

Comment Resolution

Consultation with Rural Elected Officials Policy

**Results of 60 day review period
September 1, 2010 – December 31, 2010**

In accordance with federal regulation, ADOT submitted the draft Transportation Consultation with Rural Elected Officials Policy (attached) to Rural Elected Officials throughout the State for the required 60 day review period. This was accomplished with the help of CCP Intergovernmental Affairs staff, who emailed the document to approximately 300 elected officials. The purpose of the 60 day review period was to solicit comments on the draft Policy. A survey link was provided within the attached document that enabled the elected official to easily link to the survey and provide comments. The review period began on September 1, 2010 and remained open thru December 31, 2010 (exceeding the required 60 days). The following comments were received during the review period:

1.	Comment:	Change County “Commissioners” to “Supervisors”
	Response:	Agree to make change
2.	Comment:	Recommends a two-tier system that delineates who is invited to meetings. For example: Long Range Transportation Plan = Policy = Elected Official Five Year Construction Program = Programming = Technical Staff
	Response:	This is a policy written specifically to address meetings with elected officials. Technical staff and others have the ability participate through the public participation process.
3.	Comment:	Elevate the word “Consultation” to “Cooperation & Collaboration” (more accurate language is appropriate).
	Response:	This language is part of the federal regulations – no change will be made.
4.	Comment:	Provide a schedule (no dates) that illustrates when the engagement occurs.
	Response:	Agree to add a ‘calendar of important dates’ that addresses a tentative meeting schedule related to the Five Year Construction Program, and designate staff to coordinate deadline dates and schedule pre-meetings. This will be included on the web page dedicated to this policy.
5.	Comment:	Recommend at least 2 meetings for NACOG due to size.
	Response:	Agree to add language that states the numbers of meetings will be determined by the COG or MPO during a pre-meeting.

6.	Comment:	Make it clear that meetings are open to all officials across the state regardless of location –OR- Open to target audience –OR- Left to the discretion of the COG/MPO.
	Response:	The COG/MPO determines the appropriate officials to invite. ADOT reviews and has final approval of the list – no change necessary.
7.	Comment:	List of ‘Officials’ may be too broad (Don’t list?). Too many leads to a watered down process and less distinction between this process and other public participation – be careful not to create redundancy.
	Response:	Agree, the List of Officials will be revised.
8.	Comment:	Changes titles: Association of County Board of Supervisors; State Transportation Board are appointed (not elected).
	Response:	Agree
9.	Comment:	Schedule meetings in Yuma
	Response:	Agree
10.	Comment:	Implement the Casa Grande Accord.
	Response:	Comment unclear, no response.
11.	Comment:	Need to make sure there is tribal involvement/need more tribal involvement
	Response:	COG/MPO will invite Tribal Officials from member agencies.
12.	Comment:	Please insure that the agreement also identify who has responsibility to inform local elected officials and management about the date and location, as well as how far in advance notification will be sent.
	Response:	Agree, the COG/MPO will alert officials approximately 4-6 weeks in advance of the meeting with a ‘save the date’ notice.
13.	Comment:	More meetings with elected officials should be held
	Response:	This will be determined by COG/MPO and the current plans ADOT is working on.
14.	Comment:	COG regional councils are not your audience in many cases.
	Response:	Agree, invitations will be sent to all council/board members.
15.	Comment:	State how far in advance invites will be sent – suggest 3 weeks
	Response:	the COG/MPO will alert officials approximately 4-6 weeks in advance of the meeting with a ‘save the date’ notice

16.	Comment:	Suggest more than one meeting.
	Response:	This will be determined by COG/MPO and the current plans ADOT is working on.
17.	Comment:	There needs to be more announcements of the alternative methods to participate.
	Response:	This will be determined once a meeting location is determined and based on the technology the facility offers.
18.	Comment:	In person meetings most effective
	Response:	Agree
19.	Comment:	Will input be shared with the entire State Transportation Board as well?
	Response:	Invitations will be sent to members. Exploring the possibility of creating a web page that would contain information/results of meetings.
20.	Comment:	The process specifies that a minimum of one meeting will be held each year in each COG or MPO region. ADOT should consider partnering with large geographic regions to provide consultation meetings in multiple locations, as deemed appropriate by the region.
	Response:	Agree, this will be determined at the pre-meeting.
21.	Comment:	Consultation meetings should be conducted at meaningful points in the process to allow rural local officials to provide input that can be considered by ADOT well in advance of any final decisions.
	Response:	Agree
22.	Comment:	ADOT should consider a more narrow definition of rural local officials than the one described in draft consultation process. It is the opinion of our (NACOG) members that this definition appears more representative of a stakeholders list than a definition of elected or appointed rural officials with responsibility for transportation.
	Response:	Agree, the List of Officials will be revised.
23.	Comment:	It might be thoughtful to have an appendix to list changes made to the process as a result of the review period or to list changes resulting from the review period.
	Response:	Agree
24.	Comment:	Discuss how comments received on the LRTP, STIP, etc. will be treated. A commitment to include them in related appendices perhaps?

	Response:	All comments will be sent to the COG/MPO for distribution to members. Also, exploring the possibility of creating a web page that would contain information/results of meetings.