



December 19, 2017

**CITY OF
TUCSON**

OFFICE OF THE
CITY MANAGER

Charla Glendening
Long-Range Transportation Plan
c/o ADOT Communications
1655 W Jackson St, Mail Drop 126F
Phoenix, AZ 85007
CGlendening@azdot.gov

Re: ADOT's Tentative Long-Range Transportation Plan

Thank you for continuing to keep PAG Region and Southern Arizona priorities in mind as ADOT programs projects in each successive 5-year-plan. We want to keep working together to concentrate on the I-19, I-11 and I-10 corridors as well as the Sonoran Corridor (SR410), the Aviation-Barraza Parkway (SR210), Oracle Road (SR77) and Ajo Way (SR86).

The PAG region remains committed to improving commercial corridors to support freight and tourist traffic within and through our region. Please keep us advised as opportunities arise to work together to achieve our regional goals.

Sincerely,

Michael J. Ortega, P.E.
City Manager

Cc: Mayor and Council
Albert Elias, Assistant City Manager, Tucson Arizona
Daryl W. Cole, Department of Transportation Director, City of Tucson
Robin Raine, Deputy Director, Department of Transportation, City of Tucson



December 19, 2017

**CITY OF
TUCSON**
OFFICE OF THE
CITY MANAGER

Charla Glendening
Long-Range Transportation Plan
c/o ADOT Communications
1655 W Jackson St, Mail Drop 126F
Phoenix, AZ 85007
CGlendening@azdot.gov

Re: ADOT's Tentative Long-Range Transportation Plan

Thank you for continuing to keep PAG Region and Southern Arizona priorities in mind as ADOT programs projects in each successive 5-year-plan. We want to keep working together to concentrate on the I-19, I-11 and I-10 corridors as well as the Sonoran Corridor (SR410), the Aviation-Barraza Parkway (SR210), Oracle Road (SR77) and Ajo Way (SR86).

The PAG region remains committed to improving commercial corridors to support freight and tourist traffic within and through our region. Please keep us advised as opportunities arise to work together to achieve our regional goals.

Sincerely,

Michael J. Ortega, P.E.
City Manager

Cc: Mayor and Council
Albert Elias, Assistant City Manager, Tucson Arizona
Daryl W. Cole, Department of Transportation Director, City of Tucson
Robin Raine, Deputy Director, Department of Transportation, City of Tucson

Chris Fetzer
Executive Director

December 19, 2017

Charla Glendening
Planning and Programming Assistant Manager
ADOT MPD
206 S. 17th Ave. MD 310B
Phoenix, AZ 85007

**RE: What Moves You Arizona -
Long-Range Plan Update Comments**

Dear Ms. Glendening:

On behalf of the NACOG Transportation Policy Advisory Committee (TPAC) I am writing to provide comments on the draft ADOT Long-Range Plan Update and recommendations that directly impact Greater Arizona. Based on our review of the information published during the current public comment period, the committee has made the following observations and offers the following questions and suggestions.

- According to the needs assessment developed during this plan update it appears that needs for the state highway system have grown substantially since the prior plan was completed; however, it is unclear which category of project needs is driving this increase in total needs and why? Has the current level of available funding contributed to declining system performance resulting in a corresponding increase in future needs? Any additional data the department can provide related to these questions will provide greater context for understanding future needs by investment category.
- The Recommended Investment Choice (RIC) for Greater Arizona focuses nearly 80 percent of available revenues for Preservation. While it is understood by most that Preservation investment is critical to maintain the integrity of existing assets, how will this RIC and level of annual investment impact the system's performance? Will this level of annual Preservation investment result in improved, the same, or possibly worsened system performance over time? Since the department has recently referenced several different levels of needed Preservation annually, what amount of annual Preservation investment is required to meet the department's determination of acceptable levels of system performance?

December 19, 2017

Page 2

- It has long been clear that additional statewide investment is required, and based on the updated needs and revenue forecasts in this plan update, the unmet funding need has now grown to \$30.5 billion over the next 25 years. It is much less clear how ADOT might treat allocation of new revenues that may be available to Greater Arizona in the future. Would new resources permit the investment in system Expansion in Greater Arizona, or would those revenues also be allocated only to the Preservation and Modernization categories? A clearer understanding of the trade-offs and impacts of different levels of investment in each funding category would be beneficial to illustrate both the size and seriousness of the current level of underinvestment in the system.
- The five percent cap on RIC funding in a given Five-Year Program year to provide 'seed money' to consider future highway expansion projects in Greater Arizona, coupled with the requirement for non-state resources, appears too restrictive given the magnitude of certain rural expansion projects. We would recommend the department and State Transportation Board establish guidelines for providing 'seed money' for expansion projects but avoid establishing a specific cap and non-state resource requirements via formal policy in order to provide flexibility to the department and Board to leverage unknown future partnership or grant opportunities.
- Finally, while the Long-Range Plan Update does not make specific project level recommendations, if the Greater Arizona RIC is implemented as currently described, what are the likely impacts to specific projects, such as Interstate 17, that have been previously identified in the department's Year 6 – 10 Development Program?

