



SIERRA VISTA METROPOLITAN PLANNING ORGANIZATION EXECUTIVE BOARD WORK SESSION MEETING SUMMARY: OCTOBER 15, 2020

DRAFT

MEETING LOCATION:

City of Sierra Vista, City Hall
City Manager's Conference Room
1011 North Coronado Drive
Sierra Vista, AZ 85635

To attend the meeting by telephone:
Call 1-415-655-0001. Meeting # 287 957 271.
Enter # for Attendee ID. For Arizona Relay
Service use 1-800-367-8939, or dial 7-1-1.

MEETING DATE AND TIME:

October 15, 2020
3:15 PM

FOR MORE INFORMATION OR TO REQUEST ACCOMMODATION FOR SPECIAL NEEDS:

Website: www.svmmpo.org
Email: SVMPO@SierraVistaAZ.gov
Administrator Phone: 520-515-8525

EXECUTIVE BOARD MEMBERS IN ATTENDANCE:

Chair	Rick Mueller, Mayor, City of Sierra Vista
Vice-Chair	Tom Borer, County Supervisor, Cochise County
Member	Rachel Gray, Vice-Mayor, City of Sierra Vista (<i>telephonically</i>)
Member	Joy Banks, Councilmember, Town of Huachuca City
Member	Richard Searle, STB District 3

EXECUTIVE BOARD MEMBERS ABSENT:

Member	Sarah Pacheco, Councilmember, City of Sierra Vista
--------	--

STAFF:

SVMPO Administrator: Karen L. Lamberton, AICP

OTHERS PRESENT:

Jeremy Moore, Arizona Department of Transportation (*telephonically*)
Cynthia Butterworth, Councilmember, Town of Huachuca City, (*alternate member/telephonically*)
Brent Crowther, Kimley-Horn, LRTP Project Lead (*telephonically*)
Dale Miller, Rick Engineering, LRTP Sub-Consultant (*telephonically*)
C.T Revere, Gordley Group, LRTP Sub-Consultant (*telephonically*)

1. CALL TO ORDER AND ROLL CALL

Chair Mueller called the Board Work Session to order at or about 3:12 p.m. As roll call had just been taken for the preceding regular Board Meeting that had just adjourned, it was noted a quorum was still present and that no one else had joined the meeting, either in person or on the phone.

Administrator Lamberton noted the presence of Brent Crowther, the consultant project lead for Kimley-Horn and Dale Miller, the project lead for Rick Engineering, both on the telephone for this

meeting. She stated that she expected C.T Revere, the consultant on this project for the public outreach effort was expected to join the meeting by telephone shortly.

2. SVMPO 2050 LONG-RANGE TRANSPORTATION PLAN INTRODUCTION

The SVMPO Administrator provided a very brief background to the regional long-range transportation plan update and stated for the Board that the initial work tasks to identify the region's existing conditions, and develop the Transportation Analysis Zones, were underway. Administrator Lamberton advised the Board that they would hear a lot about these zones, usually called TAZ's, especially Member Searle at the State Transportation Board, but not to be too worried about them. They are just areas defined where people are traveling out of, or traveling into, and how they are getting there and what is the route they are taking to get there.

She stated that more would be described about these efforts at the next Board meeting, but the purpose of this Work Session was to gain understanding about the foundational elements required for regional project selection. Administrator Lamberton re-introduced the consultant project lead, Brent Crowther, and stated that he would be leading part of the discussion on the federal and state performance measures for project selection.

3. LONG-RANGE TRANSPORTATION PLAN PERFORMANCE MEASURES

Brent Crowther, then described for Board members and attendees the federal performance measures required under the MAP-21 and FAST-Act legislation. These are shown on Slide 2, on page 11 of the agenda packet. State targets or goals for these performance measures are reviewed, and formally adopted, on an annual basis by the Board.

Administrator Lamberton stated that these two foundational elements: federal performance measures and state targets, or goals, are the basis for developing what this specific region would like to define as their own regional transportation project priorities.

Member Searle asked if there was any reason why the Board would not just adopt the State goals. Administrator Lamberton stated there was not any reason to not do so – especially in a very small MPO where justifying a different target would be quite an undertaking. In the last few years, the SVMPO has been adopting the state targets for the federal performance measures. There was general consensus expressed from the Board members to continue with this practice.

