the process works, and pointed out that the tool had a threshold for being able to compare the value of projects which may result in the need to combine future projects in the tool's analysis to give a more correct scope of cost and benefit. Ms. Metzger inquired how the BCA tool differed from their current system, Mr. Wessel clarified that in the past they had made "rough economic assessments." He explained that the BCA made rigorous net impact assessments that may be simplistic, whereas their former assessments were more objective and detailed. Mr. Overton asked if they should be the ones making the assessments in cases that may be tied with private development. Mr. Wessel replied that that sort of inquiry would be best left to the consultant to determine the return to public dollar and private dollar, and therefore the possible contribution from either side. Mr. Overton inquired what the course of action would be if the data from the BCA did not match the cost assessments of private sectors, citing the Lone Tree interchange as an example. Mr. Wessel stated that there was no formal adoption of the model, but they could determine down the line (and with help from an experienced consultant) how much weight the BCA tool should carry in decisions for or against future projects, especially once factoring in intangible benefits to society and the local population. Ms. Evans inquired how intangible benefits would be measured. Mr. Wessel replied that even in cases where the benefits could not be factored in they could still be taken into account, and that they would need to remember that the BCA tool "is only part of the equation" and needs to be balanced with outside factors. Ms. Evans used the Lone Tree interchange to illustrate the need to consistently include intangible factors in project analysis, both when they are negative as well as when they are beneficial, not simply to emphasize the positive sides of projects. Mr. Wessel returned to the Lone Tree example with a table of benefits and pointed out how the benefits would vary on a local, state, and federal-viewed national level, as well as how costs to mitigate negative intangibles would be factored into project costs. Mr. Wessel reiterated the need for the BCA tool in light of the expiring transportation tax and the potential

need for funding from sources that would require a benefit cost assessment. There was discussion only.

#### **4. Regional Plan 2012 Update**

Ms. Metzger left due to time constraints, quorum was maintained. Mr. Wessel went over the update and discussed the Citizen's Advisory Committee's retreat outcomes and next steps. He stated that the CAC's spring hiatus had ended and that the Committee had split into groups at its June retreat to better advance key issues, such as economic development, circulation, housing, and public facilities. They had discussed models of development scenarios and concluded that a compact land use plan was most favorable. The transportation groups will therefore create transportation scenarios that support the compact land plan for evaluation down the road. Mr. Wessel stated that while policies had been made in the past to not change road capacity, it may be an option to explore in keeping with the compact land plan, offering several examples of which roads may be narrowed or widened and the impact such changes might have. Mr. Wessel also mentioned that the CAC had updated its schedule to two monthly meeting to accommodate the necessary discussions regarding future group progress. Funding for the group was discussed by the Board. There was discussion only.

#### **5. Current Topics of Interest**

Ms. Evans requested maps of railway tracks in Northern Arizona, both current and defunct, for a project that may become relevant to the Board down the road. She specified that unused tracks running between Flagstaff and the Grand Canyon were priority, and others in the local area. Vice Chair Ryan recommended contacting Pat Stein and Mr. Wessel recommended other contacts she could speak to for help finding the required maps. There was discussion only.

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

Mr. Wessel announced that there would be no Executive Board meeting in July and they would reconvene in August. There was discussion only.

### **V. CONCLUDING GENERAL BUSINESS**

#### **D. REPORTS**

The TAC Action Summary was mentioned but there were no highlights to discuss. Mr. Wessel mentioned that there was a rotating schedule for meeting locations and board members should note the venue on future agenda packets. New officers will be appointed before the next meeting.

#### **E. ANNOUNCEMENTS**

There was no discussion.

### **ADJOURNMENT**

Vice Chair Ryan adjourned the meeting 9:56 a.m.