Thank you for the department's efforts to proactively address the state's transportation infrastructure investment and preservation needs now and into the future. We appreciate the opportunity to review the draft recommendations and provide comments.

Sincerely,

/s/

Thomas Thurman
TPAC Chairman

Also, that higher level of articulation will speak to the real culprit impeding progress – the magnitude of under-investment on the state highway system. That level is startling and guarantees that any distribution plan will leave some very significant highway needs unfunded. The ability to articulate those shortfalls and their impacts is vital to narrowing the funding gap through justifying revenue increases.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Craig L. Brown". The signature is fluid and cursive, with a long horizontal stroke extending to the right.

Craig L. Brown
CYMPO Executive Board Chairman



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

December 5, 2017

ARIZONA LONG-RANGE TRANSPORTATION PLAN UPDATE

As the draft long-range plan update has circulated across Greater Arizona, the overwhelming reaction continues to be centered around the virtual elimination of all future expansion projects. While an understandable response, more alarming is the already sizable yet growing gap between the infrastructure needs and projected revenues forecasted in the plan.

OVERALL FUNDING: For the highway system alone, the draft plan anticipates \$53.3 billion in needs and \$22.8 billion in available funding. While a very spirited conversation about the most appropriate distribution between preservation, modernization and expansion is already occurring, it is important to acknowledge that the magnitude of the funding gap is such that there is no ideal way to distribute the funding. Regardless of how the money is divided, the extraordinary level of under-investment insures that there will be some very pressing needs on the highway system that will not be addressed.

PRESERVATION: Without a better articulation of the impacts that underinvestment will have on preservation, modernization and expansion; it is difficult to suggest an improvement to the Department's recommended investment choice for distribution between them. The plan places a tremendous emphasis on preservation. With the considerably higher costs of reconstruction, a focus on maintaining current facilities and preventing their slippage into a state of disrepair requiring reconstruction seems an appropriate priority. However, as recently as last year, \$260 million was stated as the targeted preservation investment level. The draft plan increases that number to \$320 million and there have been indications that the new number is considerably inadequate. It would be helpful to know the specific long-term preservation needs, their costs and the impacts of any under-investment.

MODERNIZATION: While most of the debate appears to be preservation versus some expansion, modernization is also significant. Much of the infrastructure in Greater Arizona is relatively older and was originally designed to carry much lower traffic volumes. As consistently scored by TRIP, Arizona's rural highways continue to be some of the deadliest in the nation and are experiencing an increase in fatalities and serious injuries. The draft plan does dedicate \$91 million a year to modernization projects. It would be helpful to know how that level compares to the total modernization needs as well as the impact from any under-investment.

EXPANSION: As previously stated, the strongest reaction to the draft plan is centered around the potential elimination of any future expansion projects in Greater Arizona. Over the next 25 years, six of the thirteen counties in Greater Arizona are expected to incur population growth of at least 25% and another five will experience growth of up to 25%. Registered vehicles, vehicle miles travelled, and freight movement are all anticipated to grow. Over the last half-century,

Arizona has been one of the fastest growing states in the Nation and that growth is anticipated to continue. ADOT has prioritized the Key Commerce Corridors which include the need to expand highway capacity to compete economically. The overwhelming majority of KCC lane miles and much of the targeted improvements are located in Greater Arizona. As with preservation and modernization, it would be helpful to know what the specific expansion needs are in Greater Arizona, both the specific projects and costs, and what the impacts would be from lesser levels of investment.

Also, even if the heavy emphasis on preservation remains, ADOT and the State Transportation Board should consider proscribing more flexibility for considering future expansion projects than the 5% cap and outside funding contribution requirement currently in the draft plan would allow.

CONCLUSION: The focus over the draft plan in Greater Arizona centers around the lack of expansion funding and whether too much would be allocated to preservation. Based on the lack of information regarding the needs for both, it is difficult to recommend an appropriate division. While the plan provides a net cost total for highway needs and the size of the funding gap, it fails to break it down by preservation, modernization, and expansion needs; and what the impacts of underinvestment would be for each. What will preservation under-investment do to pavement conditions and reconstruction needs? What will modernization under-investment do to accident and fatality rates? What will expansion under-investment do to congestion, system reliability and economic growth potential? Answers to these questions would greatly help in providing recommendations for the best distribution levels.

Also, that higher level of articulation will speak to the real culprit impeding progress – the magnitude of under-investment on the state highway system. That level is startling and guarantees that any distribution plan will leave some very significant highway needs unfunded. The ability to articulate those shortfalls and their impacts is vital to narrowing the funding gap through justifying revenue increases.