There being no further questions on this topic, Chair Muller directed the Administrator to continue to the next agenda item.

4. LONG-RANGE TRANSPORTATION PLAN PRIORITIES FOR PROJECT RANKING

Administrator Lamberton and Brent Crowther then led a discussion with the Board members about project selection and desired priorities for ranking regional projects. Administrator Lamberton advised the Board that she had provided to them half-sheets of each potential criteria written out. These individual factors were not bound together so that they could more easily be re-ordered by the Board if they wanted to change the level of priorities shown in the first initial draft developed by the consultant team and the SVMPO staff, as shown in slide 4 on page 12 of the agenda packet. This slide was also provided as one single page for ease of reference.

Board members took a small amount of time to look through these drafted regional criteria for project selection. Brent Crowther, Kimley-Horn, shared that other agencies have chosen different ways of ranking their project priorities and that this is a policy decision of each regional Board. These priorities do have to reflect the federal measures and state targets but how they are described and weighted is developed at the regional level.

Member Searle asked if the Administrator had a recommendation. Administrator Lamberton stated that based on discussions on projects with this SVMPO Board in the past it seemed that the issues that arose the most often were multi-modal connections and economic vitality or support for economic development. Board members concurred with that perspective. Discussion then occurred about the interconnection between all of these criteria and that all of them are important, so it is virtually impossible to separate them or to rank one higher than the other. Board members asked if they had to rank them differently or if they could all be given equal weights. Both the Administrator and the consultant teams indicated that they could weight them in any manner or order that the Board might choose, including giving each equal ratings.

There was consensus that rating these criteria equally made the most sense given how interconnected all of these factors are. Brent Crowther, Kimley-Horn, asked if the Board members could identify their top one of the identified criteria, and Member Banks indicated she could select out her top two: for the Town it would be safety and multimodal for transit, bicycle and pedestrian as the need for connectivity is really very important to them, and the safety issues for pedestrians crossing the highway will not be going away. Vice-Chair Borer stated that it is hard to choose but he would select sustainable projects as a high priority as building something that ends up not being used or cannot be maintained is not a good idea. He also stated that regional connections are very important. Chair Mueller concurred with Member Banks that safety is everything but this factor should be reflected in every aspect of the criteria noted and should be considered with every project. Member Searle stated he would have to pick regionally significant as his top consideration. Member Gray agreed with what had been stated by other Board members and said that regionally significant and safety rise to the top for her as well.

The Board discussed that the eventual goal is a connected system. They acknowledged that there are a number of missing links in the system, especially if considered at the regional scale. Administrator Lamberton asked if there was anything the Board thought was important that was missing in the regional prioritization criteria noted. Several Board members felt the criteria did include all the factors that they had thought of, or thought should be included, and there was general consensus that this was a good starting place for the prioritization process for this regional effort. All concurred with taking the approach of using these seven factors and ranking them equally at this time.

Administrator Lamberton stated that the MPO would take this direction forward with the consultant team. As it is actually put to use with a set of proposed projects, the weighting of each factor could be revisited easily, if desired and directed by the Board.

5. PUBLIC OUTREACH OPPORTUNITIES

The SVMPO Administrator stated that an ongoing part of this effort was to conduct activities to solicit public input into this longer-range transportation plan in a series of four phases. C.T. Revere,

the sub-consultant to Kimley-Horn on this project for the public outreach efforts, had joined the Board Work Session telephonically by the time of this item. Administrator Lamberton turned this item over to him and Mr. Revere shared with Board members that public outreach was planned to be ongoing throughout the planning effort. One key component of the public outreach plan was building in flexibility to be able to react to changing conditions in the region so that opportunities for the community to discuss issues and future projects comfortably together might be accomplished both through virtual types of outreach and also in more traditional settings, when and where appropriate.

One of the primary goals for the first phase is to increase the public's awareness of the project, why it is being done, what is important about it and how they can be involved. One way that is planned is using a virtual mapping tool called Social PinPoint that has been shown to be effective for gaining many, many comments about specific areas of interest to the public. Social Pinpoint allows people to log in and zoom into a specific location in the region and add notes about their concerns or ideas. The site is monitored so that inappropriate subject matter is removed before being made available to the public. The SVMPO website is intended to be the launching pad for outreach but will be supplemented with other types of direct advertising.

