



## PIMA COUNTY TRANSPORTATION ADVISORY COMMITTEE

### **WEBEX MEETING Tuesday, September 22, 2020 12:00 PM**

**Members Present:** Albert Letzkus, Eric Ponce, Kendall Elmer; John Wallace, Don Weaver, Lucretia Free, Frank Santa Cruz, John Bernal, Tom McGovern and Curtis Lueck

**Members Absent:** Yolanda Weinberger, Dan Eckstrom and Ed Verburg

Others Present: Ana Olivares (PCDOT), Jim Cunningham (PCDOT), Kathryn Skinner (PCDOT), Rich Franz-Under (PCDOT), Annabelle Valenzuela (PCDOT) and Robert Lane (PCDOT)

1. **Pledge of Allegiance** - *Lucretia Free, PCTAC Chair*, (Part 1 – 00:08)

2. **Call to Order- Roll Call** - *Lucretia Free, PCTAC Chair*, (Part 1 – 00:40)

Chair Free calls the meeting at 12:05 p.m. Ms. Valenzuela takes roll call and a quorum is present.

3. **Action: Approval of [Meeting Summary for August 25, 2020](#)** – *Lucretia Free, PCTAC Chair* (Part 1 – 2:30)

Mr. Letzkus makes a motion to approve the meeting summary and Mr. McGovern seconds. Motion passes unanimously.

4. **[Fiscal Year 2020/2021 Road Repair Program](#)** – *Robert Lane, PCDOT Staff*, (Part 1 – 3:12)

Mr. Lane presented the Update to Fiscal Year 2020/2021 Road Repair and Pavement Preservation Program. As discussed last month the first three projects have been awarded, which represents 3.2 Million of this year's budget. Currently, we are utilizing our Master Agreement for Crack Fill treatments; we are issuing a delivery order to the contractor this week for the crack seal order. The contractor anticipates beginning work mid-October. The other surface treatments packaged into a single hard bid that will go out the end of December, beginning of January for work to be complete by 2021. The [Road Repair & Preservation Projects Map](#) provides public information about past, current, and future, roadway improvement projects.

5. **[Fiscal Year 2021/2022 Pavement Program Criteria](#)** – *Rich Franz-Under, PCDOT Staff*, (Part 1 – 11:40)

Where we ended last month was presenting some recommendations for consideration. The first recommendation is a bit of a change from what we are doing right now, and that was to change the budget split from our current methodology, which is 66% Locals and 34% Arterial-Collectors to 58% Locals and 42% Arterial-Collectors. There were two reasons for this, once we got the Lidar back, we learned there was actually a less area for Locals and more for Arterial-Collectors. The second one was the Arizona Department of Transportation (ADOT) changed a functional class, where quite a few Locals turned into Arterial-Collectors. The rest of these 3 recommendations are really a continuation of our current methodology, so continue with the worst first methodology for Locals that you approved back in December 2019, after a lot of constituent outreach and discussion.



Then with a little bit of nuance; because of the change in the function class of a lot of Locals to Minor-Collectors, when we put together a Bid Package for a subdivision, we want to make sure we do not leave out that road that leads into the subdivision. In the current program, most of those are actually local roads; in next year's program many of those will be Minor-Collectors. If not otherwise captured, in the Arterial-Collector Package from StreetSaver, we will want to do those feeder roads to the subdivisions when we do the subdivision. Therefore, it is essential to how we have been doing work now but because of that functional class change, we are recommending this nuance in the criteria. Then we are recommending to continue with the Arterial-Collector criteria that you approved in April 2019. Which is we use the StreetSaver tool to give us the highest return on investment and it is looking at both milling and filling our failed roads plus doing the surface treatments crack seals and the fog seals, and micro-seals in some cases on the good pavement. In this case we keep the good pavement good as well as repair the worst of the bad pavement. We work to minimize to mobilization cost and to make sure we are not getting any fragments of work (i.e. we had management sections along Ina Road, that had bad PCI, then there was a section in the middle between them that had poor PCI). That was an example of minimizing the fragmentation where we just did all that piece of Ina Road. That is the recommendation that we have for this year.