Representing, one of only eight small urban populations in Arizona we must find a more reasonable balance for greater Arizona between preservation, modernization, and expansion. The balance must not be to eliminate from two vital areas (modernization and expansion), so that one can exist (preservation). Our local leaders recognize the value of these dollars in light of specific projects such as the needs we face for State Route 95 in the Lake Havasu region, which is the spine of the Lake Havasu region. Today, this state route requires funding from all three sources of funding. Preservation must happen to deter further deterioration of the highway. Modernization must happen to promote safety with medians, turn lanes, traffic signals. Expansion must happen to address capacity with an ever increasing population. I cannot in good conscious support preservation in such disparity over stewarding safety at this time for our region and greater Arizona.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Vincent Gallegos', with a long, sweeping horizontal line extending to the right.

Vincent Gallegos
Director



**Lake Havasu Metropolitan
Planning Organization**
900 London Bridge Road, Bldg. B
Lake Havasu City, AZ 86404
(928) 453-2823

18 December 2017

Long-Range Transportation Plan
c/o ADOT Communications
1655 W. Jackson St., Mail Drop 126F
Phoenix, AZ 85007

Thank you for receiving and considering the following comments regarding the Long Range Transportation Plan. I fully appreciate the essential and difficult role ADOT plays in determining how best to divide up transportation funding between preservation, modernization, and expansion. We recognize that all three areas of transportation funding are critically important. To have them compete against each other proposes a "no-win" situation and even worse will lead to decreased safety and efficiency of our state highway system.

With all this said, it is most clear and evident that first and foremost, the overall transportation funding must be addressed. We can continue to debate how the funding pie is being divided, but no matter how it is divided the LRTP has clearly demonstrated an alarming overall lack of funding. I realize ADOT does not have the ability to increase the overall funding as this must be addressed with our state elected officials and possibly voting population. I would describe the LRTP as a resource to help us illustrate the true crisis we are facing in transportation for greater Arizona.

Regarding, what may be more in your control today with the division and breakdown of transportation funds. I would provide my feedback through similar comments and questions as described in the letter from the Rural Transportation Advocacy Council (RTAC) to the LRTP (RTAC Letter Attached). We all understand the vital importance of preserving what we currently have, but I am not sure how we could be asked to support the measures to which we are going to preserve the state infrastructure. ADOT is proposing in the LRTP that in order for greater Arizona to preserve the infrastructure we currently have, then we must eliminate expansion funds and reduce modernization for all of greater Arizona. However, this approach will directly impact the safety and capacity for greater Arizona.

3. Expansion

- Establish minimum peak hour operations level of service such as Level of Service D representing the minimum quality of traffic service for stable traffic flow and whereas expansion projects may be justified and prioritized when (1) existing infrastructure under existing or Project year traffic demand operate at LOS E or worse and (2) minimum benefit/cost criteria is met through Project investment offset by operations benefit quantified by value of travel delay savings, safety benefit, and environmental/emissions benefit.

On a second *non-critical* but essential/preventive level, the common approach of setting funding allocations to project categories - preservation, safety, and expansion - is reasonable.

Mohave County offers these comments with due respect to the time and effort which has already been expended on the Tentative LRTP preparation. We are available for questions and to give further assistance as needed.

Thank you.

Sincerely,



Steven P. Latoski, P.E., PTOE
Director
Mohave County Public Works
An APWA & CAPRA Accredited Agency
PO Box 7000 Kingman, AZ 86402
P 928.757.0910 F 928.757.0913
steven.latoski@mohavecounty.us

cc: Michael P. Hendrix, P.E.
County Administrator/County Engineer



MOHAVE COUNTY PUBLIC WORKS

Telephone (928) 757-0910
3715 Sunshine Drive
Steven P. Latoski, P.E., PTOE
Public Works Director

Fax (928) 757-0913
P. O. Box 7000 Kingman, Arizona 86402-7000

TDD (928) 753-0729
www.mohavecounty.us
Michael P. Hendrix, P.E.
County Administrator / County Engineer

December 6, 2017

Long-Range Transportation Plan
c/o ADOT Communications
1655 W. Jackson St., Mail Drop 126F
Phoenix, AZ 85007

RE: Arizona Department of Transportation's Tentative Long-Range Transportation Plan

Dear ADOT Associate:

This communication offers Mohave County comment on the Department's Tentative Long-Range Transportation Plan (LRTP). A focus element of the LRTP need consider - in lieu of arbitrary investment allocations - a top tier *projects of critical importance* that satisfy stringent performance criteria supported by engineering justification as decision criteria or *triggers for critical* capital improvement project funding and prioritization. Please note:

- Projects of critical importance may address (1) those that have important impacts on a region and cumulatively may well have larger effect than a collection of discrete capital projects under any allocation category and/or (2) support a pre-defined regionally significant transportation corridor or network.
- Projects of critical importance may expand the types of projects included in the State's transportation improvement plan, and this can help ensure that policy makers have ready access to the best information possible to make cooperative, transparent, and prioritized investment decisions.

