

**STATEWIDE TRANSPORTATION PLANNING FRAMEWORK
JUNE POLICY COMMITTEE MEETING**

Thursday, June 18, 2009

John McNamara: I thought you were setting up the phone. Do we have anybody on the phone here?

Nope, okay. Well let's give it another minute or two and while we do that who, let's just see here. Jennifer do we have confirmation from other board members that were going to be available here?

Jennifer Toth: We did. Bobbie and Bob said they would be here.

John McNamara: Thanks.

Felipe Zubia: I got an email from Bill yesterday which said he was going to be here.

John McNamara: Okay, good so everybody said they were going to be here so we'll take their word for it, right.

Felipe Zubia: Well, let's don't bank on it.

John McNamara: We'll go ahead and get started. We're not going to hold everybody up but before I do, again this is a joint meeting of the - or joint study work session of the ADOT Transportation Board and the bqAZ Policy Committee.

So with that, if there is anybody that is a member of the bqAZ Policy Committee that's actually out in the gallery if you wouldn't mind coming up and sitting at the table. I don't think I see anybody sitting out there but just in case I thought I'd make sure. All right.

With that then we'll go ahead and start with the introductions starting with Mayor Loomis there on the far right.

Paul Loomis: I'm Paul Loomis, I'm the Mayor of the town of Oro Valley and I'm representing the PIMA Association of Governments.

Matt Ryan: I'm Matt Ryan, Coconino County Supervisor representing NACOG.

Paul Johnson: Paul Johnson, Yuma City Council Member representing YMPO.

Jeff Milbeck: Jeff Milbeck. I'm the General Manager for NAPTA in Northern Arizona Intergovernmental Public Transportation Authority but I'm also on the board of the Arizona Transit Association and Paul Miller who's President of the board asked me to represent him at this meeting.

Larry Voyles: I'm Larry Voyles, Director of Arizona Game and Fish Department.

Felipe Zubia: I'm Felipe Zubia, member of the State Transportation Board and Co-Chair of the bqAZ Policy Committee.

Delbert Householder: I'm Del Householder Chairman in the ADOT Board.

John McNamara: All right, well we'll go ahead and get started and as people join us either her physically or on the phone let's ask them to introduce themselves and continue on the meeting.

But if I could briefly just introduce the format here, as a joint work studies session of course the policy committee as well as any board members to feel free to participate, ask questions, whether it has to do with any of the proposed alternatives, or I guess we would call them scenarios.

And then I guess as we move forward if I can ask is (Jennifer) going to be giving this presentation or - okay, James Zumpf of ADOT. And we'll be giving the background as far as where we are to date and then start going through these scenarios. So with that, unless there are any questions from the committee or the board members, we'll go get started. Thank you James.

James Zumpf: Well I'd like to thank everybody for this opportunity to be in front of you today, board members and committee members. As the agenda does state, we've got basically an overview of the process. We want to give some history because there are some new faces at the table, some new faces in the audience. So we're going to give you a basic overview of how the process started, why we started the process and kind of give you a flow chart of where we are today.

That will work us into discussing the Vision and Guiding Principles. The last time the policy committee met we made some changes based on your recommendations to both the Vision and the Guiding Principles so we'll kind of go over that in general study. We'll work into some of the refinements that we made to the scenario. We've developed three scenarios and over the course of the study we have made some refinements with some input from the policy committee. Then we'll go into the overview of the Rail Framework Study as it's concurrent with this one that will eventually feed into the framework study when we're done, and then we'll discuss the next step. Next step is what we'll kind of need your input and guidance on helping us with the next steps and then we'll go over some next phase and locations.

Well give you some history, what is the bqAZ? Well back in 2007 we were approached by the MPO and COG Association and it was requested of ADOT to do a framework type of study to look at transportation needs over the entire state. This request was made based on some of the successes that have been seen that MAG had with the two framework studies that they did in

Hassayampa and Hidden Valley. So, at the request of the MPO and COG Association we decided to do a similar type of study statewide.

But this is kind of a unique study, kind of different from typical planning studies. One of the unique features is it looked out to 2050 horizon; typically a long range transportation plan that ADOT would conduct would only look out 20 years. But this one we're looking out to 2050 and that's kind of a unique way of looking at planning. So we're kind of not only looking to the future but we're looking to a vision of what our future needs would be,

It's also going to take into consideration and integrate technical analysis, heavy input from community issues and it's going to be a need based finding document when we finally get done.

The other thing that we thought we were going to need is heavy input from community partners, stakeholders, workshops to really encourage people to get engaged because it is a unique study across. Another interesting aspect that this study has is the looking at the relationship between land use and transportation. Those two are connected as we've seen in the past and we want to take a look at how can we integrate the two to explore more options for economic vitality and what we ultimately want to do is set up a vision to where we need transportation to take us into the future.

Now this slide kind of shows you kind of a timeline of what we've done and where we're going. In the beginning we kicked off the study you've got an environmental scanner and when you think about an environmental scanner we've looked at a lot of different environmental scans. Natural resources, wildlife linkages, water resources, a whole slew of different things we needed to take a look at. We looked at past and current findings. We decided to have these very engaging stakeholder and community input. We developed those two public outreach approaches and then, as part of the study, we started to develop the state's very first travel demand model and that's currently being

refined and in transit propensity analyses that will help us identify some of those future needs.

Now taking an approach like this on a statewide level is a pretty big endeavor if you think about how big our state is the amount of roads we have in the state. We needed to have a little bit more manageable than just going out and doing a statewide approach right away. What we did was break it down into four regions and I'll show you the regions later on in the PowerPoint and it was broken into four parts.

It was the Eastern portion of the state, along with Northern, Central and Western. What we did was as breaking those four parts of the state up it allows the teams to go out develop some frameworks for the region and allow the regions to kind of have some influence on their plan because every region has different priorities and so it allowed them to have a little bit more influence on the study.

Now developing the regional frameworks we had involvement with stakeholder interviews. Each region had a Regional Technical Advisory Committee made up of representatives from the county, city and town and were represented on the TAC and we engaged the community to get involved on the regional framework to tell us did we hit our marks as we start looking at needs for the region.

Each one of the four regions developed three scenarios. You can see the scenarios up here, you've got Scenario A, B and C and we developed those in the regions. Once those were developed we moved into combining all four regions into one statewide scenario for each scenario. I kind of put this right here, the preliminary statewide scenario.

And what that did, combining the four regions, it took a little massaging if you will as we sewed the regions together we were looking for continuity between

the regions and so we had to smooth out some edges. So that was our first attempt at developing three statewide scenarios.

Since then we have been refining the scenarios looking at additional special interest groups. We've met with economic development, tribal communities, natural resources, planning professionals, resource agencies, the development community and major freight users. We showed them the three scenarios and said "what are your thoughts"? You guys have a certain perspective that you're coming from and did we hit the mark? If we didn't, what are some of the issues that we need to make sure we keep on the radar when we're looking out into the 2050 planning horizon?

