



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 ♦ fmpo@flagstaffaz.gov

Approved Minutes FMPO Executive Board 10:45 a.m. to 12:15 p.m. Thursday, June 22, 2017

Special Location: Coconino County Offices, 2nd Floor Conference Room
219 East Cherry Avenue, Flagstaff, Arizona 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.***

Chair Babbott called the meeting to order at 10:45 am.

EXECUTIVE BOARD MEMBERS

Art Babbott, Chair, Coconino County Board of Supervisors **Present**
Jeff Meilbeck, Vice-Chair, NAIPTA CEO & General Manager **Present**
Coral Evans, Mayor, Flagstaff City Council **Present**
Jesse Thompson, Arizona State Transportation Board Member **Present**
Matt Ryan, Coconino County Board of Supervisors **Present**
Celia Barotz, Flagstaff City Council **Present**
Jim McCarthy, Flagstaff City Council **Present**

FMPO STAFF

David Wessel, FMPO Manager **Present**
Martin Ince, Multimodal Planner **Absent**
Dusty Rhoton, Administrative Specialist **Present**

FMPO STAFF

Audra Merrick, District Engineer ADOT **Present**
Dan Folke, Community Planner City of Flagstaff, **Present**
Mark Landsiedel, Community Development Director, City of Flagstaff, **Present**
Bill Bess, County Engineer, Navajo County, (Arrived at 10:52 am) **Present**

I. PRELIMINARY GENERAL BUSINESS

1. PUBLIC COMMENT

There was no public comment.

2. ANNOUNCEMENTS

Mr. Thompson announced that Navajo County Engineer, Bill Bess would be attending today's Executive Board Meeting.

3. ITEMS FROM THE BOARD

Mr. Babbott re-ordered this item to the end of the Agenda.

4. APPROVAL of MINUTES.

Minutes of May 25, 2017

(pages 7-11)

Motion: Mr. Ryan made a motion to approve the minutes as presented. Mr. McCarthy seconded the motion. Motion passed unanimously.

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

1. FMPO Staffing, Funding and Work Program Discussion

(pages 12-19)

FMPO Staff:

David Wessel, Manager

REQUESTED ACTION:

Discussion only

Staff will report on existing and alternative staffing levels and job descriptions relative to their alignment with the FMPO vision, mission and strategic objectives.

RECOMMENDED ACTION:

Discussion and direction

Mr. Wessel overviewed the staff report (*pg. 12*) which overviewed maintaining the FMPO's technical capacity (*moving halfway from "technical" to "leadership"*), and overviewed opportunities for shifting resources, transferring and/or sharing duties with member organizations and expanding the FMPO presence in the community. He then presented a power point with the various scenarios, breakdowns on distributions of efforts, which exhibited what the FMPO staff do, and how they prepare the Work Program.

Staff Breakdown: Administration – typical supervision, budget training, data (including model developments), trip diary efforts, transportation improvement program (*project programming and monitoring*), public process and long range planning. It is important to note that when the Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) comes around in the cycle, it is THE biggest component and/or when the regional plan comes around as well. Mr. Wessel continued that Special Projects also arise (i.e. most recent were Dark Skies, Outreach efficiency studies, ongoing with the City of Flagstaff and Coconino County, and the city's transportation impact analysis process, regional planning quarter studies, model support for the TIA's (*Plaza Viejo for example*), just to name a few.

Multi-modal planner – Time breakdown is 60% by FMPO and 40% by the City of Flagstaff. Emphasis is on regional trails planning and project trail management, bike and pedestrian committee support, and the big effort right now is the master plan. He added that this position includes a good deal of public participation.

