



6 E Aspen Avenue, Suite 200
Flagstaff, AZ 86001
928-266-1293
www.metroplanflg.org

Agenda

MetroPlan Technical Advisory Committee Meeting

1:30 pm to 3:30 pm

August 25, 2021

Join Zoom Meeting: <https://us02web.zoom.us/j/74739184308>

Meeting ID: 747 3918 4308

Dial-in: +1 408 638 0968 US

Regular meetings and work sessions are open to the public. Persons with a disability may request a reasonable accommodation by contacting the MetroPlan Office at 928-266-1293. MetroPlan complies with Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 to involve and assist underrepresented and underserved populations (age, gender, color, income status, race, national origin and LEP – Limited English Proficiency.) Requests should be made by contacting MetroPlan at 928-266-1293 as early as possible to allow time to arrange the accommodation.

Public Questions and Comments must be emailed to rosie.wear@metroplanflg.org prior to the meeting.

TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE MEMBERS

- ☐ Nick Hall, Coconino County Assistant Engineer, Chair
- ☐ Jason James, ADOT Transportation Planner, Vice-Chair
- ☐ Anne Dunno, NAIPTA Capital Program Manager
- ☐ Rick Barrett, City of Flagstaff Engineer
- ☐ Nate Reisner, ADOT North Central District Development Engineer
- ☐ Jess McNeely, Coconino County Community Development Assistant Director
- ☐ Dan Folke, City of Flagstaff Community Development Director
- ☐ Jeff Bauman, City of Flagstaff Transportation Manager
- ☐ Andrew Iacona, Northern Arizona University
- ☐ Ed Stillings, FHWA

METROPLAN STAFF

- ☐ Jeff Meilbeck, Executive Director
- ☐ David Wessel, Planning Manager
- ☐ Rosie Wear, Business Manager

I. PRELIMINARY GENERAL BUSINESS

A. CALL TO ORDER

B. ROLL CALL

C. PUBLIC COMMENT

(At this time, any member of the public may address the Committee on any subject within their jurisdiction that is not scheduled before the Committee on that day. Due to Open Meeting Laws, the Committee cannot discuss or act on items presented during this portion of the agenda. To address the Committee on an item that is on the agenda, please wait for the Chair to call for Public Comment at the time the item is heard.)

D. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

- [Minutes of Regular Meeting: May 26, 2020](#) (Pages 5-10)

II. CONSENT AGENDA

(Items on the consent agenda are routine in nature and/or have already been budgeted or discussed by the Technical Advisory Committee.)

III. GENERAL BUSINESS

- A. [Project Priorities Matrix](#) (Pages 11-15)

MetroPlan Staff: Dave Wessel

Recommendation: Staff recommends that the TAC adopt project priorities for MetroPlan and recommend adoption to the Board.

- B. [RTAC Funding Project Priorities](#) (Pages 16-19)

MetroPlan Staff: Jeff Meilbeck

Recommendation: Staff recommends the TAC approve a project to pursue \$2.6M of State funding through the Rural Transportation Advocacy Council (RTAC) Statewide initiative.

- C. [Mini-Grant](#) (Pages 20-24)

MetroPlan Staff: Jeff Meilbeck

Recommendation: Staff recommends that the TAC consider and adopt criteria for a competitive MetroPlan mini-grant to member agencies of \$210,000.

D. [West Route 66 Planning Process](#) (Pages 25-27)

MetroPlan Staff: Dave Wessel

Recommendation: Staff recommend the TAC supports launching the West Route 66 Planning effort at a cost of \$100,000.

E. [Issue Resolution Process](#) (Pages 28-31)

MetroPlan Staff: Jeff Meilbeck

Recommendation: Staff recommends TAC members have an open discussion related to MetroPlan's role in the resolution of issues between MetroPlan member agencies.

F. [Regional Transportation Plan Update](#) (Pages 32)

MetroPlan Staff: Jeff Meilbeck

Recommendation: Staff will provide an update on the Regional Transportation Plan.

G. [Northern Arizona Healthcare Hospital Relocation](#) (Pages 33-34)

MetroPlan Staff: Dave Wessel

Recommendation: None. This item is for discussion only.

H. [Executive Board Agenda Review](#) (Pages 35-38)

MetroPlan Staff: Jeff Meilbeck

Recommendation: None. This item is for discussion only.

I. [Current Items from the Executive Director](#) (Pages 39-40)

MetroPlan Staff: Jeff Meilbeck, Executive Director

1. FY2022 Rebuilding American Infrastructure with Sustainability and Equity (RAISE) grant application

2. Advanced Transportation and Congestion Management Technology Deployment (ATCMTD) grant application
3. Intelligent Transportation System (ITS) Strategy
4. Milton Corridor
5. Historic Funding Levels

J. Future Agenda Items

MetroPlan Staff: Jeff Meilbeck, Executive Director

Recommendation: Discuss items for future MetroPlan agendas.

IV. CLOSING BUSINESS

A. ITEMS FROM THE COMMITTEE

(Technical Advisory Committee members may make general announcements, raise items of concern or report on current topics of interest to the Committee. Items are not on the agenda, so discussion is limited and action not allowed.)

B. NEXT SCHEDULED TAC MEETING

6. September 22nd, 2021 at 1:30 pm - Zoom

C. ADJOURN

The Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) includes Northern Arizona Intergovernmental Public Transportation Authority final program of projects for Sections 5307 and 5339 funding under the Federal Transit Administration, unless amended. Public notice for the TIP also satisfies FTA public notice requirements for the final program of projects.

CERTIFICATION OF POSTING OF NOTICE

The undersigned hereby certifies that a copy of the foregoing notice was duly posted at www.metroplanflg.org on August 23, 2021 at 2:00 pm in accordance with this statement.

Dated this 23rd Day of August 2021.

Rosie Wear Business Manager



6 E Aspen Avenue, Suite 200
Flagstaff, AZ 86001
928-266-1293
www.metroplanflg.org

Minutes

MetroPlan Technical Advisory Committee Meeting

1:30 pm to 3:30 pm

May 26, 2021

Join Zoom Meeting: <https://us02web.zoom.us/j/74739184308>

Meeting ID: 747 3918 4308

Dial-in: +1 408 638 0968 US

Regular meetings and work sessions are open to the public. Persons with a disability may request a reasonable accommodation by contacting the MetroPlan Office at 928-266-1293. MetroPlan complies with Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 to involve and assist underrepresented and underserved populations (age, gender, color, income status, race, national origin and LEP – Limited English Proficiency.) Requests should be made by contacting MetroPlan at 928-266-1293 as early as possible to allow time to arrange the accommodation.