We also had the opportunity during this refinement stage to look at bordering states. So we met with New Mexico, we met with Colorado, California, Nevada and it gave us the opportunity during these meetings to show them the three scenarios to explain what Arizona is doing as far as transportation goes but a more interesting fact was we got to see what they were doing.

A real interesting project that we learned about was the Rail Runner in New Mexico. They actually have an intercity commuter rail in New Mexico and we got the opportunity to hear how it went from just an idea all the way to an operating system. So we learned some lessons in talking to our fellow states.

We also had the opportunity to meet with the Arizona-Mexico Commission and to find out what's going on south of the border. Some of their transportation expectations and improvements that are going on currently and to hear what they're doing in the deep ports of alignment. There's a lot of things going on with those ports that could have direct impact on the state of Arizona. So we kind of did big outreach not only internally in the state but externally outside the state.

So what that's doing now is we're still here. We're still working on these refinements of the scenarios and we're working on finalizing those scenarios. Once we get those three scenarios finalized then we're going to work towards developing a recommended scenario and that will kind of be the vision that we'll set up the State Long Range Plan.

That's kind of where you come in. We're really still at the point where we can still refine the scenarios with input from yourselves and we do want to go out on one last leg, if you will, of outreach. We want to engage our local elected officials. So we want to work once again with the MPO and COG and get them to help us engage the local elected officials and we're hoping to get this outreach with the elected officials done probably in July.

So that's kind of the timeline and kind of what we've done in the past and where we are today. So looking out to 2050 we had to take a look at the population projections. We basically we started with the base year 2005 and if you look at these numbers, in 2005 we had 6 billion people.

We looked at 2030. Where are we going to be at 2030? We're going to be at approximately 11 billion people. Where are we going to be at 2050? Approximately 14 billion. So that kind of gives you the order of magnitude just how many people are going to come into our state and by looking that far ahead and kind of developing that vision we can plan differently. We can be more proactive than reactive and that's what this study is going to help us do is be prepared for this type of population increase.

Man: James real quick, can I stop you? Where are the population projections? Are those developed in house or did you guys get that from a different source?

James Zumpf: We took those from the local input.

Man: Okay, and what about the projections into Mexico. Where did those come from?

John McNamara: They came from the bordering states transportation agencies or if they had a Department of Commerce or even a population czar. We used the best of their guidance.

James Zumpf: So with that kind of population projection you can kind of see this shows you kind of where the population is right now. The concentration of them and as we get to the 14 or 15 million mark you're going to kind of see where you're starting to see a corridor starting to develop in here and where the population is going to be. This right here is called the Sun Corridor and if you haven't heard that before, that's the Sun Corridor, it's kind of a megapolitan of where a lot of that population is going to ultimately reside in Arizona.

Now this is an interesting slide. We wanted to put that in there just to kind of give you some perspective on what that could do to our current transportation infrastructure.

If you look on the map on the left, the blue lines show our current highway system and it shows capacity, what that particular route can hold. What the red shows you is traffic flows in 2005. Now that's what we currently have. You can see where it starts to get kind of congested in Maricopa County, in Pima County coming up in here the Verde Valley, going up I-17, kind of I-10 has got some red lines developing. On the right it shows...

John McNamara: Did someone just join us on the phone?

David Wessel: Yes, this is David Wessel from Flagstaff. Sorry for joining late.

John McNamara: That's all right. Thank you David for joining us. Go ahead James.

James Zumpf: Okay. On the right shows what our infrastructure would be if we did no more improvements to our transportation. Just the improvements that we currently have with the program, what that population projection would do to our roads and what our current highway system is right now.

It would completely shut down pretty much a lot of the routes around the state. So that kind of gives you an order of magnitude on just what the population will do to our current infrastructure. Go ahead. Now like we said this is a process for the future. This is going to be a compilation of a lot of information and planning information.

When we finally get the framework completed we intend to incorporate the regional frameworks from MAG and PAG which is this area right here and this is the two frameworks that they're doing in MAG and PAG in Hassayampa.

In Hidden Valley, it's going to involve the MAG and PAG RTPs, which is the Regional Transportation Plan which is going to kind of fill in this part. PAG is - this part's going to kind of fill in the pieces of the puzzle if you will. The color areas here are the four regional studies that we have done that make up the statewide framework. You've got the Western, the Northern, the Eastern and Central. So you put all these pieces together and you start in developing the states framework.

It's also going to include the MAG Transit Framework along with the PAG High-Speed Rail Transit Study to put everything together and then as we complete the Statewide Rail Framework Study that's identifying rail opportunities to cross the state. It will be rolled into ultimately the one recommended framework for the state of Arizona.

So that's kind of a high level overview and we'll get into some more details as we get to the presentation. Does anybody have any questions on what you've seen so far?

John McNamara: Any questions? We'll go around the table if we have them but before we do that we have two other stragglers that joined us here in the room so we'd like for them to - yeah, you want to do a little tap? No? I want to bring attention while we had a nice big break here

Victor Flores: Sorry I'm late. Victor Flores..

Bob Montoya: Bob Montoya, but we have an excuse. We got behind a highway paint crew that was painting, so it took us an extra ten minutes. Sorry.

Felipe Zubia: What happened to your ADOT siren? You didn't turn that on.

Bob Montoya: Oh, they didn't give me one. Do you have one?

\

John McNamara: Go ahead Jim.

James Zumpf: Any questions on the first part of the presentation? Yes.

Man: My question would be it's kind of - I know it's kind of late and I'm sure you got in to some of these discussions between the other states and all but I was watching a presentation, I guess during Town Hall by Jim Sharlair. He was talking about the megapolitan area and connectivity about with that and I mean with the new discussions of high-speed rail, how much of that have you included in the discussions? You modified some as you go around and discovering the other states.

James Zumpf: Well as far as the rail piece goes those conversations aren't happening right now when we're doing the rail study.

Man: Okay.

James Zumpf: But we were getting into a little bit more detail on rail statewide.

Man: Okay.

James Zumpf: We'll get into that a little bit more later on in the conversation.

Man: Okay.

Man: Just to add on to that. Are you integrating with the other states, the rail opportunities? Are you talking, have you worked with them to see what their plans are with respect to rail?

James Zumpf: Yes we have. We've already talked to New Mexico and we still have California to talk to and Nevada. Yes.

John McNamara: Thank you James, go ahead.

James Zumpf: Okay. Well working at - kind of give us some direction on the whole process we developed a vision that's kind of where we're going and what we want to achieve. Then we've also worked on the guiding principles which were some of the principles that were set early on in this study and so what I'd like to do it turn it over to Peggy, one of my team members, and she'll kind of walk us through the Vision and Guiding Principles and kind of take us through that.

