

TRANSPORTATION 
America's Future Depends on it **2020**

SUMMARIES OF
THE ARIZONA PUBLIC FORUM
& PUBLIC SURVEY

TAT 1.2: E93
COPY 2

ARIZONA STATE LIBRARY
UNIVERSITY AND Jepson Center

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY OF

ARIZONA'S "TRANSPORTATION 2020"

EFFORT

AN EXECUTIVE SUMMARY
OF THE
TESTIMONIES, WRITTEN SUMMARIES, AND PUBLIC SURVEY RESULTS
ASSOCIATED WITH THE
ARIZONA "TRANSPORTATION 2020" PUBLIC FORUM

In September of 1987, the Arizona Department of Transportation and the Arizona Highway Users Conference mailed the announcement of the coming "Transportation 2020" Public Forum to about 880 leaders around the State of Arizona. A transportation survey instrument was enclosed in the Public Forum announcement.

On November 24, 1987, Arizona's "Transportation 2020" Public Forum was held at the State Senate Building in the City of Phoenix by the Arizona Department of Transportation and the Arizona Highway Users Conference.

The Public Forum and the Public Survey were both successful. One-hundred and twenty-five (125) people attended the forum and heard fifty-four (54) people make prepared statements. Over one-hundred (100) Public Survey forms were filled-in and returned to the Department.

Separate summarizations of the results of the Public Forum and the Public Survey have been made. Many additional findings and conclusions can be drawn from the tables and exhibits included in the separate summarizations. Close examination and in-depth analysis of the tabular results prepared for and provided in the other summaries will yield a wealth of interesting and enlightening supplemental information.

Because of the intentionally brief nature of this document, and because of the availability of the other two summarizations, the tables and exhibits have not been reproduced for this executive summary.

The following remarks represent only the final major conclusions from the aforementioned summarizations. In each case, the major results solely reflect the preponderance of opinions expressed.

COMBINED FORUM AND SURVEY RESULTS

In the following paragraphs the results from the Public Forum and from the Public Survey have been combined into a single presentation.

Because the results in the separate Public Forum and Public Survey summarizations were presented in their order of occurrence within the tables, as opposed to their relative priority; the presentation order of the results in this executive summary will undoubtedly differ from the presentation order of the results in the separate summarizations.

Care was taken in the preparation of the following list to reflect the apparent priorities of the speakers and respondents.

1. TRANSPORTATION FINANCING SHOULD CONTINUE AT THE FEDERAL AND STATE LEVELS AND ALL DIVERSIONS OF TRUST FUNDS SHOULD BE STOPPED IMMEDIATELY.
2. WHILE TRAFFIC CONGESTION IS NOT PRESENTLY A MAJOR PROBLEM IN ARIZONA, IT WILL BECOME ONE IN THE NEAR FUTURE.
3. HIGHWAY CAPACITY, PRESERVATION AND MAINTENANCE NEEDS ON ALL LEVELS OF THE SYSTEM ARE AN IMPORTANT FACTOR WHICH WILL DETERMINE ARIZONA'S FUTURE QUALITY OF LIFE AND ECONOMIC VITALITY.
4. PRIVATE DEVELOPERS SHOULD BE CHARGED FEES FOR THE IMPACTS WHICH THEIR DEVELOPMENTS HAVE ON ADJACENT ROADWAY FACILITIES.
5. ARIZONA'S CONSTANTLY GROWING POPULATION WILL RESULT IN INCREASED TRAVEL DEMAND AND DECREASED AIR QUALITY.
6. EXISTING PLANS FOR FUTURE TRANSPORTATION IMPROVEMENTS HAVE BEEN WIDELY PUBLICIZED AND ARE GENERALLY KNOWN AND UNDERSTOOD BY THE PUBLIC.
7. EXISTING TRANSPORTATION FACILITIES AND SERVICES ARE NOT VIEWED AS A POSITIVE ELEMENT IN ATTRACTING NEW BUSINESSES AND RESIDENTS TO ARIZONA.

