



Initial Community Workshops Summary December 2008

In a process known as Building a Quality Arizona (bqAZ), Councils of Governments (COGs), Metropolitan Planning Organizations (MPOs), land management agencies, and Tribal governments from around the state are working with ADOT to talk about state infrastructure needs over the next three decades. During public meetings held statewide in March/April 2008, stakeholders and interested citizens voiced their opinions on transportation issues that will affect Arizona's quality of life in the 2030 and 2050 planning horizon.

The Arizona Department of Transportation (ADOT) and local/regional partners hosted a second series of community workshops across the state in November 2008 to present future transportation scenarios to the community for feedback. The scenarios were developed based on input from the first round of workshops. The second round of community workshops was designed to encourage participation from local communities by providing information about the process, reviewing work to date, and providing input.

Participants were invited to contribute to the creation of a future plan that addresses transportation options that will affect future Arizona generations. Citizens reviewed and provided input on three planning frameworks, called "scenarios."

The main topics of discussion that occurred during the workshops included the following:

- Transportation funding; how will future improvements be implemented if we don't have a funding source?
- Emphasis on coordination and planning; general consensus that planning is necessary and coordination with other regions, other states, other studies, is crucial.
- Difficulty to envision a 2050 where rural areas are more urban and transportation choices have evolved beyond personal vehicles.
- General interest in and support of transit. Emphasis in discussions on education necessary to get people to willingly replace personal vehicle use with transit use.
- Discussion of "state highways as main streets" and local alternatives, or bypasses. There was a divergence in viewpoints on this topic.
- Much discussion centered on how the state can grow if other infrastructure is not developed such as water.
- Some indication of acceptance of imminent growth, some discussion of discouraging growth (or avoiding the encouragement of growth with new roads—"if you build it they will come.")
- Support for environmental sensitivity in infrastructure planning and development.
- No clear support statewide for one scenario over the others.

The workshops are being posted in early December online at www.bqaz.gov so that people who could not attend one of the workshops in person learn about the scenarios and provide input.

A summary of the community workshops held in November 2008 is presented below by region. The regional teams are under way preparing full summaries, and the online workshops will be live through January 2009. A full report of the second round of participation will be made available at that time.



Central Arizona

Community Workshop Attendance		
Date	Location	Total Attendees*
11/12/08	Globe, Besh-Ba-Gowah Archaeological Museum	16
11/13/08	Coolidge, Central Arizona College	37
Total Attendance		53

*Attendance numbers from sign-in sheets.

The Central Arizona Framework Study Project Team held community workshops in Coolidge and Globe. The team opted to schedule the Coolidge community workshop immediately following a Pinal County Comprehensive Plan meeting in order to garner the participation requested. Attendance was considered good; in Globe the team was pleased with the turnout during the afternoon session, but no one attended in the evening.

Generally the topics discussed were similar to the first round of community workshops and included: economic development; population growth, whether desired or not; transportation funding; the incorporation of ongoing planning and transportation studies; availability of and realities of implementing transit; tribal community coordination; and the surrounding natural resources.

Changes suggested to the scenarios presented:

- Maintain 10 lanes of improvement on Interstate 10 in all three scenarios

Common themes that came up across the geographic areas included:

- In order for transit to work, nodes of density will be required.
- Local and regional representatives want assurance that local and regional planning processes will be tied in to scenario development.
- General discontent with the separation of studies (i.e. why was the Central Arizona Framework Study separate from the Hidden Valley Framework Study?).
- General consensus at Coolidge workshop that Scenario B was most like Pinal County Comp Plan.
- Facilities are needed for emergency transportation in Gila County to Phoenix area for medical and other types of emergency trips. Air transportation service is important.
- Allow flexibility for other types of infrastructure to be paired with new transportation infrastructure (water/wastewater, telecom and more).
- Scenario A looks like sprawl.
- Natural resource advocates preferred larger footprints of current infrastructure as opposed to new roads.
- Transit is needed regardless of which scenario is selected.

Differences between geographic areas within Central Arizona Framework Study:

- Coolidge groups (Pinal County) seemed to have accepted growth as reality; Globe (Gila County) attitude towards growth was mixed.
- Coolidge groups were generally accepting of new routes, seeing that they were coming; Globe had mixed reactions to any new routes.
- There was mixed opinions about bypassing existing communities around Globe/Miami – some people felt it would hurt local economy, while others wanted to divert the through traffic.
- Globe area--not enough land to develop--state needs to think of land exchanges for economic development purposes. Florence area--has plenty of developable land.
- Globe area has important history it wants to hold on to.



