



**PIMA COUNTY TRANSPORTATION ADVISORY COMMITTEE**

**SUMMARY OF WEBEX MEETING**

**Tuesday, April 27, 2021**

**12:00 PM**

**Members Present:** John Bernal, Melissa Brown-Dominguez, Dan Eckstrom, Kendall Elmer, Lucretia Free, Tom McGovern, Frank Santa Cruz, John Wallace, Ed Verburg, Don Weaver, John Winchester

**Members Absent:** Albert Letzkus; 1 Vacancy: County Administrator’s representative

**Also Present:** Transportation Staff: Ana Olivares, Director; Jorge Riveros, Deputy Director; Kathryn Skinner, Deputy Director; Annabelle Valenzuela, Juanita Garcia-Seiger, Lauren Fecteau, Michelle Montagnino, Rich Franz-Under, Robert Lane

Madam Chair Lucretia Free brought the committee meeting to order at 12:02 PM.

<b>Item</b>	<b>Agenda Topic</b>	<b>Recording Time</b>
1.	<b>Pledge of Allegiance</b> – <i>Lucretia Free, PCTAC Chair</i>	00:49
2.	<b>Call to Order and Roll Call</b> – <i>Lucretia Free, PCTAC Chair/Annabelle Valenzuela, PCDOT Staff</i> Ms. Valenzuela took attendance; a meeting quorum was achieved.	01:25
3.	<b>Introduction of Incoming Members &amp; DOT Deputy Director</b> - <i>Lucretia Free, PCTAC Chair</i> <i>John Winchester</i> is the Executive Director of Southern Arizona’s Northwest YMCA in Supervisory District 1. Transportation is the number 1 constituent issue in Southern Arizona and feels honored to serve with the PCTAC on this important regional issue. <i>Melissa Brown-Dominguez</i> is a City of South Tucson business owner, works with the University of Arizona and has been a licensed realtor in Arizona since 2001. The transportation and roads topics are important to her as a constituent and business owner. She is excited to serve for Supervisory District 2. <i>Jorge Riveros</i> is the new Deputy Director for the Pima County Department of Transportation. He worked in Texas and most recently as Chief Transportation Engineer in Nashville, Tennessee. The role was equivalent to a Transportation Director, under the Public Works umbrella. He is excited to work with the PCTAC and looks forward to advancing the good work in Pima County, in particular providing exceptional service in the advancement of the Smart Mobility Center and the Pavement Preservation Program.	03:05 03:34 04:15 05:40
4.	<b>Approval of Meeting Summary for February 23, 2021</b> – <i>Lucretia Free, PCTAC Chair</i> Mr. Bernal motioned to approve; Mr. McGovern seconded. Later in the meeting, the motion was unanimously passed.	07:00
5.	<b>Road Repair Update</b> – <i>Michelle Montagnino, PCDOT Staff</i> Reference Ms. Montagnino’s presentation for details regarding this year’s Pavement Preservation Program, comprised of 31 different projects in the following categories: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <u>04 Recently Awarded</u> projects are included as part of the addendum program. They were made possible due to cost-savings and favorable bidding from the original project list.</li> <li>• <u>04 Upcoming Construction</u> projects scheduled to begin in early May. The Orangewood Development project was started last week and moved up to the In Construction category;</li> </ul>	07:40