Under the three identified project categories - preservation, safety, and expansion - the following performance criteria can be considered for *projects of critical importance*. These suggested performance criteria, as well as other pertinent criteria as identified under a final LRTP, would be tuned to thresholds clearly exhibiting critical need specific to both condition and investment (e.g., higher benefit/cost ratio thresholds).

1. Preservation

- Bridge Condition Rating - establish rating threshold justifying Project funding and prioritization.
- Pavement distress/condition rating consistent with best engineering practices such as FHWA guidance under the Long-Term Pavement Performance Program.

2. Safety

- Establish minimum, rigorous benefit/cost criteria justifying investment of Project monies on basis of safety benefit in reducing crash likelihood and/or crash severity from published, engineering-based crash modification factors.





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

December 5, 2017

ARIZONA LONG-RANGE TRANSPORTATION PLAN UPDATE

As the draft long-range plan update has circulated across Greater Arizona, the overwhelming reaction continues to be centered around the virtual elimination of all future expansion projects. While an understandable response, more alarming is the already sizable yet growing gap between the infrastructure needs and projected revenues forecasted in the plan.

OVERALL FUNDING: For the highway system alone, the draft plan anticipates \$53.3 billion in needs and \$22.8 billion in available funding. While a very spirited conversation about the most appropriate distribution between preservation, modernization and expansion is already occurring, it is important to acknowledge that the magnitude of the funding gap is such that there is no ideal way to distribute the funding. Regardless of how the money is divided, the extraordinary level of under-investment insures that there will be some very pressing needs on the highway system that will not be addressed.

PRESERVATION: Without a better articulation of the impacts that underinvestment will have on preservation, modernization and expansion; it is difficult to suggest an improvement to the Department's recommended investment choice for distribution between them. The plan places a tremendous emphasis on preservation. With the considerably higher costs of reconstruction, a focus on maintaining current facilities and preventing their slippage into a state of disrepair requiring reconstruction seems an appropriate priority. However, as recently as last year, \$260 million was stated as the targeted preservation investment level. The draft plan increases that number to \$320 million and there have been indications that the new number is considerably inadequate. It would be helpful to know the specific long-term preservation needs, their costs and the impacts of any under-investment.

MODERNIZATION: While most of the debate appears to be preservation versus some expansion, modernization is also significant. Much of the infrastructure in Greater Arizona is relatively older and was originally designed to carry much lower traffic volumes. As consistently scored by TRIP, Arizona's rural highways continue to be some of the deadliest in the nation and are experiencing an increase in fatalities and serious injuries. The draft plan does dedicate \$91 million a year to modernization projects. It would be helpful to know how that level compares to the total modernization needs as well as the impact from any under-investment.

EXPANSION: As previously stated, the strongest reaction to the draft plan is centered around the potential elimination of any future expansion projects in Greater Arizona. Over the next 25 years, six of the thirteen counties in Greater Arizona are expected to incur population growth of at least 25% and another five will experience growth of up to 25%. Registered vehicles, vehicle miles travelled, and freight movement are all anticipated to grow. Over the last half-century,

Arizona has been one of the fastest growing states in the Nation and that growth is anticipated to continue. ADOT has prioritized the Key Commerce Corridors which include the need to expand highway capacity to compete economically. The overwhelming majority of KCC lane miles and much of the targeted improvements are located in Greater Arizona. As with preservation and modernization, it would be helpful to know what the specific expansion needs are in Greater Arizona, both the specific projects and costs, and what the impacts would be from lesser levels of investment.

Also, even if the heavy emphasis on preservation remains, ADOT and the State Transportation Board should consider proscribing more flexibility for considering future expansion projects than the 5% cap and outside funding contribution requirement currently in the draft plan would allow.

CONCLUSION: The focus over the draft plan in Greater Arizona centers around the lack of expansion funding and whether too much would be allocated to preservation. Based on the lack of information regarding the needs for both, it is difficult to recommend an appropriate division. While the plan provides a net cost total for highway needs and the size of the funding gap, it fails to break it down by preservation, modernization, and expansion needs; and what the impacts of underinvestment would be for each. What will preservation under-investment do to pavement conditions and reconstruction needs? What will modernization under-investment do to accident and fatality rates? What will expansion under-investment do to congestion, system reliability and economic growth potential? Answers to these questions would greatly help in providing recommendations for the best distribution levels.

Also, that higher level of articulation will speak to the real culprit impeding progress – the magnitude of under-investment on the state highway system. That level is startling and guarantees that any distribution plan will leave some very significant highway needs unfunded. The ability to articulate those shortfalls and their impacts is vital to narrowing the funding gap through justifying revenue increases.