8. PUBLIC TRANSPORTATION SERVICES AND FACILITIES SHOULD BE IMPROVED TO MEET FUTURE TRAVEL DEMANDS AND TO REDUCE AIR POLLUTION.
9. PUBLIC TRANSPORTATION IS VIEWED AS BEING INADEQUATE, BUT THE CURRENT LOW LEVEL OF SERVICE HAS NOT AND WILL NOT CAUSE THE COST OF DOING BUSINESS TO INCREASE.

Although these nine summary statements of the results from the Public Forum and the Public Survey do reflect the major findings from Arizona's "Transportation 2020" efforts, it should be remembered that many other significant conclusions can be drawn from the tables and exhibits presented in the separate summarizations. All interested parties are urged to consult the Public Forum and Public Survey summarizations for additional insight into the perceptions of Arizona's transportation system users and managers.

CONCLUSIONS FROM THE FORUM AND THE SURVEY

Arizona's "Transportation 2020" Public Forum and Public Survey revealed several key insights into the perceptions of this state's transportation system users and managers.

It is apparent that current transportation conditions in Arizona are generally tolerable, but most residents believe that a significant deterioration in the level of transportation service and air quality is inevitable and inherent in the dramatic trend in population increases which continue throughout the state.

Monies from the federal and state trust funds should continue to flow, without delays or diversions, into highway projects which increase capacity and preserve pavement on all levels of our state's roadway network. Of particular interest were urban controlled access facility needs of both the Interstate and urban freeway varieties.

Although improvements in public transportation will not significantly impact the economic outlook of the state, transit and/or rail projects should be funded at the federal and state levels to help reduce traffic congestion and air pollution.

SUMMARIZATION OF

ARIZONA'S "TRANSPORTATION 2020"

PUBLIC FORUM

A SUMMARIZATION OF
THE TESTIMONIES AND WRITTEN STATEMENTS
FROM THE
ARIZONA "TRANSPORTATION 2020"
PUBLIC FORUM

On November 24, 1987, the Arizona Department of Transportation and the Arizona Highway Users Conference conducted its "Transportation 2020" Public Forum at the State Senate Building in the City of Phoenix.

The Public Forum was well attended. One hundred and twenty-five people from the various urban and rural areas around the state, representing nearly every major sector of Arizona's economy, came to the forum. Including the four panel members who made formal presentations, fifty-four people testified at the Arizona "Transportation 2020" Public Forum.

RESULTS OF THE FORUM

The representatives who testified at the Public Forum were placed in eight different categories in order to analyze their responses. The categories of representatives are:

1. **Transportation Business** - Business engaged in transportation development and construction;
2. **Private Business** - Other private business concerns;
3. **Interest Groups** - Public and private interest groups;
4. **Municipal Officials** - Elected and non-elected officials from cities and towns around the state;
5. **County Officials** - Elected and non-elected officials from counties around the state;
6. **State Officials** - Elected and non-elected officials from state government;
7. **Transit / Rail** - Representatives from transit and rail agencies and interests; and
8. **Other** - Leaders representing various other interests within the state.

As can be seen below, representation was particularly weak from government officials at the county and state levels. Although transportation businesses were well represented, speakers from other private businesses were scarce.

<u>CATEGORIES:</u>	<u>ABBREV.:</u>	<u># RESPONSES:</u>
Transportation Business	(TRB)	8
Private Business	(BUS)	1
Interest Groups	(INT)	19
Municipal Government	(MUN)	6
County Government	(COU)	0
State Government	(STA)	2
Transit/Rail	(TRR)	4
Other	(OTH)	10
<u>TOTAL:</u>	(TOT)	<u>50</u>

Three tables were prepared to summarize the results of the testimony at the Public Forum. Each of these tables uses the eight categories listed above for determining the percentage of comments on each given issue.

The tables included in this summarization of the testimonies and written statements from the Arizona "Transportation 2020" Public Forum are:

Table I - "Percentage Of Comments On General Transportation Program Issues," presents how the various groups of speakers felt about general issues like transportation finance, travel growth, federal sanctions, program flexibility, transportation planning and research, and air quality. Also included in this table are the comments regarding transportation systems management.