Item	Agenda Topic	Recording Time
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <u>14 In Construction</u> with three curb ramp projects and the Northeast Arterial Collector project nearing completion.</li> <li>• <u>09 Completed Projects</u> are fully complete and paid.</li> </ul>	09:07
	<p>Under the FY 21 Program Status Summary, Ms. Montagnino has a different perspective based off of mileage and ADA ramps. There are 1.3 miles of Arterial/Collector Roadways and 23.65 miles of Local Roadways that are projects Awarded but not yet in Construction. Most of the current work falls under the In Construction category, except most ADA ramp projects will soon be moved to the Completed category. About 50% of roads in Arterial/ Collectors and almost 114 miles of local roads, plus 18 miles of Surface Treatments are in Construction now.</p>	09:38
	<p>PCDOT will end of the year by doing 11 extra miles of Arterial/Collector Roadways, or 123% of the original estimate. They added 19% additional Local Roadway miles and substantially increased Surface Treatments. DOT was able to deliver more than planned with the dollars projected to spend.</p>	10:36
	<p>Ms. Montagnino informed that DOT is keeping up with everything and reflecting the changes on the Roadway Repair Preservation map</p>	11:12
	<p>Mr. McGovern asked what the contract time is on each project getting started and due to be finished before the end of the fiscal year. Ms. Montagnino replied, 30 working days for most subdivision projects. Everything is projected to be paved with current fiscal year funding, though some cleanup work may spill into the next fiscal year.</p>	11:40
6.	<p><u><a href="#">Pavement Preservation Program Acceleration Measure</a></u> – Ana Olivares, PCDOT Director        Ms. Olivares explained Jorge Riveros replaces Deputy Director Jim Cunningham, who retired earlier this year. He will oversee the Maintenance and Operations and Project Delivery divisions.</p>	12:43
	<p>Refer to Ms. Olivares’ presentation for details of the February 16, 2021, Board of Supervisors (BOS) request to have PCDOT provide options for accelerating the repair of county roadways. She explained that the plan has been that by 2030, all county roads would have an average PCI of 80. Staff was asked what it would take to accelerate the plan and how much that would cost.</p>	13:35
	<p>Ms. Olivares summarized all options the BOS reviewed that applied PCDOT’s portion of State-shared revenues with supplementation from the county’s PayGo program, for the county’s capital improvement and infrastructure with part of the funding going to roadway repair.</p>	14:01
	<p>The PayGo plan, Option 1, was BOS-approved in November 5, 2019. Based on revenue for that time, to achieve an average PCI of 80 required incremental funding of \$5M allocations each fiscal year starting with FY 19/20 through FY 22/23. Thereafter, funding would be capped at \$25M per year through FY29/30.</p>	14:18
	<p>PCDOT reviewed several scenarios while preparing the current FY plan. It was considered a baseline plan, and since then changed slightly from the original plan. In FY20, rather than completing \$26M of work, \$36M was completed because of an additional PayGo amount.</p>	15:02
	<p>For FY21, staff was unsure if additional revenues would be received since the pandemic was evolving. PCDOT planned \$3M and the BOS approved \$50M from PayGo for FY21, the program being worked on now for completion by the end of April 30<sup>th</sup>.</p>	15:24

Item	Agenda Topic	Recording Time
	PCDOT's Baseline Plan for FY21 was to use past years' savings and pandemic revenues. PCDOT's PayGo funding was \$0, resulting in \$35.5M for FY22. FY23 to FY26, were reduced from the original \$25M, \$25M and \$25M amounts because PCDOT needed to pay back \$50M of borrowed funds for FY21.	15:50
	PCDOT was asked what could accelerate the program and several options were reviewed. Option 1: add another \$50M for FY22, reduce PayGo allocation through FY26 to pay back debt, and resume annual \$25M funding beginning FY27 through FY29. This resulted in PCI of 80 by 2030 and spends slightly less of originally planned PayGo allocation.	16:30
	Option 2: would obtain PCI of 80 by 2028, but funding would be increased by \$10M from the original program.	17:14
	Mr. McGovern noted a typo in Ms. Olivares' presentation of the total funding for Option 2. It should be \$440,600,000. Recognizing the error, Ms. Olivares confirmed the total allocated Transportation Department Funding allocation of \$206,000,000 and the total General Fund PayGo Allocation of \$234,600,00 were correct. <i>(Note: The slide has since been corrected and posted on line.)</i>	17:29
	Option 3: achieve PCI 80 by 2027 by exceeding adopted PayGo allocations.	18:19
	Option 4: would reach PCI 80 by 2026. All repairs would occur sooner original plan. However, this scenario exceeded the PayGo allocation even more and fiscal years past 2030, required additional PayGo allocations for FY33 through FY36 to maintain the road repair rate without State-shared revenues.	18:36
	Of four scenarios presented to the BOS, Option 1 was chosen at the April 6, 2021 BOS meeting. The option allocated an additional \$50M for FY22 local road repair program, doing the 'worst first' as PCTAC requested and effectively minimizing pressure on the General Fund by remaining within established 2019 PayGo allocations.	19:20
	Mr. Bernal asked if the selected Option is on track to achieve 80 PCI by 2030. Ms. Olivares replied, yes.	20:12
	Mr. McGovern explained that \$50M would be repaid for two consecutive years, an amount greater than the usual \$25M the other scenarios considered. It would be four years without a PayGo allocation. Ms. Olivares confirmed, saying it would be a very minimal amount.	20:35
	Supervisor Rex Scott thanked the Committee for their service. Regarding Messrs. Bernal and McGovern's questions, Supervisor Rex Scott informed that the BOS will always look at ways to accelerate the Pavement Preservation Program. Option 1 was selected because it had the least impact on the General Fund and would remain true to the original formula. It takes 60% reduction in the secondary property tax, as debt is paid down. The 60% increase in the county's residential property base is then applied to the PayGo. The remaining 40% will reduce the primary property tax. Supervisor Scott said Deputy County Administrator Carmine DeBonis reported to the BOS on April 6, that it is an ideal time for the industry and the County's subcontractors to handle additional projects. The BOS was assured that PCDOT can oversee \$83M of work in one year, as does the industry.	21:26