Ms. Barotz asked about how the decision was made for the multimodal planner to be part of the FMPO. Mr. Wessel responded that the FMPO was originally part of the City of Flagstaff and run by the city engineer and then in about 2005, it transpired into a quasi-independent organization with a full-time manager and then looking for a staff report knowing that the manager would be doing a broad range of activities. Looking at the resources available at the time and looking at splitting the planner made financial sense. At the time, the enhancement program was still a growing concern – there were many trail projects and other things being funded, support for that process was seen as a need, and knowing that many of those resided in the City, multi-modalism was a big part and having a multimodal planner made sense.

He then overviewed the FMPO Manager's role for FY15 and FY16 noting that 2016 was predominantly taken up by the RTP, the other areas vary depending on special projects that arise; state work program, managing the TIP program, data management – (*wrangling data is a large task and being able to get consistent support would be useful*).

Chair Babbott took a moment to have the late attendees; Mr. Bess and Mr. Landsiedel introduce themselves to the Board.

Ms. Barotz stated she still was not clear on what Mr. Wessel does every day, how to distinguish the difference between special projects, regional planning, and long-range planning and asked for clarification. Mr. Wessel explained that long range planning is looking at a 20-yr horizon whether it is at the regional or state level, coordinating with the land use side (long-range look). Regional planning would be compared to current planning where you are looking at subdivisions, bringing projects into a pipeline (i.e. corridor study), and special projects fall as ancillary support.

Mr. Babbott voiced observance of the relationship between the manager time allocation, what the measurable objectives were, and how they relate to the strategic work plan, (SWP). He noted he wanted to make sure that items QA and QB ensure that the assets and staff resources we have are supporting and engendering the SWP. He posed some questions: Who and what the FMPO staff is doing and how that is serving what the Executive Board (EB) want the FMPO to become. Another question was if the 60% of the multimodal planner is what the community expects, and whether the time and energy is relevant to the SWP. He continued that a final question would be how the EB could have the capacity staffing question be brought forward which may be another opportunity for a sub-core committee. (*ie: to look at expectations, different work activities, etc.*). Mr. Meilbeck concurred and added he had questions as well: Where on the continuum do we want to be and until that is crystal clear – there's no point in putting together a staffing plan, which has to support that vision. Mr. Meilbeck also noted the budget questions and concluded by commending Mr. Wessel for including the strategic work plan first in the meeting packet, having the funding sources and eligible uses as a reference included, coupled with the mission and vision, which helps the EB stay on task.

Mr. Babbott asked for more clarification. Mr. Wessel responded by showing that currently the FMPO is heavily focused on planning and programming. Need to expand capacity – some scalability – adding some staff here and some here – the technical parts are staying the same – the manager position becomes more of a director position with added staff. Mr. Meilbeck confirmed the amount of technical planning on each of the scenarios - the FMPO needs to be in a place where they are doing comprehensive leadership and technical planning. Ms. Evans asked about the funding associated – if this is the direction to go – then having to figure out how to fund that and what happens if you don't get the full funding for that. Mr. Wessel added that in the conversations today in looking at the base funding which is defined as the planning of PL funds and the STBG funds and what remains. There are some other opportunities or strategies that might be employed – shifting the focus of the multimodal planner, for example. Ms. Evans inquired if the bulk of the funding was going towards the technical portion – and if the FMPO is looking at a way to adequately balance that funding to meet all the needs. Mr. Meilbeck brought up the example from last month's meeting (re: the \$114K) to which Mr. Wessel responded it was technical programming (only funding source that can be used for capital) and Mr. Meilbeck said that is a really important point – as the current budget is not allocated among the different categories. Mr. Babbott noted using resources to garner more resources. Mr. Wessel noted that this was part of the reason Mr. Landsiedel and Mr. Folke attended the meeting today – (*ie: What is their contributions to the process?*) Mr. Thompson said that things were moving in the right direction and he was supportive and asked if the opportunity to leverage monies appeared available. Mr. Meilbeck added that it is a fact that if you put money into leadership – it will attract additional grants. Mr. Babbott added that he felt everyone was in agreement that the Executive Board wants a balanced approach, so focusing insufficiently on the advocacy and broker component now, comes some of the discussion that we know we have technical needs, and the existing planning staff serving the interest of the tech adequately and see if Mr. Wessel's time was serving the balance adequately.