Table II - "Percentage Of Comments On Highway Issues," shows how various groups of speakers felt on several key issues surrounding the future of the nation's highway programs. Among the major issues delineated are: Interstate Highway System needs; Primary Highway System needs; Secondary Road System needs; Urban System needs; local road needs; and general maintenance requirements.

Table III - "Percentage Of Comments On Modal Issues," indicates testimony that was presented which specifically addressed aviation, transit and rail issues.

Table I, shown below, groups the speakers comments into the sub-categories of: Transportation Program Issues; Transportation Finance Issues; and Federal Program Issues. While these sub-categories are somewhat arbitrary and do indeed overlap one another, they have been created to facilitate comparative analysis.

TABLE I
PERCENTAGE OF COMMENTS ON GENERAL TRANSPORTATION PROGRAM ISSUES

	T	B	I	M	C	S	T	O	T
	R	U	N	U	O	T	R	T	O
	B	S	T	N	U	A	R	H	T
TRANSPORTATION PROGRAM ISSUES									
Continued Population Growth	13	0	32	33	na	50	50	20	28
Increased Travel Demand	13	0	26	33	na	0	25	20	22
Need Comprehensive Planning	13	0	5	50	na	0	0	0	10
Importance Of Air Quality	0	0	21	33	na	0	75	40	26
Need For Renewed TSM	25	0	5	17	na	0	25	10	12
Need For Planning/Research	38	0	0	0	na	0	0	20	10
TRANSPORTATION FINANCE ISSUES									
Continue Federal Commitment	25	100	32	33	na	100	25	40	36
Continue State Commitment	13	0	26	17	na	0	25	20	20
Continue Local Commitment	0	0	16	17	na	100	25	0	14
Stop Trust Fund Diversions	25	100	68	33	na	0	25	20	42
Stop Federal Sanctions	0	0	16	17	na	50	0	0	10
Encourage Block Grants	0	0	0	17	na	0	0	10	4
FEDERAL PROGRAM ISSUES									
Need To Define Federal Role	0	0	5	17	na	0	0	10	6
Need To Reduce Red Tape	0	0	5	17	na	0	0	0	4
Need For More Flexibility	0	0	5	17	na	50	0	0	6

* NOTE: The groupings of speakers used in Tables I, II and III are the same as those presented on Page Two.

Table II, shown below, has been divided into the following five sections: Comments About The Interstate; Comments About The Primary System; Comments About Rural Roads; Comments About Urban Facilities; and Comments About Other Road Needs.

**TABLE II
PERCENTAGE OF COMMENTS ON HIGHWAY ISSUES**

	T	B	I	M	C	S	T	O	T
	R	U	N	U	O	T	R	T	O
	B	S	T	N	U	A	R	H	T
COMMENTS ABOUT THE INTERSTATE									
Core Of The Nation's System	0	100	16	0	na	0	25	0	14
Preservation/Rehabilitation	25	100	26	33	na	100	25	0	30
Need For New Urban Capacity	0	100	26	17	na	100	0	0	20
Need For New Rural Routes	13	0	26	17	na	100	0	0	18
COMMENTS ABOUT THE PRIMARY SYSTEM									
Interstate Significance	0	100	21	0	na	100	25	20	22
Recreational Routes	13	0	10	0	na	0	0	0	6
COMMENTS ABOUT RURAL ROADS									
Required For Commerce	13	0	26	0	na	100	25	30	24
Key To Economic Development	0	100	0	0	na	50	0	50	14
COMMENTS ABOUT URBAN FACILITIES									
Need Urban Freeways	50	100	21	83	na	50	50	40	44
COMMENTS ABOUT OTHER ROAD NEEDS									
Local Roads Need Funding	13	0	10	17	na	0	25	30	16
All Need Preserv./Maint.	25	0	42	0	na	50	25	30	28

Table III, shown below, is grouped into Public Transportation Issues and Aviation Issues.