Item	Agenda Topic	Recording Time
	The PayGo program will be revisited as needed to review opportunities for accelerating it and achieve overall PCI 80 before 2030 without adversely effecting other General Fund priorities.	23:46
	Supervisor Scott is impressed with PCDOT and its staff. There has not been a time when a District 1 constituent concern was not responded to with promptness, care, and with needed information. The answer may not always be what the constituent wanted, but it certainly had all the information needed.	24:12
7.	<a href="#">Staff Summary of Regional Transportation Authority Citizens Advisory Committee Presentation</a> – Kathryn Skinner, PCDOT Deputy Director	
	Ms. Skinner provided a summary of the RTA Proposal presentation she and Director Olivares made before the BOS on April 12, 2021 and April 20, 2021. It focused on two main areas:	25:14
	<b>A) Improve Safety</b> for vehicles, bicyclists and pedestrians.	25:24
	<b>B) A Flexible, Adaptable, Resilient</b> plan will last for 20 years and the department should have flexibility to determine the appropriate scope at the time of implementation because travel patterns may have change, or a technology disruptor as the cellphone affects the roadway.	
	The June 2020 proposal was shared with the PCTAC in July 2020. It included 21 named roadway projects and focused on five categories that include:	29:39
	<u>Maintenance:</u> RTA funding to cover regional arterials and collectors;	30:16
	<u>Technology:</u> Intersection signalization and hand-held technology to help route drivers to the least congested routes; incentivizing change of habits; considering alternate modes of transit;	30:52
	<u>Livable Streets:</u> Safe access to modernized multi-modal corridors for the entire community, such as the 880 Streets concept;	31:45
	<u>All-weather Roads:</u> Spot infrastructure improvements on 20 crossings routinely closed due to weather activity that cause a breakdown of the transportation network;	32:31
	<u>Public Transit:</u> Providing mobility options by harnessing technology to have more predictable routes and safer transit stops for the non-driving public.	33:00
	Chair Free asked that copies of the County’s full presentation be emailed to the PCTAC. Ms. Skinner said full slide and audio recording link would be provided.	33:38
	Mr. Bernal asked if the proposal submitted to RTA in June 2020, changed with the latest submittal. Ms. Skinner replied, no. It was the first opportunity to describe to the CAC what was in the county’s proposal. The portal was for named projects only. The discussion related to the categories was provided in County Administrator Chuck Huckelberry’s memorandum to the RTA’s CAC.	33:58
	Mr. Bernal noted the proposal had 21 specific road segments listed, and asked if 11 all-weather crossings were specified. Ms. Skinner replied 20 were identified that regularly hit the maintenance list for closure.	34:53
	Mr. Bernal asked if the intention is to use the funding for as many all-weather crossings as possible. Ms. Skinner replied yes, the submittal included \$65M for that category.	35:18
	Chair Free asked when residents will see whether their intersection that floods made the final list. Ms. Skinner replied the development of the RTANext plan is being managed by the PAG RTA, the RTA Citizens Advisory Committee and the Technical Management Committee. Mr. McGovern said CAC remains in holding pattern since June 2020, awaiting all jurisdiction submittals. PCDOT’s submittal was tremendous; he wished RTA’s portal would have allowed plan to be submitted more easily. The CAC has been receiving information in subsequent explanations and presentations to determine needs of the various jurisdictions.	35:46