Mr. McGovern makes a motion to approve recommendation criteria for Fiscal Year (FY) 2021/2022 pavement program and Mr. Weaver seconds. Motion passes unanimously

**6. RTAnext Transit Discussion – Jonathan Crowe, PCDOT Staff, (Part 1 – 22:18)**

Mr. Crowe presented and noted the Transit presentation is presented because of a request for information and going forward into RTA Next. We have several different types of Transit Services in Pima County that we pay for: 1) SunTran Bus Service has several routes that cover and cross over into unincorporated areas, 2) SunTran Express has several bus routes, 3) Sun Shuttle routes service at more rural, suburban and remote areas of the county, 4) Sun Shuttle Dial-A-Ride has services. We need to think about what kind of Transit Service we want to recommend to RTAnext moving forward. We spent \$534 Million as a region on Transit to do RTA programs in 2006, which gives you a little context on how much the region spent on Transit as a whole. Now, moving forward into RTAnext, Pima County has already submitted our recommendations for these categories and this amount of money for the different types of transportation infrastructure. Obviously the greatest proportion areas on roadway capacity projects and we submitted a list of \$486 Million for the next for roadway expansion. The second highest is for Pavement Preservation, we have also included money for Technology, Livable Streets, All-Weather Roads, and Public Transit. We always have needs for Sun Van, and some paratransit needs, which both go hand in hand with bus service. We always have needs for bus shelters and ADA at the bus shelters, so people can use them effectively. We may have needs for park and ride lots, which are also funding in the first program.

Mr. Bernal (Part 2 - 00:04) asked of the program that has been submitted on RTAnext of the \$53 million, was that constrained by any artificial means, or is that what Pima County considers as needs for the next RTA program. Mr. Crowe responded, no, that is, considered our needs, in general. It is proportion to what our needs are. The RTA specifically requested that we submit roadway projects, so we went beyond that request. By not only recommending roadway projects, but also, suggesting what categories we think can be incorporated into our next RTA program and within those categories allocated about \$53 Million towards Transit. Which is about 4% of the total program that we recommended, this is a real small percentage. However, we felt it to be important to put in some money for Transit. We are obviously paying for Transit right now as an entity, and we do not want to be short scripted in the future, if there is Transit expenditures. It was extreme maybe in a sense, which it is a reasonable amount that we thought to recommend moving forward.



Mr. Bernal additionally asked does that anticipate any express services into Green Valley or Vail, or anything like that. Mr. Crowe replied not specifically. We have not finalized our specific Transit recommendation yet. It does not preclude express services at Green Valley, but we haven't gotten to the point yet, where we are recommending individual components of that. What we are going to look at when we put together that recommendation is where is the greatest need, and where is the potential providership and make our recommendations accordingly. We probably will recommend a variety of different types of services throughout the county.

Ms. Free interjected, our unincorporated Pima County areas as Vail, and Green Valley are much unrepresented in terms of services. I am hoping you will take that into consideration as we submitted some information along with the county.

Mr. Lueck inquired about roadway widening component which looks like it is going to be your biggest dollar. The roadway widening would have several elements; one is suggesting relief, the second, improvement to roadway that would otherwise need major rehabilitation. You are basically reconstructing things, that if you weren't widening, you would have to place into the maintenance category. The third portion of that would be some transit component, which the roadway widening is going to have bus pullouts and things like that. Maybe we can parcel out that roadway widening so that we could get a better idea of the benefits associated with that roadway widening, particularly since it is such a large nut of your overall request. Mr. Crowe responded in agreement, and explained that not all the streets that we are recommending for improvements from RTA are served by Transit. But those that are we can certainly look at the top estimates that we put together and maybe parse out the Transit component. Mr. Lueck added that would help because of all the roadway components and a pedestrian component. You could almost link some Transit with some pedestrian access as well. Almost everybody is walking to a Transit; obviously in a rural area have a park-and-ride also. Maybe some way of contributing or parsing out some of the roadway widening and giving Transit portion credit.

Ms. Free asked Mr. Crowe to repeat what are his next steps with this. Mr. Crowe explained we are waiting for RTA to put out the request for the other categories that we have not submitted yet. We represented our recommendations for roadway projects. However, we also submitted the suggested categories that we think need to be incorporated. We also have a meeting with RTA this Friday, to look at our actual submittal and probably make any adjustments to that.

Mr. Bernal asked about the topic being discussed by RTA staff on long-range transit tram. Do you think our request is consistent with the long-range plan? Mr. Crowe replied, absolutely. The Transit Tram Plan is long-range, it is not very specific, even the short-range Transit Plan Pima Association of Governments (PAG) is working off of doesn't get to the level of detail of specific route adjustments, route improvements. What we essentially put together so far internally with our Transit recommendations certainly falls within the general guidance of those documents. Expansions of service, increased frequency of service, and rural programs that provide service to areas that are currently unmet. Mr. Bernal added he does think that 4% of our request is good, and hope we look at that further when we refine the county's request.

Ms. Skinner pointed out the original key fee request was simply for the roadway element project; there is a combination on every project of technology and transportation choice, it was challenging within the constraints of the request to fully express that. We definitely see a lot of overlap between the different categories in RTA and what has been represented and we look forward in working with other jurisdictions that are submitting to find a program that balances that and provides the flexibility we think is necessary looking forward 20 years in the future.