Central Yavapai Metropolitan Planning Organization

1971 Commerce Center Circle, Ste. E
Prescott, AZ 86301
Phone: 928-442-5730
Fax: 928-442-5736
www.cympo.com

December 18, 2017

Arizona Department of Transportation
Long-Range Transportation Plan
c/o ADOT Communications
1655 W. Jackson St., Mail Drop 126F
Phoenix, AZ 85007

RE: ADOT Long Range Transportation Plan

As the draft long-range plan update has circulated across Greater Arizona, the overwhelming reaction continues to be centered around the virtual elimination of all future expansion projects. While an understandable response, more alarming is the already sizable yet growing gap between the infrastructure needs and projected revenues forecasted in the plan.

OVERALL FUNDING: For the highway system alone, the draft plan anticipates \$53.3 billion in needs and \$22.8 billion in available funding. While a very spirited conversation about the most appropriate distribution between preservation, modernization and expansion is already occurring, it is important to acknowledge that the magnitude of the funding gap is such that there is no ideal way to distribute the funding. Regardless of how the money is divided, the extraordinary level of under-investment insures that there will be some very pressing needs on the highway system that will not be addressed.

PRESERVATION: Without a better articulation of the impacts that underinvestment will have on preservation, modernization and expansion; it is difficult to suggest an improvement to the Department's recommended investment choice for distribution between them. The plan places a tremendous emphasis on preservation. With the considerably higher costs of reconstruction, a focus on maintaining current facilities and preventing their slippage into a state of disrepair requiring reconstruction seems an appropriate priority. However, as recently as last year, \$260 million was stated as the targeted preservation investment level. The draft plan increases that number to \$320 million and there have been indications that the new number is considerably inadequate. It would be helpful to know the specific long-term preservation needs, their costs and the impacts of any under-investment.

MODERNIZATION: While most of the debate appears to be preservation versus some expansion, modernization is also significant. Much of the infrastructure in Greater Arizona is relatively older and was originally designed to carry much lower traffic volumes. As consistently scored by TRIP, Arizona's rural highways continue to be some of the deadliest in the nation and are experiencing an increase in fatalities and serious injuries. The draft plan does dedicate \$91 million a year to modernization projects. It would be helpful to know how that level compares to the total modernization needs as well as the impact from any under-investment.

EXPANSION: As previously stated, the strongest reaction to the draft plan is centered around the potential elimination of any future expansion projects in Greater Arizona. Over the next 25 years, six of the thirteen counties in Greater Arizona are expected to incur population growth of at least 25% and another five will experience growth of up to 25%. Registered vehicles, vehicle miles travelled, and freight movement are all anticipated to grow. Over the last half-century,

Arizona has been one of the fastest growing states in the Nation and that growth is anticipated to continue. ADOT has prioritized the Key Commerce Corridors which include the need to expand highway capacity to compete economically. The overwhelming majority of KCC lane miles and much of the targeted improvements are located in Greater Arizona. As with preservation and modernization, it would be helpful to know what the specific expansion needs are in Greater Arizona, both the specific projects and costs, and what the impacts would be from lesser levels of investment.

Also, even if the heavy emphasis on preservation remains, ADOT and the State Transportation Board should consider proscribing more flexibility for considering future expansion projects than the 5% cap and outside funding contribution requirement currently in the draft plan would allow.

CONCLUSION: The focus over the draft plan in Greater Arizona centers around the lack of expansion funding and whether too much would be allocated to preservation. Based on the lack of information regarding the needs for both, it is difficult to recommend an appropriate division. While the plan provides a net cost total for highway needs and the size of the funding gap, it fails to break it down by preservation, modernization, and expansion needs; and what the impacts of underinvestment would be for each. What will preservation under-investment do to pavement conditions and reconstruction needs? What will modernization under-investment do to accident and fatality rates? What will expansion under-investment do to congestion, system reliability and economic growth potential? Answers to these questions would greatly help in providing recommendations for the best distribution levels.

Charla Glendening

From: Laura Douglas
Sent: Thursday, December 21, 2017 2:19 PM
To: ct@gordleygroup.com; Stephanie Stanley (stephanie@gordleygroup.com); 'Vanessa Noonkester'; kristin@centralcreativeaz.com; Charla Glendening
Subject: FW: my comments to Transportation Plan

Email 2 of 2 from the ADOT Projects email address.

Laura Douglas
Community Relations Project Manager
Office of Community Relations
Arizona Department of Transportation
1655 W. Jackson, Room 170, Mail Drop 126F
Phoenix, AZ 85007
602.712.7683 (office)
602.568.7721 (mobile)
news@azdot.gov
azdot.gov



From: Projects
Sent: Thursday, December 21, 2017 1:53 PM
To: Laura Douglas
Subject: FW: my comments to Transportation Plan

Here you go!