Eastern Arizona

Community Workshop Attendance		
Date	Location	Total Attendees*
11/10/08	Safford, Graham County Services Building	48
11/13/08	Show Low, Days Inn	28
11/18/08	Sierra Vista, Windemere Hotel	79**
11/19/08	Nogales, Holiday Inn	**
Total Attendance		155
*Attendance numbers from sign-in sheets.		
** A total of 79 attendees for both locations combined in Cochise/Santa Cruz Focus Area		

Overall Outreach Summary

- Conducted eight public workshops with a total of 155 attendees.
- Provided information to 64 local agencies, organizations and businesses.
- Distributed nearly 33,000 fliers.
- Advertised on 15 local radio stations with nearly 200 ads or live mentions.

Copper Country Focus Area

- Two public workshops with a total of 48 attendees.
- Provided outreach at Graham County Fair; distributed 1000 fliers and over 900 hard hats.
- Attended eight community group/local government meetings; over 200 fliers distributed.
- Distributed over 2,000 fliers to other agencies and school districts.
- Advertised on four local radio stations with a total of 16 spots.

Mogollon Rim Focus Area

- Two public workshops with a total of 28 attendees.
- Four community group contacts.
- Advertised in and briefed two local newspapers.
- Advertised on seven local radio stations with a total of 70 spots over a one-week period.
- Conducted outreach to multiple government agencies.

Cochise/Santa Cruz Focus Area

- Four public workshops with a total of 79 attendees.
- Attended nine community events/local government meetings with 240 fliers distributed.
- Mailed and e-mailed 366 fliers to contact list.
- Distributed over 29,000 fliers to local schools.
- Fliers posted online with eight local agencies.
- Phone call outreach to 35 local businesses and organizations.
- Advertised on four local radio stations with a total of 85 spots and 28 live mentions.

Overall Comment Summary

- Consistent support across study area for investing in more local and regional transit service (Scenario B).
- Transit service needs to be convenient and interconnected to be feasible.
- Copper Country and Cochise/Santa Cruz areas expressed interest in passenger rail; freight rail was identified in the Mogollon Rim area (Scenario B).
- Identified need to add capacity in major regional roadway corridors (Scenario A and C).
- Supported concept of creating additional local alternatives (bypass) to state routes to relieve local congestion issues (Scenario A).
- General desire for improved safety on major roadways (Scenario A and C).
- Supported the concept of investing in bicycle and pedestrian facilities for local trips (Scenario C).



Northern Arizona

Community Workshop Attendance		
Date	Location	Total Attendees*
11/12/08	Flagstaff, High Country Conference Center	63
11/17/08	Prescott, Yavapai College	60
11/18/08	Holbrook, Hulet Elementary School	21
11/20/08	Window Rock, Navajo Nation Museum	24
Total Attendance		168
*Attendance numbers from sign-in sheets. Overall, attendance during the afternoon session was double the evening session.		

General Comments:

- Include statement (in assumptions) that transportation improvements will minimize impacts to wildlife habitats and will incorporate wildlife crossings as designated by (indicate agency(ies))
- Consider impacts to environmentally sensitive areas while proposing the roadway alignments.
- Protect Verde River and wilderness areas north of Chino Valley/Paulden areas (East of SR-89)
- Roadway improvements (conceptual, widen/upgrade, improved) should include facilities for bicyclists (marked shoulders and/or off-roadway pedestrian/bike trails) consistent with accepted bicycle plans
- Attendees from State and Federal Fish & Wildlife and the National Park Service indicated they have information to better incorporate environmental/wildlife/cultural concerns into the scenarios
- Need to coordinate with local agencies to ensure consistency with planning efforts, show their proposed projects to 2050
- Need to consider costs (cost per person suggested, cost of each scenario)
- Scenarios do not "show" support of future growth of commerce in the region
- Education is a major component of all scenarios
- Would like to see what's proposed in other regions, questions regarding how the regions were developed/outlined
- Concern that population centers will receive the funding for the majority of projects/improvements - concerns about distribution of funding
- Need to provide follow-up after the Community Workshops, let people know where information is available
- Is there a priority list of projects?
- ADOT's policies need to be flexible and reflect necessary improvements
- Need connectivity on all scenarios between destinations points (transit centers, airports, etc.)
- Delicate balance between anticipating and promoting growth (If you build it, they will come)
- Consider carbon loads of different scenarios
- Population projections maybe too low (or some thought too high)
- Questions regarding the validity of the population projections – may be too low (or some thought too high)
- Consider different population projection numbers for each scenario

