



MEETING SUMMARY NOTES

Table with 2 columns: Field (Date Produced, Meeting, Date, Location, Purpose) and Value (August 10, 2008, Framework Management Committee/Regional Advisory Team, July 9, 2008; 1 – 5 PM, ADOT Administration; 206 S. 17th Avenue, Phoenix, Update on Statewide Framework process and TIME Initiative)

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 Introductions

Victor Mendez, Co-Chair called the meeting together at approximately 1:15 PM. He had everyone introduce themselves. Several committee members joined the meeting via telephone and video conference. He mentioned that Dennis Smith, Co-Chair would be joining the meeting late.

TIME Initiative Update

Richard Travis provided an update of the TIME Initiative. He mentioned that 150,000 signatures were needed and 250,000 submitted. A law suit was filed by TIME Coalition regarding the legislative description being biased and inaccurate.

Regional Framework Process Update/Schedule Update

John McNamara provided an update of the schedule. He said that the project schedule was extended approximately four months. He distributed a revised Work Program schedule. The modeling effort was taking longer than anticipated, the alternatives analysis was lengthened, and a rail framework was added. This schedule will allow other studies (e.g. Flagstaff Regional Plan, MAG RTP Update, and PAG High Capacity Transit) to feed into the process.

John mentioned that the inventory of existing conditions and issues was basically complete. The modeling effort is moving forward but slower than anticipated.

Regional Framework Public Involvement

Peggy mentioned that first round of public involvement included a three-pronged approach (interviews, focus groups, and community events) within each of the regions. The purpose of this round of involvement was to solicit input to regional needs, issues, opportunities and vision. Over 600 people statewide were involved from February to March 2008. The final report was distributed via CD.

Evaluation Criteria Presentation and Discussion

John provided an overview of the evaluation criteria process that builds upon the lessons learned through the Hassayampa and Hidden Valley Transportation Framework process. He discussed a handout titled "Regional Framework Studies Evaluation Criteria." John walked the participants through the handout. The purpose of the evaluation framework provides a structure to evaluate multimodal transportation alternatives in each region within the larger context of smart growth, sustainable development, and sound transportation planning.

Following the presentation, participants discussed and provided the following comments.

Participants commented that not all of our criteria apply to all communities or regions. According to Eric Anderson "one size does not fit all." Several of the Transportation/Land Use Integration Criteria exemplify this, such as "Support existing and locally approved mixed use development." Richard Travis gave Wellton as an example: it is 95% agricultural and intends to remain that way. Another example is supporting redevelopment—some areas haven't developed in the first place. John from PAG proposed a toolbox from which the regional teams can select appropriate criteria. Dianne suggested a core set of criteria that apply statewide, overlaid with a customized set tailored to each region. John McNamara agreed with this approach and said his team will work on a toolbox approach for the Alternatives Development Workshops in late July. Fine-tuning the evaluation criteria by region will be part of the agenda for the workshops.

MAG staff suggested changing the last sentence of the introduction to read: "The following evaluation framework, developed for the regional framework studies, provides a structure to evaluate multimodal transportation alternatives in each **of the four regions**, in the larger context of smart growth, sustainable development and sound transportation planning." This process excludes MAG and PAG.

Eric commented on the lack of specific bicycle and pedestrian criteria. John McNamara replied that we are not looking at that level of detail, but instead will consider accommodation of non-motorized transportation from a Complete Streets perspective. Eric responded that we are, however, getting down to the level of local transit service. He also said that the MAG region is moving toward more of an off-road bikeway system, which tends to be safer and more practical given the limitations of major arterial roadways.

Eric also suggested "Provide adequate transit service to the Title VI population" instead of "Maximize."

Under Economic Benefit, Dennis Smith said that our criteria are reactive and fail to say anything about the economic development plan to be supported. Where's the plan? What's the statewide or megapolitan economic development strategy? Eric: What about a strategy to enhance the state's economic competitiveness, as opposed to just regional

Statewide Transportation

development? This is a missing piece. Dennis added that the state should address the big economic engines of Sky Harbor and Phoenix/Mesa Gateway Airport. The latter will become a major freight airport. Access to the airports and the infrastructure serving them are important to the economic health of the state.

Dave Barber asked "how does the bqAZ Reconnaissance Study information feed into this study?" John mentioned that the information is a touchstone and part of the inventory phase. Dave mentioned that the "Future Growth Area" maps show growth incorrectly in Mohave County. The area about 20 miles south of the Hoover Dam was not shown as a growth area and this area is growing tremendously. John mentioned that we are depending on the "red dot maps" at this time and are using more detailed inventory to understand future growth. Dave mentioned that we might want to update the dot maps. Dave also asked "what are the factors that will determine the role freight plays in the rail study? John said that the study had not begun and scoping would occur in August.

Eric Anderson mentioned that there are unique characteristics across the state and one size does not fit all. There needs to be consistency but flexibility. Access management is a good example of this balance. Dennis Smith asked if the schedule changed based on the election. What happens to the process if the initiative does not pass? John mentioned that there is an implementation strategy that will be developed regardless of what happens with the initiative.

Written comments on the criteria are welcome, and should be submitted to Jennifer no later than Wednesday, July 23.

Alternatives Development Phase

John McNamara mentioned that the regional framework consultants are beginning to move forward in developing regional alternatives. DMJM Harris will be working with each of the consulting teams in a workshop format to discuss potential alternatives.

Next Steps

The next Management/Regional Advisory Team is set for September 3rd. The Policy Committee will meet on July 16th from 10 to Noon at HRDC.

Meeting summary notes prepared by Peggy
Fiandaca, PIMC
psainc@cox.net