Thank you,

Kimberly Noetzel
Assistant Communications Director for Community Relations
Arizona Department of Transportation
602.712.2122 – office
480.316.2469 – cell
www.azdot.gov



From: Matt Rencher [<mailto:mrencher@coolidgeaz.com>]
Sent: Tuesday, December 19, 2017 6:00 PM
To: Projects
Subject: FW: my comments to Transportation Plan

Additional comments from the City Manager for the City of Coolidge regarding the ADOT Tentative Long-Range Transportation Plan (What Moves You Arizona 2040, WMYA2040)

Thanks,

Matt Rencher, PE, CFM
Public Works Director/ City Engineer
City of Coolidge, Arizona
O: 520-723-4882
Dir: 520-723-6004
C: 520-213-7797

From: Rick Miller [<mailto:rmiller@coolidgeaz.com>]

Sent: Tuesday, December 19, 2017 5:51 PM

To: 'Jon Thompson' <jthompson@coolidgeaz.com>; 'JON M. THOMPSON' <THOMPSON5155@msn.com>; 'Matt Rencher' <mrencher@coolidgeaz.com>; glopez@coolidgeaz.com

Subject: my comments to Transportation Plan

Here are my comments on the ADOT Transportation Plan:

- There have been a number of recent fatalities and serious injury accidents on Highway 87 and 287 in Western Pinal County near Coolidge. I believe these accidents have resulted from a lack of center turn lanes and right turn lanes at major intersections. Drivers stopping in travel lanes to make left hand turns are being rear ended and pushed head on into oncoming traffic when these center turn lanes are not present. Where right hand turn lanes are missing, impatient drivers will pass vehicles that are slowing to make the turn and slam broadside into vehicles that are entering the highway because they see a vehicle slowing to make the turn. Adding turn lanes and right hand turn lanes will reduce traffic fatalities and serious injury accidents on our rural public roads
- I-10 from Casa Grande to Chandler is an embarrassing and dangerously congested chokepoint on this Interstate system connecting Florida to California. It will only get worse as the Greater Casa Grande Valley between Phoenix and Tucson continues to have economic growth creating jobs and housing. The proposed North South Corridor connecting the U.S. 60 in Apache Junction with I-10 South of Eloy and the widening of I-10 are two critical projects that will keep Arizonans moving and not parked on our highway system. The high speed passenger rail service between Tucson and Phoenix is another important step to moving Arizona forward by reducing vehicle trips on our SHS
- The proposed inland port project on the Union Pacific Railroad just North of the I-10/Highway 87 intersection in Coolidge will connect the international market to rural Arizona via rail from the very congested California port cities. Railcars full of goods moving between this inland port and Southern California ports will reduce carbon emissions by significantly reducing semi-tractor trailer trips currently delivering these goods on our interstate system. The port will increase capacity of our Highway System by reducing the truck traffic. Local, State, County and Regional partners should continue to support TIGER and INFRA Grant applications that have been submitted for federal funding assistance of this important Arizona economic development project.
- Understandably, preservation and maintenance should be a high priority for funding to extend the life of our highway systems throughout the State, however, now that other areas of the State are beginning to see the growth that Maricopa County and Pima County have benefitted from, consideration must be given to expand important connections to these shifting population and employment centers. Must find new sources of revenue to expand the system while maintaining what we have in place. State's elected officials need to find ways to keep up or we are going to be left behind as a great place to do business in a very competitive world economy. Increasing the gas tax seems to be a reasonable solution since vehicles are getting much better mileage, and tax electric and hybrid vehicles that also benefit from an expanded highway system

- Center and right turn lanes on rural highways at the heavier traffic intersections is very important. Lives depend on it as can be seen in the large number of fatalities and serious injury accidents on our rural highways.
- Our City recently conducted an inspection stop for commercial haulers coming through town on Hwy 87/287 and found a large number of the vehicles were overweight, having safety violations and other concerns. These inspections on State Highways through rural areas should probably be conducted more often with local police departments to improve safety and put heavy truck traffic on routes more suitable for these large commercial vehicles.
- Do not forget to mention the need for inland ports such as the one being proposed in Pinal County. Inland Port Arizona on the Union Pacific Railroad will become a major employment center for the region and will significantly reduce the number of Semi Trucks on I-8 and I-10 as goods are shipped to this port, inspected and distributed to markets in this region.
- The economic value of our smaller airports throughout the State must not be underestimated. These important facilities attract business and innovation and hopefully funding from ADOT for Aviation will continue with local and federal sharing. Cities have adopted land use plans around airport facilities that will become the major employment centers around the State which will enhance revenues for Arizona.
- Now that we start to see and will continue to see population and job growth in urbanizing areas in rural Arizona, we sadly hear, "ADOT cannot consider significant new system expansion investment outside the PAG and MAG regions". All of Arizona supported the expansion of SHS in metro areas in the past and all of Arizona must continue to support the expansion of the SHS in rural Arizona as it begins to urbanize. The voter approved Pinal County Regional Transportation Plan and its funding mechanism will help with this expansion but additional funding will be needed to implement this plan and ongoing maintenance as these new systems are developed.

Rick Miller

City Manager

130 W. Central Avenue

Coolidge, AZ 85128

520-723-6000

Public Record Notice: Under Arizona law, e-mail communications and e-mail addresses may be public records subject to disclosure pursuant to a public records request.