Member Banks asked if funding for advertisements, like in newspapers, was available. Administrator Lamberton indicated that public outreach funding had been included in the project budget. Member Banks asked if billboards might be one outreach idea stating that they did have them in the area of the Town, as well as down in the Hereford and Palominos areas. Vice-Chair Borer stated he looked into that during his campaign and there was some question about how effective they were for the cost involved. However, using billboards is one idea that could be explored further.

It was noted by the consultant team that only using virtual means might weaken outreach to those that did not have access to the internet. Having a phone-in option will be available, as most people do have phones. In addition, this effort will be coordinated with outreach on the short-range transit plan so outreach will also be directed to both transit riders and transit drivers. Administrator Lamberton noted this will help in reaching the Title VI population groups that are dependent on transit options.

Chair Muller and Member Gray both mentioned connecting to their Sierra Vista PIO, Judy Hector, who could advise as to what types of outreach might work best for their population groups. Several members stated that Social Media, like Facebook and Twitter, are used a lot by their jurisdictions to reach their residents. Member Searle stated that phone options, just talking to people, sounded very reasonable. Public meetings, he noted, rarely receive much of a turn-out.

Chair Mueller indicated that the City would like a Council Work Session on this project as it gets going, and at the appropriate time. Vice-Chair Borer asked if a joint work session of all three member jurisdictions might make sense and wondered if that could be arranged. Member Banks thought that sounded like a good idea. Board members discussed that this might reduce confusion if everyone heard the same thing at the same time because the regional plan was going to take all of them to coordinate the recommendations together. There was a feeling this might be possible if a large enough space could be identified or a virtual meeting could be arranged. The SVMPO staff and consultant team will follow-up on this idea.

6. FUTURE DISCUSSION ITEMS AND BOARD REQUESTS

Administrator Lamberton stated that she would keep the Board posted on the status of this project and opportunities for Board member to participate or assist in putting information out to their own jurisdictions or networks. The next Board meeting in November will be setting the tentative calendar for 2021.

7. DIRECTION TO THE SVMPO ADMINISTRATOR

The Board Chair asked if direction was clear to the consultant team and the Administrator regarding the project prioritization criteria. Administrator Lamberton stated, yes, it was and added that her understanding was that the prioritization criteria, as presented to the Board, were to be equally ranked as the initial starting place for this long-range transportation plan.

Chair Mueller asked if the consultant team had anything else to add. Brent Crowther for Kimley-Horn advised the Board that he appreciated their interaction and input at this stage of the project. Dale Miller for Rick Engineering concurred and stated that his comments had all been reflected in the discussion, in particular those comments related to the importance of regional significance and safety as project priority factors. CT. Revere for Gordley Group also thanked the Board for their time and attention to this discussion and concurred with the Board direction and identification of regional prioritization criteria.

Chair Muller asked if any of the other Board members or attendees had anything to add. Mr. Moore, for ADOT, stated they were good, as did Alternative Member Ms. Butterworth for the Town of Huachuca City. Member Searle, for the STB, stated that connectivity was still needed related to the failed BST extension project from an earlier regional project effort of about five years ago. Chair Mueller concurred and said that the regional connection issue from east to west and north to south was going to be a future consideration, although it was a long way out from an actual project being undertaken by any of the member jurisdictions. No other comments were offered by attendees, all stating they had no questions or additional comments at this time.

8. FUTURE DISCUSSION ITEMS AND BOARD REQUESTS

It was noted that the next Board of Directors meeting is set for **Thursday, November 19th at 3:00 p.m.**

9. ADJOURNMENT

Chair Mueller adjourned the Work Session at 3:52 p.m.

SVMPO Work Sessions are informal meetings where Board members may prepare for upcoming regular Board meetings, have staff and/or agency briefings on issues, and provide an opportunity for detailed discussions on topics of regional concern among themselves. These meetings are open to the public, but time is not reserved for public comment. Members of the public may attend in person, or by phone, and may share written comments through the SVMPO website.

No formal action was taken by the SVMPO Board at this scheduled Work Session.