Item	Agenda Topic	Recording Time
	Building on Mr. Bernal’s comment regarding all-weather access funding, Mr. McGovern said it relates to the maintenance category. In developing the plan, the CAC focused on regionalism, corridors and projects that enhance regional mobility and connectivity of long-distance projects connecting places from where people live to where they work. In the case of maintenance and all-weather roads, he asked if the maintenance funding is limited to projects classified as regional. Likewise, will the all-weather access, such as collectors that isolate small areas when it rains, will they fit the regional definition? Ms. Skinner replied, 20 areas include crossings are on major roadways or well-used regional routes versus limited spot improvements.	37:33
	Mr. McGovern agreed and said naming projects and giving as much detail regarding the planned funding is critical for achieving public support, so that it is not viewed as wasteful spending.	39:47
	Mr. Winchester asked if the report lists an overall operating set of principles or goal the County wants to achieve with the next round of RTA and not guide what projects they are offering. Is there an abstract of the report that can be shared? Ms. Skinner replied that she would share PCDOT’s Vision and Mission that guide the department’s decision-making and the RTA CAC set of Guiding Principles and Framework document for forming the RTANext plan, which the county’s proposal is aligned with.	40:55
	Ms. Brown-Dominguez asked how the discussions around the categories been received by the RTA CAC members and are they open to them? Mr. McGovern informed Categories were discussed during Framework, Goals and Objectives development for their work. All Categories of RTA1 will be a starting point for discussions in RTANext, along with maintenance and complete streets discussions. Individual funding topics will be discussed and aligned with the County’s request.	42:03
8.	<a href="#">Network Analysis Tools</a> – Lauren Fecteau, PCDOT Staff	
	Reference Ms. Fecteau’s audio and linked presentation for information on PCDOT’s network tools used to screen and evaluate the safety and mobility of the Pima County road network to review system performance:	44:10
	<b>Dynust</b> is a dynamic traffic simulation and assignment software that allows for scenario planning and evaluation.	45:55
	<b>StreetLight Data</b> is an analytic program that uses anonymized road data to provide multi-modal trip quantities such as Average Annual Daily Traffic (AADT), origin-destination and zone activities.	47:03
	<b>Miovision</b> uses signalized intersection cameras and a cloud-based analytic program for signal optimization, intersection counts and performance measures.	48:42
	<b>Signalized Intersection Management Tool</b> is an automated application to pull data from Miovision to create data visualizations and allow for network screening to review various metrics.	49:57
	<b>PAG Safety Explorer</b> provides predictive and expected crash data aligned with AASHTO Highway Safety Manual; Level of Safety Service and Level of Service; and allows crash data to be filtered by numerous metrics with a heat map to visualize patterns or clusters where crashes may be occurring.	52:16
	<b>Network Analysis Application</b> is a screening tool for safety and mobility analysis that leverages StreetLight Data, United States Road Assessment Program (usRAP) safety ratings and statistical hotspot analyses of crash data.	54:58
	<b>RITIS/PDA (Regional Integrated Transportation Information System)</b> a cloud-based tool that provides real-time congestion, traffic and bottleneck data for review.	59:39
	<b>PimaMaps Crash Layer</b> leverages raw crash data as provided through crash report data received from the Sheriff Department.	01:00:13
	Chair Free asked if the tools are available to the public. Ms. Fecteau replied only the PimaMaps is currently available. Next steps are development of web dashboards.	01:02:13