Charla Glendening

From: Laura Douglas
Sent: Thursday, December 21, 2017 2:14 PM
To: ct@gordleygroup.com; Stephanie Stanley (stephanie@gordleygroup.com); 'Vanessa Noonkester'; kristin@centralcreativeaz.com; Charla Glendening
Subject: FW: Public Comments for ADOT Tentative Long-Range Transportation Plan

Here is one of two emails that were sent to the ADOT Projects email address.

Laura Douglas
Community Relations Project Manager
Office of Community Relations
Arizona Department of Transportation
1655 W. Jackson, Room 170, Mail Drop 126F
Phoenix, AZ 85007
602.712.7683 (office)
602.568.7721 (mobile)
news@azdot.gov
azdot.gov



From: Projects
Sent: Thursday, December 21, 2017 1:53 PM
To: Laura Douglas
Subject: FW: Public Comments for ADOT Tentative Long-Range Transportation Plan

For you!

Thank you,

Kimberly Noetzel
Assistant Communications Director for Community Relations
Arizona Department of Transportation
602.712.2122 – office
480.316.2469 – cell
www.azdot.gov



From: Matt Rencher [<mailto:mrencher@coolidgeaz.com>]
Sent: Tuesday, December 19, 2017 8:55 AM
To: Projects
Subject: Public Comments for ADOT Tentative Long-Range Transportation Plan

Good Afternoon,

I am the Public Works Director and City Engineer in the City of Coolidge. After reviewing the ADOT Tentative Long-Range Transportation Plan I have some comments I would like to see addressed. I have indicated the page number from the full report as shown on the ADOT website and the comment(s).

Page 5: Goal to “Reduce traffic fatalities and serious injuries on all public roads”

Comment: How much funding will be dedicated to education? If a vast majority of the fatalities and serious injuries are a result of human error or behavioral decisions, would the funds not be better spent on education to prevent the fatalities and serious injuries from happening in the first place rather than spend money to minimize the effect when they DO occur?

Page 5: Goal to “Reduce congestion on the National Highway System”

Comment: How will this be accomplished if Pinal County is projected to experience between 75% and 100% growth in population over the next 25 years? Most of the population growth in Pinal County will likely be making up a significant portion of the work forces of Phoenix and Tucson. The 78% Preservation and 0% indicated for Greater Arizona Expansion will only make the existing congestion worse.

Page 5: Goal to “Reduce congestion on the National Highway System”

Comment: How much of the funding is dedicated to furthering passenger or high speed rail transportation between Phoenix and Tucson? If Pinal County sees as much growth as projected, an alternative mode of transportation (other than the I-10 or SR-87) will be crucial for sustainability and levels of service and the overall economic development throughout the state.

Page 5: Goal to “Improve the national freight network, strengthen rural access to national/ international markets and support economic development.”

Comment: How will this be accomplished if Pinal County is projected to experience between 75% and 100% growth in population over the next 25 years? Most of the population growth in Pinal County will likely be making up a significant portion of the work forces of Phoenix and Tucson. The 78% Preservation and 0% indicated for Greater Arizona Expansion will only make the existing congestion worse. Furthermore, the distribution of available funds appears to overwhelmingly support MAG and PAG, with the MAG allotment almost equal to the whole of the Greater Arizona portion. Moreover, 87.5% of the MAG allocation is proposed for expansion. The expansion probably should happen in the areas that connect the labor force (Pinal County) with the jobs (MAG and PAG).

Page 6: “Improved connectivity and more travel options are needed in rural areas.”

Comment: According to the population growth graphic on page 9, Pinal County is showing a 75% - 100% population growth. The vast majority of these people will commute to and from the Maricopa or Pima County areas. There is no discussion about expansion of the highway system between Maricopa and Pima Counties or possible alternatives such as passenger/commuter rail or public transportation.

Page 9: Projected Population Growth

Comment: Pinal County has a growth projection of 75% to 100%, at least double the projections from any other county. This population growth will contribute a significant portion to the economic development of MAG and PAG. With the large projected population growth, there should be more funding dedicated to expansion of the transportation system within Pinal County to reduce the congestion. Other transportation alternatives should also be considered, such as passenger rail or public transport.

Page 13: Modernization and Expansion

Comment: Why does modernization and expansion not include alternative types of transportation such as commuter/passenger rail or public transportation? It seems these should be primary areas of focus, especially given the projected growth in rural areas (e.g. in Pinal County where the projected population growth is between 75% and 100%) and the National Highway Performance goals indicated previously in the report of reducing the congestion, improving the efficiency, and protecting the environment? Also, one of the key themes throughout the process was “more travel options are needed in rural areas.” One of the 6 WMYA2040 goals was specifically to “improve access to multimodal

transportation and optimize mobility and reliability for passengers and freight.” Yet nowhere in this report is there a discussion of passenger/ commuter rail or public transportation.