TABLE III
PERCENTAGE OF COMMENTS ON MODAL ISSUES

	T	B	I	M	C	S	T	O	T
	R	U	N	U	O	T	R	T	O
	B	S	T	N	U	A	R	H	T
PUBLIC TRANSPORTATION ISSUES									
Need Better Public Transit	13	0	26	83	na	0	75	10	30
Need Local Decision Making	0	0	0	50	na	0	25	0	8
Need To Preserve ROW	13	0	5	17	na	0	25	0	8
Explore Light-Rail Options	0	0	5	17	na	0	50	10	10
Address Suburban Transit	0	0	0	17	na	0	0	0	2
AVIATION ISSUES									
Need For Airport Capacity	0	0	10	17	na	0	0	0	6
Need For Access To Airports	0	0	10	17	na	0	0	0	6

Recognizing the previously admitted lack of speakers representing private business, county government and state government, analyses of the comments reflected in Tables I, II and III can still be made by either parameter in each matrix.

The conclusions presented in the next section of this summary focus on the "comments made most frequently" at the forum. "Comments made most frequently" were defined as those specifically mentioned by twenty percent (20%) or more of the speakers. This low percentage was deemed appropriate because: 1) each speaker was only allowed five (5) minutes to present comments, and 2) each remark made was totally unsolicited.

Although no attempts were made to distinguish comments among the various groups, in some cases it is informative to note when one group or another was particularly concerned about a specific issue or item.

CONCLUSIONS FROM THE PUBLIC FORUM

The following conclusions were drawn from the spoken and written statements presented at Arizona's "Transportation 2020" Public Forum. These conclusions reflect only input from the comments which were made most frequently - that is, comments made by twenty percent (20%) or more of the fifty (50) speakers who testified.

Many additional observations could be made by carefully studying the data presented in Tables I, II and III of the previous section of this summary. While such observations could be made, they were not deemed appropriate at this level of summarization.

1. ARIZONA'S CONSTANTLY GROWING POPULATION WILL RESULT IN INCREASED TRAVEL DEMAND AND DECREASED AIR QUALITY.

Twenty-eight percent (28%) of all the speakers referred to the fact that the State of Arizona would continue its population growth. Twenty-two percent (22%) related population growth directly to increases in travel demand and the stress it will place on our transportation facilities and services.

Twenty-six percent (26%) saw a direct correlation between Arizona's population and travel increases and worsening air quality throughout the state. The following quotes demonstrate the perceived relationship among population, travel and air quality.

- O "Within the next 20 years the population of the Valley is estimated to grow by another 80 percent, which we anticipate will add more than a million vehicles to the roads in this area."
- O "As our population increases and the number of cars increases, so too does the number of times we exceed standards for air pollution."

It should be noted that many of the twenty-six percent (26%) who expressed concern for air quality mentioned public transportation and transportation systems management (TSM) as potential solutions.

- O "Serious air pollution in our urban areas . . . point that a new emphasis on public transportation is needed."

2. TRANSPORTATION FINANCING SHOULD CONTINUE AT THE FEDERAL AND STATE LEVELS AND ALL DIVERSIONS OF TRUST FUNDS SHOULD BE STOPPED IMMEDIATELY.

Speakers at Arizona's "Transportation 2020" Public Forum made a strong and consistent plea that the diversions of the Highway Trust Fund be stopped. Forty-two percent (42%) of the speakers specifically mentioned past, current and proposed diversions. The following quotes are representative of the general sentiment.

- O "I was incensed then and incensed now with the cavalier treatment that Congress continues to give the American taxpayers on the use of that Trust Fund."
- O ". . . federal gas taxes should go for the purpose for which they were originally designed."
- O ". . . if this money is spent on roads, then these taxes are appropriate; but a gas tax increase . . . to reduce the deficit is incredibly regressive."

In addition to the forty-two percent who mentioned the diversions of federal highway funds, thirty-six percent (36%) of the speakers strongly supported the continuation of the current federal financial commitment to transportation.

Although state funding levels were not mentioned as often as the federal funding commitment, twenty percent (20%) of the speakers indicated that the financial commitments of the states should remain as a high fiscal priority.

3. HIGHWAY CAPACITY, PERSERVATION AND MAINTENANCE NEEDS ON ALL LEVELS OF THE SYSTEM ARE AN IMPORTANT FACTOR WHICH WILL DETERMINE ARIZONA'S FUTURE QUALITY OF LIFE AND ECONOMIC VITALITY.

