



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

A G E N D A

Executive Board

8:00 a.m. to 10:00 p.m., Wednesday, November 28, 2012

County Supervisors Offices, 2nd 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. The FMPO complies with Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 to involve and assist underrepresented and underserved populations (age, gender, color, income status, race, national origin and LEP – Limited English Proficiency.) Requests should be made by contacting the FMPO at 928-213-2651 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	Hank Rogers
Coral Evans, Vice Chair	Mark Woodson
Mandy Metzger	Jeff Oravits

FMPO STAFF

David Wessel, FMPO Manager
Martin Ince, Multimodal Planner
Justine Otto, Administrative Specialist Temp

I. PRELIMINARY GENERAL BUSINESS

A. PUBLIC COMMENT

(At this time, any member of the public may address the Board on any subject within their jurisdiction that is not scheduled before the Board on that day. Due to Open Meeting Laws, the Board 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.

Meeting October 24, 2012

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

1. Legislative and Regulatory Update and Review

FMPO Staff: David Wessel, FMPO Manager
REQUESTED ACTION: Handout – no discussion

Staff seeks Board direction as needed. Board may wish to discuss positions of federal reauthorization issues with a set policy and/or to support indexing in the short term. Staff will report on state legislation with an update from RTAC.

RECOMMENDED ACTION: Discussion and Possible Action

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

1. Draft FY 2014 Unified Planning Work Program and Budget

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

Staff will seek direction from the Board in preparing the FY 14 work program and budget. A draft program with suggestions from the Technical Advisory Committee and Management Committee will be presented.

RECOMMENDED ACTION: Discussion and Possible Action

2. FMPO Working Calendar

FMPO Staff: David Wessel, FMPO Manager
REQUESTED ACTION: Table the item

The agenda on the next meeting will include the work program, transportation improvement program process and legislative update. If possible, updates on I-11 and freight will be made.

RECOMMENDED ACTION: Table this item

IV. CONCLUDING GENERAL BUSINESS

A. REPORTS

- 1) Technical Advisory Committee
- 2) Staff Report

B. ANNOUNCEMENTS

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

TAC	December 6, 2012 Coconino County Human Resources Bldg
Management Committee	December 14, 2012 (probable cancellation) Coconino County Supervisors Offices
Executive Board	January mid-December (To be determined) Coconino County Supervisors Offices

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 _____, 2012.



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 ♦ fmpo@flagstaffaz.gov

Draft Minutes
Executive Board Fall Retreat
8:00 a.m. to 12:00 p.m., Wednesday, October 24, 2012

City of Flagstaff Aquaplex
1702 N. 4th Street , Flagstaff, AZ 86004

Chair Ryan called the meeting to order at 8:09 a.m.

Roll Call
Present:

Chair Matt Ryan, Supervisor Coconino County
Hank Rogers, Arizona Department of Transportation
Mark Woodson, Councilmember City of Flagstaff
Mandy Metzger, Supervisor Coconino County
Jeff Oravits, Councilmember City of Flagstaff
Chuck Gillick, Arizona Department of Transportation (designated alternate)

Others Present:

David Wessel, FMPO Manager	Rick Barrett, City Engineer
Martin Ince, FMPO Multi-Modal Planner	Mackenzie Kirby, ADOT
Justine Otto, FMPO Admin Specialist Temp	Jeff Meilbeck, NAIPTA
Jim Cronk, City Planning Director	Julian Avila, ADOT
Erika Mazza, NAIPTA	Kate Morely, Coconino County
Bryce Berry, Greyhound	Barney Hemlick, Airport Director
Brent Crowther, Kimley-Horn	Brandon Chandler, Nestle Purina
Caleb Lanting, CAC/Peak Engineering	Barbara Goodrich, City Finance/Budget Manager
Dave Healey, Parsons Brinckerhoff	

I. PRELIMINARY GENERAL BUSINESS

A. PUBLIC COMMENT

None.

