



PIMA COUNTY TRANSPORTATION ADVISORY COMMITTEE

**SUMMARY OF *AD HOC WEBEX MEETING
Tuesday, March 23, 2021
12:00 PM**

***NOTE: Due to a lack of quorum, meeting considered ad hoc. No action items were moved or voted on.**

Members Present: John Bernal (joined at 12:30 PM), Dan Eckstrom, Lucretia Free, Albert Letzkus, Tom McGovern, Frank Santa Cruz, John Wallace, Ed Verburg

Members Absent: Kendall Elmer, Don Weaver, Vacancies: Supervisory Districts 1 and 2, and County Administrator’s office.

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

Madam Chair Lucretia Free brought the ad hoc meeting to order at 12:10 PM and informed all present that there can be no voting due to a lack of quorum.

Item	Agenda Topic	Recording Time
1.	Pledge of Allegiance – <i>Lucretia Free, PCTAC Chair</i>	04:13
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 not achieved.	04:45
3.	<u>Approval of Meeting Summary for February 23, 2021</u> – <i>Lucretia Free, PCTAC Chair</i> Lacking a quorum, item continued to the April 27 th agenda.	06:26
4.	Five-Year Tentative Subdivision Streets Repaving Priorities/Schedules – <i>Albert Letzkus</i> Mr. Letzkus credited the PTAC for developing the annual road priority system and asked to explore expanding it to a multi-year schedule. He acknowledged there being many challenges to this and had already received feedback from others that a multi-year schedule may be difficult to accomplish. Nevertheless, he wanted to investigate the concept with the committee.	07:00
	Chair Free inquired what the position of staff is and Ms. Olivares replied that a multi-year schedule is possible but not recommend for several reasons. The main reason is that the County Board of Supervisors approves a yearly budget in June. She explained that making a road list for unknown, or yet to be approved, budgets would convey a false sense of scheduling. As has been experienced by the PCTAC, the Pavement Management Program budget allocation for pavement preservation has changed throughout the years. This year, the budgeted amount is \$56M and next year, it is proposed to increase to \$85M, which is a large change from the original proposal. Had the PTAC made a list for a budget done two years ago, already there would be a change to the list and schedule. The second reason, is the criteria established each year by the PCTAC on road evaluations. Each year, the intent is to evaluate roads condition for future planning. Currently, the criteria focuses on repairing the “worst first” local roads; however, in a few years as the committee plans for the continuation of the preservation of repairs completed three or four years ago, the discussion will be on how to fund the preservation of those local roads going forward. Those discussions may change the criteria, which would in turn change the priority of the list.	07:57

Item	Agenda Topic	Recording Time
	<p>Ms. Olivares explained the program will provide worst road list in order but that is not how the work is undertaken. There is a trigger road identified as the worst and then the work continues with roads in a subdivision, which takes up a certain amount of budget. That priority cycle then continues with the worst first list until the entire budget is spent. To create multiple year lists, the committee would need to work with multiple year budgets and should there be one change, then all that planning work would start anew. Staff does not recommend distributing a list of roadways, that DOT may not be able to meet community expectations because of changing variables. Even the budget allocation can impact the list depending on how costs come in from contractors, i.e., increase in construction costs, resources, asphalt oil, - all variables that can change from year to year.</p>	10:24
	<p>Ms. Olivares stated the committee has done well preparing a list and the department has done well in accomplishing the work on the list, delivering work within budget and even adding some roads when there are cost savings. DOT’s record has been good at delivering what was promised for the following year and that is what staff proposes to continue doing.</p>	11:36
	<p>Mr. Verberg, believes Ms. Olivares to be on point. Though he would like a comprehensive five-year plan, its practicality is another matter when details need to be seen year by year.</p>	12:06
	<p>Mr. McGovern suggested that should a maintenance ‘bucket’ be included in the RTANext plan with a guaranteed 20-year funded plan, there may be some framework for 5-year schedules because unless there is an ongoing funding source, it would be problematic to try to project out.</p>	12:39
5.	<p>Road Repair Update– <i>Michelle Montagnino, PCDOT Staff</i> Ms. Montagnino provided an update to last month’s presentation. All of the original work has been procured and much of the amended roads added to existing contracts. There is approximately \$4M remaining to advertise to JOC contractors. Construction is running smoothly and on schedule this year. \$52M of the original \$56M budget is under contract, and \$16M of that budget invoiced to date. Curb/ramp projects are nearing completion and paving projects will begin to move quicker. All \$56M will be spent this year.</p>	14:27
	<p>Due to technical difficulties, Mr. Letzkus will contact Ms. Montagnino directly to discuss the repair list posted on the County’s PCTAC website. Ms. Free asked that he submit questions to Ms. Valenzuela.</p>	
6.	<p>Chair Free reminded the committee that this topic was brought up at the last meeting. The next two matters were from a broader category of topics to be discussed in the coming year. She had asked committee members to submit questions or topics for future meetings. Two such topics, the impact of COVID-19 on transportation and the PAYGO acceleration plan, will be addressed at the April 27th meeting.</p>	15:47
	<p>A) RTANext Transportation Plan – Chair Free said the PCTAC will collaborate on the RTANext Plan with the RTA. She asked Mr. McGovern to elaborate on what the association would look like.</p>	16:25
	<p>Mr. McGovern explained that the PCTAC’s role is to be in support of DOT staff. Part of that support is helping with development and prioritization of a list and type of projects the County would like the RTA to consider. During the start of COVID last year, for example, the County was able to get its list of projects to the RTA. However, all of the projects that need to be submitted by other jurisdictions have not been yet received by the CAC.</p>	16:37