Item	Agenda Topic	Recording Time
	<p>Chair Free asked to be walked through a scenario where these tools would discover and what action item would result from the evaluation. Ms. Fecteau replied that the data is used to evaluate citizen inquiries or identify hot spots for system-wide review. The mobility on demand approach is being leveraged, as well. Traditionally, when receiving a request for a traffic signal at an intersection, PCDOT would evaluate it based upon federal guidelines and may recommend a signal. It would be focused on a single intersection and benefits for a single location. Having network-wide metrics would allow for analyzing the data via these platforms to see the benefit or non-benefit the intersection control may have for the entire network. Data specific to pedestrians or bicyclists is available network that can be evaluated for different things. PCDOT is leveraging these technologies and additional data for potential alternatives for a specific location.</p>	01:02:51
	<p>Mr. McGovern appreciated the presentation, acknowledged amazing amount of data to have to sift through that can deliver in real time. He asked if the real time congestion incident monitoring tools were auto-alarmed or auto-monitored so that when something happens PCDOT doesn't have to a technician looking at various locations. Are the tools tied to emergency services, whether PCDOT or emergency response to crash sites? Ms. Fecteau replied that currently, some data is real-time but other data is received for an entire year's duration. There are other applications that allows for citizens to report incidents but Ms. Fecteau is not aware that those are leveraged and coordinated through the Sheriff's Department for reporting.</p>	01:05:31
	<p>Mr. McGovern noted that some of the software service applications provide real-time automatic monitoring of some areas such as water systems leaking. An automatic email is sent to an emergency contact or maintenance person. He asked if that is the next step to have the systems monitored to take real-time action. Ms. Fecteau agreed that those are next steps and anticipates that the Regional Center for Smart Mobility would evaluate through leveraging that technology for future application. There are also within Miovision, within signalized intersections the help metrics – a proactive way for monitoring signals and inform where review needs to be completed.</p>	01:07:33
	<p>Mr. McGovern said built-in system alarms allow automatic action to be taken to adjust signal timing. Currently, emergency vehicles have signal override capabilities but for the system itself to work best, it needs to be automated and allow for big cues to be dissipated more quickly. Ms. Olivares reiterated that the Regional Center for Smart Mobility Solutions will be staffed to manage congestion and vehicular traffic demand but also the traffic safety and management operations of the network. The new Director for the Center will start in mid-May and part of the Center is staffed to review alarm systems and other things to make sure PCDOT is leveraging the data response in real-time. The Director and staff will reach out to emergency services to develop a plan to use the data.</p>	01:09:09
	<p>Ms. Free asked for periodic summary reports at a high-level view of the Center's findings. Ms. Olivares said reports on the progress of the Center will be provided similar to PCDOT's road report.</p>	01:10:53
	<p>Mr. Bernal was impressed by the amount of data. He asked about pedestrian accidents and pedestrian safety. He read in the newspaper that the City of Tucson is concerned with pedestrian accidents and asked if PCDOT is similarly establishing priorities for those types of incidents and how are such priorities being addressed. Ms. Fecteau replied that data can be leveraged through platforms such as Miovision and PAG Safety Explorer. PCDOT is able to conclude if there are pedestrian crash hot spots in certain locations. PCDOT also wants to determine where there are potential facilities present or higher concentrations of pedestrians, rather than only locations of crash occurrence. Future discussions and reviews of potential crash patterns for pedestrians, bicycles and multi-modal facilities will take place.</p>	01:11:19

Item	Agenda Topic	Recording Time
	Ms. Free appreciated Ms. Fecteau’s thorough report and detailed responses to the committee’s questions.	01:13:29
9.	<b>Topics for Future Discussions – Lucretia Free, PCTAC Chair</b> Chair Free informed that this place on the agenda is for items that do not neatly fit into a category. One such topic is the impact of COVID-19 on transportation. If there are other concerns for future discussion, there is a place for that each month.	01:13:31
	<b>a. COVID-19 Impact on Transportation – Jorge Riveros, PCDOT Deputy Director</b> Mr. Riveros sought clarification on whether the PCTAC would like information about the impacts of Pima County or more of a global view of what the COVID-19 impacts have done to transportation networks, in general. If the former, versus the latter, information will be provided in a future meeting.	01:14:16
	From a global level, transportation agencies did not know how to react to COVID-19 and how it would affect transportation networks nationally or globally. As a result, some state and local agencies were better prepared to collect data about what was happening.	01:15:53
	There was a decline in the number of people using streets, from a motorist’s point of view. Essentially congestions managed itself. However, there were some detrimental effects of COVID-19 on the transportation network such as increases in speeding, increases in serious injuries and fatalities for motorists, bicyclists, pedestrians and other mobility users.	01:15:26
	As a result, transportation experts quickly formulated programs or moved around programs that emphasized the need to put other mobility users front and center. The motorists and amount of through-put were the focus, with some agencies across the world looking at the Slow Streets Program. They closed off streets to find ways for local residents to interact in positive ways during the shelter-in-place directive. There was more use of pedestrian and bicycle facilities.	01:16:26
	Information about these global impacts of COVID and how the cities reacted can be found on the National Association for City Transportation Officials website ( <a href="http://www.NACTO.org">www.NACTO.org</a> ). Some impacts include the decline of transit use and transit agencies needed to figure out how to sanitize assets. There were impacts to micro-mobility like the big disrupter – the scooter. In some cities they were popular and in some cases scooters were banned during the early March/April 2020 pandemic with a slow return in late summer.	01:17:33
	Mr. Riveros informed some transportation agencies shifted resources. As an example, Austin, Texas learned to shift resources to food distribution and work with third party companies to help distribute food to vulnerable populations. They also saw the suspension of parking enforcement, permitting fees and the move to remote work.	01:19:36
	Many are trying to understand how the move to remote work will impact the future of transportation networks. Many companies saw the benefit of remote work on their resources and assets with not having to lease or pay for commercial space, turn on power or water, while having their employees work from home delivering the same amount of work. The metrics of the work could be measured. Therefore, transportation officials will need to figure out how to operate in the future and shift resources similar to concerns with how the COVID vaccine will help the population. The answer to what the long-term effects will be is unknown. The long term impacts of COVID-19 are unknown and there has been a shift in how businesses see future operations.	01:20:23