B. ANNOUNCEMENTS

Mr. Wessel stated that the agenda had been amended to include the Safety Program in the TIP Amendment.

C. APPROVAL of MINUTES.

Mr. Oravits made a motion to approve the Minutes of September 26, 2012 and Mr. Woodson seconded, motion passed unanimously.

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

1. Legislative and Regulatory Update and Review

Mr. Wessel provided a legislative review and update to the Executive Board, explaining the history of state funds for the public attendees. There was discussion only.

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

1. Transportation Improvement Program Amendment – Transit & Safety Program

Mr. Wessel called on Erika Mazza to address the Board. Ms. Mazza gave a brief comparison between hybrid and clean diesel technologies and handed out a memo with an overview of the facts. Mr. Wessel reviewed the Safety Program and stated the need to re-order the projects due to delays in the guardrail design portion of the current priority project. He stated that in the current version of the TIP the construction funds would be shifted to sign replacement. He confirmed for the Board that the funding came from the Federal government and was dispersed through the State. Mr. Woodson moved to approve the Transportation Improvement Program as presented, Ms. Metzger seconded, and the motion passed unanimously.

2. Rural Transportation Advocacy Council Representation

Chair Ryan introduced the topic and explained the function of the RTAC representative, stating that the position had previously been held by Mr. Overton. Mr. Woodson volunteered to be the representative to the Council. Mr. Oravits moved to approve Mr. Woodson's appointment, Ms. Metzger seconded. Mr. Oravits moved to amend the motion to state that Mr. Ryan would remain the alternate to Mr. Woodson, Ms. Metzger seconded, the amended motion passed unanimously.

3. FMPO Working Calendar

Mr. Wessel stated that the November and December Executive Board meetings would be combined into a single meeting in mid-December based on the Board's availability. He added that the Management Committee meeting would also take place in early November pending quorum. There was discussion only.

IV. CONCLUDING GENERAL BUSINESS

A. REPORTS

There was no discussion.

B. ANNOUNCEMENTS

There was no discussion.

V. FMPO FALL RETREAT

1. Retreat Purposes

Mr. Wessel opened the retreat at 8:30. He overviewed the purpose of the retreat, outlined the exercises they would be participating in, and presented the hypothetical futures that different decisions could result in. He stated that the projected futures and hypothetical road projects supporting them were deliberately provocative to inspire big thinking during the discussions. The attendees introduced themselves.

2. The Region in Context and Policy

Mr. Wessel stated the importance of transportation and a long-range transportation plan, both in regional use and in global context. He presented the in-progress Land Use Policy that the Citizen Advisory Committee was currently drafting and showed on the maps how Scenario D was the most compact plan that had emerged. The future assumptions made would be based on a population of 150,000 with employment to match in the Flagstaff region within the next 20 years, 25,000 of

which is the projected student population. It was recommended that urban neighborhoods be created south of the University to accommodate the student population. The Circulation policy was discussed. Mr. Wessel stated that context sensitivity was important for their planning purposes and would give the different agencies direction as they made future plans. Some possibilities to keep in mind were increased and safer connectivity for bikes and pedestrians, and greater multi- and inter-modalism using railways. Mr. Wessel stated that it was generally agreed by both Staff and the CAC that, due to its positive impact on the economy, increased manufacturing should be encouraged through flexible land use policies. Mr. Oravits pointed out that while long-term plans called for building, in the short term there were many open spaces that were not being used to their capacity. He stated that projections were good for planning but they needed to match reality as well. There was discussion only.