Comments on Assumptions:

Scenario A

- Not realistic, would improvements actually accommodate demand in 2050?
- Most realistic for rural areas
- Alternative fuels or affordable fuels do not reduce car trips
- Concerns about available water to support growth
- Environmental concerns based on the proposed projects and potential impacts
- Concerned that this scenario will become a self-fulfilling prophecy



- Consider climate change
- Concern we can't continue our existing strategy of building and widening roads forever
- Ignores other public costs/implications of building roads
- Consider alternative funding sources, like P³

Scenario B

- Most accurate representation of 2050
- Viable assumptions for Prescott and Chino Valley area, but more difficult above the Rim
- Needs to be affordable to encourage use
- Need more convenient transit hubs to encourage use
- Concern scenario is dependent on other organizations (Amtrak, cities, and counties) to have funding to implement project
- Concern this scenario is not feasible in rural areas
- Consider rail with car loading capabilities (land ferries)

Scenario C

- Need to increase densities for transit to be viable
- Need rail to support local transit
- Coordinate with local planning and zoning efforts
- Existing plans should be reflected in this scenario
- Not sure the projects adequately address the assumptions, but it's a starting point.
- High density area for Flagstaff isn't accurate, overlaps Federal land and Walnut Canyon
- Should consider airport expansion
- Protects quality of life for current residents
- Most challenging since it will require a shift in mindset
- Need policies to encourage Smart Growth

Future Issues:

- Water availability
- Wildlife Corridors
- Increasing fuel costs
- Peak Oil
- Global Warming
- Collaboration between agencies
- Increasing availability of public transportation
- Utility needs and right-of-way
- Lack of funding
- Education about alternate modes of transportation
- Recognizing local experts
- Sustainable development
- Need for open space
- Tourism
- Aging Population

Flagstaff

Scenario A

Comments on Projects:

1. East/West Connection (New Roadway) between SR-89 and US-180 north of Flagstaff through National Forest Service (NFS) area.
2. Remove roadway grid in the Yavapai Ranch Area (NW of Chino Valley Area).



Statewide Transportation
Planning Framework

3. 4th Street extension from I-40 to I-17 with a new Interchange at I-17 and continuing west to connecting to I-40 turning north.
4. Transit Centers at Winslow, Holbrook, Chinle, Kayenta, Shonto (Jct SR-98/US-160).
5. Safety Improvements along SR-89A from Flagstaff to Sedona.
6. Safety Improvements along Leupp Rd. from Townsend Winona Rd. to SR-99 and SR-99 from Leupp Rd. to I-40 (to serve as a detour route to I-40 when needed).
7. Bike Lanes along US-180 from Flagstaff to Valle and along SR-64 from Valle to Cameron through Grand Canyon.
8. Preserve Scenic Beauty of US-180 from Flagstaff to Valle (SR-64) while considering roadway improvements.
9. Refer to scenic Byways Program for US-89A from US-89 to Fredonia, SR-67 from US-89A to Grand Canyon North Rim, SR-64 from Valle to Grand Canyon.
10. Extend I-17 north to Page and beyond
11. Provide a parallel road system for when accidents occur along I-17 and I-40
12. Consider truck lanes on I-40 if widened
13. Provide transit service from Flagstaff to Grand Canyon

Scenario B

Comments on Projects:

1. Passenger Rail Service between Flagstaff and Phoenix along I-17 (with limited stops to keep the time of travel down to encourage use)
2. Need to refine how people will get to transit centers
3. Transit Centers at Leupp, Shonto, Kykotsmovi Village
4. Improve Passenger Rail Service between Williams and Grand Canyon.
5. High Speed Bus Service between Ash Fork and Flagstaff along I-40.
6. Improve US-191 between Chinle and Many Farms

Scenario C

Comments on Projects:

1. Passenger Rail along I-17 from Flagstaff to Phoenix
2. Passenger Rail from Flagstaff to Grand Canyon, along US-180, SR-64
3. Improve SR-64 from Williams to Valle.
4. Transit Centers at Jct SR-564/US-160, Leupp, Kykotsmovi Village, Shonto, Cameron.
5. Bus Service along proposed I-17 parallel between Seligman and Prescott Loop.
6. Bus Service along Chino Valley Extension between Prescott Valley and Chino Valley.