Peggy Fiandaca: Good afternoon. As many of you, not really all of you because I wasn't here - many of you have had a chance to take a look at the Vision and Guiding Principles. What we did was had a lot of public input as James was talking about in this process. It's really been a grass roots effort. From all of that input we began to identify some of the key concepts that really provide us some

guidance and direction when we look out to 2050 on where transportation, multimodal transportation should go in the State of Arizona.

We just worked with a lot of the stakeholders and a lot of the folks, perhaps the Vision and Guiding Principles and the policy committee has seen it last in April, provided some comments to the Vision and Guiding Principles and we've incorporated those. We've also had input from the other committees that we have which is the regional advisory team and the management team into this.

It's still in a draft form. We'd love to see your comments but what I thought I would do was highlight some of the key points of the Vision and Guiding Principles. The vision, the one that we heard over and over again throughout this whole process is how critical it is to have the integration of transportation options. A key component of the vision is this multimodal integrated transportation system statewide, as well as ensuring that we provide mobility choices for the traveling public and offering those mobility choices throughout the state. We also talked a lot with folks, which was important to ensure that they were taken into consideration when we do transportation planning and some natural resources that make Arizona unique. So you'll see that reflected in the vision statement and something that we should really look to when we're doing planning.

Another key component is that the technology is truly going to change over when we look out to 2030 or 2050. Technology will continue to evolve. So how we plan for transportation over that time has to recognize the changes in innovation and the changes in technology and so that's also embedded in this vision and an important part to take into consideration as well as fuel efficiencies.

What, if that occurs, what are you doing to address that in a plan? Then the other point that James made and we heard over and over again across the state

is how critical linking transportation and land use planning decisions are. That linkage between those really needs to come into play when we're looking long term at the state and how we're going to be planning for transportation. So all of that is embedded along with the more traditional things like public safety and efficiency of how we move people throughout the state.

John McNamara: Thank you. Real quick I did (break) - but did we have someone else join us on the phone? Okay, thank you Peggy.

Peggy Fiandaca: So the vision kind of provides a broad umbrella looking out very long term. Then we have a series of guiding principles that again begin to focus in a little bit more on some principles that we also need to take into consideration and there are five of these and I'll touch on each one.

The first one is improving mobility and accessibility. We heard that it's critical to connect activity centers around the state. When you're looking at economic development for the state, transportation plays a key role in enhancing economic development statewide. One way to do that is ensuring that we connect those activity centers and allow business, services and goods to be able to move efficiently so that we can link our state to not only the national marketplace but also the international marketplace.

Reducing traffic delays is critical for improving mobility. Traffic congestion, how do we mitigate that? Ensuring that all modes of transportation are considered, not only roadway but rail and how the modes are linked together. Ensuring that accessibility for all users are addressed when we think about planning and that we consider the cost benefits of analysis. All of these principles lead into improving the mobility and accessibility of the transportation system statewide.

The next topic is supporting economic growth and ensuring that we build transportation that not only we move people effectively and travelers but that

we're able to move goods and services in a seamless way around the state. Again this talks about the integrated system, the roads to rails to transportation and aviation and so that you have freight being able to move effectively statewide. We also talk in this one about non-motorized modes of transportation and how that is also connected very effectively.

John McNamara: Peggy you want to take a - we had a question from Matt here?

Peggy Fiandaca: Yes.

Matt Ryan: Actually I'm looking at what I had, what I pulled off the information that I had. There are new bullets in all these that we have in our package today versus what we just got off our email.

Peggy Fiandaca: Yes, the two do not match.

Matt Ryan: So could you highlight the new one as well?

Peggy Fiandaca: Well it caught me off guard too because the one I have in my hands is a little different also. Some of the new ones, I believe are the intermodal facilities and I'm not certain if that is one that you have.

Matt Ryan: I don't mean to mess up the presentation, that's okay.

Peggy Fiandaca: Right, but here...

Matt Ryan: There's one - if you had...

John McNamara: Actually, they're actually the same except the intros that are on the Web site that's been made into bullets.

Peggy Fiandaca: Oh, is that what it is.

John McNamara: Matt if you look at the first stop on the email.

Peggy Fiandaca: Very good. That's the difference between - so where I'm talking about the seamless transportation is the first stop point and talking about the integrated system that's a comment from the first paragraph. Then from the third dot point on should be the same as what you have in front of you.

Matt Ryan: Thank you.

Peggy Fiandaca: Thanks for pointing that out. I didn't catch that. So a couple other key points I wanted to focus on, on economic development is making sure that we plan for the particular high priority break corridors and the framework addresses that and as we move into the Long Range Transportation Plans that will also be very important.

But that's a key component that the guiding principles that we have here as well as ensuring that we're connected not only through the state but also intra-state and ensuring that we're able to get to our product on an international basis.

Okay, in terms of promoting a sustainable pattern of growth and ensuring that the link between land use and transportation is critical. The first two again are related to the paragraph that you have in front of you. It's critical that, that linkage is there because if you make decisions about land use, it's going to impact transportation and vice versa, ensuring that those activity centers and employment centers are well linked. People travel throughout the state for jobs and employment.

Physical development, encouraging the type of physical development that maximizes your infrastructure and best method is part of this principle using transportation infrastructure. So to support new areas that growth should occur

and guiding that kind of growth. Ensuring that there's coordination and collaboration and linkages between planning at the regional level, local level and statewide level are just some of the key aspects of this particular principle.

The environmental and natural resources, again we've heard a lot about the importance of that and how transportation has support or impact for natural resources and the environment. Critical to this is that we provide transportation options but also take into consideration the implications that have on the natural environment, that we're sensitive to that and create systems that are compatible, that we again - in our decision making about transportation that it's of - it's integrated into the decision making process.

So we look at contact steps of planning and how we plan roadways in collaboration with groups as well as making sure that they're place sensitive. We encourage development patterns that also work towards reducing greenhouse gas emissions as well as improving the air quality and so on.

The fact, as I talked earlier about, the technology and innovation is going to change overtime that we're constantly monitoring that and moving forward in our planning and that we're fostering energies independent through a broader range of transportation options.

The next one, the last one I believe, is ensure safety and security and this is a more traditional principle that transportation systems get into but we've expanded it even further because of Homeland Security. Our location here in Arizona, the importance that transportation plays in ensuring the security of not only Arizona but the security of the nation and so that needs to be taken into consideration with the border crossing and so on. But not only to make sure that we design, build, operate and maintain transportation as with our safety and security but that we're always looking to see how we can reduce the risks through the way we do our planning and development.

The last one, other point that I want to make, is that we address those high priority safety issues statewide. Again another traditional principle that we use when we're looking at transportation planning, because you've heard over and over again how important that is for us to continue to focus on that. So those are the Vision and Guiding Principles. I'll open it up to any comments or questions or thoughts that you might have related.

