



PIMA COUNTY TRANSPORTATION ADVISORY COMMITTEE

**SUMMARY OF WEBEX MEETING
Tuesday, February 23, 2021
12:00 PM**

Members Present: Albert Letzkus, John Bernal, Kendall Elmer, Lucretia Free, Tom McGovern, Frank Santa Cruz, Ed Verburg, Don Weaver

Members Absent: Dan Eckstrom, John Wallace, Yolanda Weinberger

Also Present: Transportation Staff: Ana Olivares, Director; Kathryn Skinner, Deputy Director; Rich Franz-Under, Annabelle Valenzuela, Michelle Montagnino, Robert Lane

Welcoming Board of Supervisors (BOS), PCTAC members, online citizens and participants to the first meeting of 2021, Madam Chair Lucretia Free called the meeting to order at 12:07 PM.

| Item | Agenda Topic | Recording Time |
|-------------|--|-----------------------|
| 1. | Pledge of Allegiance – <i>Lucretia Free, PCTAC Chair</i> | Pt 1 05:00 |
| 2. | Call to Order and Roll Call – <i>Lucretia Free, PCTAC Chair/Annabelle Valenzuela, PCDOT Staff</i> Ms. Valenzuela took attendance; a meeting quorum was achieved. | Pt 1 06:50 |
| 3. | <u>Approval of Meeting Summary for October 27, 2020</u> – <i>Lucretia Free, PCTAC Chair</i> Don Weaver motioned to approve; Tom McGovern seconded. The motion passed unanimously. | Pt 1 08:05 |
| 4. | <u>Fiscal Year 2020/2021 Road Repair Program</u> – <i>Michelle Montagnino, PCDOT Staff</i> Reference presentation regarding: <u>Pima County’s Road Selection and Ratings:</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Local road selection process prioritizes ‘worst first’ roads for repair based on an assigned Pavement Condition Index (PCI) rating between 0 and 100. The higher number the better the road condition. • Arterial/Collector roadway selection process is different. A computer-generated list is developed to help analyze and prioritize roadway segments for treatments. • 5% of arterial/collector budget for surface treatments and the remainder for milling and paving. | Pt 1 09:00 |
| | Mr. Bernal asked about prioritization of roadways without ADA-compliant ramps. He inquired if those roads were distinguished with or without ramps in place. Ms. Montagnino replied that developments having roads without sidewalks are prioritized ahead of roads with sidewalks. Any ramps that are non-ADA compliant at that time are then upgraded. | Pt 1 13:42 |
| | <u>Project Updates:</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Five mill and pave and a crack seal (72.62 miles of arterial/collector roads and 13.77 local roads) completed due to quick turnaround on advertisement and bidding processes. • 21 projects being tracked. All advertised and contractors selected. Five near completion, involve curb ramp work for ADA improvements. Six other local and arterial/collector projects are underway and two additional local projects with a requested NTP for early March. Remaining are one arterial/collector project and five local projects coming soon after curb ramp construction. | Pt 1 14:35 |