Public Questions and Comments must be emailed to rosie.wear@metroplanflg.org prior to the meeting.

TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE MEMBERS

- ☒ Nick Hall, Coconino County Assistant Engineer, Chair
- ☒ Jason James, ADOT Transportation Planner, Vice-Chair
- ☒ Anne Dunno, NAIPTA Capital Program Manager
- ☐ Rick Barrett, City of Flagstaff Engineer (*Excused*)
- ☒ Nate Reisner, ADOT North Central District Development Engineer (*Arrived at 1:44 pm*)
- ☒ Jess McNeely, Coconino County Community Development Assistant Director
- ☒ Dan Folke, City of Flagstaff Community Development Director (*Arrived at 1:38 pm*)
- ☒ Jeff Bauman, City of Flagstaff Transportation Manager
- ☒ Greg Mace, Northern Arizona University
- ☒ Ed Stillings, FHWA (non-voting)

METROPLAN STAFF

- ☒ Jeff Meilbeck, Executive Director
- ☒ David Wessel, Planning Manager
- ☒ Rosie Wear, Business Manager

OTHERS IN ATTENDANCE: Bret Petersen

I. PRELIMINARY GENERAL BUSINESS

A. CALL TO ORDER

Chair Nick Hall called the meeting to order at 1:31 pm.

B. ROLL CALL – See above.

C. PUBLIC COMMENT – None.

(At this time, any member of the public may address the Committee on any subject within their jurisdiction that is not scheduled before the Committee on that day. Due to Open Meeting Laws, the Committee cannot discuss or act on items presented during this portion of the agenda. To address the Committee on an item that is on the agenda, please wait for the Chair to call for Public Comment at the time the item is heard.)

D. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

- Minutes of Regular Meeting: April 26, 2020

Motion: TAC member Anne Dunno made a motion to approve the April 26, 2021 meeting minutes. TAC member Jason James seconded the motion. The motion was passed unanimously. 6-0-0

II. CONSENT AGENDA

(Items on the consent agenda are routine in nature and/or have already been budgeted or discussed by the Technical Advisory Committee.)

III. GENERAL BUSINESS

A. FY2022 Budget Discussion

(Pages 11-20)

MetroPlan Staff: Jeff Meilbeck

Recommendation: None. This item is for information and discussion only.

Discussion: Committee was generally supportive of the new position. The planner should live in Flagstaff.

B. Project Priorities Matrix Update

(Pages 21-28)

MetroPlan Staff: Dave Wessel

Recommendation: Staff recommend the TAC review and reaffirm the Project Prioritization Matrix for MetroPlan.

Direction: Chair Hall requested a 3-step process: 1) Ask member agencies to provide a list of their priority project, 2) Put the list out to all the organizations, and 3) Ask the organizations for feedback. MetroPlan will then synthesize the projects and come back with our recommendations.

C. Title VI Plan and Accomplishments Report

(Pages 29-37)

MetroPlan Staff: Rosie Wear

Recommendation: Staff recommends the TAC endorse adoption of the FY2022 Title VI Plan.

Motion: TAC member Anne Dunno made a motion to endorse adoption of the FY2022 Title VI Plan. TAC member Jason James seconded the motion. The motion was passed unanimously. 6-0-0

D. ITS Strategy and Grant

(Pages 38-41)

MetroPlan Staff: David Wessel

Recommendation: Staff recommends TAC support pursuing a federal technology deployment grant for Advanced Traffic Management Systems based on the ITS Strategy interim findings

Motion: TAC member Greg Mace made a motion to support pursuit of a federal technology deployment grant for Advanced Traffic Management Systems, and to decide between a partnership project or a city-centric project by June 25, 2021. TAC member Dan Folke seconded the motion. The motion was passed unanimously. 6-0-0

E. RAISE Grant

(Pages 42-47)

MetroPlan Staff: Jeff Meilbeck

Recommendation: Staff recommends the TAC support a coordinated effort to pursue a RAISE grant of \$1,000,000 to plan the “Downtown Mile” projects.

Direction: TAC supports the effort to pursue a RAISE grant of \$1,000,000 to plan the “Downtown Mile” projects as presented.

F. Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) Amendment (Pages 48-49)

MetroPlan Staff: David Wessel

Recommendation: Staff recommend the TAC support a TIP amendment for anticipated grant projects placing the “Downtown Mile” RAISE grant, Lone Tree Authorization Request, Technology Deployment grant and Mountain Line support vehicles in the illustrative year.

Motion: TAC member Dan Folke made a motion to amend the TIP amendment to add the four anticipated grant projects placing the “Downtown Mile” RAISE grant, Lone Tree Authorization Request, Technology Deployment grant and Mountain Line support vehicles in the illustrative year. TAC member Anne Dunno seconded the motion. The motion was passed unanimously. 6-0-0

G. RTP Contract Draft (Pages 50-52)

MetroPlan Staff: Jeff Meilbeck

Recommendation: Staff recommends the TAC endorse the findings of the Regional Transportation Plan Review Committee and pursue a contract with Burgess and Niple for approximately \$362,793.

Motion: TAC member Anne Dunno made a motion to endorse the findings of the Regional Transportation Plan Review Committee and pursue a contract with Burgess and Niple for approximately \$362,793. TAC member Jeff Bauman seconded the motion. The motion was passed unanimously. 6-0-0

H. Historic Funding Levels

MetroPlan Staff: Jeff Meilbeck

Recommendation: None. This item is for discussion only.

In the interest of time, the item was not addressed and will be carried forward to the next meeting.

I. Milton Discussion

(Pages 53-55)

MetroPlan Staff: Jeff Meilbeck

Recommendation: None. This item is for discussion only.

[Staff provided an update on the Regional Transportation Plan and no action was taken.](#)

J. Northern Arizona Healthcare Traffic Impact Analysis

(Pages 56-57)

MetroPlan Staff: Dave Wessel

Recommendation: None. This item is for discussion only.

[Bret Peterson provided an update on the Regional Transportation Plan and no action was taken.](#)

K. Executive Board Agenda Review

(Pages 58-61)

MetroPlan Staff: Jeff Meilbeck

Recommendation: None. This item is for discussion only.

[Staff reviewed the draft Executive Board agenda and no action was taken.](#)

L. Items from the Executive Director

MetroPlan Staff: Jeff Meilbeck, Executive Director

1. Work Program Agreement
2. Summer Schedule

M. Future Agenda Items

MetroPlan Staff: Jeff Meilbeck, Executive Director

Recommendation: Discuss items for future MetroPlan agendas.

IV. CLOSING BUSINESS

A. ITEMS FROM THE COMMITTEE

(Technical Advisory Committee members may make general announcements, raise items of concern or report on current topics of interest to the Committee. Items are not on the agenda, so discussion is limited and action not allowed.)