Man: Just for internal question is from a coordination standpoint, can you email out the updated version of that so that we can...

Peggy Fiandaca: Well you have the updated version. This is the correct version. What I think they did for the slides is to highlight, instead of having a paragraph and the dot point, we wanted to just make it graphically show on the slide. That's why you have more dot points.

John McNamara: The one you have in your package...

Peggy Fiandaca: Is the correct version.

John McNamara: I guess then I'll turn it over to the joint group here and pass it around for questions, comments. At least at this time you have the five kind of main overriding vision points if you and now is the time if you're going to give your input and any suggestions or revisions that you think might be appropriate for any one of those categories. With that I'll open it up for comments, suggestions or questions.

Peggy Fiandaca: Or did we miss something, miss anything?

Matt Ryan: I guess two that I'm looking for and I'm not sure is the discussion of fiscal sustainability or discussion of the maintenance sustained maintenance in here. I see, and maybe we're being global here and I'm thinking more specific and I just want to toss that out there but I'm not seeing anything that really speaks

well to that and that seems to be our glitch that we've been in for many years that we might suggest that in here.

Peggy Fiandaca: There are two and maybe we need to elaborate. On Page two if you look under Improved Mobility and Accessibility, the first one regarding high-speed was attempting to get to part of that, maintenance and ensuring efficient operation of management and facilities and effective use of technology and information and coordination. That one was attempting to get to that maintenance issue but maybe we need to elaborate. Then the last dot point under that first one, ensure that cost benefit considerations are included in transportation investment decisions. I don't know if that goes far enough for what you're suggesting or not.

John McNamara: If I can make a supplement to Mr. Ryan's comment, and a reminder that this document here is really not cost constrained, so we're not actually putting a dollar figure to this plan here. But I think Supervisor Ryan's comment is pertinent in that we need to at least try to establish a link between this plan and future funding opportunities.

Whether that's through federal funding sources or even to the extent that there's any future statewide vote proposed in the future that this plan provide a basis for that and I don't mean to kind of open a door that we don't want to go down.

But not specifically calling out any future transportation, dedicated transportation funding source but that there should be some reference in here that this should be the base that we start with, should any of that future funding source be considered in the future. Does that make any sense?

Peggy Fiandaca: And I think James is going to maybe talk a little bit later in the presentation on how this links between what we're doing where and how it links to the Long

Range Transportation Plan and transportation programming, the whole continuum so to speak of transportation planning.

Man: With regard to the link on land use, or the feds, if there's points of entry, is this like a foundation, hopefully, everybody would buy into this particular plan. Where do they come in and where does the collaboration occur? Is it housing for example with regard to land use? Where is the discussion, does it happen through the individual municipalities or the MPOs or...

John McNamara: I'll try to answer it given my understanding of it but maybe James can go into a little more detail. The collaboration has been happening throughout the process. The groups have been meeting with the COGs and MPOs throughout the state, as well as the district engineers, not only to look at transportation options but also to find out what existing land use plans are out there to ensure that it is being planned as part of this takes those into consideration.

So that's kind of a general response and I don't know if there is , but I mean it's all based on transportation and suggesting that some road is going to be built because there is a planned community. Is that in a nutshell?

James Zumpf: That's kind of the challenge, that's the kind of bridge we're trying fill the gap here is that the land use. All of these are developed by local municipalities where they develop future infrastructure and they're kind of operating on two different levels. That's what we're trying to do, start the dialogue of bridging that gap and where that dialogue might take us we don't know but at least we are starting to talk and having those conversations.

So now we've been more reactive. A developer comes in, then we build a road to accommodate that. Well if we knew that development was coming in before hand, is there a way that we can build before we're building in response. So that's one of the, that's what we're hoping that it will help is start.

Man: So it's to get to a more detailed question whether or not the local community has to follow this or a developer has to follow this and the answer is "no". It's not a binding document. Hopefully it provides a guide for the local land planners and transportation planners to use making their decision with their development.

Peggy Fiandaca: Well one of the things when James was saying that we did the environmental early on in the process, we did look at part of that data and that foundation that we built was looking at all of these options and general plans and comprehensive plans which are land use plans that all of the cities and towns and the regions had in place and that was input into this entire process.

John McNamara: Okay. John?

John: I think a related point that really comes into play here is the federal government and as recently as the day before yesterday issued new policy guidance on the integration of land use, housing and affordable housing, the EPA from an environmental perspective, and transportation.

In fact there's a federal, what I would almost term executive order, that directed the heads of HUD, EPA, and transportation to work together in the future to address exactly what is being raised here. As you can see from what James pointed out, that's been kind of built in to our philosophy since the beginning.

It was kind of nice to see that coming out of the federal government, and I have a strong feeling. We haven't even had a chance to discuss this much as a team in the last two days, that that ought to be almost a guiding foundation at the beginning of our final reports and documents to come out of this. Because clearly we are in sync with what's coming out of the administration and that's the way I think we're going to see funding.

Man: I guess to - this roadmap, whatever it results would be, was adopted by all of the stakeholders, then I mean, I guess it's statistic thinking to suggest that developers would have to develop along the road map. I mean that would be a nice thing if it could happen because it would be a land vs. development issue.

John McNamara: That's a good point though. You expect that this provides that guiding out and that more people can buy in then the better off we are and not only that, we intend to be a little hopefully, a little bit ahead of the game and in fact that's the model we need to start using. Any other questions on the vision part, anybody else here at the table?

Man: I don't know I'm usually the last one and here I'm worse. Maybe on that, improve mobility and accessibility. Include cost benefit consideration. I suggest putting in sustainability in transportation investment decision making.

Peggy Fiandaca: So inserting the sustainability issue or transportation decision making. Okay.

John McNamara: So before we move on, one last comment on board member floor's question. There is actually a bullet point under the vision part for promoting a sustainable development pattern, bullet point under what we have. Bullet point number four. I just want to go back to that real quick. It simply states that we'll work with local county and travel officials to plan for major developments and work collaboratively to minimize impact.

Man: Transportation infrastructure).

Peggy Fiandaca: Again trying to make that tighter linkage so that everyone is playing the same game, or playing with the same rules of the game. Basically statewide on where we're headed in terms of transportation planning.

John McNamara: Okay, with that Peggy you want to move on?

Peggy Fiandaca: James again, thank you.

John McNamara: Thanks Peggy. Those are good comments. So I'm going to step out here in about 15 minutes. I've got to jump on a conference call so feel free to continue without me but Delbert will take over or one of the other board members here. Okay I wasn't interrupting you James.

James Zumpf: Okay. Thanks. Okay so now you've got kind of where we started and what are some of our goals and some of our guiding principles and those types of things. Now you kind of get an idea of how the teams are thinking what we ultimately want to achieve. Now we're going to take you from the bigger picture down to a little bit smaller.