Multimodal Planner Discussion: Mr. Wessel continued that the multimodal planner is a bit more consistent with the use of their time. 60% regional planning and 40% actual planning and 10% in project management where they are working with capital staff, including some TIA and site plan review. He continued that details for ped and bike are critical and making sure site plans are done right need to happen. Mr. Babbott inquired if that needed to happen under the FMPO budget and its relevancy to the strategic plan in terms of output. Ms. Barotz inquired if the 40% is a direct contribution in the way of a match or if the FMPO is using this planner because they don't have a

planner themselves. Mr. Wessel responded the answer is all of the above – part of the planners time is used as match against grants and the FMPO is able to do that because the city’s contribution to that position and part of that is there is a need for attention to ped and bike planning issues within the city and a majority of those issues are within the city limits, (so the city picking up part of the tab makes sense), and because it is part of transportation planning and we want it to be integrated more broadly – having it under the FMPO and looking at broad range of transportation issues and modes seemed the appropriate place to do that. Ms. Barotz asked how much time is spent directed more toward specific issues that could potentially be given back to the city? Mr. Meilbeck suggested that a task force be constructed to look at what staff plan is required to deliver a bigger leadership role and recommended Ms. Barotz be on the task force. Mr. Landsiedel stated that the City of Flagstaff has no one that does transportation planning so the City of Flagstaff is 100% reliant on the FMPO for those efforts at this point. Mr. Wessel added that the long-standing reality of this MPO is very city centric – don’t have multiple cities. Everything that has transportation planning (*regardless of mode*) tends to be city centric. In addition, he added that we may need to adjust the SWP - many planning initiatives in the RTP which are not well addressed in the SWP – (*ie: safety plan, ITS plan, etc.,*) which are all very important and they are not reflected in the SWP. Likewise, ped and bike are not either. Mr. Babbott asked how do we maintain focus and implement the top priorities of the RTP? He feels it is important to choose to put a structure together and the challenge has been the MPO has not been that much of a focused organization and that is just his observation. He then inquired if the Executive Board wanted to put together a sub-committee that starts to get more specific with this proposal, does background research, etc. Thus, Mr. Babbott and Mr. Meilbeck will get together with Coral Evans to form a subcommittee. Mr. Babbott stated that reallocating the multimodal planner’s time would equip city staff to work on a number of these tasks such as the Active Master Plan, planning for subdivisions, and what to look for in TIA site plans.

Mr. Wessel continued with his presentation relating to Administrative and noted the importance of looking to do more outreach and increase the FMPO’s profile in the community. Ms. Evans asked for clarification on outreach to which Mr. Wessel responded that a portion is technical as far as putting out public notices for the TIP and UPWP, putting items out on Facebook and social media sites, conducting surveys online, as well as more opportunities for more systematic press releases and some of the work being done.

Mr. Wessel concluded with current staffing and opportunities, (*half time tech to help free up the director and planners time*), and a full time admin to help with outreach. In terms of the budget, Mr. Wessel noted there are three funding sources which are somewhat constrained to more planning type functions which are received regularly. Some of that could be used for admin support but are really geared to planning. Ms. Barotz asked about the different funding sources. Mr. Wessel directed the Board to the front of the packet for the breakdown and added that the STBG funds can be used for just about anything including admin, planning and construction. Ms. Barotz then inquired if the restrictive funds are planning and contract funds. Mr. Wessel responded that the FMPO continued using all but about \$230K of the STBG funds in this scenario – goes to planning or construction functions. He noted that indirect costs would go up, adding travel and registration, advocating for things. Increase contract and commodities, the balance of the STBG funds increases accordingly. Discussion ensued.