3. So Many Paths Up the Mountain --Evaluating Circulation Strategies

The dimensions of regional transportation were defined. Mr. Wessel stated that ideally, based on current density of ~2000 people per square mile, there should be a 4-lane arterial every mile to mile and one-half. For the urban-type development envisioned in the plan the spacing should be much closer. He added that interstates should not be factored in as arterials, instead being preserved for long trips. He made it clear that the current system did not come close to meeting those standards. A discussion identified topography, the railroad and interstate as major impediments to a complete system. Mr. Wessel pointed out that it not many cars would have to be shifted off of arterials to make a big difference in congestion and travel time. The impact and potential danger of encouraging bicyclists in the roads was briefly discussed, it was stated that education was needed to increase safety. Transportation and its relation to the economy was discussed with focus on revenue generated per acre, both downtown and at the mall. Mr. Woodson pointed out that thanks to the rent tax in the downtown area, there was another source of income generation that was not strictly retail. Mr. Wessel presented his map packets, and briefly overviewed the two main plans or "packages" of "Many" roads and "Wider" roads. He pointed out that there would be fewer connections with wider roads but a larger "backbone system" to rely on. Mr. Woodson stated that in his observation of the previous 25 years, by taking no major action they had limited their options by allowing growth where roads could be widened or added. There was discussion only.

4. Alternative Strategy Performance and Critique – a Series of Exercises

The retreat reconvened at 9:37. Mr. Wessel explained the mapping exercise, stating that he and Mr. Crowther would lead two balanced groups in the exercises. He presented a table of mode share figures from Flagstaff and similar cities noting that there is room for improvement. He clarified that the build out population is 150,000 and depending on the growth rate they should aim for a time frame of 50-100 years in the future. The groups split up and opened two separate discussions, using the maps as a basis for planning. The notes made during the discussions are attached at the end of the document. Mr. Oravits left at 10:05, quorum was maintained. Mr. Rogers left at 11:33 and was replaced by Chuck Gillick, quorum was maintained. Ms. Metzger left at 11:34, quorum was maintained. There was discussion only.

5. On Our Way—Charting a direction using the day's ideas

Mr. Wessel reviewed the comments made during the groups, inquiring if a consensus had been reached on a plan to choose, or if the plans needed to be combined. It was agreed that the plans should both be used and projects accepted or rejected on a case-by-case basis. It was noted that such factors as congestion and visitors vs. local traffic should be taken into account. It was stated that density was a large factor in Flagstaff and the comparison cities, though the road experience of those cities was questioned. It was determined that the group's favorite things in the maps were the Lone Tree railroad overpass, the activity centers south of the I-40 and on John Wesley Powell, and the extension from Babbitt Road to John Wesley Powell, the cost-benefit ratio of this latter project being questioned. It was stated that a connection between Florence and Walnut would be problematic and expensive. The possibility of narrowing 4th Street was discussed, and it was

determined that the area would have to be urbanized into a grid network to prevent traffic congestion. Areas that lend themselves to urbanization include 4th Street, the Canyon Del Rio area, and the Woody Mountain and Flag Ranch areas. The West Route 66 area was perceived as being more difficult to urbanize. There was discussion only.

ADJOURNMENT

Chair Ryan adjourned the meeting 12:04 p.m.

October 24, 2012

FMPO Retreat Group Breakout Meeting Notes

Group 1 – Brent Crowther, Kimley Horn & Associates

Existing, Committed and Developer Network Map Notes

East-west connections from Hospital to Fourth Street Corridor [For example, Forest Ave narrows from 2 lanes in each direction to 1 lane in each direction on Cedar and Locket. Improve this connection to 2 lanes in each direction.]

Many roads may better serve activity centers than wider roads [As the population increases, new activity centers will also emerge. Activity centers should be dispersed around the city and be closer to residents. Activity centers can't just be focused on the existing main corridors.]