We developed three scenarios. Okay. We basically gave ourselves some guidance and what we want the scenarios to do for us such as efficient mobility, achieve sustainable urban development patterns, we've got some place that we'd like to work towards. Reduce greenhouse gas production, be energy independent, improve our overall quality of life. What this is going to ultimately do is it's going to help us meet some of the federal required regulations that we have to adhere to as we work into a long range plan which this is ultimately going to feed into.

Now with the three scenarios that you see that we're going to talk about there's some similar features that are included in each of the scenarios. So when you start thinking about on the roadway of all three scenarios we want to enhance the capacity on all the highways.

We're looking at an east-west high capacity bypass for I-17 and there's going to be a need for that when you look out to 2050. Increase capacity through the Sun Corridor through that megapolitan. There's going to need to be some more capacity there and possibly a bypass of I-10 through metro Phoenix area.

Those are some things that if you look out here they are similar as far as roadways go and there are transit similarities in the three scenarios also. They all contain and expanded intercity bus service for activity centers in the tribal community and enhanced capacity through the Sun corridor. So those are similarities that are going to go all the way across all three of the scenarios.

But the difference, that's the more important part, we really need to emphasize the differences because that's what these three scenarios are apart from each other. Scenario A is called Personal Mobility. Now we made some assumptions when we developed this scenario. This scenario is based on people still using their personal vehicles in 2050.

Now, if you think about that, what's that going to take for you to use your vehicle in 2050?

Well there's going to need to be improved miles per gallon vehicles, more fuel efficient vehicles. There's going to need to be alternative fuels, renewable fuels, that the consumer can afford that they can still afford to use their personal vehicles.

So what we're hoping on this assumption is that the technology picks up pace. It starts picking up and it starts developing higher miles per gallon vehicles and alternative fuels become available and become affordable. That way it would allow people to still be able to use their personal vehicle on day-to-day trips and to travel.

Another thing that Scenario A uses as an assumption is that transit investments remain the same as what they are. When there's a need in a community and they need that transit system, then they'll go pursue it because people still will be using their personal vehicles.

The other thing that this assumption says is that the policies that govern land use stay the same. Now with the administration talking about working with the different agencies within a state, that might change. When we develop this assumption, we're still going to say that the local municipalities are responsible for arranging plans and policies.

Okay Scenario B is called Transit Mobility Emphasis. Now this is kind of the opposite of A in some regards. The assumption now is that the fuel costs are escalating up to a point where it becomes cost prohibitive for people to use their vehicle as often as they would have. The assumption is also that vehicle technology is not advancing fast enough. So the miles per gallon vehicle that we anticipated coming out is that to facilitate the first scenario isn't happening.

There has to be some other viable modes of transportation available for people to get around. That's where you're going to see a bigger investment in transit for your day-to-day trips, for travel within a new community, outside of the community for employment, for education, for whatever you need. It also takes a look at a high-speed intercity rail system and that's something the administration right now is investing heavily on is rail. The emphasis on this one also leaves the land use policy and plan up to the local municipality.

Now working on Scenario C, this is called Focused Growth. What we have here is what's going on where the fuel efficiency starts to increase a little bit. We may find some renewable fuels, so people will still be using their cars. But you're going to see the need and the shift from using their vehicles to using more transit.

So you're going to have to see a little bit of both still going on. What you're going to see here, and there's policy implications on this one, is to say something needs to happen with land use policy. Something needs to change.

Basically what John just informed us came out two days ago. Those land use plans and policies may be shifting. In order for Scenario C to really work, those types of policies need to change so we can have more and more focused growth as of this work. You can have a more multimodal transportation options available to you.

Now earlier in the presentation I had to explain that we had gone through a number of refinements. A lot of those refinements came from various individuals; whether they be through our workshops or our common interest workshops, stakeholder interviews, through the different committees that we have or the Rapid Management Policy Committee. What we wanted to basically capture in these slides here is of show you what some of the refinements are that we've made over the course of the study.

What it shows you is that kind of a color coding to each of the refinements which match up here on the legends. These are all removables of specific routes or specific issues that we will identify. It shows you where we removed those from which scenarios, all right - A, B, or C.

Now the yellow shows you where we added additional routes and that shows you what scenario we added to. Nine through twelve shows you where we widened specific routes and where we made that change or that refinement.

Man: Real quick can you hold on and back up?

James Zumpf: You bet.

Man: On your showing on number five...

James Zumpf: Mm-hmm.

Man: Remove the rail along SR 95 under Scenario C...

James Zumpf: Mm-hmm.

Man: ...to Scenario B.

James Zumpf: Yeah, it's still on Scenario B, but it was removed from Scenario C.

Man: Okay.

James Zumpf: It was removed from here, but it was left on the more transient here. Are we okay?

Next slide please. We just continue to show you where the different refinements were and how we captured each refinement.

Going into the blue through 2024, spot improvement which could be safety improvements, passing lanes, different types of improvements along the routes. What that does is gives you an idea of these refinements that we've made. These have gone through quit a few renditions if you will. These are kind of like the most refinement we have and those are some of the changes that we've made over the time.

Now the gray ones are where we've added transit related refinements. So whether we extended something, added something, moved something around, it kind of shows you.

That kind of gives you a real high level of the scenarios and we'll have time later on to take a look at the actual on that. I realize that the information that I sent; those maps are really, really small and hard to read. I apologize for that but we have big ones for you to look at.

Felipe Zubia: Yes, Mayor Loomis.

Paul Loomis: Just a couple of questions. Going back to the first discussion on scenario planning summaries for all those scenarios, where you were talking transit and rail and expanded intercity bus service through activity centers and tribal communities. Is there a reason why you're specifying tribal communities versus all communities in that we're trying to interconnect to everybody?

John McNamara: Well we can make that change. What we've seen on a lot of these is we've had a lot of intercity bus interest on some of the tribal communities.

Paul Loomis: Right.

John McNamara: We are trying to connect everybody.

Paul Loomis: I think, you know, we as a target for the state are trying to talk to everybody rather than, you know, I would say cities, towns and tribal communities. If we need to be sure that we include that interconnection, because I think that we need to connect all the activity centers.

John McNamara: Okay. Well the information on that slide is just kind of for me to hit the high points.

Paul Loomis: Right.

John McNamara: So we are looking at all the communities when we talk about intercity bus service and transit.

Paul Loomis: The other question that I have is on your maps, on the scenarios. What are the arrows supposed to represent?

John McNamara: The gray arrows?

Paul Loomis: Yes, the gray arrows.

John McNamara: They are future potential rail corridors.

Paul Loomis: Okay.

John McNamara: That we've started to identify through our rail study.

All right, any other questions from around the table here? Yes, Mayor - Councilman.