7. San Joaquin Road Pavement Treatment Test Update- Ana Olivares, PCDOT Director, (Part 2 – 9:14)

a. Asphaltic Concrete Thinlay

Ms. Olivares gave an update on the San Joaquin pavement treatment test which includes a thinlay and the Asphaltic Concrete (AC) Thinlay specification finalized back in December 2019 and identified conditions that would be applicable for a thinlay overlay. Back in December, the specification for Asphaltic Thinlay for a non-filled local roads were finalized. FY 2020 for failed local roads done, so, a thinlay was not a consideration. Thinlay option is now a part of our StreetSaver program, so, when it is appropriate, it appears as a recommended alternative. For FY 2021 for our local roads, we are continuing addressing failed roadways, so the AC Thinlay was not proposed for this current fiscal year's program. The thinlay is part of our StreetSaver as we continue to consider failed first roadways. However, it is not being proposed in our program at this time. The San Joaquin Pavement treatment testing was done on San Joaquin Road between Old Ajo Highway and past Bopp Road all the way to Neil Avenue. There are 4.3 miles and 14 different 1,000-foot test sections of different treatments. The webpage for San Joaquin Pavement Treatment Test is: <https://webcms.pima.gov/cms/One.aspx?portalId=169&pageId=355530>. The contractor, IMF Contractor did all our road readings last year to get PCR Ratings for all our roadways. They also went over the treatment test. They will be doing another reading this September and another reading in 2021 that will give us 3 points to start flushing out our performance curves for the treatments. These performance curves will be correlated against longer-term national research data for treatment type. DOT staff did research on how the performance of these treatments would operate on a national average, and developed the Family Curve. Then our performance curves will be measured against that to see how well it is performing. The treatment curves will be controlled to account for localized variations and drainage conditions. Once we have all the information we will rank each treatment based on the benefit cost projection, and based on the return of investment to see which treatment we would like to continue to use and which would best for our local roads.

Mr. Letzkus asked when the thinlay is approved, and all the data given, is it only going to be used for local roads? Could this be used on minor collector as well? Ms. Olivares explained depending on the volume we will look at that. Right now it is for a low volume; we have minor collectors that have low volume. We will look at those when they show up for repair. Mr. Letzkus inquired about the way DOT is developing performance curves is a great approach, so that you can plug it into to StreetSaver. But, you're only going to have only two years plus of wear and tear on these test sections with not enough time to develop these reference points based on weather effect, such as rain. Is two years plus sufficient time to develop adequate results for each test section? Ms. Olivares pointed out in the spring we have 3-points, however, it is difficult to make any kind of conclusion from 1 data point, but once we have the other 2-points we will see how the curve start shaping up. Once we have the 3-point showing a curve, if we will be able to say yes on some, no on others, or more information on other, we will have more information once we have more information on the third data point.

Mr. Bernal asked on the 14-test section that we have, do we know if any have failed already and probably won't be considered going forward. Ms. Olivares inputted no, we don't have any that have completely failed at this time. Mr. Bernal responded, but they must be showing signs of wear and tear and distress. Ms. Olivares replied, they have been but none that has reached failure. We have not been able to conclude one, so we won't even consider, we are not at that point, yet.

Mr. McGovern wanted more information about updating the webpage and when information will be fully uploaded? Will there be photos of the test sections, kind of showing their performance over time visually. Ms. Olivares explained the webpage will be updated with the performance curves. It is in editorial changes to the scales of the graph so they look better, so that should be up today or tomorrow. Once we get the new data point, which ran in September and expect their review of PCIs back in October, we will update it at that time, then update it again when they do a third run and update those curves as they come along. I will check with staff on picture for each section.



**8. PCTAC Meeting Schedule for 2020 – *Lucretia Free, PCTAC Chair***

Chair Free suggested to meet in October as scheduled, skip November, and meet December 8<sup>th</sup> via WEBEX.

**9. Next meeting October 27, 2020 WEBEX - *Lucretia Free, PCTAC Chair***

- a. Agenda Items – Please submit by October 2, 2020 to [Annabelle.Valenzuela@pima.gov](mailto:Annabelle.Valenzuela@pima.gov)**

**10. Call to the Audience - *Lucretia Free, PCTAC Chair, (Part 1 – 20:15)***

Mr. Joseph Schmidlin: presentation on Fiber Reinforced Asphalt Concrete, a simple and proven approach to paving that public agencies all over the US are using to build longer lasting roads, catch up on maintenance backlogs, and raise overall pavement network PCI.

**11. Adjournment - *Lucretia Free, PCTAC Chair***

Mr. Lueck makes a motion to adjourn meeting and Mr. Bernal seconds the motion. Motion passes unanimously and meeting is adjourned.

**\*Action May be Taken on Any Item\***

Para información en español, contáctese a Annabelle Valenzuela al (520)724-6410.