



MEETING SUMMARY NOTES

Date Produced:	March 17, 2009
Meeting:	ADOT Communication and Community Partnerships Common Interest Group Workshop
Date:	March 16, 2009; 12:30 PM – 2 PM
Location:	ADOT HRDC; 1130 N. 22 nd Avenue, Phoenix
Purpose:	Gather input from ADOT’s Communication and Community Partnership Department on the three transportation scenarios.

Participants

See attached roster

The following meeting summary notes are intended to be a summary of the discussions at the meeting. Any changes or corrections to the meeting summary notes must be received by the author within ten days. After that date, they will be final.

Welcome and Opening Remarks

Sally Stewart, ADOT CCP Deputy Director called the meeting together at approximately 12:30 p.m. and led introductions. A brief presentation was given by the project’s Planning Management Consultant John McNamara.

Overview of Scenarios

Scenario A - Personal Vehicle Mobility

This scenario assumes a continuation of the existing approach of focusing on transportation solutions (primarily roadways) that assume people will continue to choose to drive their cars as their primary mode of transportation. However, the scenario assumes that automobile technology will continue to advance and that more high-fuel-efficiency vehicles such as hybrids, etc. will be more prominent than today. This scenario also includes significantly more transit than is currently available today.

Scenario B - Transit Mobility

This scenario shifts the focus from personal vehicles to a heavier emphasis on public transit, walking, and bicycling for regular daily trips in response to increased cost of owning and operating personal vehicles (fuel, insurance, and vehicle maintenance costs) and socioeconomic trends such as an aging population, environmental considerations, and a desire for a wider range of transportation choices.

Scenario C – Focused Growth

This scenario envisions a change in community development patterns toward more compact instead of spread-out development. It shifts the focus from personal vehicles only to transportation improvements emphasize local travel using transit, bicycling, and walking. This scenario responds to a growing trend toward a non-auto-dependent lifestyle that encourages a mix of land uses close to one another.

Small Group Discussions

Following the presentation the participants were asked to divide into two small groups to discuss the three scenarios. Dianne Kresich (ADOT) and Kristin Bornstein (Public Involvement Management Consultant) led the groups in their discussions. The following is a summary of all two small group discussions.

Group I:

Scenario A:

- Supportive rail transportation to and from major airports like other large cities.
- Passenger rail was the main mode of transportation in the past. There are many railroad lines that are still in existence. Has there been any thought of using this rail corridors and building passenger rail along them?
- Scenario A lacks a rail component.
- We assume that busses ma be obsolete in 40 years.
- This scenario lacks an alternative to I-17 between Flagstaff and Phoenix. Unfortunately due to the terrain there is no reasonable solution at this time.
- The Hassayampa corridor is not a reasonable alternative to I-17. We would need to use the existing I-17 alignment for improvements.
- Other alternatives to a north-south corridor east of I-17 would be to extend SR 51, SR 101, or SR 202 north to Camp Verde.
- There needs to be a better way to encourage people to use transit.
- There are more north-south corridors identified than east-west corridors. With fewer east-west corridors, there is great potential for more congestion in the urban areas. There need to be east-west bypasses of Phoenix and Tucson.

Scenario B:

- Supportive of rail along I-40
- Commuter rail is included in MAG's plans in the West Valley.
- Rail along I-17 is not feasible due to the terrain.



- There should be discussions about public-private partnerships. Casinos may be willing to help fund some roads leading to their establishments.
- Consideration of effects of this growth on the air quality should be considered.
- You need to consider integrating areas where people can live, work, and play.
- In order for Scenario B or C to be realistic, there needs to be public education on using transit. The way that people view transportation needs to be shifted away from personal vehicle use.
- Scenario B assumes that vehicles will not be as available as they are today.
- There needs to be an improved link between Camp Verde and Payson. There are improved links/connections throughout the state, but not there.
- Rural communities sometimes do not want the improved roads because that brings development and more people.
- ADOT goes where the money goes. If an area is developed, than money will follow to help improve the roadways.
- Quality of life is important to many people. Time is valuable. They want to be able to get places quickly and conveniently.

Scenario C:

- This scenario is unrealistic for Arizona because of land rights.
- This scenario would not meet the travel demands of today. There would still be congestion.
- If you constrain growth, commuter rails would not be as important.
- Any transportation improvements enhance growth.
- Would it be feasible to take commuter rail from Peach Springs to Yuma? Is there really a need for all this planned commuter rail?
- Rail in some cases does not save people time. If people are concerned about their time, will rail be sustainable?
- Would passenger rail be strictly for recreation?
- Why is there rail between Yuma and Bullhead City?

Overall Comments:

- The scenarios are hard to imagine without the MAG and PAG portions.
- We need to look at cost factors and technology. We don't know what technology will bring. This will be a defining factor in attracting passengers to transit.
- Supportive of keeping a personal vehicle for transportation.
- There needs to be many transportation options. These options improve the quality of life.
- Transit is a great option to help parents get their children to their activities.



- Having multiple transportation options are economically useful with the uncertainty of gas prices.
- The connectivity of modes is very important.