| Item | Agenda Topic | Recording Time |
|------|---|----------------|
| | <p><u>FY Program Status:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • All listed projects advertised/awarded with 100% of ADA curb ramp under construction. • Only 7% of arterial/collector work awaits construction. • 11% of local roads complete; 68% in construction and 24% awaiting curb ramp work. • Surface treatments constitute 52% of completed projects and remaining 48% have been awarded. • Competitive bids allowed nearly \$7.0M in unallocated funds for “Bonus Projects.” • Bonus projects to be delivered through Change Orders to existing contracts, Job Order Contracts to be advertised to our list of contractors. | Pt 1 15:00 |
| | <p><u>Road Repair & Preservation Projects Map:</u> The Pavement Preservation Program periodically updates the map shown on slide 13 to reflect status of roadway projects and preservation projects dating back to 2017. The map now includes the amended bonus project list.</p> | Pt 1 20:30 |
| 5. | <p><u>Fiscal Year (FY) 2021/2022 Department Budget Overview</u> – Ana Olivares, PCDOT Director</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • FY21 Adopted Revenues, PCDOT adopted ~\$41M of Highway User Revenue Funds (HURF) gas tax and ~\$15M of Vehicle License Tax (VLT). This was less expected revenue than adopted in FY20, \$48M in gas tax. • Plan to repair roads to an average PCI of 80 by 2030 had included transfers from General Fund (GF) and Transportation funding but due to pandemic, PayGo program for Pima County Board of Supervisors (BOS) did not move forward. • BOS authorized transfer of \$50M of GF funds via Certificates of Participation. These funds provided \$50M for the FY21 Road Repair program to continue from past years. • In FY18, voters approved a property 25-cent per \$100 valuation road tax for local road repairs. Remaining \$3M was applied to this year’s local road repair program. • PCDOT applied \$3M, plus \$120,000 for graffiti abatement, totaling \$56M for this year’s local road repair program. • Currently, the pandemic decreases were not severe. More gas tax revenue is being collected and end of year projections show about \$48.5M in gas tax revenue and VLT about \$16.98M. Forecasted revenue for this year is a difference of \$1M in VLT and \$8.5M in HURF. However, only adopted budget can be spent. Remaining money collected will sit in the fund balance for use in next year’s requested budget. • PCDOT FY22 Requested Budget consists of 70% funding for maintenance of infrastructure, 13% funding for Operations, and 17% debt service payment for 1997 HURF Bond program. • Highlighted on budget for FY22 are \$35.5M for pavement repair and preservation to continue getting all County roads to a PCI average of 80 by the year 2030. Ongoing discussions regarding the potential of additional funding that may require a change in the budget but that will be addressed at a later time. Another expense, \$2.0M is for establishing the Regional Center for Smart Mobility Solutions (The Center) that will study traffic efficiency. • The Center’s inception will be in FY22, and is in line with the DOT’s Vision to utilize smart transportation strategies, enhance roadway user’s mobility, and improve overall multi-modal transportation network. The Center will manage analytics, signal optimization and active demand management via an educative Mobility on Demand platform. • Draft organizational chart for The Center was presented. Recruitment for a Director is underway. The Director will report to the Information Technology Department Director. Remainder of positions will be filled in FY22. | Pt 1 22:35 |
| | | Pt 2 00:00 |
| | | Pt 2 05:00 |

