



**PIMA COUNTY TRANSPORTATION ADVISORY COMMITTEE
(PCTAC)**

**Abrams Public Health Center, 3950 S. Country Club Road
Tuesday, March 27, 2018
Noon**

Members Present: Chris DeSimone, Barney Brenner, Dan Eckstrom, Eric Ponce, Lynn Mangold, Lucretia Free, Dan Castro, Bob Gugino, John Bernal, Tom McGovern, Curtis Lueck

Members Absent: Kendall Elmer, Rick Price

Others Present: Carmine DeBonis (Deputy County Administrator-Public Works), Ana Olivares (PCDOT), David Cummings (PCDOT), Robert Lane (PCDOT), Yves Khawam (PCDOT) Annabelle Valenzuela (PCDOT), Brenda Garcia (PCDOT), Juanita Garcia-Seiger (Public Works)

1. Call to Order - Roll Call

Chair Free calls the meeting to order at 12:01 p.m. Annabelle Valenzuela takes roll call and a quorum is present.

2. Pledge of Allegiance

General Items

3. Introductions for New Members

Chair Free introduces two recently appointed members to PCTAC; Lynn Mangold, District 3, and Barney Brenner, District 1.

Member Brenner introduced himself to PCTAC members and the audience.

4. Approval of Meeting Summary

Meeting Summary for January 23, 2018

ACTION: Chair Free asks if anyone would like to modify/change minutes and no one answers. Eric Ponce makes a motion to approve minutes, Curtis Lueck seconds. Motion passes unanimously.

5. Regional Pavement Preservation Program Update

a. Bid updates

Rob Lane presents. **See “Regional Local Road Repair: Program Update” under “Documents” tab**

The Regional Local Road Repair Program has three bid openings. Each bid opening has been under the bid estimated amount. We have three packages that are “Out to Bid” or “Advertise to Bid” soon. There are three different contractors. Package 1 for Marana and Oro Valley is Southern Arizona Paving, Package 3 was Cholla Asphalt (they are out of the Phoenix area), and Package 4 is South Western

Paving, also out of the Phoenix area. Package 6 was to open this Thursday. However, we asked for a change in the contract time period, and that extended the bidding another week. It will open next week.

PCTAC members asks if the work from the overages from Year 1 will be moved to Year 2, or will all the work that can be done in Year 2 with Year 1 money be allocated to Year 1.

Carmine DeBonis interjects just to remind the committee what we are shooting to do is to complete Year 1 and Year 2 within the calendar year 2018. What you have indicated aligns well with our ability to keep moving. The bulk of the Year 1 work is targeted to be completed in the spring. As we have gone through the bid process and we have engaged with the contractors around scheduling. You will recall the temperature dependencies to these different treatment types. Some of that Year 1 work may carry over into the early part of the spring. But, by being able to apply the savings in these packages to work that we will carry forward from Year 2, we can then come back on a subsequent date and say, okay, we were able to do this much work of Year 2 under the Year 1 savings. Then we can have a discussion with the committee about how to round out the Year 2 package of work by adding new work. It gives us some more time to evaluate and to decide on which projects we want to include. What you have indicated today is certainly doable. Let's just keep moving, work with the contractors to get the body of work amended with additional Year 2, already approved projects. Then we can come back and have the discussion on how do you want to supplement Year 2 to round out that package. Recall, that the Board of Supervisors (BOS) has not yet allocated funding for Year 2. We expect that discussion to take place as part of the annual budget process.

Chair Free asks if anyone has any thoughts or comments; no one answers.

6. Sales Tax Committee and Legislative Update

Carmine DeBonis provides an update. See "Impact of a Possible Half-Cent County General Sales Tax on Low-Income Households" under the "Documents" tab**

Carmine DeBonis provides an update on the Sales Tax Advisory Committee (STAC). The STAC has completed their public outreach and gathering input from citizens; they have prepared a report to the BOS and it contains several recommendations. The committee voted unanimously to go ahead and recommend to the BOS, approval of a half-cent sales tax. Using the existing statutory authority that authorizes the BOS to enact that sales tax upon a unanimous vote of the BOS. They recommended:

1 - To go ahead and approve a half-cent sales tax with a ten-year time frame. The revenues from the sales tax are recommended to go towards road repair with some property tax reduction.

2 - A proposal that had increasing amounts of the sales tax revenue going towards property tax reduction over a ten-year period of time. Beginning Year 1, 100% would go to road repair. Then each year thereafter, an additional 2.5% would go towards property tax reduction. They did include that component in their recommendation.

3 - That the BOS take action, to go ahead and mitigate impacts to low-income residents in our community. One of the items was to increase the available tax return preparation assistance to low-income residents. There is a refund or a rebate that can be received by low-income individuals that would offset a portion of that sales tax increase. That rounds out the recommendation. The item will be on the BOS agenda for presentation by the STAC in discussion and direction by the BOS at their April 3 meeting. You are all invited to attend, or welcome to listen or provide comments.

The existing legislation authorizes the BOS to enact a sales tax with a unanimous vote of the BOS. There is a bill that is making its way through the legislature that is also sales tax related. It would also authorize enactment of a half-cent sales tax. It gives the authority to the Regional Transportation Authority (RTA), in addition to their existing authority for a half-cent sales tax, the authorization to enact a full-cent sales tax. Half of which could go towards road repair. The bill includes the provisions that it would need to go to the voters for approval. It would have to be approved by the BOS. It was originally proposed as a simple majority of the BOS. Three members could vote to send two voters a question for the half-cent sales tax through the RTA. That has been through the Senate Committee; it has been to the House Transportation Committee and the House Ways and Means Committee. It was approved at each of those. There were amendments made in the House Ways and Means Committee, which most notably changed the provision regarding how many of the votes of the BOS would be necessary to send it to the voters. That amendment as approved in the House Ways and Means Committee would require a unanimous vote of the BOS. That is where that stands; next stop along the way is the Full House.