Activity center will be more east, more activity centers closer to residents [The group suggested that new and emerging activity centers will be towards the eastern part of Flagstaff]

Most serious problems

1. Downtown to anywhere could reverse the trend of growth if we get too congested [The group stated that we need to address congestion. We can't just let it increase due to a lack of desire to widen roads or build new roads. If we do, economic development will be stifled].
2. South Side has more issues than the north side. [The group observed that the congestion/performance maps show that congestion is more prevalent south of the railroad than it is north of the railroad]
3. Will choke off downtown [The group observed that the performance maps illustrate that the downtown will suffer disproportionately]
4. Exterior areas will open up [The congestion in the downtown area will encourage new activity centers to be developed in areas away from downtown, thus dispersing the congestion]
5. Is NAU growth to 25,000 contributing to the issues?

Wider Roads and Transit Vision 1 Map Notes

Provide connections to J.W. Powell to encourage as an alternate. JWP makes sense to preserve now – access, etc. [The group commented that JWP provides some good opportunities now to preserve r/w, access, and plan intersections and connections. The group also commented that JWP can feel far away for residents who live north of it, and they may not want to drive south to access JWP. This could be addressed if some strong roadway connections to JWP were developed to make access more direct]

Bottleneck at Milton/Butler – 2 lanes here with 3 lanes elsewhere [The map shows a segment of Milton as staying at 2 lanes. It may not make sense to widen Milton to 3 lanes elsewhere when there is a bottleneck. The group recognized the challenges associated with widening Milton to 3 lanes for its entire length, but that it doesn't make sense to have 3 lanes feeding into 2 lanes.]

Need a combination of wider roads and many roads to solve the issues [The group observed that neither of the approaches (wide roads vs. many roads) will solve all of the problems in the best way possible or desirable. It will take a hybrid approach, with a segment by segment focus. In some areas, wider roads are needed, whereas in other areas, new roadway connections may address the issue.

Milton won't be able to be widened – intersection improvements – what do we do with them at the terminus [The group observed that the Milton Road corridor is too developed. Widening Milton will be too impactful. Alternative solutions need to be identified, such as access management, intersection capacity improvements including roundabouts, traffic signal coordination, innovative intersection treatments, travel demand management/transportation system management. Bike/ped becomes an important solution.

Access management (two checks) 66 / Milton needs a median [see above]

Generally support many roads [The group generally was more supportive of the many roads concepts, but recognizes that widening may be needed in some areas. Connections such as the Lone Tree overpass was specifically identified and discussed as a new very important connection that will have a significant impact.]

When widening, make it bike/ped friendly [The group stated that when widening roads, they should have bike lanes and sidewalks. Wide roads must have every provision possible for bicycles and pedestrians. The major concern with wide roads is pedestrian crossings. Pedestrian crossing treatments should be identified and considered on all widening projects.]

Butler model works very well, repeat Butler model throughout the city [The group discussed how they really like the improvements that have been made to Butler over the past several years. It is a roadway that moves traffic very well, but also is a significant improvement for bicycles and pedestrians. The landscape improvements are very attractive. The roadway is changing the character of the Butler corridor from primarily an industrial corridor to a multi-use corridor]

Hybridization – considering feasibility, cost, character, etc. [The wide roads vs. many roads decision must also consider cost. Is there a way to show which is more cost effective? Lane miles may be a good proxy for cost at the modeling level. The group observed that it is important to consider the character of the area when making a decision. Roadway improvements have the potential to fundamentally change the character of an area or neighborhood. This is an important consideration].

Fourth Street – is this reasonable to narrow to 2 lanes from 5 lanes w/ 15k-20k traffic? [The group asked if the projected traffic on 4th Street can be accommodated with just 2 lanes. Are we proposing to narrow this when we need the capacity? What are the alternate routes to 4th Street?]

Wider Roads and Transit Vision 2 Map Notes

Need a healthy too level (?) for congestion [Congestion cannot be eliminated. Healthy cities have a tolerable level of congestion. However, if congestion becomes too much, it will stifle economic development, people will avoid downtown, etc.]

Want to know costs associated with each scenario / package? [Similar to previous comment, the group would like to see the relative costs between “wider roads” and “many roads”.]