B. NEXT SCHEDULED TAC MEETING

3. August 25th, 2021 at 1:30 pm - Zoom

C. ADJOURN

Chair Hall adjourned the meeting at 3:30 pm.

The Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) includes Northern Arizona Intergovernmental Public Transportation Authority final program of projects for Sections 5307 and 5339 funding under the Federal Transit Administration, unless amended. Public notice for the TIP also satisfies FTA public notice requirements for the final program of projects.



METROPLAN

GREATER * FLAGSTAFF

STAFF REPORT

REPORT DATE: August 12 2021

MEETING DATE: August 25, 2021

TO: Honorable Chair and members of the TAC

FROM: David Wessel

SUBJECT: Project Priorities Process and Update

1. Recommendation:

i Staff recommends that the TAC adopt project priorities for MetroPlan and recommend adoption to the Board.

2. Related Strategic Workplan Item

i Update the project prioritization matrix by June 2021, run all projects through the matrix by October 2021 including the possibility of three (3) I-40 pedestrian underpass locations.

3. Background

i MetroPlan seeks to re-focus its efforts on member priorities that meet key criteria. MetroPlan. Efforts are comprised of planning, funding, and data collection and management. Roles can range from project lead, participant, advocate, to simple support. Key criteria for MetroPlan involvement are priority projects that are multi-agency, multimodal, lack staff and/or funding resources or longer-term in nature.

Staff intends to establish priorities with the TAC and Board first and will develop a work program for consideration by the Executive Board in October. The program will consist of the following:

- Planning Projects that MetroPlan will lead (3 - 5)
- Funding Projects that MetroPlan will lead (3-5)
- Member Agency Projects that MetroPlan will support (3-5)
- Ongoing MetroPlan project responsibilities that must be continued (3-5)
- Remaining top 20 projects that are not prioritized for MetroPlan effort at this time.



METROPLAN

GREATER † FLAGSTAFF

MetroPlan established the prioritization process in February 2020 and developed its first set of priorities the following May. The Executive Board reaffirmed the process this Spring, including these recommendations from the Technical Advisory Committee:

- *Circulate the entire existing list to all member agencies*
- *Provide an update on existing projects*
- *Include Title VI implications as evaluation criteria to address equity*

Staff requested member agencies to update and return a project matrix by August 10 and received one. Attached to this report are staff's recommendation on priorities.

Discussion

One of MetroPlan's Guiding Principles is to be focused. By identifying 15 to 20 projects instead of 3, a case could be made that MetroPlan's efforts are too diffuse and may lead to ineffectiveness. This is an important consideration. However, staff believe that by prioritizing projects into different categories, managing staff time carefully, and managing to a 3-year time horizon we can be effective. Simply put, the breadth of work happening in the region requires MetroPlan to be strategic in how it will partner and support member agencies as well as how it will lead. Staff believe the attached matrix accomplishes these goals.

4. Fiscal Impact

- i** *All priorities will be managed within MetroPlan's budget. MetroPlan's priorities do not drive the budget so much as the budget drives MetroPlan's capacity to work on the projects. For example, if "Main Street" is identified as a priority, MetroPlan will need to approach the project in a manner that meets budget constraints. Although MetroPlan can pursue grants for projects, the project budgets will not be increased until the grants are received, and the Board has opportunity to consider them.*

5. TAC and Management Committee Discussion

- i** *Pending*



METROPLAN

GREATER † FLAGSTAFF

6. Alternatives

- i** *Adopt project priorities. This alternative will allow MetroPlan to focus on projects based on clear understanding from all member agencies*
Modify and adopt project priorities. This alternative will incorporate recommended changes and bring them to the Board for discussion.
Do not adopt project priorities (not recommended). Adopting project priorities will provide needed focus for the organization. Failing to adopt project priorities will put MetroPlan in a more reactive position.

7. Attachments

- i** *MetroPlan Project Priorities Recommendation*

MetroPlan Regional Project Assessment - 2021														
Priority Matrix	Regional Importance					Action Need					MetroPlan Involvement			
	Urgency	Magnitude	Multi-modalism	Regional Impact	NEW!!! Title VI Implications	a- VI	a- Plan Need	Funding Need	b	Multi-Agency	Staff Need	Funding Opportunity	Long Term Need	Amended? Y/N
All Projects	5	4	5	4	4	18	22	2	5	7	4	5	5	Y
	5	5	5	3	4	18	22	4	3	7	5	5	5	Y
	5	4	3	5	2	17	19	5	5	10	5	4	4	Y
	4	4	5	5	5	18	23	5	3	8	5	4	5	Y
	4	4	5	5	4	18	22	4	4	8	5	3	5	N
	4	4	5	4	3	17	20	5	5	10	5	3	3	Y
	3	3	3	5	2	14	16	5	5	10	3	5	5	N
	3	4	3	5	3	15	18	4	5	9	5	4	4	Y
	4	4	4	4	3	16	19	4	5	9	4	4	3	N
	3	5	5	4	2	17	19	4	4	8	3	3	5	N
	5	5	2	5	3	17	20	3	3	6	5	4	5	Y
	4	4	3	4	4	15	19	3	5	8	3	4	4	Y
	3	4	5	5	1	17	18	4	4	8	5	3	4	Y
	4	5	4	4	3	17	20	2	5	7	4	3	5	N
	3	4	4	4	3	15	18	4	5	9	3	3	4	Y
Priority Crossing Warrant Analysis	3	3	3	5	3	14	17	5	3	8	4	5	3	N
	3	4	4	4	4	15	19	3	4	7	5	3	3	Y
	4	4	5	5	2	18	20	3	3	6	3	3	4	N
	3	5	4	4	4	16	20	2	2	4	4	3	4	Y
	4	4	4	4	2	16	18	1	5	6	4	2	5	N
	3	3	5	4	3	15	18	4	3	7	4	3	4	N
	3	4	4	3	2	14	16	3	5	8	3	4	5	Y
	5	2	3	5	2	15	17	5	3	8	2	5	3	Y
	4	4	4	4	4	14	17	4	4	7	4	4	4	N
	4	4	4	4	4	15	18	4	4	8	4	4	4	Y
Interstate Pedestrian Crossing	5	2	3	5	2	15	17	5	3	8	2	5	3	Y
	5	2	3	5	2	15	17	5	3	8	2	5	3	Y
	5	2	3	5	2	15	17	5	3	8	2	5	3	Y
	5	2	3	5	2	15	17	5	3	8	2	5	3	Y
	5	2	3	5	2	15	17	5	3	8	2	5	3	Y

