



PIMA COUNTY TRANSPORTATION ADVISORY COMMITTEE

WEBEX Meeting
Tuesday, August 25, 2020
12:00 p.m.

Members Present: Albert Letzkus, Eric Ponce, John Wallace Don Weaver, Lucretia Free, Frank Santa Cruz, John Bernal, and Tom McGovern (telephonic)

Members Absent: Yolanda Weinberger, Dan Eckstrom, Kendall Elmer, and Curtis Lueck

Others Present: Yves Khawam (Assistant County Administrator-Public Works), Ana Olivares (PCDOT), Jim Cunningham (PCDOT), Kathryn Skinner (PCDOT), Rich Franz-Under (PCDOT), Annabelle Valenzuela (PCDOT), Michelle Montagnino (PCDOT), John Olivas (PCDOT)

1. **Pledge of Allegiance** - *Lucretia Free, PCTAC Chair (0:45)*
2. **Call to Order- Roll Call** - *Lucretia Free, PCTAC Chair (1:15)*
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 July 28, 2020**– *Lucretia Free, PCTAC Chair (12:27)*
Mr. Bernal makes a motion to approve the meeting minutes and Mr. Weaver seconds the motion.

4. **Impact Fees Update** – *Kathryn Skinner, PCDOT Deputy Director (15:00)*
The Impact Fee re-write is complete. On August 17, 2020, the Board of Supervisors (BOS) approved Ordinance 2020-27, which is the New Impact Fee Ordinance. Along with that approval was the approval of the Development Fee Study, and the Impact Fee Phase-In Schedule. These fees will not go into effect until January 1, 2021. As a reminder, the New Impact Fee program has seven benefit areas; they all have names for the different ordinate directions. These are the new service areas we will be collecting under. Each of those benefit areas has specifically named projects which are allowed to have Impact Fees used on those projects, and only on those projects. There are 28 projects in all.

Mr. Letzkus asked about the Adopted IIP Projects List. Is there a timeline for the 28 projects, or are they just approved for anytime in the future? Is there a date for those constructions projects? Ms. Skinner explained yes, there is not a hard date, but the new State Statute requires the improvements that are identified in the infrastructure plan be within the next ten years, unless there is a BOS action that would change that list. We are required every five years to make an update to the project list to make sure they are still consistent with these. The short answer is no, we don't have specifically scheduled as of yet, unless it is a project that is currently under development, and/or in construction.



5. **Fiscal Year 2020/2021 Road Repair Program** – *Michelle Montagnino, PCDOT Staff (19:30)*

Update to Fiscal Year (FY) 2020/2021 Roadway Pavement Preservation Program. We have been tasked with completing \$56 million of work this fiscal year. The first \$4.4 million is under contract, and we have another \$4.6 million project out to bid right now. This year, we have 127 miles of local roads that have been selected for mill and fill projects. We are currently assembling the next Job Order Contract (JOC) which are American with Disabilities Act (ADA) Improvements in Green Valley. The remaining ADA and local roadway work will be packaged to bid before the end of November. This year, 45.65 miles of Arterial and Collector roadways have been selected for the mill and fill projects. The first two projects have been awarded, which is approximately \$1.2 million of this year's budget. Borderland was the successful bidder on both the Mission Road and the Snyder Road projects. These projects were actually bids of FY 2019/2020, but shifted into 2020/2021 due to budget constraints. The engineering estimate for this project is \$4.6 million and the bid opening is scheduled for September 1, 2020. We anticipate having the project presented to the BOS for approval at the October 6, 2020 BOS meeting. The Sahuarita Road project is anticipated to be a JOC contract, and the remainder of this year's arterial and collector roadways will be packaged into several other hard bid projects advertised by the end of November 2020. The Surface Treatments will be broken down into two projects. We will utilize our Master Agreement for the Crack Fill treatments, and anticipate Crack Fill treatments will be completed this fall, and the other surface treatments will be packaged into a single hard bid, which will be completed by the end of June 2021. FY 2020/2021 Road Repair Plan is on the DOT website: [Roadway and Pavement Maintenance Page](#).