Prescott

Scenario A

Comments on Projects:

1. Check Location of the proposed new roadway (Fain Road Connector) between SR-169 and Fain Rd.
2. New Roadway to east connecting Payson from either SR-69 or SR-169 at I-17.
3. The proposed I-17 parallel roadway should follow the existing SR-169 alignment east of I-17 and then continue to north to SR-89
4. Frontage Road System along I-17
5. I-17 Bypass
6. New Roadway east of I-17 and south of the National Monument connecting I-17 and I-40.



Scenario B

Comments on Projects:

1. Bus Service between Prescott and Chino Valley along SR-89, along Simmons Highway between Proposed Prescott Loop and Iron Springs Rd.
2. Bus Service from Williams to Tusayan.
3. Passenger Rail Service from Williams to Grand Canyon.
4. High Capacity Transit Service from Flagstaff to Phoenix along I-17.

Scenario C

Comments on Projects:

1. Include Alternate Route to SR-260 between I-17 and SR-260 in Cottonwood Area same as the one in Scenario A.
2. Bus Service along Glassford Hill Extension from SR-89A to proposed Prescott Loop.
3. Side Road Extension from Side Rd. to Glassford Hill Rd. Extension (same as shown in Scenario A).
4. Great Western Blvd. Extension north of SR-89A to Glassford Hill Extension (same as shown in Scenario A).
5. Passenger Rail Loop connecting the proposed rail to the west of Prescott to travel through Prescott and Chino Valley (also Ernest A. Love Field Airport).
6. New Roadway from Jerome to Chino Valley Extension.
7. New Roadway from Jerome or Clarksdale to SR-89.
8. Extend Community Circulator Service to Dewey Humboldt, Southwest Prescott, Yavapai Ranch Area (NW of Chino Valley).

Holbrook

Projects for all Scenarios:

1. Improve Leupp Rd. from Townsend Winona Rd. to N-2.
2. Improve N-15 from N-2 to Burnside (SR-264)
3. Improve N-12 from I-40 to Window Rock (SR-264)

Scenario A

Comments on Projects:

1. Transit Center at Leupp (Jct. SR-99 /I-40)
2. Bus service from Flagstaff to Holbrook along I-40. Also a Bus Service from Holbrook to Globe/Tucson along SR-77

Scenario B

Comments on Projects:

1. Transit Center at Jct. SR-564/US-160.
2. Improve Turquoise Trail from US-160 to SR-264
3. Improve N-2 from Leupp to Kykotsmovi Village.
4. Extend bus service to Holbrook from Flagstaff along I-40.
5. Bus Service along SR-77 between Holbrook and Second Mesa.
6. Improve US-160 between US-191 and Jct US-160/US-64.
7. Improve US-191 between Chinle and Many Farms.
8. Bus Service from Holbrook to Globe/Tucson along SR-77
9. Bus Service from Holbrook to Phoenix along SR-377/SR-260/SR-87.



Scenario C

Comments on Projects:

1. Bus Service along I-40 from Winslow to N-12.
2. Bus Service along N-15 from Leupp to Burnside.
3. Bus Service along SR-77 from Holbrook to Second Mesa.
4. Bus Service along US-191 from I-40 to SR-264.
5. Bus Service along N-12 from I-40 to Window Rock to north of Window Rock.
6. Bus Service along Turquoise Trail from SR-264 to US-160.
7. Several Transit Centers along State and Indian Reservation roads along Bus routes.

Window Rock

General Comments:

- Need better coordination between agencies
- Recommend developing one scenario for the Navajo Nation
- People on Navajo Nation will continue to use their cars regardless of price

Projects for all Scenarios:

1. Improve Leupp Rd. from Townsend Winona Rd. to N-2.
2. Improve N-15 from N-2 to Burnside (SR-264)
3. Improve N-12 from I-40 to Window Rock (SR-264) for increased tourist access to the Tribal attractions in the area

Scenario A

Comments on Projects:

1. Improve N-12 from I-40 to Window Rock for tourism.

Scenario B

Comments on Projects:

1. Bus Service along Turquoise Trail from SR-264 to US-160.
2. Bus Service from Many Farms to Dennehotso.

Scenario C

Comments on Projects:

1. Improve N-15 from Leupp to Burnside.
2. Bus Service along N-15 from Leupp to Burnside.
3. Improve N-12 from I-40 to Window Rock and to north of Window Rock.



Western Arizona

Community Workshop Attendance		
Date	Location	Total Attendees*
11/17/08	Bullhead City, Mohave Community College	23
11/18/08	Lake Havasu City, Mohave Community College	23
11/19/08	Yuma, Pivot Point Conference Center	60
Total Attendance		106
*Attendance numbers from sign-in sheets.		

