



Stride Forward – Regional Transportation Plan

Stakeholder Engagement Round 1 Report

Introduction

Stride Forward is MetroPlan’s mandated update to the regional transportation plan. This plan is unique coming on the heels of a City of Flagstaff declared climate emergency and subsequent Carbon Neutrality Plan (CNP). The CNP calls for the maintenance of vehicle miles travelled at 2019 levels.

Stride Forward will include a robust public involvement plan including stakeholder engagement. Other elements of the PIP include a random sample survey, online surveys, open houses (possibly virtual), and pop-up events.

Stakeholder Engagement

A list of over 240 names from various agencies, private firms, business groups, environmental interests was compiled with input from the Regional Transportation Plan Advisory Group and the MetroPlan Executive Board. This group is asked to share important *Stride Forward* information, events and documents with their constituencies. They are also asked to bring their experience and perspective to *Stride Forward* process. This is garnered through virtual or in-person meetings and occasional surveys. A full list of stakeholders is available on request.

Round 1 Summary of Activities

The first round of stakeholder engagement focused on introducing *Stride Forward*. Introductory emails were sent in November 2021 inviting participation and commitment to circulate *Stride Forward* information to their constituencies and membership. A request to make a presentation to these groups soon followed. Ultimately, presentations were made to 20 groups attend by over 200 people through

the months of January to March. Presentations to two other groups did not take place for lack of quorum or time.

In addition to basic process information, two questions were posed to these groups:

- What is the finest transportation system you've experienced?
- What questions can MetroPlan answer for you through the *Stride Forward* process?

These questions were also posed in an online survey to the full stakeholder list in March. Directions were given to respond only if they had not participated in a presentation. 29 responses were received.

Representation from a broad cross-section of the community was received. A small plurality of presentations made and surveys received were from transportation interests representing several modes. Mountain Line Transit, Flagstaff Biking Organization, and the Flagstaff Transportation Commission are examples. Title VI interests (e.g., minorities, disabilities, low-income) were the next largest group followed by education and business – either individually or through the Chamber. Other interests included neighborhoods, planning, engineering, and economic development.

How This Information Will Be Used

Though introduced as a “fun, icebreaker” type question, the information regarding experience with other systems informs us of the qualities people enjoy. It sheds some light on the modes they delight in when they are done well. Additional inquiry and definition of what it means to be “the finest transportation system in the country” is needed.

The questions people desire to have answered will guide our analysis and policy development as we try to address them throughout the process. A Frequently Asked Questions document is recommended to be developed.

Round 1 Summary of Findings

What is the finest transportation system you've experienced?

The predominant answers identified large metro transit systems in the United States and Europe and intercity rail systems in Europe, China and Japan. These appeared in some form 68 times from the presentations. The online survey referenced bus transit 11 times and rail 20 times. San Francisco, New York, Washington, D.C., and Chicago were the most frequently cited American cities with Denver, Seattle and others getting honorable mention. In Europe, the cities of London and Paris and the Country of Germany were cited as was Tokyo in Japan. Cleanliness, efficiency, accessibility, and ease of use were popular attributes. It was noted by several groups that these are large systems not easily scaled down to the Flagstaff region. To that point, Mountain Line was commended several times as being very good when compared to regions of similar size.

At 35 presentation and 13 survey mentions, the category including trails, pedestrian and bike facilities was a distant but important second. The Netherlands and Copenhagen were frequently mentioned. Washington, D.C. was also listed as were Boulder and Fort Collins, CO. Flagstaff's FUTS system also received many compliments.

Highways and streets were mentioned twenty times with roughly half of those in a negative context. The Phoenix freeway system and the German Autobahn were mentioned.

Some one-off systems that impressed participants included gondola systems in Telluride and Minneapolis skywalks. Systems commended for their integration across modes included Tokyo, the Netherlands and Europe in general. Seattle was noted for its complete streets and complete streets were mentioned generally, as well. Curitiba, Brazil was mentioned twice. It is unique for its massive Bus Rapid Transit system.

Participants listed several features that contributed to their positive experience. In rough order of frequency:

Presentations

- Easy
- Clean
- Efficient
- Convenient

Surveys (check all that apply)

- Easy
- Access to destinations
- Efficient
- Inexpensive
- Fun

What questions can MetroPlan answer for you through the *Stride Forward* process?

The questions posed can be placed in several categories. Some came in the way of comments or critiques. These groupings are placed in rough order of frequency.

Service to Surrounding Areas & Regions: These questions came in two forms. Most prevalent was transit service to areas like Bellemont and Kachina Village, framed as an equity and mobility management issue. Access to affordable housing options was cited several times. Also mentioned was service to visitors and tourists.