MetroPlan Regional Project Assessment - 2021														
Priority Matrix	Regional Importance					Action Need				MetroPlan Involvement				
	Urgency	Magnitude	Multi-modalism	Regional Impact	NEW!!! Title VI Implications	a- VI	Plan Need	Funding Need	b	Multi-Agency	Staff Need	Funding Opportunity	Long Term Need	c
All Projects														
Lone Tree I-40 - Lone Tree TI	3	4	3	5	2	15	17	3	5	8	2	3	5	13
Beulah University & Ped underpass at Milton	5	3	5	4	3	17	20	2	4	6	2	4	2	12
Urban Design & TOD	3	4	4	4	3	15	18	2	4	6	3	4	4	14
ATMP Crossing Warrants	3	3	3	3	3	12	15	4	4	8	3	4	4	15
Safety Study - ongoing	4	2	5	5	2	16	18	5	3	8	1	5	1	12
Routes - BRT	2	4	4	4	3	14	17	2	2	4	2	5	4	16
Transportation Modelling	2	3	5	5	3	15	18	1	2	3	3	3	5	16
Milton CMP	1	5	3	5	3	14	17	1	5	6	3	5	3	14
TSMO Transportation System Maintenance & Operational Decision Making - peer review of existing operations (signals, signing, markings)	5	2	5	5	2	17	19	5	1	6	1	5	1	12
W/ Route 66 Construction * SR 40 B- Widen road from a 2-3 lane facility to 5 lanes + bike/curb/gutter * ADA ramps * Woody Mtn Signal * Thompson Signal	3	3	4	4	2	14	16	2	5	7	2	3	4	13
On-Call consultant services	2	3	5	5	1	15	16	2	1	3	1	5	5	16
US 180 N of Columbus	3	3	3	5	2	14	16	1	5	6	3	5	3	13
Transportation Planning Integrating CAAP	4	3	5	4	3	16	19	2	3	5	2	2	3	11
Travel Demand Management	3	3	4	3	3	13	16	2	3	5	4	3	4	14
Lone Tree overpass	2	5	5	5	2	17	19	2	2	4	2	3	3	11
CDL Test & Training facility	4	3	2	4	1	13	14	2	4	6	3	2	4	14
Lone Tree S. Lone Tree CMP	3	4	4	4	2	15	17	5	2	7	3	3	2	10
Data Access	4	3	2	3	2	12	14	3	3	6	4	3	4	14
5-Year Transit Plan	2	4	3	4	4	13	17	2	2	4	2	4	3	12
NACTO Training	2	3	4	3	1	12	13	1	5	6	3	3	4	14
Stardust Trail (Yancey Ln. to McBee Rd.) Reclamation & Widening	5	4	5	5	2	19	21	3	2	5	1	1	2	7
Lone Tree Corridor	3	5	5	5	2	18	20	1	1	2	1	4	5	11
TSMO Fiber ADOT coordination	3	2	3	3	2	13	15	3	3	6	2	5	2	12
US 180 - Humphreys	2	1	3	5	2	11	13	2	4	6	2	6	3	13



METROPLAN

GREATER ↑ FLAGSTAFF

6 E Aspen Avenue, Suite 200
Flagstaff, AZ 86001
928-266-1293
www.metroplanflg.org

STAFF REPORT

REPORT DATE: August 12, 2021
MEETING DATE: August 26, 2021
TO: Honorable Chair and Members of the TAC
FROM: Jeff Meilbeck, Executive Director
SUBJECT: RTAC Funding Project Priorities

1. Recommendation:

- i** Staff recommends the TAC approve a project to pursue \$2.6M of State funding through the Rural Transportation Advocacy Council (RTAC) Statewide initiative.

2. Related Strategic Workplan Item

- i**
 - Identify and scope projects for federal and state earmarks by 12-31-2021
 - Secure \$2 Million in additional resources by 12-31-2022.

3. Background

- i** The Rural Transportation Advocacy Council (RTAC) represents 10 small Councils of Government (COGs) and Metropolitan Planning Organizations (MPOs) around the State. The mission of RTAC is “to protect and promote rural and small metropolitan transportation interests, as well as creating a stronger and more effective rural transportation advocacy network in Arizona”. Councilmember Regina Salas serves on the RTAC Board and Supervisor Jeronimo Vasquez serves as the alternate.

RTAC is kicking off a new funding initiative this year, one that promises to benefit the MetroPlan region in significant ways. Specifically, RTAC is pursuing a \$50M funding initiative through the Governor and State Legislature as a special budget appropriation. This is not funding that would be apportioned



METROPLAN

GREATER † FLAGSTAFF

through ADOT, and the funding would go directly to the local agencies for local projects.

The major benefit of this Statewide approach is that it amplifies MetroPlan's request and enlists additional champions. Our request will be packaged with the requests of 9 other COG's and MPO's. For example, rather than MetroPlan submitting a standalone \$2.5M request and soliciting support, we will be partnering with 9 other organizations that all want to be successful. This is a benefit to MetroPlan because our stand-alone requests with the State legislature the past few years have not been successful. By partnering with others, we can amplify our voice and link up with additional champions.

Another advantage of this approach is that there is little risk. MetroPlan can continue to pursue stand-alone requests for funding as we have done the past few years. For example, on behalf of MetroPlan, Councilmember Salas made a request of Senator Rogers and Representative Blackman for \$5M for the Fourth Street Corridor last year. Such efforts at stand-alone funding can continue.

RTAC has asked each organization to provide a priority project and make the case for funding. Given that MetroPlan is updating our Project Prioritization Matrix, that document will inform this request. However, one of the criteria for this request is knowing what will be successful. In other words, putting forth a project that resonates with the State and meets the State's priorities is important to the competitiveness of our funding request. As such, a lower priority MetroPlan project that is a high priority for the State, is arguably a better choice than a higher priority project for MetroPlan that is a low priority for the State. Ideally, we will find a project that is a high priority for both.

The Lone Tree Corridor is seen as the highest priority for the RTAC grant because it was approved by voters, has local funding, is pursuing federal funding, and construction will happen relatively soon. In other words, there is momentum behind this project and it is highly tangible. Further, the \$2.6 Million from a special budget appropriation can be used to match potential federal funds and further reduce the City's match. Success in this way would allow the City to use limited 419 funds on the many other projects that have been approved.



METROPLAN

GREATER † FLAGSTAFF

4. TAC and Management Committee Discussion

i Pending

5. Fiscal Impact

i There is no cost to pursuing this funding.