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

1. Potential Revisions to FMPO Governing Documents (pages 20-22)

FMPO Board/Staff: Celia Barotz/David Wessel, Manager

REQUESTED ACTION: Discussion only

Board member Celia Barotz will provide an overview of governing documents and potential revisions. Adoption of revisions is scheduled for October 2017 per the Strategic Work Plan.

RECOMMENDED ACTION: Discussion only

Ms. Barotz reminded everyone that one of the measurable objectives is to strengthen the board leadership and she took on the task of reviewing the governing documents and gave a synopsis of potential revisions on the governing documents. She discovered that there is an opportunity to streamline the structure. She continued that the FMPO Manager reports to the Management committee who then talks to the Executive Board and if you look at the alternative structure – there is the option to change that to the FMPO Manager reporting directly to the Executive Board which is really the way it should be in a policy making organization.

She added that she was looking for feedback from Mr. Landsiedel and Mr. Folke. Mr. Folke noted he was not on the Management Committee and Ms. Barotz asked for the current members. Mr. Wessel responded it was comprised of the District Engineer, Flagstaff City Manager, the County Manager and Erika Mazza from NAIPTA. Mr. Babbott noted that Dan Folke is involved in much of the review and Mr. Folke added that his job is to do the evaluation for the FMPO director although Mr. Wessel does not work for Mr. Folke nor does he supervise him. Mr. Landseidel added that the City of Flagstaff as a host agency provides all HR support, and Mr. Wessel’s evaluation runs thru the state process which is why it was requested of someone at the City of Flagstaff to provide the FMPO Management Committee with a forum. Ms. Barotz felt that the people who never work with the manager of the FMPO does not make sense and she feels that this is a relatively easy change to make and could have sub impacts on achieving our goals. Mr McCarthy noted he was generally supportive. Mr. Babbott added it was a strange system of accountability – people outside of the work of the group doing the assessment.

Mr. Wessel stressed that the FMPO has been mostly a technical organization and so a lot of the work of staff has been at the technical level with people at the city and county. The process has been Mr. Folke’s position taking the lead, who then typically interview 3 people from the TAC, and then have conversations with the Management Committee, who then put together the evaluation. The Management Committee reviews it and then it goes to the FMPO Executive Board who then attaches a letter to the file noting any other goals and/or thoughts. He continued that as the FMPO transitions to a more policy laden organization that daily interaction will increase and he feels this makes more sense. Mr. Babbott noted he understands this is going to take a discussion and legal questions that need to have some review to see what is proposed and the reason why. Ms. Barotz inquired why the Management Committee was needed and when it comes to the TAC asked how much direct advisory support is received from them. She continued if the FMPO Executive Board does not want a Management Committee, then the operating procedures would need to be amended. Ms. Evans asked if the FMPO has to have HR support and if it could be a could be a stand-alone organization and Mr. Wessel said that was possible. Mr. Meilbeck noted he prefers the incremental approach to streamlined reporting structure. He continued that the role that the City of Flagstaff has committed to play is a very generous role to support the FMPO – the City of Flagstaff is an org that has a lot of resources and a lot of expertise and he would be hesitant to step away from that without a lot of consideration. Mr. McCarthy said he has no concept of what the Management committee does. Mr. Ryan added that the FMPO is a small organization and if we want to broaden it, we have to add additional resources from all members and the incremental approach would be a more measured consideration. Discussion ensued.

2. FY2018-2022 Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) (pages 23-24)

FMPO Staff: David Wessel, Manager

REQUESTED ACTION: Discussion and Possible Action

Staff will continue the discussion from last month on how to strategically align resources within the TIP with the new Strategic Work Plan.

RECOMMENDED ACTION: Elect to work with the current TIP and defer adoption of an FY2018-2022 TIP.

DW said that for the TIP – similar to the action we took on the Work Program, this will be a placeholder action discussing how we are going to use our funds – looking for an action to defer adopting the 2018 TIP we are permitted to continue operating under our FY17-21 TIP. Once confirmed it will be communicated to ADOT.