Paul Johnson: In Scenario C - Focused Growth, it doesn't show the potential rail corridor that's shown in Scenario B. If you take a look over here on the fourth map the railroad is already there. It's been there since 1880. The tracks are there - the Union Pacific doesn't use it. They haven't used it in 10 or 15 years, but they've got the right-of-way, they've got the tracks, and it's a very gentle grade and an almost straight line all the way from Phoenix to Yuma to Los Angeles.

The grade going into Los Angeles is one-third of the grade - the statements of the grade as if you used another routes to get into Los Angeles, and it's there.

John McNamara: Well I think the arrow is just an oversight. It should have been going on here also.

Paul Johnson: I think that was referring to the passenger rail down to Southern California; is that what you're... Yeah.

John McNamara: Can I clarify?

Paul Johnson: Yes you may John.

John McNamara: Those arrows are indicative of potential high-speed rail corridors; high-speed passenger rail corridors. As Councilman Johnson pointed out, that is the Wellton Branch and used to have Amtrak as well as Union Pacific service on it.

This scenario, Scenario B, being the one that's most transit and rail oriented identifies that as the potential high-speed rail corridor. It doesn't get in to whether it could also be reopened for freight purposes. That's actually being studied as part of the rail framework effort. It was not included on this one - on this scenario because as James pointed out, Scenario C is a little more of a balance between A and B. There are a lot of pieces, parts and pieces of both of these that are in C. We are here to hear your comments on it, but we - it specifically not on there because we were not trying to illustrate that we possible needed two high-speed rail connections to California.

However, this whole subject of high-speed rail I'm going to get into it in just a minute. It is so lofty right now that that arrow could be 300 miles wide and it still achieves its purpose.

So I think it's a point well taken, that looks rather specific. Whether that connection from here in Phoenix all the way over to Los Angeles over here somewhere actually occurred that way or this way is probably not critical. We need to make that point as we talk through the scenarios.

Paul Johnson: I could see it going on either corridor. I mean granted there's the population probably more dense than California - I mean in Los Angeles, but anecdotally, you know, you hear everybody going to San Diego all the time.

John McNamara: Right.

Paul Johnson: So I guess that would fare out when you start to get more details as far as potential passenger count and so forth.

John McNamara: Exactly. And actually there's even a third way.

Man: We won't go there yet.

Felipe Zubia: All right, is that all?

Paul Loomis: My concern was that if you go the way you're showing the arrow on Scenario C, going parallel, there is no railroad there.

John McNamara: Right.

Paul Loomis: You'd have to be building an entire railroad from scratch. Whether it's a freight railroad or it's a passenger or its high-speed, you'd have to be building it from scratch. Whereas that southern one exists and it can be put into service tomorrow as passenger rail or freight rail and it would just have to be upgraded to go to high-speed.

John McNamara: Right.

Paul Loomis: Why build 300 miles of railroad?

John McNamara: Those are some of the things we're looking at in the Rail Study is what would it take to do that. So those are some of the things we'll identify through the Rail Study.

Man: Just to at least put that issue to rest if we could, is there a way John to widen that just to show...

John McNamara: Sure.

Man: ...you know, I mean, that way there is no provision to give the Rail Study - understand it will be refined.

John McNamara: Yep. James go ahead.

James Zumpf: Yeah. Do you have a question Mayor?

Paul Loomis: Yeah, I do. Actually it's kind of pushing the envelope a little bit further which goes to my earlier question. When you start looking at the western megalopolis', and interconnectivity then you have the front range corridor that is now being connected down to Albuquerque in New Mexico begging the discussion of the link between that and the L.A. or Phoenix/Las Vegas one. We're drawing general concepts there and it's one that, you know, I might suggest that you look at or think about in that way.

James Zumpf: Okay.

Man: If I could make one further comment, you drop the new built from scratch railroad from Yuma to Las Vegas for Scenario C, but you left it in Scenario B.

U.S. 95 from Yuma to Quartzsite, there's nothing there. You would have to be acquiring right-of-way through a military artillery range or a national wildlife refuge. There is no traffic on that highway is only about 4,000 cars a day and it's not even an all-weather highway. There's 60 low-water crossings between Yuma and Quartzsite and I know exactly where the suggestion came from. Two people showed up at a public hearing in Yuma. One of them was the President of the Audubon Society and I can't see how you could ever justify the expense of building a 200 or 300 mile railroad to serve how many people - and you've only got 4,000 cars a day on it today?

James Zumpf: Right and you're probably right. That's probably where the input came from, a public meeting. As we further refine the scenarios that might be something that doesn't make it into the rest. That could very possibly drop out.

Paul Loomis: Part of my concern on it is that's not - the road is a problem for your wildlife crossing from the Kofa Wildlife area across the Yuma proving grounds to the river for water. You have a constant flow back and forth of deer, big horn sheep, and wild horses and we periodically run into those wild horses on I-95. You put a rail line there it's just going to make it that much worse. It's just that much more of a barrier to wildlife.

John McNamara: Okay, so next on the agenda is going to be the Rail Framework Study, and I don't want to cut this discussion short, but I am going to go take a conference real quick. Before I do, I want to remind the Board though that we're going to see this again and it will come back to us for final review and approval. Before we do that, again the reason for having the joint work study session was to give the Board the opportunity to give input so that we don't see it at the last minute and be surprised with anything that's been there.

To the extent that you guys have any comments or recommended suggestions statewide or within your specific districts, now would be the time for us to suggest. Are there any other questions going around the table here on the alternative scenarios? No? All right well we're going to move on to the Rail Framework.

James, go ahead.

James Zumpf: I'm basically going to turn it over to John and he can continue on some of the overview on some of the Rail Framework stuff that we've accomplished today.

John McNamara: Thank you James. And hopefully I'll elaborate further on a lot of the points that have already been raised. As you remember from that flowchart that James started with, there was just a little box coming in from down below called the strategic rail vision. This is a little more detail as to how we're getting to this rail vision.

The rail framework was added in December of 2008 so it didn't start in December of 2007 like the regional scenarios did that all then fed into the three statewide scenarios that have been refined that you just reviewed. This is a little bit later starting. It was intended to build on work ADOT had already done relative to the Tucson-Phoenix Intercity High-Speed Rail Study that had been done by ADOT, and also to build on work that was going on in both the PAG region as well as in the MAG region. In the MAG region there's a high capacity transit center that's almost complete now that talks a bit about commuter rail along with all the other forms of high speed transit. Then also in the MAG region there has been specific efforts going on for the last 18 months on commuter rail. The intent here was to try to begin to fold all of that together on a statewide basis.

Quite frankly to have ourselves positioned if as we saw last fall, direction out of the federal government moving in terms of the ability to tap resources for all kinds of reasons - sustainability, immobility, and land use reasons. If they were moving in the direction of rail, we would have ourselves positioned for that. This effort has been moving very much full steam because it has some catch-up to do to get caught up to these others. It's not quite there yet, but we're almost there.

