



MEETING NOTES

Regional Plan 2012 – Working Group for Circulation & Bicycle Element

Thursday, January 26, 2012

3:30 p.m. – 5:00 p.m.

Flagstaff City Hall, Staff Conference Room

CAC Members:

1. Julie Leid
2. Nat White
3. Ben Anderson
4. Mike Nesbitt

Contributing Staff and General Public

1. Darrel Barker, Comprehensive Planning Project Manager
2. Bob Caravona, Advance Planning Manager
3. Kim Sharp, Neighborhood Planner
4. Dave Wessel, FMPO Manager
5. Martin Ince, Multi-modal Planner
6. Kate Morley, Coconino County Planner
7. Brian Foley, FMPO and City of Flagstaff Intern
8. Rick Miller, General Public and Conservation Study Forum

Meeting commences: 3:34 p.m.

Darrel Barker, Comprehensive Planning Project Manager leads meeting discussion.

1. **Documents on the Web Page:** Darrel Barker opens the meeting by asking if the requested circulation-related documents posted on the working group web page are sufficient, or if additional information is necessary. The group responds that the information is sufficient to date.
2. **General Comments/Questions:**
 - a. Julie Leid commented that the state legislature is currently reviewing Highway User Revenue Funds (HURF), and questioned what implications, if any, this might have on our approach to the Regional Plan update. Dave Wessel responded that it was immaterial to the regional plan process, and especially to the RTP and FMPO. He said that it is difficult at the regional plan level to take these things into account. May look at some level of cost/benefit analysis to see if larger, future projects are worth it. There is fiscal constraint with larger projects, such as the Lone Tree interchange.

- b. Mike Nesbitt asked if several circulation problems in the city would be addressed in the regional plan. He specifically discussed issues with 4th St to Butler, the intersection of Rte. 66 and Switzer Canyon Rd., and Humphreys St., as related to the dangers and difficulties for truck deliveries. Dave Wessel responded that design standards for arterial and collector roads would follow from the circulation element, but would not be specifically addressed in the element, as with road capacities.
- c. Dave Wessel asked the group what circulation maps we would need in the regional plan, stating as an example the truck routes map in the current regional plan. Rick Miller asked if there is a map that shows where we are not meeting our standards, and stated that it might be a good map to include. Dave Wessel responded that we do not have such a map.
- d. Nat White referred back to circulation problems and safety, and inquired about a study or map that would show turning radii at intersections throughout town. Mike Nesbitt asked if it was going to take a bad accident for such issues to be addressed. Dave Wessel responded that in the context of the regional Plan, we could address such issues with policies related to trucks and safety, but cannot get down to extremely fine detail. Dave Wessel, alluding to the “Planning Pyramid”, further stated that master plans would likely address such issues, such as the transportation master plan. He also stated that Humphreys Street is a state highway, and its future is likely to remain status quo. Nat stated that there are currently no policies in the Regional Plan that address “Delivery Service”. Ben Anderson then referred to existing Policy T1.8, which states “Identify Truck Circulation Needs”, and stated that this policy could probably be revised to address this area of concern.
- e. Kate Morley stated that we need an “economic” component to the circulation element, as well as other “big picture” items such as “safety” and “multi-modal”, and that policies could be listed under each item. Kate stated that many of the policies are already there, and could just be rearranged. Dave Wessel stated that in the Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) there are statements for “transportation services sectors”, which define what is trying to be achieved.
- f. Nat White referred to Table 7 in the existing transportation element, and how it provides definitions, categories and classification of roads and what we are trying to achieve. Dave Wessel stated that we have a very broken grid system, and gave examples of Butler into Clay, and I-17 dumping into Milton, and that these are issues that we need to address/overcome. In reference to grid systems, Flagstaff doesn’t come close to meeting the parameters – details ¼ and 1 mile connectors for urban/suburban form. He said that solutions to circulation problems can sometimes be painful, especially considering that many people in Flagstaff favor Traditional Neighborhood Development (TND). If not looking at road systems then what are we looking at –context, habits?
- g. Nat White referred back to the “big picture” categories, and asked what our goal is with the circulation element. Is it to change habits? Address housing? He stated that we need different goals for different things. Dave Wessel commented that there are different solutions that can be considered - such as technological solutions, alternate modes (such as transit), work from home, addressing circulation issues through land use and development patterns, considering public health, energy, cost of fuel, and more cost-effective modes such as using rail freight/freight yard. He further stated that we need to meet the mobility needs of the future population, and that what we are trying to deliver is

largely addressed in the RTP. He suggested that we should frame the discussion in the circulation element in a similar way.

- h. Julie Leid commented on the priorities outlined in the “Community Values Survey” (p. 16 of the circulation packet) and that we need resolve the information gleaned from such surveys and establish a hierarchy of goals and policies. Julie further stated that she agreed with Kate Morley’s comments on page 34 of the packet - that the hierarchy of goals, policies and strategies do not always line up. Kate stated that we also need to look at ways to encourage other modes of travel. Martin Ince stated that we should also look at “context sensitive solutions”, and gave examples of pedestrians being the top priority in the downtown area and vehicles taking priority in industrial areas.
- i. The discussion then returned to “big picture” categories, and the following chart was drawn on the white board:

Economic	Safety	Multi-modal	Quality Design
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Deliveries/Service • Rail • Efficient travel, less fuel • Serve activity centers, Ind., BP • Access - rural, urban, etc. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Serve all modes • Access • ADA • Walkability • Wildlife corridors 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Efficiency of travel • Transit/walk/bike • Transit Oriented Design (TOD) • FULTS • Transit stops 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Context sensitive solutions • Aesthetics • View-sheds • See “Community Character” element • Environment design to address air quality, water • Complete Streets • Bring existing up to better standard

- j. Dave Wessel stated that we could use Table 7 on page 8 of the packet to expand on, or to get to the four major categories/headings. Nat White commented that the Regional Plan should be used to address future, global concerns/trends. Kate commented that we may need a “vision” before each goal, and referred to her comments on page 24 of the packet, related to breaking existing goals into two separate goals. Ben Anderson stated that each of the four major headings should be a goal. Ben further commented that the first existing goal is too broad, and that the policies and goals which follow are redundant to it.
- k. Nat asked how the overall vision statement for the Regional Plan relates to the Circulation and Bicycle element. Nat further suggested that we should draft a paragraph stating how the circulation and bicycle element is going to implement the overall vision. Julie Leid agreed, and commented that this “paragraph” should be included on every future agenda.
- l. Rick Miller commented that the existing system might be retro-fitted to accommodate future circulation needs, and that part of the vision should reflect this. Dave Wessel suggested a “prioritization policy”, and that considering the current lack of funds, that we

could take care of what we have - to retro-fit, but still meet goals (fix it first). Kate referenced “Quality Design” and that we should bring existing conditions to a better standard - upgrade. Dave commented that strategies would probably be put in an appendix of the Regional Plan.

3. Meeting Conclusion

- a. Darrel Barker stated that the next packet would focus on revising the existing goals and policies to reflect working group comments and meeting discussion. The four main headings would be implemented, text would be cleaned up, and some information removed. The next packet would be the first version of Packet #2. Kate stated that the working group comments that haven’t been addressed should be left in the document. Nat stated that the “Vision and Guiding Principles” should be emailed with the next packet.

Meeting adjourns at 4:50 p.m.