Congestion: Milton/66 to Elden during peak hours [The group stated that this is the segment that suffers the most from congestion]

Next 30 years will go from tolerable to intolerable [The group observed that they have a very tolerable level of congestion today. When looking at the performance model outputs, about 5 minutes per capita delay, that is consistent with their observation. This is very tolerable. The group observed that even doubling this to perhaps 10 minutes per capita may be tolerable. However, the do-nothing alternative is not tolerable. The group observed that the performance summary shows that there are a number of ways to address congestion – both the many roads and wider roads, in combination with transit, improve conditions. Other factors, such as community character, etc. become very important to selecting the right technique in the right area.

What percent of congestion is local versus regional congestion [The group asked if it was possible to determine congestion caused by pass-through trips vs. that caused by local trips. Can alternates be developed to get those who don't want to be here away from the core areas? What would be the economic impacts?]

Will alternate activity centers draw traffic or spread it out such as Saw Mill or Mall

Downtown north of tracks versus south of tracks [Areas north of the railroad appear to have less congestion than areas south of the railroad.

Will other activity centers develop as population grows – equilibrium [as population increases, new activity centers will be developed around town that will disperse traffic. Everyone can't be headed to the same location].

Flagstaff is a destination [Flagstaff is no longer the town on the way to the Grand Canyon. Flagstaff is the hub of tourist activity in northern Arizona.]

Keep integrity of neighborhoods [Don't let the wider roads package negatively impact neighborhoods; similarly, new roadway connections should not have negative impacts on neighborhoods.]

Make downtown attractive by getting cars that don't want to be there elsewhere

Many Roads Vision 1 and 2 – No notes from Group 1

Group 2 – David Wessel

By comparison to Phoenix or other metropolitan areas, congestion in Flagstaff is “okay.” Flagstaff has a peak of 15-minutes where Phoenix may have a 2-hour peak. Phoenix has congestion in many places; Flagstaff primarily suffers congestion only on Milton. Phoenix has a grid – alternate routes, even if not used, are known to exist which improves perceptions. In Flagstaff, alternatives are limited. The group noted that one expects more congestion in larger cities, so it is more acceptable or tolerable.

Existing, Committed and Developer Network Map Notes

JWP preservation of right-of-way for 2 lanes each direction is key

Fourth Street is under estimated in the model

The Lone Tree Traffic Interchange is not part of this package

W. 66 and the Woodlands Village area crash – they're “gnarly” and may be approaching Phoenix-like levels without the alternate routes.

Woody Mountain Road should be connected to Beulah – it would shift several thousand cars to Beulah worsening its congestion and possibly improving W. 66 from F and G to E and F

Many Roads & Transit Vision 1 Map Notes

Regarding the 89 Connector – retail hates a bypass, would also need work to avoid new development

Is an alternate to the connector an extension of Dodge to 89? Probably not due to neighborhood cut-through issues.

Linda Vista connection – could create issues with cut through traffic, without the connection is misdirects busses, with the connection provides better access to services for residents along Fourth Street, US 180, and Country Club.

Policy Issue: Traffic through neighborhoods caused by new connections or patterns of development needs to be discussed.

Fourth Street, Canyon del Rio, Downtown and Southside/Sawmill are areas that can handle urban development and transportation services. W. Route 66 may not be.

Goods and services at an activity center or centers south of I-40 could beneficially shift traffic patterns. A large neighborhood center at Canyon del Rio and a smaller one at Juniper Point seem appropriate. The Lone Tree Traffic Interchange and corridor is important to this area and the broader network.

The Babbitt connection under I-40 appears very expensive. However, without it problems are increased on Butler Avenue.

The Kittredge and Walnut-Florence connections seem the least feasible of all new connections due in large part to neighborhood issues.

The connection under I-40 at the University Heights FUTS connection needs a cost benefit analysis. It connects at McConnell and Woodlands Village – is this near warrants? A transit only connection could be beneficial.

