

# FLAGSTAFF METROPOLITAN PLANNING ORGANIZATION STAFF SUMMARY REPORT



To: FMPO Executive Board  
From: David Wessel, FMPO Manager  
Date: November 30, 2012  
Meeting Date: December 6, 2012

---

## *Summary From: Regional Plan 2012 Network Analysis Overview*

### Is the “FUTURE BASE” condition acceptable?

Congestion goes up dramatically in most places in the region. It can be demonstrated through modeling and past practice that improvements are possible.

### What is acceptable regarding levels of congestion?

**Conclusion:** The following are recommended worst acceptable LOS for major roads in their respective contexts:

- Urban Activity Centers: E, some F, no G
- Urban Neighborhoods: E and D
- Suburban Activity Centers: D, some E
- Suburban/Commercial Corridors: D, some E
- Suburban Neighborhoods: D and C
- Rural Neighborhoods: C and B

**Perception:** It is agreed that much of this is a matter of perception. As one travels to larger cities, one expects and is more accepting of congestion. Also, acceptance grows as options to avoid congestion are apparent whether one uses them or not.

**Context:** The current regional plan implies adaptation to development context. The draft update is explicit about it as is the current FMPO Regional Transportation Plan. One expects congestion in urban areas, particularly the activity centers, much more so than in rural areas. The regional plan calls for more urban activity centers, so congestion should be expected to occur in more areas.

### Are complete streets expected?

That is policy in the FMPO RTP and in the draft regional plan. Context will be considered. Right-of-way may force trade-offs and in these cases alternative routes of equal quality facilities should be provided to accommodate all modes.

### “WIDE ROADS” –VS- “MANY ROADS” packages:

A hybrid approach is necessary and a logical conclusion. A resilient approach allows for future roadway capacity AND a major mode shift to non-automobiles, responding to market conditions or alternate futures (see responses regarding expanded use of transit potential below). The following are recommended network improvements. **Substantial expansion of transit, bicycle and pedestrian facilities are also planned.**

### **Recommended “Widening” Projects**

- Interstate 40: 3 lanes, prepare for auxiliary lanes. Priority is I-17 to Country Club. Median protection a priority.
- Interstate 17: 3 lanes
- Butler Avenue (I40 to Fourth): 4 lanes and medians
- W. Route 66: 4 lanes and medians
- Fourth Street (Huntington to Harold Ranch): 4 lanes and medians
- Lockett (Old 66 to Fourth Street): 3 lanes or 2 lanes and median
- Cedar (Fourth to West): 3 lanes with enhance edges or 4 lanes and medians
- N. Beaver and N. San Francisco (Columbus to Forest)
- J.W. Powell: 2 lanes with median but preserve for 4 lanes
- Woody Mountain (W. 66 to Woody Mtn collector): 4 lanes with median

### **Recommended Connections:**

- W. Route 66 urban network including Clay Avenue extension (possible Forest Meadows exception)
- Woody Mountain to at least Pulliam, possibly High Country extension
- Anita Drive
- Fourth Street urban network – (pending model run for narrowing of Fourth Street)
- Linda Vista and/or Lockett to Kaspar/Route 66
- 89 bypass (*preserve possibility*)
- Ponderosa Parkway – Gemini (*preserve possibility*)
- Sinclair Wash Transit Way (*preserve possibility*)
- Babbitt Way to J.W.Powell and Little America collector (*preserve possibilities depending on development patterns and other alternatives*)
- Butler Avenue extension (*assuming Section 20 is developed*)
- Relocate Milton/Plaza Way signal to new intersection south, perhaps as far as Chalmers
- Metz Walk to Plaza Way

### **Recommended new interstate traffic interchanges**

- Camp Navajo (pending development decisions)
- Woody Mountain
- Lone Tree
- 89 Connector (preserve possibility)
- v) Major intersection improvements
- Humphreys/E. Route 66 – this is a safety and capacity issue
- Milton – Butler-W. Route 66. This presupposes that a solution is possible. It may not be. Solutions could influence the possibility or advisability of connecting Riordan Ranch Street to the Milton/W.66 intersection as part of the backage road system. Clay Avenue extension consideration may also be impacted.

### **How does the recommended hybrid network support Scenario “D”?**

- Urban networks: Introduced or attempted on N. Fourth St, W. Route 66, Milton Rd
- Suburban systems: J.W. Powell and Woody Mountain Rd