| Item | Agenda Topic | Recording Time |
|------|---|----------------|
| | Mr. Verburg asked if similar expertise in PAG or RTA, what interface is envisioned between Smart Mobility Center and PAG/RTA? Ms. Olivares replied The Center will work with PAG. PAG has Analytics and GIS but not modeling of existing infrastructure or changes when adding new assets. The Center will work closely with PAG and other regional agencies. | Pt 2 08:15 |
| | Chair Free said it would be an opportunity for the PCTAC to provide guidance on The Center’s plan. | Pt 2 09:47 |
| | Mr. Letzkus suggested The Center be called Pima County DOT Center for Smart Mobility Solutions. Reference to ‘regional’ makes it sound like it falls under PAG’s authority. Ms. Olivares replied that efficiencies do not stop at boundaries. Work to be done will not only affect Pima County movement. It is regional because PCDOT wants input from other agencies on improvements to maximize regional mobility. | Pt 2 10:25 |
| | Mr. Letzkus asked if The Center, software, digital map and data being brought in will be housed in a separate building. Ms. Olivares replied that there is an existing map showing all signals. Space is available on 4th floor of the Public Works Building and there is a remodeling partnership with the City of Tucson (COT) to fit some of the staff there, while others work remotely. | Pt 2 11:16 |
| | Mr. Letzkus noted COT has their own traffic signal management center. He asked if there would be a COT traffic management center and a separate County management center. Ms. Olivares has not seen office layout plans but believes the two will be combined. | Pt 2 12:13 |
| | Mr. Bernal asked if the 1 st year budget for The Center is \$4M with equal shares from the ITD and DOT. Ms. Olivares explained FY22 funding is \$2.0M including funding for ITD staff. | Pt 2 12:44 |
| | Mr. Bernal inquired if \$10M accrual will go to Fund balance. Ms. Olivares confirmed it is in the proposed expenditures for FY22. For FY21, it sits in the fund balance because of already having an adopted budget capacity, which only included the \$41M. | Pt 2 13:22 |
| | Mr. Bernal reviewed FY22 capacity and determined DOT has \$15M for HURF and \$17M for VLT, making up the bulk of \$69M. He inquired where the additional \$10M would come from. Ms. Olivares replied FY20 closed with \$16M fund balance and FY21 will close with approximately \$26 to \$27M. That money will roll over and that is what will be used for the \$35.5M for the pavement preservation. Whatever is in the fund balance will be added to the expected revenues and that is how the planned budget for FY22 came about. | Pt 2 13:52 |
| | Mr. Bernal asked if the budget would be close to \$105M. Ms. Olivares informed that the budget will remain at \$91.6M. | Pt 2 14:45 |
| | Mr. McGovern felt that there will be a significant drop in money available for pavement repair/preservation and with the BOS not contributing \$50M from General Fund, he asked how that would impact the projected path to PCI 80. | Pt 2 15:32 |
| | Ms. Olivares informed, PCDOT has \$56M this year. Next year, fund balances from FY20/21 will rollover to cover proposed \$35.5M. Proposed remainder of 10-year plan is: FY22, \$45.5M; FY23, \$28M; and FY24, \$35.3M; then, \$40 and \$41M through FY26. Some GF monies will come in but not as originally planned (\$20M, \$25M, \$25M, \$25M). For the years COPS debt is being paid back – for the \$56M, on the remaining \$9M is received. All 10 years based on a projection of \$50M expected in FY22 plus growth. This plan maximizes available funding for pavement repair. It allows maintaining everything at a good level condition. | Pt2 16:08 |

| Item | Agenda Topic | Recording Time |
|--|---|----------------|
| | The remainder received and the GF money for the debt paid is being maximized to pavement repair. They are not equal to the \$56M for this FY, but the least amount will be \$28M programmed for FY23 and then the remainder grows and with those amounts arrive to an average PCI 80 by 2030. | |
| | Mr. McGovern said it is not the same path as the original pass and it is assumed that next year the same conversation will take place - as to how to change the trajectory slightly here and make up for it there. Ms. Olivares acknowledged plan and funding has changed but staff continues looking at other ways to add money. Should it come in, different scenarios will be reviewed to determine best application of those funds to arrive at PCI 80 average. | Pt 2 18:12 |
| | Mr. McGovern wants to confirm that the changes in projections, actuals and rollover funding will not change staff's PCI target of 80. Ms. Olivares said that the target remains. She further explained Capital funding relies on impact fees and regional funds but not HURF Funds. That money is for pavement repair. This is regional funding and the impact fee program for Capital Improvement Program. In FY22, there is a program of \$51.7M. | Pt 2 18:46 |
| | Ms. Olivares reviewed the FY22 Capital Improvement Project list. \$35.1M will be prioritized for large projects: South Houghton Road Widening; Kolb Road: Sabino Road to Sunrise Drive; Silverbell Rd Blanco Wash Bridge; and Sahuarita Rd at Rudasill Rd Intersection Improvements. The remaining \$16.6M is "pass-thru" money, destined for projects managed by other agencies (e.g., Sabino Canyon Park 1 project, is handled by the Federal Parks Department). | Pt 2 19:15 |
| 6. Additional Items for Discussion in 2021 – Lucretia Free, PCTAC Chair | | |
| | Chair Free added this topic in case PCTAC had items of interest for County staff to address in 2021. | |
| | Vice-Chair Letzkus said PCTAC's main focus is the repaving program but the last DOT Traffic Safety Report was completed in 2016, using 2015 data. He asked if there is an ongoing Traffic Safety Program since he has not seen any report relating to traffic analytics. He is aware of reduced staff, but asked if there are plans to reenergize a traffic safety program. | Pt 2 21:41 |
| | Ms. Olivares agreed analytics, software and programs have been placed to analyze road network safety. Staff is finalizing and evaluating output of those newly placed analytics. She is uncertain if a similar report will be done but there will be a safety status of the entire infrastructure. | Pt 2 22:18 |
| | Mr. Letzkus is interested if report discusses traffic crash trends, injuries by pedestrian, bicycle or vehicle. Ms. Olivares replied yes. | Pt 2 23:53 |
| | Mr. McGovern informed that the RTA Citizen Committee and Technical Management Committee (TMC) are working on the <i>RTANext</i> Transportation Plan for voter consideration. There will be opportunities for input between jurisdictions, the Citizens Advisory Committee and TMC. He stated it would be helpful for PCTAC to stay involved and maintain contact with staff regarding proposed changes to the draft transportation plan with public input. | Pt 2 24:24 |
| | Mr. Bernal asked for updates on the outcomes of two February 16 BOS agenda items: 1) Programming of \$100M in remaining RTA funds; and 2) Action to have DOT explore a pavement preservation acceleration plan. | Pt 2 26:28 |
| | Chair Free requested regular updates regarding concerns with impacts of COVID 19. | Pt 2 27:35 |
| | PCTAC members may forward other topics to Ms. Valenzuela for discussion at future meetings. | Pt 2 27:51 |