The Kaibab to Clay connection may be essential for Scenario D, could be a very good connection for dedicated walk, bike and transit.

Wide Roads and Transit Vision 1 Map Notes

Flagstaff is not truck friendly

Mixing truck and bicycles on Major arterials can be dangerous

Preserve the ultimate right-of-way needed.

Widening Lockett. Be cautious of separating neighborhoods – layout of upper and lower Greenlaw neighborhoods may not result in too dramatic a split especially if the street is well-designed. It appears to aid E. Route 66.

Why switch a wide 4th Street for a wide Lockett? Fourth Street could be urbanized with a grid network to expand or better support the retail land base. Some of the through trips could be shifted to Lockett.

If we're at 150,000, what is the population of Winslow, Williams, etc? It was explained that the external trips were grown at about 1% per year over time to represent that growth.

Wide Road Transit Vision 2 and Many Roads Transit Vision 2 not discussed by Group 2

FLAGSTAFF METROPOLITAN PLANNING ORGANIZATION STAFF SUMMARY REPORT



To: FMPO Executive Board
From: David Wessel, FMPO Manager
Date: November 20, 2012
Meeting Date: November 28, 2012

Title: FY 2014 Unified Planning Work Program

Recommended Action: Append, amend, delete ideas for the FY 2014 Work Program

ACTION SUMMARY: Budget discussion will be starting soon and a draft work program is the foundation

DISCUSSION:

Background/History:

- The work program is a mandated element of the MPO process
- Projects and associated funding may be carried forward
- Surface Transportation Program (STP) funds may be used for planning
- Rough estimated budget subject to MAP-21 and accommodation of three new MPOs in the state:
 - FHWA-Planning (PL) \$100,000 (same as FY 2012 and FY 2013)
 - ADOT-State Planning & Research (SPR): \$125,000 (same as FY 2012 and FY 2013)
 - FHWA-STP: \$60,000 general planning, (same as FY 2012 and FY 2013)
 - FHWA-STP: \$30,000 traffic counts (same as FY 2012 and FY 2013)
 - Local Cash: \$27,000

Key Considerations (discussed at October and November TAC and November Management Committee. General TAC support for ideas supporting retreat findings or implications):

- Budget constrained
- Projects can be funded over multiple years
- Coordination with other agencies may be especially important on the heels of the regional plan update. The plan is a stronger policy document, but weaker on strategies and geographic and design details. The FMPO may be called upon to lead or support development of these ancillary documents to aid with implementation.
- Project ideas:
 - **Routine:**
 - 100 Administration – UPWP, Title VI, meetings, sick leave, vacation, etc.
 - 200 Data Collection/Modeling
 - Traffic Counts (\$30,000): May wish to go every other year except for HPMS data sites and apply funds elsewhere.
 - 300 Transportation Improvement Program
 - 600 Regional Planning – FUTS planning and acquisition, TIA support, plan review

- 700 Public Participation – website, newsletters, etc.
- **Carry Forward Projects/Efforts**
- 300 TIP
 - ADOT Coordination – Planning to Programming (P2P) an 18-month effort, approximately 25% complete.
- 400 Long-Range Planning
 - Regional Plan 2012 – Public information campaign efforts
 - Regional Transportation Plan Update – adopted in December 2009 an update is due December 2014. Will the work from the Regional Plan update be sufficient? Can staff supplement with model and cost estimating tools developed to date, including cost model tool, RP12 indicators fiscal impact tool (transit) and forthcoming benefit cost analysis tool?

POLICY CONSIDERATION: Should the FMPO Regional Transportation Plan serve directly or indirectly as the transportation master plan for the region, city and/or county through reference in the Regional Plan? Pros (Justification): The FMPO respects the land use planning of its member agencies. It does a thorough job of analyzing transportation projects. It closely coordinates with policy makers and staff. It can develop strategies that can be directly or indirectly adopted by the city and/or county for implementation. Cons (Rejection) The FMPO is to be an independent agency. Having policy dictated to it by the City limits that independence and potentially prevents some more controversial proposals from being considered.