The needs for preservation of the existing Interstate Highway System was clearly stated by thirty percent (30%) of the speakers. New urban capacity on the Interstate was urged in twenty percent (20%) of the testimonies. Although the percentage was slightly below other major issues, eighteen percent (18%) asked that new alignments and routes be added to the Interstate in rural areas around the state and the nation.

Primary System needs were seen in terms of those routes which were of interstate significance. Twenty-two (22%) percent expressed the desire that attention be focused on these highways.

Rural roads were specifically mentioned in connection with statewide commerce, economic health and development by twenty-four percent (24%) of the speakers.

Urban transportation needs, which received most of the attention at Arizona's Public Forum, were seen to exist primarily in the form of urban freeway and expressway requirements. A surprising forty-four percent (44%) of those testifying noted the need for additional urban freeways and expressways. The following quotes are is representative of the cry for urban freeway facilities.

- O "Up until 1985 we were 20 years behind the rest of the country in building freeways to handle our transportation needs. The Valley still has fewer freeway miles than 16 of the largest metropolitan areas of this country. The lack of freeways and roads has severely handicapped our ability to do business."
- O "If I may first of all speak to the local urban freeway system under construction presently and applaud the State for the vigorous approach they have taken to implementing that system."

In addition to the system specific comments recorded above, twenty-eight percent (28%) of the speakers reminded the panel of the on-going responsibilities to preserve and maintain the current roadway network which exists across this country.

4. PUBLIC TRANSPORTATION SERVICES AND FACILITIES SHOULD BE IMPROVED TO MEET FUTURE TRAVEL DEMANDS AND TO REDUCE AIR POLLUTION.

Thirty percent (30%) of those testifying at Arizona's "Transportation 2020" Public Forum expressed the desire that public transportation services and facilities be improved. The quote below is indicative of the comments made about public transportation at the forum.

- O ". . . this region should be exercising every possible resource to ensure the planning and development of a public transportation system capable ultimately of providing for all of the growth in transportation demands, particularly in the peak hours. That system should be especially focused to attract commuter trips."

In most cases the desire for better public transportation was directly related to increasing levels of travel demand and/or decreasing levels of ambient air quality.

CLOSING STATEMENT

Arizona's "Transportation 2020" Public Forum uncovered the deep convictions of residents from around the state that growing population will bring dramatic increases in travel demand and decreases in air quality.

Federal and state funds should continue to flow into transportation improvements without diversions or reduction in order that needed highway capacity improvements can be made on all systems - even on the urban and rural portions of the Interstate - and so that major preservation work can be performed to revitalize our aging highway infrastructure and protect our investments of the past.

Improvements in public transportation should also be undertaken with federal and state funds to mitigate against the increasing level of travel demands and the decreasing levels of air quality.

SUMMARIZATION OF

ARIZONA'S "TRANSPORTATION 2020"

PUBLIC SURVEY

A SUMMARIZATION OF
THE RESULTS AND CONCLUSIONS
FROM THE
ARIZONA "TRANSPORTATION 2020"
PUBLIC SURVEY

In September of 1987, the Arizona Department of Transportation and the Arizona Highway Users Conference developed and disseminated a transportation survey. Copies of the survey were included with the announcement of Arizona's "Transportation 2020" Public Forum, scheduled and held on November 24, 1987.

The survey was mailed, along with the announcement of the Public Forum, to about 880 leaders around the State of Arizona. Over 100 responses were received, resulting in a return rate of about 11 percent.

While it is recognized that the individuals surveyed were not randomly selected from the state's total population, they were selected on the basis of their general leadership in Arizona and for their specific interest and expertise in transportation matters. This sample population, while it may not represent the views of the average Arizona resident, does reflect how leaders in this state perceive the existing and currently planned transportation facilities and services.

RESULTS OF THE SURVEY

Eighteen specific questions were developed in order to assess the perceptions of the public regarding transportation in Arizona. Of the questions, six related to travel congestion in general, two related specifically to commuting, two related to public transportation, four addressed the modal links between highways and the other modes, one question addressed bridge sufficiency, and three additional questions targeted future plans, future funding, and appropriate governmental roles in providing future transportation facilities and services.