Item	Agenda Topic	Recording Time
	As reported by Ms. Fecteau, PCDOT will be able to measure much more data to help figure out how and where to shift resources, for example, from single occupancy vehicles to more transit and bicycle use with more pedestrian facilities. The new Regional Center will help determine those future decisions.	01:21:50
	Mr. Riveros reported that this was a devastating scenario in terms of safety and there needs to be a preparedness response to what the transportation network will look like in the future. As more data is collected, transportation experts will need to figure out whether shifting financial resources to other types of facilities is necessary and if doing so will actually meet the right needs as we prepare for such contingencies. The Regional Center will provide a good opportunity to think about table-top preparedness exercises when shifts in economy and public health take place. There were, however, some beneficial impacts as a result of COVID such as the shifts to remote work and more bicycle and pedestrian use, which were exciting to see. If the PCTAC would like information regarding COVID's impact on Pima County, PCDOT will provide.	01:22:35
	Chair Free confirmed her interest in seeing the trends for Pima County and comparatively, how in a given city, the industry that makes up the economy in that city is altered when there is a service industry versus one driven in other ways because there is a segment of the population without the luxury of working from home. She asked if the trend for those that did work from home continue now that there is Zoom or will they return to what was done before?	01:27:00
	<b>b. Other</b>	
	Ms. Free informed the PCTAC that topics of interest or agenda items for future discussions could be emailed to Ms. Valenzuela	01:27:45
<b>10.</b>	<b>Next Meeting: May 25, 2021 via WEBEX – Lucretia Free, PCTAC Chair</b> Agenda Items – Please submit by May 7, 2021 to <a href="mailto:Annabelle.Valenzuela@pima.gov">Annabelle.Valenzuela@pima.gov</a> .	01:29:00
<b>11.</b>	<b>Call to the Audience – Lucretia Free, PCTAC Chair</b> Chair Free informed meeting attendees PCTAC cannot respond during Call to the Audience. DOT will respond via email and post replies on the County's PCTAC webpage.	
	<b>Karen Christensen</b> lives off Mile Wide Road, east of Sandario. Mile Wide originates at entrance to Saguaro National Park off Kinney Road which are connector roads to access the National Park and the Arizona-Sonora Desert Museum. However, the roads have mid-center pavement breaks and numerous potholes that, while repaired, create hazards for cars and bicyclists. The PCI index for this area is 40. She requests priority repaving in the 21/22 work plan. Mile Wide and Kinney are critical components of this roadway complex and without improvement will detract from the usefulness of recent County improvements.	01:29:18
	<b>Larry Stapleton</b> spoke to the need to replace Silverbell Road from Cocio to North Red Hill Road, which accesses the Ironwood Forrest National Monument. The road has many areas with 6 to 12 potholes per 20-ft segment. When PCDOT has patches the road, the patch lasts one to two months and becomes speed bumps. Traffic slows down to 35 mph to avoid damage to vehicles. Most travelers drive on the shoulder since the dirt is better than the road. Currently, PCI 35 but questioned how that index was evaluated. Pump Station Road, rated 40, is a dirt road. In addition to the road being dangerous, it is detrimental to property values. Realtors have told him of losing customers who leave because of the road condition. Silverbell is the main artery for 640 acres of private property within the 129,000 acres of Ironwood. Currently, there are 50 to 70 houses in the area. There are many undeveloped properties and this gives an opportunity for the County to gain impact fees because each house would increase property taxes, and the road impact fee is about \$7,000 for every house. The Ironwood National Forest is a destination for tourism and entertainment but the number one negative comment is about the rough road condition.	01:31:40