- 500 Special Projects – Adaptive Control Signal Technology – new signal control that collects real time data and adjusts green time to optimize performance. Project is budgeted in the TIP for \$145,000. **Aligns with retreat implications – “fix-it-first” as many other options are very expensive.**
- 800 Public Transportation Planning – coordination only
- **New Project/Effort Ideas**
- FUTS/Regional Trails Master plan – much of the work is complete, requires assembly, formatting/editing and adoption by city and, possibly, county. (Possible intern project to assemble document and walk through adoption process)
- Transportation Funding Analysis – examine existing and potential fund sources and their ability to fund transportation capital, operations and maintenance. **Aligns with retreat implications to manage costs and revenues for transportation. May be best after or during RTP update starting near end of FY 2014.**
- Milton Road Micro-simulation Modeling (\$40-70,000) – a more in depth examination of solutions to improve the bottleneck on Milton Road including lengthening turn lanes, general widening, innovative intersection design and others. **Aligns with retreat findings that Milton is biggest bottleneck. (Endorsed by the Management Committee)**
- “Bus Port” location study – build on the 5-year transit plan/Long Range plan effort (\$\$ - vary greatly depending on level of facility programming and design).
- Safety Priority Study – a more focused effort to identify larger safety improvements for application to the state HSIP program
- Comprehensive cross-walk study – identify locations where enhanced crossings are warranted or recommended

- **MAP-21 “Overhaul”** – examination and reconstituting of all policies, processes, procedures, tools and measures to comply with federal highway reauthorization, MAP-21.
- Access Management Policy and Plan (\$100,000 very rough estimate). **Aligns with retreat implications for “fix-it-first.” (Policy level effort endorsed by the Management Committee. Could start with ADOT draft policy)**
- Regional Freight Facility – scope pending outcome of EcoNA market update. Range of effort includes organizational/initiation efforts to location analysis. **(Endorsed by the Management Committee)**

POLICY CONSIDERATION: What is the role of the FMPO in establishing and supporting a regional freight facility? Support could range from simple technical support on analysis and funding to more operational support or provide a regional management or marketing arm such as a port authority. Intermediate steps, such as researching and initiating a regional organization are also possible.

- Context Framework Study – Work with agency land use and other planners to set broad context frameworks for activity centers and surrounding areas. These would define policy-based parameters such as current and future market areas, trip-shed areas, constraints based on terrain, access to existing and planned infrastructure, and other factors that might include elements of community character. (partner with City of Flagstaff).
- Performance Measures – federally mandated activity to establish performance measures and targets. Considerable work completed. (Possible intern project to update)

Community Involvement:

- None to date

Fiscal Impact

- Not yet identified

Attachments/Exhibits:

- Draft program

FMPO FY 2014 Work Program Proposal				
28-Nov-12				
General Administration				
	Personal Services (.06% wage and 8% benefit increases)			252,088
	Contractuals			12,600
	Commodities			7,215
Public Outreach				
				3,000
Short Range Planning				
	Milton micro-simulation modeling			60,000
	Freight: Regional organization			35,000
	Access Management policy			25,000
Data Collection				
	Traffic Count Program			30,000
	* options: -sidewalk condition inventory; -performance report			
Transit Planning				
	coordination only, no new efforts			-
Long Range Planning				
	RTP update		staff effort	5,000
	* Strategies development, expanded effort			
TOTAL Expenditures				429,903