Table I, "Percentage Of Positive Responses To Survey Questions," shown on page three, presents how various groups of respondents answered seventeen of the questions. Table II, "Percentage Of Responses To Question #17," shown on page four,

presents how various groups of respondents answered the question (#17) regarding which level of government is best able to provide the transportation facilities and services required in the future.

Both Table I and Table II are divided into eight different groups, or categories, of respondents. These categories of respondents include representatives from:

1. **Transportation Business** - Businesses engaged in transportation development and construction;
2. **Private Business** - Other private business concerns;
3. **Interest Groups** - Public and private interest groups;
4. **Municipal Officials** - Elected and non-elected officials from cities and towns around the state;
5. **County Officials** - Elected and non-elected officials from counties around the state;
6. **State Officials** - Elected and non-elected officials from state government;
7. **Transit / Rail** - Representatives from transit and rail agencies; and
8. **Other** - Leaders representing various other interests within the state.

Although an adequate number of representatives from each of the preceding categories received the survey forms, the low response rate by members within some of the categories resulted in a few weak areas in the survey results. As can be seen below, representation was particularly weak from government officials at the county and state levels.

<u>CATEGORIES:</u>	<u>ABBREV.:</u>	<u># RESPONSES:</u>
Transportation Business	(TRB)	38
Private Business	(BUS)	8
Interest Groups	(INT)	18
Municipal Government	(MUN)	20
County Government	(COU)	3
State Government	(STA)	3
Transit/Rail	(TRR)	5
Other	(OTH)	6
<u>TOTAL:</u>	(TOT)	<u>101</u>

Table I, shown below, provides the survey questions in abbreviated form. The full and accurate statement of each question as it appeared in the survey is shown in Attachment 1.

TABLE I
PERCENTAGE OF POSITIVE RESPONSES TO SURVEY QUESTIONS

	T R B	B U S	I N T	M U N	C O U	S T A	T R A	O T H	T O T
Q 1. IS CONGESTION A PROBLEM?	76	62	67	20	33	33	40	83	59
Q 2. PEAKS GETTING LONGER?	92	88	67	70	33	100	80	100	82
Q 3. CONGESTION SPREADING?	95	100	78	55	67	100	80	83	83
Q 4. TRAVEL GROWING?	100	100	100	90	67	100	100	100	98
Q 5. CONGESTION MAINLY URBAN?	60	38	22	35	67	0	60	17	43
Q 6. DELIVERIES DELAYED?	5	38	11	5	0	0	0	33	10
Q 7. SUFFICIENT FACILITIES?	60	38	61	70	33	100	40	50	60
Q 8. LONG WORK COMMUTES?	66	75	61	30	33	67	40	50	56
Q 9. ADEQUATE TRANSIT?	18	25	28	15	0	33	20	67	23
Q10. IS POOR TRANSIT COSTLY?	32	50	44	55	33	0	40	33	40
Q11. FARM ROADS O.K.?	42	0	28	55	0	67	40	67	40
Q12. AIRPORT ACCESS O.K.?	32	25	50	50	67	67	40	67	43
Q13. RECREATIONAL ROADS O.K.?	24	50	44	15	67	33	60	67	34
Q14. DEVELOPER IMPACT FEES?	89	88	78	100	100	100	100	100	92
Q15. BRIDGES O.K.?	63	50	39	35	67	33	40	50	50
Q16. TRANSPORTATION IS DRAW?	16	0	11	25	0	0	0	0	13
Q17. See Table II	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
Q18. AWARE OF TRANS. PLANS?	95	62	83	85	100	67	80	83	87

Table II, shown below, addresses Question #17 regarding the level of government which is "best" able to meet the perceived future transportation needs. This table shows, in percentage by category, the relative magnitude of respondents opting for federal, state, local, or private development of required transportation facilities and services.

