



Meeting Summary Notes

Date Produced:	March 26, 2008
Meeting:	Regional Advisory Team
Date:	March 12, 2008; 10:00 a.m. to 2:00 p.m.
Location:	ADOT Phoenix Construction District Training Room 4550 N. Black Canyon Highway Training Room; Phoenix
Purpose:	Discuss Statewide Framework Modeling Effort and Smart Growth

Participants:
See attached roster

The following meeting 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.

The meeting was called to order at approximately 10:10 a.m. by Peggy Fiandaca, Committee Facilitator. Everyone introduced themselves.

Process Update

John McNamara provided an overview of the Regional Framework process. Three activities are going on now.

1. Critical Needs process – tool for the Governor to initiate the discussion with the Legislature
2. Regional Framework process
3. Statewide Framework process that will kick off in the fall

Mapping is beginning, the inventory and analysis work is underway, the various consultants are working on *Technical Report #2 – Inventory and Environmental Scan*, and the regional stakeholder interviews that will feed into the Technical Report will be finished next week. The Focus Groups start March 24. The Focus Groups are: Economic/Community Development, Multimodal/Commercial Transportation, and Preservation/Environmental. These will be held during the day at several locations within each region, with a Community Workshop held the same day. There has been a lot of progress and activity. The process is on schedule and some of the early confusion between the Critical Needs and Regional Framework process has been resolved.



Critical Needs Update: The ADOT District Engineers and COGs submitted critical needs individually. We found that they defined "critical" in different ways, so the team sent out another email defining it and asking for refinements. The Management Consultants conducted meetings with all the COGs/MPOs and District Engineers to fine-tune the submittals. These were completed yesterday. The MAG work is scheduled for next week with Eric Anderson. The COG/MPO/DE meetings intended to do three things –

1. Clarify the confusion regarding the Critical Needs process, which is intended to meet the Governor's March 31 deadline to identify High Capacity Roadways, High Capacity Transit, and Local/Arterial needs. The Management Consultant is pulling together the critical needs report so the Governor has a tool to begin discussion with the Legislature.
2. Clarify the type of package to go forward to the Governor. The Team stressed it has no control over what the Governor does with the information.
3. Estimate a range of costs for meeting statewide and COG/MPO needs in each category; and make sure that the Governor has an illustrative list of projects that illustrates the needs in each category on a preliminary basis.

Eric Anderson Can this group review the Critical Needs submittal?
 John McNamara No. The Governor asked us to do this confidentially.

Eric Anderson Have the individual COG/MPOs reviewed the DE lists?
 John McNamara Yes

Next Steps: After the March 31st submittal, the MC will address the Smart Growth initiative and respond to whatever comes from the Governor in response to the submittal. John said that we intend to provide the information to the Regional Framework Consultants when authorized by the Governor. It will then be available to the planning teams as they move forward with the planning process this summer.

An internal draft is due by March 24th. During that week, the Team will work with ADOT Senior Management to prepare the submittal to the Governor's Office submittal by March 31st.



Statewide Framework Process: The Team will begin some advance work before this fall, such as outreach to bordering states to understand what is happening on Arizona borders (e.g., traffic volumes, freight volumes), so that we are not making this effort in isolation. This work includes discussing Sonora, Mexico.

The modeling effort is moving forward. A lot of important work has been going on in the initial three months of the process.

The mapping effort is underway and will be ramping up very quickly.

Dianne Kresich In regard to the neighboring states' effort, ADOT's Freight Study has collected a lot of information already.

John McNamara The internal team will collect that information first before we go out to discuss with others.

The relationships with tribal communities have been strengthened through working with Don Sneed and the Intertribal Council. They have been in touch with the tribes and working with the communities for the critical needs effort. For example, there is a meeting with the Gila River Indian Community next week. The Regional Framework Consultants are trying to ensure that the process includes the tribal communities, because this is important to the Governor's office.

Modeling Presentation

Brent Cain and Michael Gorton of HDR provided an overview of the modeling effort to date. A Modeling Architecture Working Paper is complete and will be distributed to the RAT for their information.

Bob Hazlett Mentioned that we should include at least the two municipalios in Mexico.

Chris Fetzer The network you are showing is to model the greater southwest, right?

Brent Cain Yes. We want to ensure that the model captures influences outside the state.

Dave Barber Mentioned that the Hualapai Tribe is very interested in these roads:

1. Diamond Bar Road is an access to Grand Canyon West.
2. Another access into Havasupai.
3. The Hualapai Tribe supports the concept of Pearce Ferry Road.



Dianne Kresich I see that you included the Pinal County Roads of Regional Significance, the Hassayampa Valley Roadway Framework, and Pinal Corridors. Is there a reason for adding these and not other general roadways at this planning level?

Brent Cain We will get there. I will discuss this in a moment. The gray is the base network and the blue is the first cut of the future network.

Eric Anderson The "Roads of Regional Significance" shown are not complete. Bob Hazlett said he will get the complete information to Brent.

PAG Quite a lot of information seems to be missing from the base network.

Bob Hazlett The information being shown in the western area is way too dense; we will not have the socioeconomic data for this area; need to look at the definitions for Pinal County and relate them to the rest of the state; what is created now really needs to be tight.

There was a discussion of the importance of "Consistency of Definitions of RSR." All urban areas need to be shown as consistently as possible across the state so that the model has a fighting chance of being consistent

Pinal County: need to clarify what is being shown to ensure that only the roadways serving a regional function are included.

Bob Hazlett The issue is whether we have the data to support the model; that is always the tricky question.