Flagstaff Metropolitan Planning Organization 2012-2013 UPWP/B - Revenue Assumptions				
Revenue Source		2013 Carry forward	2014 Allocation Estimate	Total 2014 Funding
FHWA-PL			100,000	100,000
ADOT-SPR		15,000	125,000	140,000
FTA-5303			26,497	26,497
FHWA-STP			94,000	94,000
subtotal federal funds			316,497	360,497
City of Flagstaff General Funds			22,493	22,493
City of Flagstaff - Interdivisional Funds		-	43,080	43,080
Coconino County General Funds			5,000	5,000
subtotal local funds				70,573
GRAND TOTAL				431,070
Balance of funds				1,167



Memorandum – Staff Reports

Date: November 20, 2012
To: FMPO Executive Board
From: Martin Ince, Multi-Modal Planner
David Wessel, FMPO Manager

Re: Ongoing Transportation Projects

Enhancement Grants: Indefinitely on hold pending ADOT response to MAP-21 revisions.

Federal Reauthorization – MAP-21 is now law. MPO processes are relatively unchanged. Funding levels are at the same level of unsustainable. See these sites for more:

FHWA: <http://www.fhwa.dot.gov/map21/>

FTA: <http://www.fta.dot.gov/map21/index.html>

I-40 Design Concept Report – the Initial DCR is released and available for review at <http://www.azdot.gov/I40StudyFlagstaff/> . Most FUTS trails 4f issues have been resolved. The Camp Navajo traffic interchange may now be part of a separate study. The NEPA hearing is tentatively scheduled for May 2013. A Change of Access Report (COAR) for the Lone Tree Traffic Interchange is underway.

I-17 Design Concept Report. Now complete.

US 89A/J.W. Powell Boulevard Intersection – designs and clearances should be complete by June allowing construction to go out to bid and commence probably in Spring 2013.

Fourth Street North – Lee Engineering completed its analysis of Fourth Street performance. A comparison to the original analysis by city staff remains pending and is now a priority task.

FHWA Initiative - Every Day Counts – no update

Traffic Counts/ADOT Traffic Data Management System – efforts are still underway to send counts to the MS2 vendor.

Beulah Boulevard Extension – ADOT is negotiating with the two finalists to select a finalist.

Transportation Summit - presentations continuing.

Ft. Valley Corridor Study - The County applied for an EDA grant to engineer the undergrounding of utilities, no word to date.

Miscellaneous -

- Staff is cooperating with EcoNA on freight data collection as discussions with property owners and business interests regarding a regional freight facility continue. I-40 truck traffic data, meetings with BNSF, and business freight survey formulation are under way.

Sidewalk Inventory and Improvement Program

- Staff is supervising an intern in the digital mapping of existing sidewalks and development of sidewalk construction and improvement prioritization scheme. Opportunities to rate sidewalk condition exist through coordination with NAU or through use of the street video log captured for the sign inventory.

FY 13 Work Program Update

- FY 13 UPWP: Adopted
- Data Collection: FY 13 –summer counts – completed, waiting QA/QC
 - Trip Diary Survey – press release and other materials read for circulation. Surveys retrieved. Tabulation underway.
 - HPMS – no activity till April. New TDMS procedures may assist.
- TIP: FY 13 adopted. Transit amendments completed. Safety amendments complete. New process and forms for FY 14-18 process need final formatting and Board approval.
- NAIPTA 5-Year Transit Plan – First phase of public comment complete. More than 1000 on-line entries being tabulated. Draft vision being reviewed. It is a hybrid of productivity and expanded neighborhood coverage with some elements of a regional system.
- Long Range Planning
 - **Regional Plan 2012** - working draft complete. Editor hired. Visual/Graphics productions in draft. Scenario D – most compact form - is target performance for preferred scenario. Draft for public comment release planned for February 2013.
- Special Projects
 - Benefit Cost Analysis (actually under Long Range Planning) – RFP complete, pre-proposal conference held, four submittals received.
- Regional Planning
 - Juniper Point project work complete for time being.
 - Fourth Street – North Corridor – see earlier comments.
- Public Participation
 - Website is being maintained