6. **Fiscal Year 2021/2022 Pavement Program Criteria** – *Rich Franz-Under, PCDOT Staff (29:29)*

It is time to start looking at FY 2022 Prioritization Plan and to start our discussion for the criteria for the FY 2022. We have a schedule where we hope by December we can obtain PCTAC approval of the criteria. Final scenarios will run in January 2021, and then we can prepare for bid packages in the spring. There are four updates that we made to StreetSaver Model since last fall. There were new areas that we got from the LiDAR scan. We got the new Pavement Condition Index (PCI) as discussed in February. We have two new changes; one of them is Functional Class Changes that Arizona Department of Transportation (ADOT) has made to our network. The Functional Class is the description of the road so arterial, collector, or local, we are familiar with those terms because that is how we are dividing up our funds. Next are Budget Changes; some are positive and some are negative. The negative being the effects of COVID. In January when we got the LiDAR set, we ended up with a less area in locals, and more in arterials and collectors than we had been tracking. It changed our percentage, which started to make a difference in the long run. The second change was when we got the data from IMS on the PCI; it was based upon the actual distresses in the field, the number of cracks and the area raveling. The weighed area average of the overall network increased.

We adjusted the StreetSaver model to account for the fact that those PCI numbers changed. Our new information is that we have some Functional Class Changes by ADOT. As a result, about 7.6 % of the road network overall moved from residential locals up into minor collectors. We started with 65% residential local and we ended up with 58% locals. This is important because we are dividing on our buckets of money between the local bucket and the arterial collector bucket. The criteria that we developed last year was a 66/34 split, which was actually based upon running our StreetSaver scenarios to find out what proportion of money did we need to get both parts of the network to a PCI of 80 by the year 2030. That proportion was close to the actual split of the roadways, meaning 65% locals and 35% for arterials and collectors.



Now we are down to 58% locals with the rest of these being moved into the minor and major arterials. On most of these residential locals went into minor collectors, a few went into major collectors, and there is actually one that became a minor arterial.

Chair Free stated Pima County did not anticipate these changes from ADOT. Mr. Franz-Under stated we knew ADOT was doing a classification study; we did not know what the outcome of that would be.

Mr. Letzkus what is the significance of the 7.6%. Mr. Franz-Under mentioned that is the percentage of centerline miles that used to be classified as residential local and are now classified as either minor collector, major collector or minor arterial.

Mr. Bernal asked, what is the note at the bottom (page 7 of presentation) that says, “Not all 146.3 miles are County maintained.” Mr. Franz-Under clarified that some roads on the table we know that we don’t maintain through Intergovernmental Agreements (IGA) but we have not be able to actually do the mapping to figure out which ones they are. Once we have an opportunity to identify and map them out, we will have a better idea if the percentages will change.

Chair Free asked, since ADOT has this minor collector category that wasn’t used by Pima County, is Pima County going to adjust numbers and the road designations to now account for this minor collector category going forward. Mr. Franz-Under responded yes, it will take a while to get that changed through all the systems.

Mr. Franz-Under continued with the presentation on Budget Changes. Our current forecast for our Highway User Revenue Fund (HURF) for FY 2021/2022 is \$13.5 million, and we don’t have any fund forecast beyond that. Another thing to point out is the \$56 million was funded partially by Certificates of Participation (COP); that is short term debt and a portion of the General Fund (GF) monies that were going to go to FY 2022 to make this \$31 million and actually now going to go to retire this debt that bumped up this FY 2020/2021 to \$56 million. The same amount of money in GF are being allocated; it’s just that it was front loaded into FY 2020/2021 and in FY 2021/2022, We just have that HURF estimate right now. We are going to be planning for a \$13.5 program in FY 2021/2022.

Chair Free asked if FY 2021/2022 could go beyond \$13.5 million. Mr. Franz-Under replied correct. Ms. Olivares added that yes this could go up; this estimated \$13.5 million is based on the projections we have projected during COVID. As we get actual amounts of HURF and Vehicle License Tax (VLT) every month, we will see if we can change this amount as we move forward. We are asking the committee to help establish the criteria for the FY 2021/2022 program, then we will use that criteria no matter what the budget number is.

Mr. Bernal asked if based on \$13.5 million for FY 2021/2022, does that start to delay us reaching PCI 80 in 10 years. Ms. Olivares said it definitely slows it down. HURF and VLT would need to increase to continue in the next years to get to our 80. We are hoping we are conservative and that we’ll see a little more improvement.



Mr. Franz-Under continued with the presentation covering Functional Class Changes by ADOT. Our current criteria split the funds 66% to locals and 34% to arterials and collectors. Because our percentage in the network changed, we are recommending that we change that percentage with 58% going to locals and 42% going to arterials and collectors for FY 2021/2022.

This leads us to our recommendation to begin the discussion. So we are recommending a budget split of 58% for locals and 42% for arterial-collectors, continue with the worst-first methodology for locals, deal with the change in functionality by formal statement: *When there is a minor collector and we are developing a bid package and it makes sense to include that minor collector, that we can package it with the rest of the subdivision for those efficiencies.* We think this recommendation for criteria will give us the flexibility to package the bids for the most effective use of the funds.