| Item | Agenda Topic | Recording Time |
|------|---|----------------|
| 7. | Call to the Audience – <i>Lucretia Free, PCTAC Chair.</i> | |
| | <p>Norrie Nelson, President of the Hidden Valley Homeowners Association, expressed concerns with road conditions of Hidden Valley neighborhood. Roads recently improved north of Hidden Valley created consternation among HOA members because they did not understand why their roads were skipped, since road deterioration conditions appear similar. Two streets were also recently paved and it seemed odd that the equipment was in the neighborhood for only those two streets when clearly there were others severely impacted.</p> | Pt 2 29:00 |
| | <p>The part of their community, south of Snyder Road to Hidden Valley Road and up to Canyon Ranch (CR) continues to have trucks, heavy equipment loads, etc., daily - for months - going through the community. The roads already impacted became worse. That side of the community wants to know if the action that CR took which impacted their roads was taken into consideration and is there any additional work planned for that side of their community when the roads have been so seriously impacted?</p> | Pt 2 31:12 |
| | <p>Hyatt Simpson requested on behalf of residents of Catalina Madre, prioritization of this area for repaving. She informed Villa Madre intersects with north Melpomene; Tanque Verde high school is a couple of blocks away; Agua Caliente Elementary school is about a mile away. There are no sidewalks in this part of the County. Streets have deteriorated to alarming conditions in over 35 years, since they have not been repaved since the mid-1980s. She was recently on the unpaved X9 Ranch road off of Old Spanish Trail and it was a smoother ride than her own neighborhood streets. The streets in her neighborhood are all ranked poor or failed. North Melpomene is poor; Limberlost and Roger are failed; Prince Road from Homestead to Houghton ranks as failed; and Catalina Highway is currently listed in failed condition. She cannot understand why over a year ago, the neighborhood east of hers between Snyder Road and Soldier Trail, with many fewer homes and no school nearby, had their streets repaved. At the same time, in the Bear Canyon area another neighborhood's streets were repaved. She wants to know why the Villa Madre subdivision is not on any upcoming paving list. Why the wait? She suggested adding a criterion that takes into account how long it has been since roads have been paved. Pedestrians and cyclists take their chances using their neighborhood streets. It is a jolting unpleasant ride. More than vehicular use, many run, walk, bike, exercise between 7 and 9 am. She appreciates that there are a lot of roads needing repair and repaving in the County but she asks, how is it that the road system is allowed to deteriorate to the point that roads need rebuilding. It is not road maintenance or preservation; it is neglect. PCTAC members would understand if they lived on streets ranked as poor or failed.</p> | Pt 3 00:00 |
| | <p>Leslie Ckonjevic lives in North Ranch, a neighborhood with roads in poor condition, no sidewalks and with over 700 homes. She asked that PCTAC consider adding Cactus Canyon Pass to the list for the coming year. The area is used as a cut-through road between Shannon Road and Thornydale, resulting in significant traffic. The road was patched in the fall and several elderly neighbors fell and were injured due to the gravel on the road. A large portion of the community is 55+ and their ability to be active is being severely impacted. She has noticed a huge difference in the wear and tear on her vehicle tires in the 2.5 years that she has lived in this area and the road continues to deteriorate. She asked PCTAC to consider listing the road for the coming fiscal year.</p> | Pt 3 01:30 |
| | <p>Jay Friedman is unable to attend. Chair Free read his remarks into the record. West Cactus Canyon Pass is in need of repair and whomever is responsible should be embarrassed.</p> | Pt 3 02:45 |
| | <p>Eileen Oviedo requested Sabino Foothills Estates be paved. She informed that these streets consist of North Stone House place, a cul-de-sac and North Sabino Foothills Drive. They constitute about a half mile of roads and have not been paved in 40 years. In 2019, these roads were</p> | Pt 3 03:56 |