Thanks for your attention to these comments, and please let me know that these comments have been incorporated into the report.

Thanks,

Matt Rencher, PE, CFM
Public Works Director/ City Engineer
City of Coolidge, Arizona
O: 520-723-4882
Dir: 520-723-6004
C: 520-213-7797

Charla Glendening

From: Laura Douglas
Sent: Friday, January 05, 2018 1:14 PM
To: Charla Glendening; ct@gordleygroup.com; Stephanie Stanley (stephanie@gordleygroup.com); kristin@centralcreativeaz.com
Subject: FW: Comment: State Long-Range Transportation Plan

Hello all and Happy New Year! The comment below came in earlier this week to the general ADOT Projects inbox. Not sure if it's too late to include it in the report, but wanted to send it along anyway.

Thanks,
Laura

Laura Douglas
Community Relations Project Manager
Office of Community Relations
Arizona Department of Transportation
1655 W. Jackson, Room 170, Mail Drop 126F
Phoenix, AZ 85007
602.712.7683 (office)
602.568.7721 (mobile)
news@azdot.gov
azdot.gov



From: Projects
Sent: Friday, January 05, 2018 12:41 PM
To: Laura Douglas
Subject: FW: Comment: State Long-Range Transportation Plan

See below!

Thank you,

Kimberly Noetzel
Assistant Communications Director for Community Relations
Arizona Department of Transportation
602.712.2122 – office
480.316.2469 – cell
www.azdot.gov



From: Ryan Wozniak [<mailto:ryanwoz@gmail.com>]
Sent: Tuesday, January 02, 2018 5:02 PM
To: Projects
Subject: Comment: State Long-Range Transportation Plan

Hello,

My comment involves the incomplete thoughts associated with Table 2-1 of the current draft plan found here: <https://www.azdot.gov/docs/default-source/planning/wmya-2040-wp-2-draft.pdf?sfvrsn=2>

Table 2-1: WMYA 2035 Goals and Performance Measures

Link Transportation and Land Use: Congestion, speed, travel delay, and improved access management (*should include a recommendation to reduce VMT per capita, where applicable*)*

Promote Fiscal Stewardship: No performance measures (*this is unacceptable*)**

* By only controlling for congestion and travel delay, the message is clear that the Transportation Impacts of Land Use decisions should continue to use Level of Service (LOS) as the objective metric to satisfy, and thus adding to an unsustainable model of regional transportation planning. Foremost, ADOT's own [Complete Transportation Guidebook](#) is a good place to revise the messaging for consistency. For more, I quote an article:

When the state measured transportation impacts of a project based on car delay, it was fighting against its own environmental goals. Using LOS, it was easier and cheaper to build projects in outlying areas where individual intersections would show less delay resulting from new development. At the same time it was much harder and more expensive to build in dense areas where there was already a lot of traffic, and where measured LOS impacts would require expensive mitigations or reduced project size — but also where higher density would make transit, walking, and bicycling more viable transportation choices.

Now, projects that are shown to decrease vehicle miles traveled — for example, bike lanes or pedestrian paths, or a grocery store that allows local residents to travel shorter distances to shop — may be automatically considered to have a “less than significant” impact under CEQA.

- [California Has Officially Ditched Car-Centric ‘Level of Service’](#)

By Damien Newton and Melanie Curry

Aug 7, 2014

There are a number of Arizona suburbs that would benefit from ditching the LOS standard for measuring impact, and by taking the approach that California is working toward, it inspires a mixing of land uses and promotion of Transit Oriented Development that ultimately reduces dependence on personal vehicle use. That isn't to suggest that LOS should be completely abandoned, but could be evaluated in tandem with VMT per capita that a proposed land use would generate. California is currently doing the heavy lifting in this arena (<http://opr.ca.gov/ceqa/updates/sb-743/>).

** With the current projected revenue and expenditures having a gap of \$30.5B, it is unacceptable to not have a Fiscal Stewardship Performance Measure identified in the plan. Without accountability, there will be little likelihood that fiscal solvency will be in ADOT's future.

Best Regards,

A. Ryan Wozniak, AICP

Charla Glendening

From: Kimberly Noetzel
Sent: Tuesday, January 09, 2018 4:59 PM
To: Laura Douglas; Charla Glendening
Subject: LRTP comment

Hello,
I pulled a voicemail off the ADOT Project Information line from a man named Andre Ryan (I think it was Ryan, but I could not make out his last name). He has read over the LRTP and said there is no information about reducing vehicle miles travelled (VMT). He would like to see the LRTP focus on monitoring and reducing VMT. He thinks the plan should not move away from Level of Service and instead address ways to reduce the number of miles people are driving. He said that if you need a good reference document for this, please refer to the California Office of Planning and Research.

He did not leave any contact information.

Thank you,

Kimberly Noetzel
Assistant Communications Director for Community Relations
Arizona Department of Transportation
602.712.2122 – office
480.316.2469 – cell
www.azdot.gov