6. Alternatives

- i**
- 1) Approve the Lone Tree Corridor as a priority for the RTAC State Funding Initiative. This alternative is recommended because it has momentum, it is a tangible, locally funded, relatively fast moving project that benefits many partners, and it is likely to resonate with the State more than other MetroPlan priorities.
 - 2) Approve another project as a priority for RTAC State Funding initiative. There is no “wrong” way to pursue this funding and other projects can be discussed.

7. Attachments

i RTAC Funding Distribution Table



Central Arizona Governments
Central Yavapai Metro. Planning Org.
Lake Havasu Metro. Planning Org.
MetroPlan Greater Flagstaff
Northern Arizona Council of Gov'ts.
Sierra Vista Metro. Planning Org.
Southeastern AZ Governments Org.
Sun Corridor Metro. Planning Org.
Western Arizona Council of Gov'ts.
Yuma Metropolitan Planning Org.

May 25, 2021

MEMORANDUM

TO: Greater AZ COG/MPO Transportation Planners
RTAC Board & Advisory Committee

FROM: Kevin Adam, RTAC Legislative Liaison

SUBJECT: REVISED ALLOCATIONS FOR RTAC REGIONAL PRIORITY PROJECT LIST

At yesterday's RTAC Board meeting, the Board provided direction regarding an adjustment to the regional priority project list and the funding that is allocated to each region. The list was developed with the intent of identifying the priorities from all of Greater Arizona's COG/MPOs. From that perspective, we overlooked a very substantial portion of Pinal County that is no longer included in CAG or Sun Corridor MPO but is still a part of RTAC. We will add funding for this region on top of the \$40 million already allocated and round the new net total to \$50 million. This rounding has caused a slight increase to the totals for all regions. Please take notice of the new funding levels allocated to your region:

GREATER AZ COG/MPO	POPULATION	PERCENTAGE	OLD FUNDING SHARE	NEW FUNDING SHARE
CAG	80,859	4.49%	\$2,173,038	\$2,245,526
CYMPO	138,652	7.7%	\$3,726,190	\$3,850,488
LHMPO	60,775	3.38%	\$1,633,292	\$1,687,775
METROPLAN	93,679	5.2%	\$2,517,567	\$2,601,548
NACOG	334,400	18.57%	\$8,986,801	\$9,286,583
PINAL (OTHER)	312,042	17.33%	\$0	\$8,665,681
SCMPO	128,720	7.15%	\$3,459,274	\$3,574,668
SEAGO	162,972	9.05%	\$4,379,776	\$4,525,876
SVMPO	71,677	3.98%	\$1,926,277	\$1,990,533
WACOG	181,350	10.07%	\$4,873,673	\$5,036,249
YMPO	235,321	13.07%	\$6,324,112	\$6,535,072
TOTAL	1,800,447	100%	\$40,000,000	\$50,000,000



METROPLAN

GREATER FLAGSTAFF

6 E Aspen Avenue, Suite 200
Flagstaff, AZ 86001
928-266-1293
www.metroplanflg.org

STAFF REPORT

REPORT DATE: August 12, 2021
MEETING DATE: August 25, 2021
TO: Honorable Chair and Members of the TAC
FROM: Jeff Meilbeck, Executive Director
SUBJECT: MetroPlan Mini-Grant

1. Recommendation:

i Staff recommends that the TAC consider and adopt criteria for a competitive MetroPlan mini-grant to member agencies of \$210,000.

2. Related Strategic Workplan Item

i Continue mini grant program and award a project that has multi-agency benefit by 12-31-21.

3. Background

i Throughout most of MetroPlan's history, pass through funds were made available to small projects of member agencies. Funding small projects was generally accepted as a way to support important transportation needs of MetroPlan's members. For example, funds have been provided over the years for bus shelters, construction of right turn lanes, member agency planning studies, dark skies studies and other needs. In FY 2021, MetroPlan initiated a competitive "mini-grant" process and awarded \$50,000 to the City of Flagstaff for bicycle and pedestrian projects.

For FY 2022 MetroPlan will continue the process with a couple of changes:

MetroPlan has secured \$210,000 of Surface Transportation Block Grant (STBG) funds. This is a fourfold increase on last year's grant.



METROPLAN

GREATER † FLAGSTAFF

At a recent TAC meeting it was suggested that we prioritize projects in neighborhoods that have been historically underserved.

Most other elements of the program remain the same and a competitive grant process has been drafted and is attached.

4. TAC and Management Committee Discussion

i Pending

5. Fiscal Impact

i MetroPlan has budgeted a \$210,000 expense in FY 2021 for this mini-grant.

6. Alternatives

- i**
- 1) Approve the mini-grant project and approach. This alternative would be consistent with MetroPlan's strategic plan and would support member agencies in completing small transportation projects.
 - 2) Make changes to the mini-grant project and approach. We may want to change some of the grant criteria, funding amounts or other details of the grant.
 - 3) Modify the mini-grant project and expand eligibility to citizen and non-profit groups (Not recommended). Although this alternative would allow non-profit and community groups to apply for funds, it is not clear that MetroPlan is eligible to provide grants to community and non-profit groups. Furthermore, this approach risks creating a lack of alignment between MetroPlan and the member agencies. Finally, since MetroPlan is not a construction agency and is primarily focused on long term planning projects, it seems most prudent to have grants come through member agencies.
 - 4) Do not approve the mini-grant project. This alternative would reserve funds for other MetroPlan projects such as the Lone Tree Corridor, Route 66 or Milton Underpass project priorities adopted by the Board.



METROPLAN

GREATER † FLAGSTAFF

7. Attachments



Mini-Grant Project Criteria and Approach.

MetroPlan Mini-Grant FY 2022 Notice of Funding Opportunity

Purpose:

The purpose of this mini-grant is to support transportation projects of MetroPlan member agencies so that a small project can be more readily completed.

Eligibility:

MetroPlan Member agencies are eligible to apply for funds including the City of Flagstaff, Coconino County, ADOT, NAU and Mountain Line.

Criteria:

MetroPlan seeks to fund small projects that need additional money to be successful. Criteria for evaluating projects are as follows:

- 1) Timeliness.
 - a. Funding should be encumbered by March 31, 2022
 - b. Projects should be completed by December 31, 2022.
- 2) Multi-Modal. Projects should have a multi-modal element.
- 3) Local Match. 5.7% local match is required.
- 4) Readiness: Project should be eligible for a categorical exclusion or already have National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) clearance.
- 5) Social Equity. Project preference for those that meet the needs of Title VI populations in traditionally underserved neighborhoods.

Considerations and Preferences:

- 1) If an exchange for Highway User Revenue Funds (HURF) are used there will be a 10% surcharge.
- 2) Projects should be consistent with adopted neighborhood plans
- 3) Small construction or capital projects are preferred, and planning projects will be considered.

