

TAC Meeting #3 9:00-11:30 June 28th, 2016 Meeting Notes

Overview/Summary

The third Technical Advisor Committee (TAC) meeting for the What Moves You Arizona (WMYA 2040) update effort was held in Arizona Department of Transportation's (ADOT) Transportation Board Room on June 28. The purpose of the meeting was to:

1. Provide an update on project status;
2. Introduce and demonstrate the Decisions Lens software tool;
3. Field questions about and get reaction to application of the tool; and
4. Discuss plans for the upcoming scenario workshop and other Plan development activities.

The bulk of the meeting focused on running a demonstration of the Decision Lens tool.

Meeting Notes

- Charla Glendenning (ADOT) kicked off the meeting and led introductions.
- Craig Secrest (Consultant Project Manager) provided a project status update. This included presenting modifications that had been made to the WMYA 2040 goals and objectives in response to input from the first round of stakeholder outreach meetings. These included the following:
 - **Goal #1: Mobility, Reliability, and Accessibility** – Added language associated with Key Commerce Corridors, urban freeways, select rural highways, freight bottlenecks, and technology deployment;
 - **Goal #2: Preservation** – Made minor language changes;
 - **Goal #3: Safety & Security** – Added language about implementation of evacuation plans;
 - **Goal #4: Strengthen Partnerships** – Made minor language changes;
 - **Goal #5: Program Delivery** – Added language about transparency and protection of natural environment to goal definition; and
 - **Goal #6: Effective Decision-making** – Added emphasis on “balanced” investment.

Mr. Secrest also noted changes that have been made to the initial 25-year needs estimates that were presented at the last TAC meeting. These included:

- Refined the preservation need based on input from reviews;

- Refined the new roadways, interchanges, ITS, and maintenance needs based on information provided by MPOs;
 - Total highway needs revised from \$70B to \$71B;
 - Refined bicycle/pedestrian and urban transit needs based on information from MPOs;
 - Refined passenger rail needs based on additional information; and
 - Total non-highway needs adjusted slightly upward (<\$100M)
- The remainder of the meeting centered around a demonstration of the Decision Lens tool by Eric Weiner (Decision Lens, Inc.) that described the overall tool methodology, demonstrated the pair-wise approach to weighting of goals and objectives, showed how performance metrics are integrated into the tool, and showed the type of output (allocation of resources across major investment categories) that would be produced by Decision Lens (the slides from the presentation are attached). The consultant team then led the TAC in a discussion about both the Decision Lens tool and how it is going to be used to support development of WMYA 2040. Summary of questions and comments from this discussion are provide in Table 1.

Agency	Comment
YMPO	<p>Q. How will you weight the performance measures?</p> <p>A. Potential performance measures are under development internally and full coordination with MPO's and COG's will occur in the Summer and Fall of 2016, The measures are tied to goals and objectives, so the pair-wise comparison that weights these will effectively weight the measures as well.</p>
MAG	Noted the importance of "performance thresholds" and their relationship to the process for establishing targets.
MAG	Stated that description of product of Task 5 should be change from "Project Selection Process" to "Evaluation Process" to avoid creating the perception that WMYA 2040 will be developing a project list.
MAG	Expressed concern that there are disconnects between "goal content" and the pair-wise comparisons. The consultant team agreed to work on the definition of the goal and objective areas to try and minimize the disconnects.
MAG	<p>Q. Could Decision Lens create a measure for the assessment of a "Managed Lanes" project alternative making use of published research results of actual before/after applications?</p> <p>A. Most likely yes, but this would be incorporated in to Task 5 (Project Evaluation Process), not the scenario analysis which deals with program-level outcomes and impacts.</p>

MAG	<p>Q. Can we compare the AOI strategy results with the inputs provided by the stakeholders? Three different approaches could be implemented. Weights and allocations could change based on funding scenarios to be evaluated.</p> <p>A. Confirmed that the public and key stakeholders across the state will provide input to the process later this fall based on similar topics and questions using the Metro Quest tool</p>
ADOT	<p>Q. What is the range of technology that was considered in establishing the performance curve used in the assessment?</p> <p>A. The technology needs are based on current ITS and other currently anticipated technology improvements; they do not include needs associated with emerging and potential technology such as those needed to facilitate automated vehicle transition.</p>
ADOT	<p>Q. Have we considered approaching the safety measure from an infrastructure perspective? (i.e. improvement to address all sub-standard curves on state highways)</p> <p>A. To some degree, Yes. The HERS-ST model identified needs associated with addressing substandard conditions, but these are included in expansion and modernization needs, not in the “safety needs” which are for pure safety projects and initiatives.</p>
MAG	<p>Requested that ADOT share the data that was used to develop the performance curves and unit costs per increment of improvement.</p>
PAG	<p>Q. How will ADOT align the goal categories from the LRTP with the categories that are in the P2P process currently?</p> <p>A. This will be determined (with TAC input) when Task 5 is underway.</p>

Attachment (1): Meeting Presentation Slides