Item	Agenda Topic	Recording Time
	<p><b>Heather Hatfield</b> – In Sabino Vista Hills on the north east side of Tucson, the roads are deteriorating and difficult to drive, walk or ride bikes. It’s dangerous for people to walk or bike along, specifically Larrea Lane, due to all the cracks, patches and potholes. The road should also be widened and redone because it has failed. Our neighborhood should be a welcoming and safe place for visitors, especially those visiting to participate in the swim team and other activities. There also are school buses and other recreational activities that the neighborhood offers. I just want to bring this to your attention to request that Larrea Lane would get redone and our neighborhood streets. My street, is failed. I called and found out that it is a 39. I am hoping that it will be at the top of the schedule for the next fiscal year. I appreciate your time listening to my concerns.</p>	01:36:40
	<p><b>Jane Tarson-Peters</b> – Is a resident of Sabino Vista Hills. Our roads were rated failed in many places and then re-rated after some new technology with laser beams went over our roads. They haven’t been repaved in 35 years or more. My concern is not just for safety, that is the number one priority for members of our community and a large number of people that travel through our neighborhood, because we are so close to Canyon Ranch, which is a beautiful place to walk, and so is our community. But I think that after 35 years and as I stated in my input letter, the amount of property tax that we contribute to make Tucson a beautiful place that should be reflected in the condition of our roads. So, I along with other members in this community would hope that the Transportation Department would take another look at our roads and put us in priority in the next fiscal year. We were on a five-year plan and then that went away. I hope you’ll just take another look and get us on the top of the list. Thank you so much and thank you again for all your work.</p>	01:38:26
	<p><b>Joyce Christian</b> - I am also in the Sabino Vista Hills neighborhood, as the two former people were. I agree with everything they said. I would just like to add that my understanding is that Larrea Lane from Cloud Road north was originally built to end before our subdivision was even built and before they acknowledged the amount of traffic that is currently on Larrea, and because of that, the foundation for the road wasn’t design or built to handle the amount of traffic that the over 250 homes that are now in our subdivision and have been since 1975 carry. Because those roads were not designed that way - to carry that much, they failed and they continue to fail. The potholes are dangerous and constantly being filled but we need more than just paving. We need some strengthening of the base of the road. I agree that I would hope that....we appreciate all the work you have done but we hope that you will take a look at the road Larrea as it feeds into Sabino Hills and also into Canyon Ranch because there are two gates from our subdivision, off of Larrea into Canyon Ranch, which is a substantial tax base as well and, they create more traffic than just our neighborhood traffic. I think that should also be considered. I appreciate your time. I appreciate learning what I’ve learned by sitting here for two hours and thank you very much for your work.</p>	01:41:10
	<p><b>Cristy Staff</b> - Larrea Lane, entrance to Sabino Vista Hills is in desperate need of long term repair. Potholes have made the road treacherous for autos and pedestrians. Drivers swerve across both lanes of the road trying to avoid vehicular damage. Without bike lane or sidewalk the high-foot traffic volume is at risk of injury. Please provide a permanent solution on Larrea Lane.</p>	01:44:18
	<p><b>Amanda Paladini</b> - HOA President for Riverside Crossing, reports having roads in fair to poor grade. They have been for the past ten years. With the budget for April, River Road was going to be done, which is already done, thank you guys but we would like to really work on getting Riverside Crossing the roads paved and at least looked into so that we can have a timeline. It has been brought up in previous meetings and we are under the impression that in order for us to pave our roads, right now it is Pima County and in order for us to take over our neighbor Riverside Place, we would have to pay for it. So we would kindly ask if maybe we could look at a timeline for Riverside Crossing as we are in that fair range for the road repaving. If you have any consideration let us know as HOA President and Vice-President, we could understand what is going on.</p>	01:45:31
	<p><b>Robert Larson</b> - Larrea Lane – I don’t understand why a road that gets so much traffic does not get redone while a road like Giaconda Way gets redone and seems to get less traffic.</p>	01:47:27