Common themes discussed in reaction to all of the scenarios reflected the difficulty envisioning a 2050 timeframe and the projected growth in their communities as well as a shift from rural to a more urban development. Many expressed a belief that residents moved to and remain in their communities because of the rural lifestyle as well as to escape an urban lifestyle. Most participants indicated a reluctance to replace use of a personal vehicle with transit for those living in rural communities. Several expressed the opinion that current density in their communities will not support transit development. Overall, education was a repeated theme for all scenarios – education about the potential changes in the communities, about impacts to the environment, and about creating a community acceptance of transit as a benefit for a better quality of life.

Scenario A – reaction to assumptions

- General recognition that current transportation congestion, lack of connectivity of local and regional routes, the need for increased capacity on existing routes, current community growth plans, and pressures from surrounding communities and the impact on regional and local transportation systems are already issues.
- Participants at each meeting referenced the need for educating the public on the importance of identifying acceptable alternatives to personal vehicle use that are cost effective, convenient, flexible and destination oriented.
- Most recognized that the current culture in their community will change with population increases and changes to the economy.
- Several were concerned with land use limitations and water supply limitations.
- At each meeting several people indicated that Scenario represented no change to the current status in their communities.

Scenario A – reaction to network improvements

- Most participants indicated a need for regional transit service to connect their communities.
- Many felt scenario A did not reflect leap frog development issues.
- The need to plan early for right of ways and corridors would be critical.
- The cost per person for infrastructure development would significantly increase.
- This scenario doesn't reflect changes in technology in transportation and the need to adapt (recharge stations, narrower roads, multi use paths for alternative vehicles).

Scenario B – reaction to assumptions

- General recognition that current transportation congestion, lack of connectivity of local and regional routes, the need for increased capacity on existing routes, current community growth plans, and pressures from surrounding communities and the impact on regional and local transportation systems are already issues.
- Participants at each meeting referenced the need for educating the public on the importance of identifying acceptable alternatives to personal vehicle use that are cost effective, convenient, flexible and destination oriented.
- The public would need to be educated that transit is not just for lower income users – negative connotations associated with riding a bus.



- Rural communities will still need to rely on personal vehicles.
- Recognition that transit travel time investment must be comparable to investment of time when using personal vehicle.
- Several were concerned with land use limitations and water supply limitations.
- This scenario was thought to be a good scenario for Senior Citizens, offering them more independence and cost effective transportation.
- Participants at all three meetings felt early planning and coordination between local and regional agencies, including tribal communities was essential for this scenario to be successful.
- It is important to reinstate services that have previously been cut back or eliminated (rail, buses).
- Finding a balance between growth, cultural history and quality of life to be feasible in this community.
- Arizona climate makes bike riding, walking or some electric vehicles a poor choice for transit.
- Passenger rail and freight rail would compete for land

Scenario B – reaction to network improvements

- Most participants indicated a need for regional transit service to connect their communities.
- Many felt scenario B did not reflect leap frog development issues.
- The need to plan early for right of ways and corridors would be critical.
- Light rail would be needed and would be used.
- Transit passes would need to be interchangeable between systems to make using transit simple and affordable.
- There needs to be a high speed (bullet train) option between smaller communities and destinations statewide and in California.
- Funding was considered an issue.
- Concern was expressed about the increase in traffic coming from Mexico.

Scenario C – reaction to assumptions

- Many participants expressed concern with housing costs, especially when building denser city centers.
- Education of the public about smart growth benefits would be essential for this scenario.
- Many considered living in a rural community a benefit and would not want to see their communities change to a more urban community.
- Mohave county participants felt they had access to enough land to "build out to the extreme."
- Scenario C will create logical development and encourage development control.
- It would be necessary to consider impact and development fees and make sure developers deliver what is promised.
- It is a great scenario for senior citizens.
- Smart growth would have to be legislated to be feasible.
- Historic and cultural land use would need to be preserved.
- Planning needs to begin now with communication between all agencies statewide.

Scenario C – reaction to network improvements

- Need to consider nearby states and Mexico when planning transportation.
- This scenario would provide cost savings, less investment in regional transportation and more for local transportation.
- Additional connectivity needed in communities and region.
- Rail use would need to consider community values and concerns when expanding and protect agricultural uses.
- More recreational trails need to be identified.
- Interstates need to be used for interstate travel, not a local connector.
- Need an air travel option.