It started out with a similar kind of effort and actually could utilize a lot of the work that came out of the statewide frameworks, particularly the environmental scan work that Jim talked about that included all the land use policies from around the state, all the environmental work. The Arizona Game

and Fish staff have been tremendously helpful to us, as have many of the resource agencies and environmental groups.

All that past planning was folded in. We've had a series of regional focus groups, north, south, and central dealing specifically with rail. Community input ever since this effort started, we've built a rail piece into every community meeting or community outreach effort we've had going on so that we were not talking about rail in a vacuum by itself with just rail stakeholders.

We've also done work on passenger and travel demand and freight demand forecasting relative to Arizona, but it has to look broader than Arizona because we're impacted by what's going on, particularly in the Pacific broom and coming in in terms of containers and so forth.

This effort went through first three months initial identification phase. You can see there are five key areas of issues that were identified, policy, operations, systems planning, product implementation, and sustainability. Under each of those is a tremendous amount of detail and an entire document that flushes out a whole series of detailed issues.

That document was prepared in draft form and was taken out and discussed further with all of the rail focus groups, those three I just mentioned, and then that helped refine that issue document.

We're now into the rail concept development. Initially we were thinking that we were going to go through an alternative analysis concept, not dissimilar to what was going on here in terms of these scenarios with the Roadway Transit Centers. The more we got into it the more we realized that Arizona is such, in a very, very early stage of rail – thinking about rail statewide. We really needed to develop some strategic concepts and strategies which is the high-speed effort.

The Western High-Speed Rail Alliance is literally less than two months old that's beginning to pull together these front range states of Colorado, New Mexico, Arizona, Utah, and Nevada and say to the feds, we're not even on the high-speed rail map and we need to get on that map and we need to think about connectivity both east as well as west. We're going to plug in to California; it's probably a little easier than the east right now.

So as a result the states are beginning to talk about, along with COGs and MPOs, in those states, of working together. In fact the first strategic concept that's under development here in the passenger rail area. There's going to be about 15 to 20 strategic concepts developed here that are going to address passenger, commuter and passenger being longer and intercity passenger as well as interstate passenger.

As I said, we're working on 15 to 20 different strategic concepts. We'll be bringing those back to you and explaining those and explaining the path each of those could take as we move forward.

In fact, just using the high-speed as our example, we are not really too worried at this point, as you can probably tell from my earlier comments, where this arrow is as long as it's pointed west, because it really should be illustrating the opportunity to connect into the California high-speed rail network that was approved by voters last November. Whether it follows this course or whether it follows this course or whether it follows the course up here doesn't really matter at this point. That will be debated later on in a very specific corridor study for the ton of environmental work.

Our process here is to talk about that concept and that connectivity concept, and what benefit it would have to the State of Arizona and why we should be participating in that Western High-Speed Rail Alliance in positioning ourselves for the resources that Senator Reed is trying to position in the Senate for this group of western states.

Our intent is to finish these concepts in draft within the next 60 days, actually a little bit less than the next 60 days, and be rolling those out for public discussion, including yourselves. We'll be refining those early in the fall so that this gets fully integrated into the overall Statewide Framework recommendation for the state and it becomes part and parcel of that effort.

Just to give you a couple of highlights of some other things that are embedded in here, well actually why don't we go on through the slides. I think we'll get to them, they're actually coming up. The Statewide Rail Framework really has four or five real high level goals to relate responsible economic growth in the state, obviously by utilizing rail. Maximize the use of existing rail infrastructure. We've already heard that today, that there is rail out there, some of which is either abandoned or not being used at this point in time. There's a number of short lines. We've been working with the short lines; just about six or eight short lines in the state. They have opportunities for expanding their services that would benefit economic development.

We obviously need to figure out how rail can compliment transit and roadway improvements that we've talked about already today. It certainly can address issues that are more globally oriented in terms of economic development, climate change, environment, and the energy issues. We've met with both Class 1 Railroads like Burlington Northern Santa Fe and Union Pacific a couple of times, and believe me that whole issue of climate change and energy issues is on their radar screens, and in fact, embedded in one of their strategic plans.

Then we have to figure out how to partner with the railroads, they are private companies, to encourage them to do the kinds of things that we think are important from a public purpose. They also keep us a business benefit from there and so that's a pretty unique balance too. We've got to achieve it and we put it on that path.

That map by the way is this map here, and please, this map is a very early map that just shows a number of ideas in terms of high-speed connections to Las Vegas and California.

The whole intercity corridor for the megapolitans - full Sun Corridor megapolitan that James was talking about and commuter rail intensification in the two metropolitan areas as well as Amtrak services and some enhancements to Amtrak services as well. The little green lines are all the short lines around the state.

Supervisor Ryan brought up the whole thing that Jim Charlere had talked about at a couple of recent conferences and that actually was being discussed elsewhere and that is should there even be a connection to the Front Range and the Front Range being New Mexico and Colorado. As James pointed out, we've been working with the Rail Runner folks in Albuquerque and they've done dramatic things in five years from an idea of Governor Richardson's, operating commuter and intercity rail in five years. It's amazing what they've done.

Could that be a started to connect all the way to Denver and could that somehow connect into this megapolitan which would link this large megapolitan area with the megapolitan that stretches - the Front Range megapolitan that stretches from Albuquerque to Denver and includes all those other cities like Boulder and Colorado Springs, and so forth?

Remember megapolitans, there's eleven of them in the united States and they're though to be the places where 75 percent of the growth is going to occur over the next 40 to 50 years. There are some pretty good arguments for connecting them up from an economics perspective.

As I pointed out those are the six categories of strategic concepts development. There's going to be, like I said, between 15 and 20 of those and the reasons I'm not telling you a specific number because there is a couple, particularly in the organizational area that may make a lot of sense to piggyback into one.

That is a Rail Runner by the way on the top photograph that is running into Mexico.

We thought we'd also touch on the International Border considerations while we're here. This is rail related but it's also roadway transit related as well.

As James pointed out earlier we have been in some pretty intense discussions with our bordering states as well as our bordering state of Sonora to the south and the FTP, which is the Federal Transportation Agency in Mexico. Discussing everything from border project improvement, which are illustrated here on this graphic, to rail improvements across the border into economic development projects in Mexico that if they proceed -- and of course they're all on hold because of the economy just like major projects in the U.S. are.

If those proceed, Arizona may have some significant opportunity because currently we are generally considered as a pass-through state by the railroads. We've got all that Union Pacific traffic on the Sunset Corridor and we've got similar traffic of 100 trains a day plus on the Burlington Northern Santa Fe trans corridor through Flagstaff.

Most of that traffic just leaves like it enters on the other side of the state; over a matter of hours. If there are major improvements to the Port of Guaymas, possibly even the Port of Mazatlan and the whole new port of Punta Colonet that has been proposed on the Pacific Coast of Baja, California. We may be in a situation where we aren't just the pass-through state anymore. We're a junction state where major container traffic is coming from those Mexican

ports to junctions with the Class 1 Railroads in Arizona either north or south or both; maybe new corridors connecting to those ports. As a result, we have opportunities for inland ports and other types of trade zones that really could begin to garner true economic benefit to the state over and above what we have today.