Chair Free asked what is the timeframe which you need direction on this. Mr. Franz-Under suggested for the committee's final recommendation in December.

A discussion was held to activate the subcommittee to provide recommendation on the criteria. Chair Free noted that she did not hear any objections to keeping the discussions in the larger group rather than the subcommittee.

Mr. Letzkus asked when the PCTAC would see the lists of proposed roads for FY 2021/2022. Mr. Franz-Under replied that would be in April when we are done with the bid packages. Mr. Letzkus stated he would like the committee to see the list ahead of time before the bid packages.

Ms. Olivares responded, the bid packages are internal because they will require us to make adjustments to the lists if we add minor collectors within the PCI with a subdivision. The final list will be provided to the committee before it becomes public and published. We can share the list at the April meeting. Funding does not start until July 1; having the list shared with the committee at the April meeting will not affect the May through July bid schedule.

Mr. Letzkus stated it seems scenarios are in January. He thinks the committee would be able to see the results to the final scenarios. Mr. Franz-Under replied that is no problem to show the final scenarios, it is important to understand that the scenario is not necessarily going to be the road list in this case. Chair Free commented, correct. Mr. Franz-Under replied, because when we run the arterial-collectors scenarios, it may not pick up a minor collector that makes sense to package with a local subdivision work; there could be some change between the scenario and the final list.

Mr. Letzkus asked about the Budget Change slide that showed the three FYs and that we frontloaded a lot of money from next FY to current FY, from \$26 million to \$56 million. Then in FY2021/2022 we dropped way down to \$13.5 million. What is the reason for frontloading the funding? Ms. Olivares responded that schedule was pre-COVID but we are keeping our fingers crossed that there will be an increase in that \$13.5 million. Mr. Letzkus asked we will be able to keep up with our 10-Year Program to achieve the PCI we want by 2030, right. Ms. Olivares replied that is our goal, yes.



Mr. McGovern commented on his concerns if the bid list was provided to the committee early it would have to be kept confidential. If the list is provided early there could be a potential to give a contractor an unfair advantage, so we would want to make sure to remind each other not to do that.

Mr. McGovern stated that when the minor arterials have been created from what we used to call locals and we start to fold them into arterial and collector package, we go away from the worst-first prioritization. His concern is we have to make sure that the minor arterials that we add, because the PCI will be less than 60, don't egregiously jump over another worst minor arterial or even major collector or arterial. That would not have happened, but for it switching from a worst-first to this convenience criteria. Mr. Franz-Under explained looking at the presentation sample subdivision shows Worst Road PCI 22, the rest of the roads varied in there PCI, the best case being PCI 45. What we said in the criteria is that to be milled and filled you have to be worse than 60. All of these are milled and filled. Now, what happened because this road is now split (and it's still the same road by the way) we will call it Calle de la Tierra; this is still Calle de la Tierra, it is still a PCI 28, it's just the Functional Class changed right there. It makes sense to add it in the package because of its PCI and it's really part of the subdivision that we're doing. We want to maintain that whole subdivision going forward. In 30 years it's going to be time to mill and fill again, and every street now is going to be in the same condition and the bid package is the same and we get those efficiencies moving through time.

Mr. McGovern responded what if that PCI was 58? Mr. Franz-Under replied we would still include it because it's still a candidate for mill and fill. Mr. McGovern stated you may have some on your list that get kicked off because of that may have much lower than 58 PCI. Mr. Franz-Under replied that is correct, that is why we wanted to talk about this particular piece of the criteria. Because if this didn't otherwise show up on the arterial-collector scenario list, then what that means is that we are kicking something off of that list in order to accomplish this. That is on the arterial-collector's side. We would still be doing the same amount of arterials-collectors, just not the exact list that StreetSaver recommended based upon its algorithm.

7. **Next meeting September 22, 2020, WEBEX** - *Lucretia Free, PCTAC Chair* (1:13)
 - a. **Agenda Items – Please submit by September 4, 2020 to Annabelle.Valenzuela@pima.gov**

Mr. Bernal asked staff to provide what is Pima County's position in the Transit area with a little more detail to be included in the next agenda as part of the discussion.

8. **Call to the Audience** - *Lucretia Free, PCTAC Chair* (1:16)

Ms. Martha Michaels: Thank you to PTAC members for support for the repaving of long neglected failed local roads. Commends PCDOT for recent work at Snyder and Sabino Canyon Roads. Extends a thank you to PCDOT and contract workers who are out working in the pandemic and excessive heat, providing the work to make our roads better.

9. **Adjournment** - *Lucretia Free, PCTAC Chair* (1:18)

Mr. Letzkus makes a motion to adjourn meeting and Mr. McGovern seconds the motion. Meeting adjourned.