PCTAC members ask about the STAC vote and recommendation. **See “Sales Tax Committee and meeting schedule” bullet item under “Sales Tax Advisory Committee” tab **

Chair Free asks if there are further questions for Carmine and no one answers.

7. 1997 HURF Bond Amendment Update

Ana Olivares presents. **See Report and Recommendations... under the “Documents” tab**

Ms. Olivares states at the last meeting we presented our proposal to use the unallocated \$16 Million of 1997 HURF Bonds and reallocate them to a new Pavement Preservation Project for arterial and collector roads in unincorporated Pima County. We presented that proposal on March 9 to the Bond Advisory Committee. They recommended approval of that to move forward. Our next step is to have this presented at the April 17 BOS meeting. If they are successful in approving that we will move forward with a \$16 Million arterial and collector program in unincorporated Pima County.

8. Green Asphalt Concept Discussion

Carmine DeBonis presents. **See “Green Asphalt Overview” under the “Documents” tab**

- **Overview of Proposed Green Asphalt Pilot**
- **PASER Observation Assessment**
- **Analysis Constraints**
- **Preliminary Findings Summary**

Overview of the pilot topic on Green Asphalt. Briefly touched on an overview of the Pilot with information on visual observations and assessments made using the PASER system. To give you some comparative information between Green Asphalt and Standard Asphalt treatments, analysis constraints, and give you some preliminary findings. Tucson Asphalt, a local paving contractor approached the County about the use of their Green Asphalt overlay product on failed condition roads in Pima County. The company asserts that a 1-inch green overlay can be used in lieu of a standard 2-inch mill and fill. Mill and fill were taken off the top 2 inches, and we are putting down 2 inches of new standard pavement. Standard asphalt is the PAG 2 mix standard. That is in use commonly throughout the region. The claims by Tucson Asphalt is in doing so you can save 40% to 60% on the initial asphalt application.

Based on that input the County Administrator requested that Tucson Asphalt provide estimates on two subdivisions, which are Sabino Town and Country and Moondance Patio Homes. Green asphalt estimates were provided by Tucson Asphalt and what you see here is a comparison of the cost estimates as reflected in the presentation: ** See “*Green Asphalt Pilot Option and Preliminary Assessment*” under “*Documents*” tab**. Both of these on the Pima County estimate have been revised slightly to reflect the actual width and length of the roadway. The asphalt estimate from Tucson Asphalt for their green overlay is a 1-inch overlay at approximately \$126,000 - \$127,000. For Moondance, you see a lower cost estimate on the 1-inch green asphalt overlay. Roughly, 40% less is the cost of the initial application compared to Pima County mill and fill estimate. We have had conversations with Paul Polito, President of Tucson Asphalt asking him for data. It is not available or has not been provided to Pima County. Part of the discussion with him, is that he has a patent pending on this particular product. As a result of that, he is hesitant to provide information that will potentially allow competitors to replicate the product. Even from a testing standpoint on the estimates that were provided, they have indicated that a condition of doing this work would be that they would not allow Pima County to do testing of the material. That is a common practice that we perform when roadway construction is taking place. This is the framework that we are working within here. One, we do not know what is in the mix. Two, we do not know how it performs with time. We are having to rely on representations from the product owner as well as doing some qualitative analysis. What we attempted to do is look at recent applications of the Tucson Asphalt, green asphalt product over time and apply to it a standard that you are familiar with. At least in the context of these discussions, and that is the PASER ratings. What we did is from the list of projects completed by Tucson Asphalt, we looked at some of the most recent completed applications of that. Starting with the more recent ones in 2017 and going back to 2013. To take a look at what the condition of the road would be rated at using the PASER system and we will show you the 2-inch overlay option. Then we will show you the 2-inch mill and replace from the 1-inch green asphalt product on top of the existing pavement surface. There is no removal of the failed pavement.

PCTAC asks about the condition and the performance of what Tucson Asphalt’s green asphalt compares to; what you would expect to see with 2-inch Pima County Standard, and the cost savings. Include gathering information of experience from other jurisdictions of Tucson Asphalt.

Carmine DeBonis imparts, as part of the efforts in the department to organize themselves for enhanced service delivery and lower cost, they have established an Analytics group. Part of that is to scientifically know what we know from the experimental usage. But, we do not know is what the realm of possible options for achieving those two desired outcomes is greater longevity at a lower cost. We are going to get there; it is just going to take us some time. All that we are saying in this particular product is we do not know. All we can do is apply those things here. We are happy to have conversations with anyone including Tucson Asphalt.

Chair Free asks if there are any other questions for Carmine in regard to this issue, hearing no answer. I think we will move forward and use the subcommittee and continue to work on this.

9. Next Meeting Agenda

Chair Free states our next meeting is scheduled for April 24 in this room at noon. If you have any agenda items that you would like us to include, please get those to Annabelle.

10. Call to the Audience

- a. Sharon Fielder expresses concern about road conditions for Sage Street.

- b. Martha Michaels expressed concern about road condition within Sabino Town and Country Estates.
- c. Linda Leedberg is a District 1 resident who expressed concern to move ahead with the pilot program for Sabino Town and Country and Moondance.
- d. Don Weaver, President, with Green Valley Council expressed concern of the plans for green asphalt as well as to consider PCTAC subcommittee.

11. Adjournment

Tom McGovern makes a motion to adjourn. John Bernal seconds the motion. Meeting adjourns at 1:13 p.m.