| Item | Agenda Topic | Recording Time |
|------|---|----------------|
| | <p>rated poor with failing scores of 42, 38 and 39. Two years later, they are in worse condition. She heard it would take about \$15,000 to \$30,000 to repave these streets. They do not have sidewalks, only deteriorating roads. Residents can no longer safely go for strolls, walk dogs or ride bikes. This impacts their quality of life and robs them of life's greatest simplest pleasures. In light of COVID-19 pandemic, outside exercise is even more important. North Stone House Place is rotted, pitted and cracked. It is dangerous and is a liability. An elderly neighbor, Marvin, tripped and fell, broke his hip. He did not fully recover and was moved to a nursing home, costing him his autonomy and much more. A neighbor, Carol, tripped over one of the cracks, fell and broke a foot. She was in a boot for ten weeks. These are life altering and costly consequences of failing roads. The bad condition of the roads also impacts the value of their homes. When she moved to this area in 2001, the real estate agent told her that the roads were bad but was certain they would soon be repaved. Twenty years later, the problem has gotten worse and they are still waiting for roads to be fixed. Industry standards indicate asphalt only lasts about 20 years, so they are two decades overdue. One visitor commented that the roads are very bad. The roads are original to subdivision. The roads date their homes and hurt their curb appeal and in the time they have lived in their house, taxes have steadily increased and yet they do not have decent roads. She asked that for the sake of their financial investment security, the road be repaved. She was informed that people who are unhappy with the condition of their road could use See-Click-Fix. While CPI is one of the factors, she requested adding the number of years since the roads were last paved to the algorithm. She hopes PCTAC agrees that 40 years is really a long time to go without repaving. She requested Sabino Foothills Estate road be added to the next budget for the health, safety and value of the community. While it only constitutes about a half mile of roads, it will have a huge impact on lives, well-being and futures.</p> | |
| | <p>Joe Schmidlin reported on Kolb Road (Valencia to Golf links) and Alvernon Way (22nd to Speedway); PCI 47 and 43, respectively. These are streets with similar traffic, paved 4-5 years ago. He showed differences in performance and construction. Kolb Road was a 2-inch mill and fill with PAG 1 mix, a more expensive repair. After 5 years of service, it has a PCI less than 80. However, Alvernon Way performed very well, paved with TDOT mix and appears to have a better return on investment due to the fiber reinforced asphalt mix. He invited PCTAC to a fiber-reinforced asphalt demo on Tuesday.</p> | Pt 3 08:00 |
| | <p>Chris Centuori was unable to be connected, however topic was on Cactus Canyon.</p> | Pt 3 12:40 |
| | <p>Bozena Sporna resides in North Ranch Subdivision, specifically Cactus Canyon Pass. The road has bike and walk paths but the asphalt is in bad condition. Her 21-year old son is wheel-chair bound due to muscular dystrophy. Her son and other neighbors with disabilities are excluded from social interaction their bodies are jolted due to bumpy road conditions. She requested sidewalks on Shannon Road. It has a number of chuckholes making walking the road difficult. As an example, one of her neighbors tripped while walking and sprained an arm. One mile, between Thornydale and Shannon, provides access to other amenities for the subdivision but unless one is driving, they are inaccessible. Also the road is heavily used by non-local traffic taking shortcuts heading north, connecting between Shannon and Thornydale making it even more dangerous to pedestrians.</p> | Pt 3 16:30 |
| | <p>Thomas Winenger comments were read into the record by Chair Free. He requested upper Rancho Sierra be paved in 2021. He wrote east Vallarta Drive is under construction, assumed due to red failed PCI and proximity to Sabino High School cross walk. Unfortunately, there are no current plans to pave upper Rancho Sierra neighborhood, based on current Pima Count pavement guidance. Request comes as neighborhood roadways become congested every day, when seeking alternative routes around the school's traffic along Bose/Snyder Road intersection. The neighborhood is rated failed or poor PCI rating and roadways continue to erode at accelerated rate.</p> | Pt 3 21:28 |