Motion: Mr. McCarthy made a motion to continue operating under the TIP as presented. Ms. Barotz seconded the motion. Motion passed unanimously.

3. Transit Performance Measures

(pages 25-27)

FMPO Staff: David Wessel, Manager

REQUESTED ACTION: Discussion and possible action

Staff will present recommended Transit Asset Management Plan measures to comply with MAP-21 and FAST Act.

RECOMMENDED ACTION:

Adopt the Transit Measures as Presented

Mr. Wessel announced that part of the F.A.S.T. ACT was moving to performance based planning and programming and the Transit Asset Management Plan measures would comply with MAP-21 and the F.A.S.T. Act. He added the FMPO is looking to adopt the transit state of good repair measures as presented in the packet.

Motion: Mr. Ryan made a motion to adopt the Transit Measures as presented in the packet. Ms. Evans seconded the motion. Motion passed unanimously.

4. Consideration of Adding Northern Arizona University to the FMPO

(pages 28-29)

FMPO Staff: David Wessel, Manager

REQUESTED ACTION: Discussion only

Staff will brief the Board on a meeting with NAU representatives and a staff report on advantages, disadvantages and alternatives for involving the University in FMPO activities and decisions.

RECOMMENDED ACTION:

Table for future action

Mr. Wessel announced that he had the opportunity to meet with Joanne Keene and Rich Bowen from Northern Arizona University (NAU) and noted they were interested in seeing the university become a member of the FMPO for a variety of reasons. NAU understands they are a major employer and they felt the need for coordination was important. They recognize that there are many opportunities with connections, Right-of-Ways, expanded transit opportunities, etc., which equals lots of opportunities to leverage a partnership. Mr. Meilbeck concurred with the reasons mentioned by Mr. Wessel and was looking to see the best way for NAU to enter. Ms. Evans stated that NAU was interested in participating with the FMPO and added that what they are directly doing on campus directly impacts transportation outside the campus and felt they should have a voting seat at the table. Mr. McCarthy added that he felt if NAU had a seat at the table, they would attend meetings. Discussion ensued.

IV. CONCLUDING GENERAL BUSINESS

1. REPORTS

a. TAC Action Summary June 1, 2017

(pages 30-34)

b. Staff Report

(pages 35-37)

c. Legislative activity

2. ANNOUNCEMENTS

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

- a. Future Agenda Items
 - a. Legislative Working Group
 - b. I-15 Resolution to pursue alternate funds
 - c. Strategic Work Plan amendment addressing RTP strategic initiatives

b. Meeting Schedule NO MEETINGS IN JULY – SUMMER BREAK

| | |
|----------------------|--|
| TAC | August 3, 2017 / 1:30 p.m. / County Human Resources |
| Management Committee | August 11, 2017 / 10:00 a.m. / City Hall |
| Executive Board | August 24, 2017 / 10:45 a.m. / County BOS, 2 nd . floor |

Mr. Wessel announced that the Northern AZ Legislative Working Group is being resurrected and added they had met several times already with CYMPO & NACOG and were very effective in getting some legislation to move forward. He noted that a resolution regarding I-15 and the impact it was having on monies for rural Arizona.

ADJOURNMENT Chair Babbott adjourned the meeting at 12:15 pm.

The Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) includes Northern Arizona Intergovernmental Public Transportation Authority final program of projects for section 5307 and 5339 funding under the Federal Transit Administration, unless amended. Public notice for the TIP also satisfies FTA public notice requirements for the final program of projects.

CERTIFICATION OF POSTING OF NOTICE

The undersigned hereby certifies that a copy of the foregoing notice was duly posted at Flagstaff City Hall on June 16, 2017 at 5:16 pm in accordance with the statement filed by the Recording Secretary with the City Clerk.

Dated this 16th day of June 2017.

Dusty Rhoton, FMPO Administrative Specialist