Item	Agenda Topic	Recording Time
	The CAC is basically at a stand-still for development of their draft plan. It is anticipated that when City Council meets in Study Session today, it will attempt to create its own framework for prioritizing City projects.	17:48
	The County's projects are going to be presented to the CAC at the April 12 th meeting and the Citizen's committee will hear from the County, and as a reminder to PCTAC, the county's project list is included as well as recommendations for maintenance and mobility on demand and other technology-related recommendations and others. The County's submittal was thorough and actually provided a framework for the CAC's own development of their plan. Once the plan is complete, it will return to each jurisdiction as part of the RTA's Technical Management Committee and that group with jurisdictional input evaluates those projects and makes further recommendation and comments to the CAC.	18:24
	Mr. McGovern acknowledged that it is a circular process and a good way to achieve inclusion of the PCTAC in development of the plan. When the County's and other's projects are included in the draft plan and County staff is reviewing it, it would be an appropriate time for the PCTAC to jointly review it because at the end of the day, whatever is in the plan would be mute if the voters do not approve it. If voters do not approve it, then it would be a waste of 3 or 4 years.	20:04
	Mr. McGovern feels this committee has good input, on behalf of the community, and could help advise the County as it goes forward through the TMC and interaction with the CAC.	21:09
	Ms. Free was pleased with Mr. McGovern's high-level synopsis of the RTA Citizens Advisory Committee and requested another update in late April.	21:56
	Mr. McGovern asked that DOT staff provide a summary of what is presented to the CAC. The feedback received will provide the PCTAC with an idea of where the CAC plan is heading. Ms. Free informed this topic will be added to the April 27 th agenda.	22:30
	B) Traffic Safety Report – Ms. Free informed that this topic will be discussed in detail at the April 27 th meeting.	27:14
	Ms. Olivares confirmed DOT will present various analytical tools that have replaced DOT's previous Safety Management System (SMS) report. A staff member will showcase the Network Analysis Tool used to study safety mobility data for County roads, reporting essentially what the SMS report once did. This tool is part of the County DOT data hub that assists with managing what needs to be done.	27:49
7.	Next Meeting: April 27, 2021 via WEBEX – Lucretia Free, PCTAC Chair Agenda Items—topics be submitted by April 9, 2021 to Annabelle.Valenzuela@pima.gov . Chair Free noted “Additional Topics for Discussion” will be an ongoing item for future agendas. The next agenda will include the PAYGO Acceleration Plan, the Impact of COVID-19 on Transportation and previously discussed items.	29:05
8.	Call to the Audience – Lucretia Free, PCTAC Chair. Chair Free informed the audience that PCTAC cannot respond at Call to the Audience. She assured each participant DOT staff would follow-up via email and post responses on the County's PCTAC webpage.	29:20

Item	Agenda Topic	Recording Time
	<p>Mary and Bennett Porter live on a county-maintained road, Avenida de Posada in the Catalina Pueblo Development, south of Skyline and Campbell. Ms. Porter informed that Avenida de Posada has not been addressed for about 20 years. However, roads right ‘down the street’ are being repaved. With the equipment already in the general area, she wonders why the entire neighborhood cannot be scheduled for pavement now, rather than wait to return next year.</p>	29:48
	<p>Pat Turner resides on North Roundstone St. in Gatewood Ranch, a 30+-year old subdivision. Roads have never been resurfaced but are periodically patched. Patchwork, however, seems inconsistent because some larger potholes are skipped while other smaller holes are filled. North Roundstone is not on the list. However, the majority of Barque, the primary street leading to the subdivision, was patched to extreme last year. Some segments had the entire street redone. The streets are county-owned and more gravel-like, than paved. Ms. Turner understands there is a 10-year plan but wants to know if there is a strategy to review streets listed for repair and compare. She would like some feedback whether streets not listed for this year will be on the list next year.</p>	32:21
	<p>Leslie Ckonjevic’s comment card was read by Ms. Valenzuela due to technical difficulties. Ms. Ckonjevic asked that Cactus Canyon Pass be placed on the list for road repavement. This is a one-mile stretch of road, the only access to 700 homes in the North Ranch subdivision. It is used as a cut-through for traffic moving between Shannon Road and Thornydale Road. Neighbors that require assistive devices for mobility are prohibited from accessing the neighborhood due to poor road conditions. Several older residents have also fallen and been injured since repair work was done in October.</p>	35:40
	<p>Ms. Free informed Ms. Ckonjevic that Ms. Valenzuela would be in contact to make sure all concerns were captured.</p>	38:07
	<p>Eileen Oviedo supported Mr. Letzkus’ proposal to have at least a two- to five-year road plan. A base budget would allow staff to plan two years out to repave some streets. In her case, it’s been 40 years since her subdivision was repaved. For others, between 20 and 30 years. There is frustration on tax payers’ part because they have limited information on what is happening with the property and the roads. She also wants to find out if there is any follow-up regarding the presentation last month on use of better material for paving. Certain roads would require less paving, resulting in cost-savings that could be applied to roads that have not been paved. Ms. Oviedo would appreciate her subdivision included on the road repair plan.</p>	40:02
	<p>Mr. Bernal noted that upon reading last month’s Call to the Audience, the resonating theme was that while addressing roads in a certain area, collectors were not meeting selection criteria for arterials and collectors, therefore not being done. It raised doubt in his mind whether the committee is creating difficulties by being in a location where local roads are addressed but adjoining collectors are not being worked on because they did not meet chosen criteria. He suggested using common sense, where possible, to deal with roads in close proximity.</p>	41:52
9.	<p>Adjournment – <i>Lucretia Free, PCTAC Chair</i> Not having a quorum, Chair Free closed the ad hoc meeting at approximately 12:46 PM.</p>	

Respectfully submitted, Juanita Garcia-Seiger, Assistant