| Item | Agenda Topic | Recording Time |
|------|--|----------------|
| | <p>Jeff Witthoft is the HOA President of the Sabino Vista Hill Canyon Ranch Estate Subdivision and wants an update on the paving of the failed road Larrea Lane. He said in the early 1980s his neighborhood brought their roads up to code and turned them over to the County. He worked with D1 Supervisor Ally Miller on numerous events to have their road in classification standpoint. In 2020, roads were to be paved. A quarter of the community was paved; then roads were reclassified as poor vs failing roads. Their roads have never been paved by Pima County. They are 40 years old and were supposed to be done. However, he observed Sabino Vista Roads went from fair to failed and have been paved. Even with equipment nearby, his subdivision streets have been left alone. Larrea Lane, failed road since day 1 appears to be on a regular schedule for pothole filing. Larea Lane was constructed as chip and seal and then continued as such. This is a corridor that enters Canyon Ranch. Similar to the Canyon Ranch work, Pima County also built a lift station. The trucks and crane continuously demolish the roads. Ms. Miller said it would be taken care of. The community has been wronged repeatedly. The community even offered to contribute funds toward construction of Larrea Lane to make wider bike lanes to prevent residents from being hit by cars. The County has neglected the area. Promises have not been kept. Other than his home's cul-de-sac, no other roads have been paved.</p> | Pt 3 25:03 |
| | <p>Chair Free informed meeting attendees PCTAC cannot respond during Call to the Audience. However, she assured DOT will respond via email and post responses on County's PCTAC webpage.</p> | Pt 3 29:25 |
| 8. | <p>Next Meeting: March 23, 2021 via WEBEX – <i>Lucretia Free, PCTAC Chair</i> Agenda Items–request topic submittal by March 5, 2021 to Annabelle.Valenzuela@pima.gov.</p> | Pt 3 30:04 |
| 9. | <p>Adjournment – <i>Lucretia Free, PCTAC Chair</i> Motion to adjourn made by Mr. Bernal with a second by Mr. Weaver. Without opposition, meeting was adjourned at 1:36 PM.</p> | Pt 3 30:35 |

Respectfully submitted, Juanita Garcia-Seiger, Assistant