So we're working on that and they'll be a couple of different strategic concepts in this area involving two new rail studies. All the border improvements are going to be better in the roadway transit. James?

Felipe Zubia: Anybody got any questions? Anybody has got any comments? Go ahead.

James Zumpf: In looking at Scenario A and B, and I recognize there's a lot to the scenarios and getting them down to four or five bullets, you'll lose something.

However as I look at this it looks like of the driving forces comes to for example Scenario A. If we could get clean cheap fuel then we keep doing land use and transportation and using public transportation the way we are because the main issue is fuel and the cost of it.

If you go to Scenario B it assumes that we don't have clean fuel and therefore we have to go to transit. I guess the question I'm raising with this is what other things have you considered that, are you for changes in land use and changes in the way people get from point A to point B, other than the cost and the environmental impact of fuel than dependence on foreign oil and, you know, national security issues.

Just like trying to boil down the details of a scenario to ten bullet points, we actually boiled down a number of scenarios to three and in that process probably lost a few things in that process as well.

I think there are lots of other reasons as I think you're suggesting, to enhance transit other than just fuel and environmental impacts. I think as we work our way to a recommended scenario, knowing full well that ADOT does not have land use authority, it's really a local kind of thing. As far as I can tell that's going to stay that way for probably quite a while.

If we - let's just say our recommended scenario begins to approach like C, there seems to be a whole lot of interest from major stakeholders throughout the state. Whether they're an environmental developer or municipalities that there are a lot of advantages to see, but we don't necessarily have the ability, of course, for that.

There's a lot of land use decision making within C that I think we strongly endorse relative to smart growth that can also drive us in a good way towards a much better multimodal system, including enhanced transit.

I think it's not just fuel and the environment. If we can move to a more responsible land use way to do things; more infield development mix-use and so forth. Part and parcel of that is a walkable community, it's a bikeable community, and it's a community that has a really good transit system at a number of levels, let alone connecting activity centers on a region or a state basis.

Man: We structure economic development. I mean there were a lot of things going.

James Zumpf: Yeah.

Man: And you're right, it's just trying to capture it on a couple of bullets really doesn't do it justice.

James Zumpf: Anything else? Thank you.

Paul Loomis: I think one of the things that's going to drive that as well is going to be the age issue. As we all get older the opportunities for mass transit are going to be significant.

We're running into that problem down in our area where we're looking at additional alternatives for senior transportation systems. I think the fuel prices are a major driver, but I think that we're going to see a need to move a large population that's not able to drive.

James Zumpf: That's a good point.

Man: Along those lines, two local stakeholders in this whole process have been AARP for all the reasons that you said Mayor Loomis, as well as Local Initiative Support Corporation of Phoenix, kind of an intercity revitalization organization for housing non-profits that also sees connections.

Felipe Zubia: James, are you going to go on with the next steps?

James Zumpf: Yeah, I'm going to go on with the next steps and where we go from here. Along the next steps is a continuation of the refinements. Some of the comments that were made today are going to be very useful. And what we want to do is take what you've seen today, the refined scenarios, the different scenarios, what's driving centers, and take it out to the selected officials across the state. We're going to look back at the MPO and cause and ask for their help and their assistance to take the plan out and get their local elected officials to chime in and provide their input. We really want to get buy-in from across the state. That's kind of our next step.

Like Felipe said, this isn't the last time that this is going to be seen. We're going to go out, get their input through the rule of consultation, and make some additional refinements and refined the scenarios one more time.

Then as we get those refinements boiled down we will start working towards a recommended statewide scenario. It will be one recommended scenario that will probably encompass quite a bit of features from each one, depending on the region and the kind of input that we get from the elected official. That's going to be their opportunity to say what's important to their region. Do they have an aging population that is going to need more transit in that area? That's going to be their opportunity to kind of give us an understanding of what's important to them as we get towards that refined scenario.

The bigger thing is we get to that point of the refined scenario and you have one. We also want to feed into our state Long Range Transportation Plan because that's our statewide long range cost-constraint transportation plan. This is going to be kind of the guiding tool that's going to feed into our long range plan. Those are kind of the next steps that we have for this study.

Paul Loomis: One of the things that just popped into mind and it's a very commercial which is the lead of cities and towns that are having their conference the beginning of September which seems to be tied into your timeline. Last year or the year before I think you did some presentations and I know the COGs are having a meeting there and it may be, are you talking to anybody at the League to get set up and do presentations or have displays and anything of that sort?

James Zumpf: That was mentioned when we started talking about the complications. So I'm not sure where that dialogue is, whether we're actually got a booth there or not, but we have been talking with them as a venue to take this to them.

Paul Loomis: Okay.

James Zumpf: So I'll follow up with that.

Paul Loomis: The Rural Conference is at the Wigwam Litchfield Park the last week in August. Then the League Conference is in Oro Valley at the first week of September.

James Zumpf: Okay.

Paul Loomis: Those are two opportunities to get together with a lot of elected officials.

James Zumpf: Absolutely. We definitely want to capitalize on that.

Man: I would just really commend you and ADOT and people involved for looking out 2050 and being proactive in that regard. It's very easy to be looking at five years down the road. I think we're pretty good at planning and I generally just look five years.

But yeah, because we're going to do things like these rail networks and really have an influence on the future, I think you're on the right track so thank you for the work.

Felipe Zubia: Any other comments? Go ahead.

Matt Ryan: Actually I guess one of the - where did air go?

Woman: Aviation?

Matt Ryan: Yeah, did we forget? Why are we not talking much on aviation?

James Zumpf: Well we initially started just with surface transportation.

Matt Ryan: Okay.

James Zumpf: We touched on it a little bit and then said - and then we drifted it...

Matt Ryan: Okay, right. I don't remember things. Sorry guys.

Woman: And you saw it in the goals and principles, the importance of connecting the two issues.

Matt Ryan: Yeah.

James Zumpf: Well here's the next dates and locations for the next Policy Committee meeting, the July 15 through the November 16 back at HRDC. Also the information that I sent out with the invitation to this meeting, if you go back and have some questions or comments after this meeting that you may have thought of later, please feel free to mark the document up and email it back to me or send me an email if you've got some additional comments that you want to make sure that the team considers.

Paul Loomis: Could you show us the dates again? Thank you.

John McNamara: All right, well I just came back and then Delbert ends the meeting so I guess I should go out more often.

Delbert Householder: I guess with that, James thank you. It was a great presentation, I appreciate it and I think that James is very much available if anybody does have any questions or comments afterwards.

So with that we'll go ahead and adjourn.

Man: Thank you.

END