Group 2:

- There is no high speed rail in Scenario A.
- To what extent has the competition among regions regarding future population growth driven the scenarios? Have we favored one part of the state at the expense of others? We are not the state of Maricopa and people from Maricopa County need to start thinking outside the box. (John McNamara replied that the socioeconomic projections were obtained from a variety of sources throughout the state. They have been integrated into the scenarios and the project team is confident that the whole state is covered equitably.
- What's the difference between parkways and freeways? How much right-of-way is required for each? Dianne Kresich and John McNamara explained the difference. Typically, a six-lane freeway requires about 300 feet and a six-lane parkway 200 feet. Parkway can carry around half the traffic of a freeway at much less than half the cost, and are much safer than similar arterials. During the ensuing conversation, several people mentioned existing "parkways" in the Phoenix area, but the facilitators replied that these are not true parkways. The Michigan left is the essence of a parkway or "Michigan boulevard."
- What's the comparative cost of building a railroad (for passenger or mixed service) versus a freeway? The project team told the group that it depends. The State Rail Framework will provide more data.
- Why is passenger rail from Phoenix to Flagstaff shown going through Wickenburg? Doesn't it make more sense to take the more direct route up the I-17 corridor? The project team explained that the corridors along existing freight rail lines on the maps are for illustrative purposes only. Ultimately a passenger railroad may use a new corridor. Adding passenger service to an existing freight route has advantages and disadvantages.
- What's the capital cost per mile of building passenger rail? The project team explained that it varies. Again, the State Rail Framework will provide details.
- It looks as though the state highways will be clogged forty years hence, no matter which scenario we implement. John McNamara emphasized that we need to build aggressively to make a dent in the forecast 2050 congestion. But the modeling results show that we can make a real difference.
- How much of the decision-making is driven by funding? Which scenario costs the least? John McNamara explained that the three scenarios are visionary scenarios that lack cost constraints, so a detailed comparison of



- costs is not our focus at the moment. The cost-constrained State Long-Range Transportation Plan will look at costs and funding constraints in depth.
- There needs to be a variety of ways to travel, so Scenario B looks good. Dianne Kresich responded that Scenario C also does well from this perspective. Scenario C may actually provide better transit options than B within communities, versus between communities where B is probably superior.
 - Where do we go from here?
 - Are the roadway improvements in Arizona complemented by similar improvements across the border in neighboring states? The project team explained that information from the Border Coordination meetings with the surrounding states has been included in the scenarios.
 - Where does Aviation fit into the Statewide Transportation Framework? The project team explained that the Aviation division is preparing a plan which looks at Aviation issues. The Statewide Framework looks at providing appropriate access to aviation facilities.
 - What is the share of trips attributed to transit modes in the Scenarios? The project team explained that it ranges from 6% to 16%. Personal Transportation will continue to be the main mode of transportation within the state. However, even 16% share is substantial for transit services.

Meeting summary notes prepared by Amy Rosar, KDA Creative amy@kdacreative.com



Regional Framework Study

2050 Scenario A: Personal Vehicle Mobility

- Utah Border State Coordination**
- Potential Higher Capacity Roadway in the East
 - Potential High Speed Intensity Rail from Salt Lake City to Phoenix, via Las Vegas
 - Potential Capacity Improvements on I-15 between Flagstaff and T. J.
- Nevada Border State Coordination**
- Potential Intensity Corridor between Phoenix and Las Vegas
 - Potential High Speed Intensity Rail from Las Vegas to Phoenix

- California Border State Coordination**
- Potential Capacity Improvements on I-10 between Phoenix and Los Angeles
 - Potential Capacity Improvements on I-8 between San Diego and I-10
 - Upgrade Authority on SR-52 Transit Corridor
 - Upgrade Authority on SR-52 Transit Corridor



PRELIMINARY DRAFT

NOTE: While every effort has been made to ensure the accuracy of this information, the study team makes no warranty, expressed or implied, as to its accuracy and reserves ultimate liability for the accuracy thereof. New freeways, highways, and potential, streets, bridge facilities, traffic interchanges, and transit facilities are conceptual in nature and actual alignments will be determined following the completion of appropriate corridor planning, design and environmental studies.

- Sonora Border State Coordination**
- Rail impacts on Arizona from Potential New Puerto Colón Container Port
 - Rail impacts on Arizona from Potential Guaymas Port Improvements
 - Substantial Improvements to Mex 15 from Port of Guaymas North through Hermosillo in the Connection at Nogales
 - New Coastal Highway to Eventually Extend from San Luis through Puerto Penasco, reaching Guaymas in the Long-Term Future

Facility Type *	Improvement Type	Transit Network	Land Ownership	Background Features
— Freeway	— Conceptual New Roadway	— Express Bus	— Bureau of Land Management	— Railroad
— State Highway	— Widen/Upgrade Roadway	— Intercity Bus	— State Trust Land	
— AZ Parkway	— Improved Roadway (Shoulders, etc.)			



Regional Framework Study

2050 Scenario B: Transit Mobility

City Coordination
 • Capacity Recovery in the East-South Valley Rail from Salt Lake and Las Vegas
 • City Improvements on US 89, I-17 and I-15

State Coordination
 • Connection Between Phoenix and Las Vegas Rail from Las Vegas



New Mexico: Border State Coordination
 • Coordination With New Mexico Pending

INARY
 AFT

...has been made to ensure the accuracy of this information, ...

Sonora: Border State Coordination

- Rail impacts on Arizona from Potential New Punta Colonet Container Port
- Rail impacts on Arizona from Potential Guaymas Port Improvements
- Substantial improvements to Miles 15 from Part of Guaymas North through Hermosillo to the Connection at Nogales
- New Coastal Highway It Eventually Extend from San Luis through Puerto Penasco, reaching Guaymas in the Long-Term Future

Improvement Type
 Conceptual Network

Transit Network