Eric Anderson What is the process for review?

Brent Cain The RAT is the first to see this information. It has not been through the MC Team. Once the definitional issues are resolved, we will send it out to the RAT for input.

Chris Fetzer What is the level of detail in the model?

Brent Cain Both freeway and parkway; the key is the function of the roadway; we are including roads of regional significance and roads supporting the regional system.



**Statewide Transportation
Planning Framework**

Eric Anderson In the Hassayampa Study, the MAG region defined parkways; what I understand we want in the model are those routes that provide the regional connections. Therefore some areas may name these differently. Is this correct?

Brent Cain Yes

John McNamara In rural communities, these roads are not as specifically defined as in the urban areas. It is important to define the function and not get hung up on the name such parkway. The key is function and support to the state system

Brent explained how the modeling relates to the Regional Framework process. The Regional Framework Consultants will provide input to the model. The MC is responsible for the forecasts and consistency across all regions. Additional modeling of various alternatives will be done region by region to help the team and community select a preferred plan. It is an iterative process beginning with the base network.

Dianne Kresich How will the model be used in the long run? How will ADOT benefit from this? Does it serve as the basis for modeling on an ongoing basis?

Brent Cain The intent is to be able to take the model and refine it; study a new corridor and provide more detail going forward; ultimately the model can be used to analyze new development projects. It is invaluable tool for ADOT. This tool could be used for overall travel demand on corridors. It can't be looked at in isolation.

Bob Hazlett It provides great input to all the regions. It provides a look at different trends across regions. This tool allows us to look at traffic going across regions. The Sketch Planning Model allows us to examine the movements between activity centers statewide.

Arnold Burnham A lot of distribution occurring along SR 86, 64, and 87.

Eric Anderson What will be done to check the model against the urban models? Can't assume that one model is more accurate than another? We need to understand the differences.

Brent Cain It's the external that might be different. If we use your data, the consistency should be there.



- Eric Anderson 2050 Map – The road network in Superstition Vistas for example; we did that sitting in our conference room. We need to be careful what is included. I just want to point that out. These roadway systems are not cast in stone.
SR 85 – Seasonal traffic down to Lukeville is not defined enough. Some of the rural areas have these types of unique traffic generators that must be taken into consideration. There are key recreation corridors.
- Peggy asked everyone around the table to provide their comments.
- MAG (Eric) I provided quite a bit of comments already. Key recreation corridors and unique generators should be considered (SR 85 to Lukeville, snowbirds and seasonal freight); impacts of freight movement from Mexico; Sky Harbor as a special generator; models do have limitations.
- WACOG Mentioned the McCarran Freight Airport relocation and the potential impact on traffic. Also mentioned Vicksburg Road's steady growth of freight traffic that should be considered; measure impacts of Hoover Dam Bypass; Grand Canyon Skywalk/Hualapai Tribe access; industrial development; Mardian subdivision in White Hills area; industrial development near Wal-Mart Distribution Center; prison expansion; secondary power plant; SR 95 bypass around Lake Havasu City; I-40/SR 95 bypass around Bullhead City; Vanderslice Road in Mohave County.
- YMPO New Port of Entry #2 – Creation of SR 195 expressway to proceed north to SR 95 and then north to I-10 which is part of the CANAMEX; construction of a new refinery that will employ several hundred people and its impact north of I-10; also the growth of Wellton should be considered.



- SEAGO City of Nogales – At-grade rail crossing issues. Greenlee County – Increased traffic on SR 191 as a result of mining in the area.
- CAAG Increase in truck traffic on US 60 between Mesa and Globe; US 70 between Globe and Lordsburg is now two lanes and should be expanded due to the increased truck volumes; mines opening in the area.
- NACOG East Valley to I-40 increased traffic demand (SR 87, SR 260, SR 277, and SR 377); SR 64 Williams to Valle in addition to SR 180; SR 77 Holbrook to Show Low increased traffic.
- PAG Probably some changes in current network- Cherie will provide network changes to Brent Cain; 2050 Loop System Routes; Pinal area has lack of facilities to accommodate increased travel demand; SR 83 and SR 82 are carrying a lot of truck traffic; SR 83 into Cochise County is used when incidents happen on I-10; tribal routes are used in Western Pima County.
- CYMPO Northwest planning boundary and I-40 up to Seligman; potential development of this area becoming a separate MPO; suggest contacting State Mine Department due to increased mining statewide; stressed the importance of clearly letting the COGs/MPOs know the project schedule and what is expected of them.
- FHWA It is important to use consistent definitions statewide. You might want to take a look at limited access facilities.

Smart Growth Presentation

Jim Charlier, Charlier and Associates provided a PowerPoint presentation on Smart Growth principles and discussed how they will be applied to the Statewide and Regional Framework processes.

Other Items

Participants discussed the need to move the meeting date to allow for videoconference meetings. They will be set for the First Mondays of the



Month from 1 to 5 p.m. There are videoconference locations in Tucson, Globe, Yuma, Flagstaff, and Prescott. Everyone was asked to tell Deanna Huelskamp at 602/337-2601 or Jennifer Toth at 602/337-2516 before each meeting whether and where they will be videoconferencing.

Next Steps

The next RAT meeting is scheduled for Monday April 7th from 1:00 to 5:00 p.m. NOTE –THE APRIL RAT MEETING HAS SINCE BEEN CANCELED.

Adjourn

The meeting was adjourned at approximately 2:00 p.m.

Meeting summary notes produced by
Peggy Fiandaca, PIMC
480.816.1811; F 480.816.1813
psainc@cox.net