Review Panel and award:

Projects will be evaluated by MetroPlan staff. A staff recommendation will be made to the MetroPlan Technical Advisory Committee, Management Committee and Executive Board with a request for endorsement from each group.

Timeframe:

September 2021: Adopt revised project criteria
September/October 2021: Competitive process opened
November 2021: Grant Awarded

Application Process:

MetroPlan member agencies are asked to submit a PDF file via e-mail of no more than 2 pages that provides a project description, project timeframe, project map or schematic, and project budget. Letters of support can be included but are not required.

Applications should be submitted to Rosie Wear, MetroPlan Business Manager at rosie.wear@metroplanflg.org by Friday, October 8, 2021.



METROPLAN

GREATER FLAGSTAFF

6 E Aspen Avenue, Suite 200
Flagstaff, AZ 86001
928-266-1293
www.metroplanflg.org

STAFF REPORT

REPORT DATE: August 12, 2021
MEETING DATE: August 25, 2021
TO: Honorable Chair and Members of the TAC
FROM: David Wessel, Planning Manager
SUBJECT: W. Route 66 Planning Process

1. Recommendation:

i Staff recommend the TAC supports launching the West Route 66 Planning effort at a cost of \$100,000.

2. Related Strategic Workplan Item

i 2. Initiate the West Route 66 planning process by 12/31/2021

3. Background

i The MetroPlan Board prioritized this at the last strategic advance. Improvement to the corridor is also identified in the Regional Transportation Plan, the Mountain Line 5-year Plan, and the City's Proposition 419 Transportation Tax. The need is highlighted by many large vacant parcels adjacent to the corridor and several development proposals. These proposals are subject to traffic impact analyses seeking mitigation solutions. The study can complement both ADOT's Milton Corridor Master Plan and the Mountain Line/NAU W. Route 66 entrance study. Meanwhile, the City has funds programmed and planned for W. Route 66 and seeks guidance on prioritization.

In discussions with ADOT, the City and Mountain Line, several possible scope items emerged:

- Establish policy direction early on and seek resolution where there may be differences. Crosswalks and other warrants are probable topics and can build on lessons learned through the Milton process.
- Develop a solid public participation plan.
- Determine how far the 5-lane section should extend



METROPLAN

GREATER † FLAGSTAFF

- *Recommend intersection solutions*
- *Locate and coordinate planned bus stops and crossings*
- *Forecast pedestrian and bicycle volumes*
- *Advance access management in the corridor.*
- *Understanding impacts to I-17 and I-40, if any.*
- *Determine influence on and by Climate Action/Adaptation Plan*
- *Produce a strip map for the corridor showing project, right-of-way and other elements*
- *Project costs and implementation priorities*
- *Address grading and drainage. There has likely been no work on this since the 1940's. However, this is likely beyond the budget to be scoped.*

Project limits will extend from Milton to I-40 and it is noted that the Proposition 419 limits identified Milton to Woodlands Village. Mountain Line's interest extends west to Woody Mountain. FUTS extends at least to Flagstaff Ranch.

The schedule now anticipates a Notice to Proceed in Summer 2022, no longer Spring, to permit the Regional Transportation Plan trends and conditions task to conclude and scenario planning to be underway. This implies stakeholder scoping interviews in taking place in Spring with a scope following shortly. Use of the on-call lists produced by CYMPO and/or SVMPO are likely. Close coordination with the Regional Transportation Plan and Regional Plan processes will be necessary to assure compatible solutions and proper messaging to the public.

MetroPlan will manage the project and work with ADOT on defining roles and responsibilities ahead of the project launch.

4. TAC and Management Committee Discussion

i *Pending*

5. Fiscal Impact

i *MetroPlan budgeted \$100,000 for this project.*

6. Alternatives

i *1) Launch a \$100,000 West Route 66 Planning effort to run concurrently, or slightly after, the Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) process. This*



METROPLAN

GREATER † FLAGSTAFF

alternative will allow the West Route 66 effort to build on and add depth to the work done in the RTP. The work will need to be staged and coordinated appropriately to make the most efficient use of time and funds.

- 2) *Attempt to coordinate with Mountain Line to spend additional section 5339 funds on this project. For a variety of reasons, this opportunity is no longer deemed the best use for those funds.*
- 3) *Shift funds from the mini-grant program by reducing or eliminating that program in order to expand the W. Route 66 CMP scope.*

7. Attachments

i None



METROPLAN

GREATER ↑ FLAGSTAFF

6 E Aspen Avenue, Suite 200
Flagstaff, AZ 86001
928-266-1293
www.metroplanflg.org

STAFF REPORT

REPORT DATE: August 12, 2021
MEETING DATE: August 25, 2021
TO: Honorable Chair and Members of the TAC
FROM: Jeff Meilbeck, Executive Director
SUBJECT: Issue Resolution Process

1. Recommendation:

i Staff recommends TAC members have an open discussion related to MetroPlan's role in the resolution of issues between MetroPlan member agencies.

2. Related Strategic Workplan Item

i 5 Year Horizon: Facilitates communication and planning between member agencies to identify shared priorities, align goals and advance projects with one consolidated regional voice

Measurable Objective: Develop a structured, transparent process to bring issues to the table in a timely way to enhance communication and understanding between member agencies by June 30, 2022.

3. Background

i As part of the April 7, 2021 Strategic Advance process, we discussed some of the similarities and differences between member agencies. It was observed that although we want to "speak with one voice", MetroPlan member agencies don't always agree. To the outsider, this might seem odd since we are all interested in transportation planning, services, and infrastructure. To the insider, it is clear that our agencies each have distinct cultures, policy priorities, and an ebb and flow of funds. For example, when Mountain Line got a grant to build a Bus Rapid Transit (BRT) route on Milton in 2015, ADOT recognized that they needed a vision for the



METROPLAN

GREATER † FLAGSTAFF

corridor before they could fully support the project. Indeed, the cultural and policy differences between Mountain Line and ADOT may be the most distinct since Mountain Line is focused on public transportation and spends virtually 100% of their funding on it. ADOT, on the other hand, spends approximately 96% of their federal funding and 0% state funding on public transportation. Clearly, these financial differences reflect project priority and cultural differences as well.

One perspective is that our differences are a strength and not a weakness. The fact that MetroPlan member agencies have different needs and priorities doesn't mean there is anything "wrong". For example, ADOT has critical projects that are driven by the momentum, interests and existing land-use patterns geared toward the private automobile. Mountain Line has a clear public transportation focus as dictated by federal regulation, local voter approved mandates, and a core belief that public transportation is a solution to environmental, land use and economic equity issues. Neither of these perspectives are wrong and MetroPlan's ability to respect, appreciate and meet the needs of all our member agencies is important to our ability to serve.