Representation – underserved/broader region: Many people and groups expressed concern or asked about how *Stride Forward* will reach under-represented communities and groups. Those without computer or phone access, those who traditionally can't or don't participate, and surrounding county areas were mentioned.

Density and Growth: Issues raised ranged from education the public about densities impacts, regulations surrounding density, and the ability to supply adequate parking and other resources.

Measures and Modeling: Many people were curious as to the measures to be used, the efficacy of the modeling and the types of analysis to be done.

Access/Accessibility: Several questions were posed about how accessibility will be provided or improved particularly for underserved or under-represented groups. The digital divide is included here.

Traffic/Congestion/Capacity: Like vehicle miles of travel (VMT), another category, people asked or were concerned about analysis, expanding capacity for growth, and the management of winter snow play or NAU traffic.

Vehicle Miles of Travel (VMT): Participants were curious or concerned about the ability to measure, limit, or otherwise control VMT. Concerns included impacts to the economy and fair treatment of automobile travel.

Safety: Questions focused on how to improve safety for vulnerable users like bicyclists and pedestrians. One person asked how safety can be included as an evaluation criteria.

Other topics: Less frequently cited are questions about funding, electric vehicles and vehicle charging, incentives for people to change behaviors, induced traffic, and students.

Appendices

Presentation Attendance Log

MetroPlan Stride Forward Stakeholder Round 1 - Participation Log			
Date	Organization	Attendees	Live/Virtual
1/24/2022	Peak Engineering	5	V
1/25/2022	FUSD Board	20	V
1/26/2022	County P&Z	10	V
1/28/2022	NAU Transpo.Act.Team	5	V
2/2/2022	Coconino CHAC	13	V
2/9/2022	Coconino ADAC	7	V
2/10/2022	Friends of Flagstaffs Future	10	V
2/10/2022	Snowbowl Mgmt	12	V
2/16/2022	NAU GPR Faculty	8	V
2/17/2022	Chamber Business Advocacy	8	L
2/17/2022	Southside Community Assoc.	8	V
2/18/2022	Coordinated Mobility Council	15	V
2/22/2022	Commission on Inclusion and Adaptive Living	N/A	V*
2/24/2022	NACA Leadership	N/A	V**
2/24/2022	Engineering Division	20	V
2/24/2022	Sustainability Commission	5	V
3/2/2022	Transportation Commission	17	V
3/9/2022	ASCE	8	V
3/9/2022	La Plaza Vieja	5	V
3/15/2022	Council on Diversity Awareness	7	V
3/23/2022	Coconino IPAC	8	V
3/25/2022	NAU Environmental Caucus	17	V
Totals	22	208	

*/** Scheduled presentations did not take place due to lack of quorum and lack of time, respectively

Survey Responses

Q1 Are you associated with the private, public or non-profit sector. (choose one)

ANSWER CHOICES	RESPONSES	
Private	17.24%	5
Public	62.07%	18
Non-profit	20.69%	6
TOTAL		29

Q2 What interest group do you or your organization most closely align with? (choose one)

ANSWER CHOICES	RESPONSES	
Aviation	4.17%	1
Bicycle/pedestrian	4.17%	1
Business	4.17%	1
Communications	0.00%	0
Construction	4.17%	1
Development	0.00%	0
Economy	4.17%	1
Education	25.00%	6
Engineering	4.17%	1
Environment	0.00%	0
Finance	0.00%	0
Health	0.00%	0
Housing	12.50%	3
Manufacturing	0.00%	0
Planning	8.33%	2
Social	0.00%	0
Sustainability	0.00%	0
Tourism	4.17%	1
Transit	4.17%	1
Transportation	20.83%	5
Workforce Development	0.00%	0
TOTAL		24

Q3 Where is the finest transportation system or component (like trails or highways) you've ever encountered? (choose one)

ANSWER CHOICES	RESPONSES	
Europe	24.00%	6
Germany	8.00%	2
Netherlands	20.00%	5
France	0.00%	0
San Francisco	20.00%	5
Chicago	12.00%	3
New York	0.00%	0
Washington, D.C.	16.00%	4
TOTAL		25

Q4 What components made it the finest transportation system? (check all that apply)

ANSWER CHOICES	RESPONSES	
Bus transit	47.83%	11
Rail	91.30%	21
Highway system	17.39%	4
Trail system	21.74%	5
Bicycle system	56.52%	13
Total Respondents: 23		

Q5 What characteristics made it the finest transportation system? (check all that apply)

ANSWER CHOICES	RESPONSES	
Access to key destinations	85.71%	24
On-time/efficient	71.43%	20
Fun	32.14%	9
Easy to use	89.29%	25
Inexpensive	57.14%	16
Total Respondents: 28		

Stakeholder List
Available upon request.