Item	Agenda Topic	Recording Time
	<p><b>Kristine Morgan</b> – on the Board of Directors for Sabino Vista Hills. Living there since January 1989. Larrea Road and our subdivision roads have never been repaved. They have occasionally had some tarring and gravel and they had potholes patched but they’re not fixed permanently and it’s unsafe for a family neighborhood like ours, with a swim team with over 100 kids and also Canyon Ranch and pedestrians. I agree with Ms. Christenson. It should be repaved and bicycle lanes added. I’ve been calling for years to the roadway maintenance and they’ve told me there’s no money in the budget to fix Larrea Lane and that it’s not on the schedule. They’ve been telling us this 2019 to 2020 and 2021 that there is no plan to repair this road and that service is over 150 families as Canyon Ranch. As other people have expressed, we see a lot of minor roads that have been repaired including a couple in our subdivision, but why isn’t Larrea Lane ever fixed?</p> <p>Ms. Morgan asked, what the follow-up protocol is. Ms. Valenzuela replied that a response would be provided a week before the next meeting. Ms. Morgan knows the budget is set for several years in advance and asked about the protocol to change the schedule. Ms. Valenzuela replied PCDOT is working on the list for FY21-22 which starts July 1, 2021. The list will be published by April 30. Ms. Morgan may contact PCDOT directly for information on whether her road is included. All other responses will be addressed at the Call to the Audience responses, as part of next meeting’s material. Ms. Morgan asked, “To contact you directly, how do you do that?” Ms. Valenzuela replied that she would send her a message in ‘chat.’</p> <p>Another question Ms. Morgan had, was about a bicycle lane or a pedestrian pathway. She spoke with PCDOT was told “...absolutely not. Don’t even dream of it.” That it was not in the realm of possibilities. Ms. Morgan said the road connects family area and Fruchthendler Elementary on Cloud and kids ride their bicycles in the midst of these potholes. There is no shoulder at all on this road. It’s desert.</p> <p>Ms. Morgan also had a civil engineer visit her-and he reminded her that these roads, as they are allowed to go longer and longer without repair, the amount of money and the amount of effort to repair them, goes up. So it’s a cost vs time issue. She said maybe we can save the County some money by looking at the roads now and repair those that need to be done.</p>	01:48:12
	<p><b>Paul Henry</b> - Several days a week, he bicycles down Larrea Lane. The condition of the pavement makes the two-minute ride unsafe. The road is narrow and the margins of the road are so broken up as to be unrideable [<i>sic</i>], even at a slow speed. This is not a long road, it needs to be repaved before somebody is injured and sues the county. It has been in disrepair for years and that would make it negligence on the part of the county.</p>	01:53:20
	<p><b>Ed Flores</b> – Added to Amanda Paladini’s comments, President of the HOA for Riverside Crossing. He spoke with PCDOT and learned half of their roads are in poor condition. Some of them, close to failing. The subdivision has been in existence for over 20 years. There are many kids who can’t ride their bicycles because they’re riding on the sidewalks rather than the road. He owns a bike and rides on the sidewalks because the roads are bad. Potholes keep forming and keep being repaired. He wants to have the subdivision reviewed again. He knows other people have been saying that on the eastside, but he resides in a community of elderly people, not just families. There are 135 homes and many people walk with their kids. Kids can’t play in the roads. He really would like to have the roads reviewed and elevated because they’re failing</p>	01:56:13
12	<p><b>Adjournment</b> – <i>Lucretia Free, PCTAC Chair</i>        Motion to adjourn moved by Mr. Weaver; seconded by Mr. McGovern. Without opposition, meeting was adjourned at 2:00 PM.</p>	01:58:10

Respectfully submitted, Juanita Garcia-Seiger, Assistant