It can be said that a City Manager does not work for a City Councilor: rather they work for the City Council as an entity in and of itself. Similarly, it could be said that MetroPlan does not work for any particular member agency, we work for the needs of all the agencies together. As such, MetroPlan's approach has been to find solutions that all member agencies agree with. For example, in 2021 when member agencies agreed that pursuing bicycle and pedestrian funding was good for all, there was no conflict, and it was easy for MetroPlan to speak with one voice. Similarly, MetroPlan's work on Smart Signals, Downtown Mile, West Route 66 and Lone Tree Corridor projects are supported by all member agencies. These types of consensus projects are the sweet spot for MetroPlan to operate in.

While consensus is great, the reality is that planning and policy elements of all projects are not always shared by all member agencies. A clear recent example of these differences is seen in the Milton Corridor Project: In simplified terms, ADOT's focus was on ensuring that traffic flow not be impacted. While not explicitly defined as such in the ADOT effort, it was assumed that "traffic" referred to automobiles. This definition was not shared by all MetroPlan member agencies, some of whom want to increase viability of bicycle, bus and pedestrian activity in the corridor.

To identify even more complexity, it should be pointed out that MetroPlan member agencies themselves sometimes have conflicting policy directives. For example, the City may have a priority in one department to reduce emissions and in another department to move automobile traffic more expediently, and in another to promote



METROPLAN

GREATER † FLAGSTAFF

bicycle usage. This complexity explains why finding consensus within MetroPlan member agencies -- let alone between them -- can be so challenging at times.

MetroPlan's Role

In recent months, the cultural and policy differences between member agencies and the resultant issues created are being openly discussed. In the hectic pace of any given day, it is occasionally easy to forget that these issues are based on principles rather than personalities. In other words, we could have an entirely different make up of staff and elected officials at each and every member agency, and the issues would likely be the same. The issues are driven by culture, policy and paradigm. People carry the message, because that's their job.

By recognizing respective agency differences, MetroPlan members have the best chance of moving ahead productively, both individually and collectively. In other words, energy can be put towards supporting the goals of other agencies while pursuing their own. While it may sometimes feel like anything less than consensus is a win for one and a loss for another, this does not have to be the case. Our options are to find consensus decisions in some areas, simply agree to disagree in others, and to make wise resource allocation choices in others. For example, at some point it may make the most sense for Mountain Line, the City and MetroPlan to recognize and respect the car dominated parameters of ADOT in the Milton corridor and support them. This support might look like focusing on projects like the University underpass or shifting to other "off-Milton" solutions such as backage roads and other corridors. When such decisions are made openly as being in the best interest of organizations and the community, MetroPlan member agencies are using their limited resources of time, money, and creative energy more effectively and efficiently.

MetroPlan's 5 Year Horizon articulated as "facilitates communication and planning between member agencies to identify shared priorities, align goals and advance projects with one consolidated regional voice" has lead us to a measurable objective to "develop a structured, transparent process to bring issues to the table in a timely way to enhance communication and understanding between member agencies by June 30, 2022."

At this point in the discussion, the question is, "what is MetroPlan's role and how can we help?"



METROPLAN

GREATER † FLAGSTAFF

4. TAC and Management Committee Discussion

i Pending

5. Fiscal Impact

i Unknown at this time.

6. Alternatives

i This is a discussion item and no alternatives are being presented.

7. Attachments

i None



METROPLAN

GREATER † FLAGSTAFF

6 E Aspen Avenue, Suite 200
Flagstaff, AZ 86001
928-266-1293
www.metroplanflg.org

STAFF REPORT

REPORT DATE: August 12, 2021

MEETING DATE: August 25, 2021

TO: Honorable Chair and Members of the TAC

FROM: Jeff “Miles” Meilbeck, Executive Director

SUBJECT: Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) Update

1. Recommendation:

i *This item is for discussion only and no recommendation is being made.*

2. Related Strategic Workplan Item

i *Complete MetroPlan’s long range Regional Transportation Plan and have it adopted by the Board by 12-31-2022*

3. Background

i *Staff will provide an update on the RTP*



METROPLAN

GREATER ↑ FLAGSTAFF

6 E Aspen Avenue, Suite 200
Flagstaff, AZ 86001
928-266-1293
www.metroplanflg.org

STAFF REPORT

REPORT DATE: August 12, 2021
MEETING DATE: August 25, 2021
TO: Honorable Chair and Members of the TAC
FROM: David Wessel, Planning Manager
SUBJECT: Northern Arizona Healthcare Hospital Relocation

1. Recommendation:

i None. This item is for discussion only.

2. Related Strategic Workplan Item

i MetroPlan builds trust and credibility
• Exhibits integrity in its work products

3. Background

i City staff will provide an update on application by Northern Arizona Healthcare to relocate the Flagstaff Medical Center hospital and office facilities to a site immediately northeast of Fort Tuthill County Park. A formal application has been submitted and a more complete update will be provided as information becomes available.

MetroPlan staff provided modeling data in support of the traffic impact analysis for this proposal and will defer to the City on when it is appropriate to share more information.

4. TAC and Management Committee Discussion

i Pending



METROPLAN

GREATER † FLAGSTAFF

5. Fiscal Impact

i *There is no fiscal impact to MetroPlan beyond staff time*

6. Alternatives

i *None provided. This item is for discussion only.*

7. Attachments

i *None*

AGENDA

Executive Board Meeting

10:00 AM to Noon

September 1, 2021

Join Zoom Meeting: <https://us02web.zoom.us/j/79199115652>
Meeting ID: 791 9911 5652
Dial-in: +1 408 638 0968US

Regular meetings and work sessions are open to the public. Persons with a disability may request a reasonable accommodation by contacting MetroPlan via email at rosie.wear@metroplanflg.org. The MetroPlan complies with Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 to involve and assist underrepresented and underserved populations (age, gender, color, income status, race, national origin and LEP – Limited English Proficiency.) Requests should be made by contacting the MetroPlan at 928-266-1293 as early as possible to allow time to arrange the accommodation.

PURSUANT TO A.R.S. §38-431.02, as amended, NOTICE IS HEREBY GIVEN to the general public that the following Notice of Possible Quorum is given because there may be a quorum of the Flagstaff City Council and/or the Coconino County Board of Supervisors present; however, no formal discussion/action will be taken by members in their role as the Flagstaff City Council and/or Coconino County Board of Supervisors.

Public Questions and Comments must be emailed to rosie.wear@metroplanflg.org prior to the meeting.