**TABLE II
PERCENTAGE OF RESPONSES TO QUESTION #17**

	T R B	B U S	I N T	M U N	C O U	S T A	T R A	O R H	T O T
FEDERAL GOVERNMENT CAN BEST MEET THE NEEDS	10	0	24	0	50	0	25	20	12
STATE GOVERNMENTS CAN BEST MEET THE NEEDS	74	50	47	67	50	100	25	80	61
LOCAL GOVERNMENTS CAN BEST MEET THE NEEDS	16	50	29	27	0	0	50	0	24
PRIVATE FIRMS CAN BEST MEET THE NEEDS	0	0	0	6	0	0	0	0	3

Many types of analyses can be made from the data shown in Table I and Table II. Even recognizing that the data for county and state representatives is weak, analyses can be conducted by category or by question response.

The conclusions presented in next section of this summary are based upon analyses which focused solely on the "major findings" from the survey. "Major findings" were defined as those issues which received more than 67% or less than 33% positive responses based on the data provided in Table I.

Responses to Question #17 regarding governmental roles, summarized in Table II, are handled in a separate analysis which draws additional inferences from group responses based upon the identified categories.

CONCLUSIONS FROM THE SURVEY

The following conclusions were drawn from the responses to Arizona's "Transportation 2020" Public Survey. These conclusions represent only the "major findings" from the survey.

Many other less obvious inferences can be drawn by analyzing the data in Table I and Table II. While these tables are included in the preceding section of this summary, such analyses are not appropriate at this level of summarization.

1. **WHILE TRAFFIC CONGESTION IS NOT PRESENTLY A MAJOR PROBLEM IN ARIZONA, IT WILL BECOME ONE IN THE NEAR FUTURE.**

The overwhelming perception of the respondents to Arizona's "Transportation 2020" Public Survey is that traffic congestion is becoming more widespread, morning and afternoon peak hours are getting longer, and travel demand is continuing to grow with no end in sight.

Although congestion is viewed as a present reality in the State of Arizona, respondents did not seem to feel that it is a "major" problem today. Congestion, as it exists today, was not seen by respondents as creating undue delays in work commutes or product deliveries.

The recognition of the fact that travel demand will continue to grow throughout the state shows respondents perceive that traffic congestion will become a more serious problem in the near future.

2. **PUBLIC TRANSPORTATION IS VIEWED AS BEING INADEQUATE, BUT THE CURRENT LOW LEVEL OF SERVICE HAS NOT AND WILL NOT CAUSE THE COST OF DOING BUSINESS TO INCREASE.**

Respondents to the survey indicated that, in general, they believe that public transportation in the State of Arizona is inadequate for work commutes.

This perceived lack of public transportation is not seen as being costly to business either now or in the near future.

3. PRIVATE DEVELOPERS SHOULD BE CHARGED FEES FOR THE IMPACTS WHICH THEIR DEVELOPMENTS HAVE ON ADJACENT ROADWAY FACILITIES.

Strong feelings existed among those who were surveyed that private developers should be charged impact fees for the contribution to traffic that their developments make on adjacent transportation facilities and services. These strong feelings existed among all categories of respondents, including private businessmen.

4. EXISTING TRANSPORTATION FACILITIES AND SERVICES ARE NOT VIEWED AS A POSITIVE ELEMENT IN ATTRACTING NEW BUSINESSES AND RESIDENTS TO ARIZONA.

From the survey results, it is strongly indicated that Arizonans do not perceive existing highways and transit services to be an incentive for industry, business, or individuals to locate in the state.

This conclusion reflects the perception that the existing transportation facilities are marginally meeting the current needs, but will not be adequate to serve future travel demands.

5. EXISTING PLANS FOR FUTURE TRANSPORTATION IMPROVEMENTS HAVE BEEN WIDELY PUBLICIZED AND ARE GENERALLY KNOWN AND UNDERSTOOD BY THE PUBLIC.

Respondents to the survey indicated that they were aware of state and regional plans to address future transportation demands. Results show that representatives from every category generally understand what future transportation improvements are currently planned.

CLOSING STATEMENT

Arizona's "Transportation 2020" Public Survey shows that transportation system users and managers perceive that current conditions are generally tolerable, but that deterioration will occur in the near future due to the inexorable growth which the state will be experiencing over the next few decades.