NOTICE OF OPTION TO RECESS INTO EXECUTIVE SESSION

Pursuant to A.R.S. §38-431.02, notice is hereby given to the members of the MetroPlan Executive Board and to the general public that, at this regular meeting, the MetroPlan Executive Board may vote to go into executive session, which will not be open to the public, for legal advice and discussion with the MetroPlan Executive Board's attorneys for legal advice on any item listed on the following agenda, pursuant to A.R.S. §38-431.03(A).

EXECUTIVE BOARD MEMBERS

- ☐ Jim McCarthy, Flagstaff City Council, Interim Chair
- ☐ Patrice Horstman, Coconino County Board of Supervisors, Vice-Chair
- ☐ Jeronimo Vasquez, Coconino County Board of Supervisors
- ☐ Austin Aslan, Flagstaff City Council
- ☐ Dan Okoli, Mountain Line Board of Directors
- ☐ Regina Salas, Flagstaff City Council
- ☐ Jesse Thompson, Arizona State Transportation Board Member
- ☐ Judy Begay, Coconino County Board of Supervisors (alternate)
- ☐ Becky Daggett, Flagstaff City Council (alternate)

METROPLAN STAFF

- ☐ Jeff Meilbeck, Executive Director

☐ David Wessel, Manager

☐ Rosie Wear, Business Manager

I. PRELIMINARY GENERAL BUSINESS

A. CALL TO ORDER

B. ROLL CALL

C. PUBLIC COMMENT

(At this time, any member of the public may address the Board on any subject within their jurisdiction that is not scheduled before the Board on that day. Due to Open Meeting Laws, the Board cannot discuss or act on items presented during this portion of the agenda. To address the Board on an item that is on the agenda, please wait for the Chair to call for Public Comment at the time the item is heard.)

D. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Minutes of Regular Meeting: June 2, 2021

(Pages 6-11)

II. CONSENT AGENDA

(Items on the consent agenda are routine in nature and/or have already been budgeted or discussed by the Executive Board.)

III. GENERAL BUSINESS

A. FY21 Year End Financial Report

(Pages 21-28)

MetroPlan Staff: Jeff Meilbeck

Recommendation: None. This item is for discussion only.

B. Project Priorities Matrix

(Pages 21-28)

MetroPlan Staff: Dave Wessel

Recommendation: Staff recommends the Board review and reaffirm the Project Prioritization Matrix for MetroPlan.

C. RTAC Funding Project Priorities

MetroPlan Staff: Jeff Meilbeck

Recommendation: None. This item is for discussion only.

D. Mini-Grant

(Pages 53-55)

MetroPlan Staff: Jeff Meilbeck

Recommendation: Staff recommends the Board support adoption of the MetroPlan mini-grant Notice of Funding Opportunity

E. West Route 66 Planning Process

(Pages 53-55)

MetroPlan Staff: Dave Wessel

Recommendation: None. This item is for discussion only.

F. Issue Resolution Process

(Pages 38-41)

MetroPlan Staff: Jeff Meilbeck

Recommendation: None. This item is for discussion only.

G. Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) Amendment

(Pages 48-49)

MetroPlan Staff: David Wessel

Recommendation: Staff recommends the Board support a TIP amendment ...

H. Regional Transportation Plan Update

(Pages 50-52)

MetroPlan Staff: Jeff Meilbeck

Recommendation: Staff will provide an update on the Regional Transportation Plan.

I. Items from the Executive Director

MetroPlan Staff: Jeff Meilbeck

1. FY2022 Rebuilding American Infrastructure with Sustainability and Equity (RAISE) grant application

2. Advanced Transportation and Congestion Management Technology Deployment (ATCMTD) grant application
3. Intelligent Transportation System (ITS) Strategy
4. Milton Corridor

V: CLOSING BUSINESS

A. ITEMS FROM THE BOARD

(Board members may make general announcements, raise items of concern or report on current topics of interest to the Board. Items are not on the agenda, so discussion is limited and action not allowed.)

B. NEXT SCHEDULED EXECUTIVE BOARD MEETING

1. October 6th, 2021 at 10:00 am - Zoom

C. ADJOURN

The Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) includes Northern Arizona Intergovernmental Public Transportation Authority final program of projects for Sections 5307 and 5339 funding under the Federal Transit Administration, unless amended. Public notice for the TIP also satisfies FTA public notice requirements for the final program of projects.

CERTIFICATION OF POSTING OF NOTICE

The undersigned hereby certifies that a copy of the foregoing notice was duly posted at www.metroplanflg.org on May 28, 2021 at 3:00 pm.

Dated this 28th Day of May 2021.

Rosie Wear, Business Manager



METROPLAN

GREATER ↑ FLAGSTAFF

6 E Aspen Avenue, Suite 200
Flagstaff, AZ 86001
928-266-1293
www.metroplanflg.org

STAFF REPORT

REPORT DATE: August 20, 2021
MEETING DATE: August 25, 2021
TO: Honorable Chair and Members of the TAC
FROM: David Wessel, Transportation Planning Manager
Jeff “Miles” Meilbeck, Executive Director
SUBJECT: Update on Current Events

1. Recommendation:

i This item is for discussion only

2. Related Strategic Workplan Item

i MetroPlan exercises openness and transparency

3. Background

i The purpose of this report is to provide updates on various projects and efforts MetroPlan is leading or involved in.

- FY2022 Rebuilding American Infrastructure with Sustainability and Equity (RAISE) grant application. The City of Flagstaff submitted a \$3.5 Million grant on July 12, 2021 to create a Master Plan for the Downtown Mile projects. The application was the result of input and effort of many in the region and a skilled consulting team. It is possible that grant awards will be announced this fall.
- Advanced Transportation and Congestion Management Technology Deployment (ATCMTD) grant application
- Intelligent Transportation System (ITS) Strategy



METROPLAN

GREATER ↑ FLAGSTAFF

- Milton Corridor

ADOT continues work on the Milton Corridor Master Plan and partner agencies continue to be involved. The final report and presentation is scheduled to be distributed by September 3rd.

- Historic Funding Levels

MetroPlan staff presented a report to the MetroPlan Board on June 2, 2021 regarding historic funding levels. The following graph quantifies the trends in terms of the number of grants pursued, amount of funding sought, and amount of funding awarded over the past 6 years. These numbers represent projects MetroPlan was directly involved in, not grants MetroPlan directly received. For example, only Mountain Line could apply for the \$5.6 Million Bike and Pedestrian Grant in 2021 and Mountain Line lead that effort with the strong support of the City. MetroPlan's role was identificatory and facilitative and involved, so the numbers are included here.

Historic FMPO (MetroPlan) Funding Pursuit

