

# **MARICOPA ASSOCIATION OF GOVERNMENTS**

## **INFORMATION SUMMARY... for your review**

**DATE:**

January 4, 2011

**SUBJECT:**

Programming of Pave Unpaved Road Projects for MAG Federal Congestion Mitigation and Air Quality Improvement Funding in the FY 2011-2015 MAG Transportation Improvement Program

**SUMMARY:**

The MAG Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) allocates MAG Federal Congestion Mitigation and Air Quality Improvement (CMAQ) funds to specific modes, and, in some cases, identifies specific projects for the funds. Currently, the FY 2011-2015 MAG TIP identifies \$4,898,000 in CMAQ funding for the pave unpaved road program in FY 2014. MAG relied on its competitive application process to program these funds. Applications were made available in August 2010 with a due date of September 16, 2010. There were fifteen complete project applications submitted on time, and fourteen were deemed eligible for federal funding. These fourteen projects requested a total of \$9,211,627 of CMAQ funding for 2014.

The projects went through a two-tiered Street Committee review process starting in October that resulted in project rankings by the Air Quality Technical Advisory Committee in November 2010. This process follows the Draft MAG Federal Fund Programming Principles. The attachments include a memorandum from the Chair of the Air Quality Technical Advisory Committee that details the evaluation and ranking process used, the ranked list of projects, and the Street Committee discussion notes per project, which are provided in alphabetical order.

**PUBLIC INPUT:**

None.

**PROS & CONS:**

**PROS:** Approval of the funding for these projects will enable their inclusion in the Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) and will allow jurisdictions to develop their projects in a timely and integrated manner.

**CONS:** If these projects are not approved, the time to develop projects will be limited. Timely development of projects is needed to ensure that MAG federal funds are fully utilized and to enhance opportunities for additional federal funds.

**TECHNICAL & POLICY IMPLICATIONS:**

**TECHNICAL:** Project selection has been addressed by members of MAG technical advisory committees. Air Quality Emission Reduction scores were considered and the program is fiscally balanced.

**POLICY:** The MAG federally funded program has been developed in accord with federal regulations and MAG policies.

**ACTION NEEDED:**

Recommend a list of pave unpaved road projects to be funded with CMAQ funds, and that the identified work phases and costs from the project application are added to the FY 2011-2015 MAG Transportation Improvement Program.

## **PRIOR COMMITTEE ACTIONS:**

Transportation Review Committee: On December 9, 2010, the Transportation Review Committee recommended a list of pave unpaved road projects to be funded with CMAQ funds, and that the identified work phases and costs from the project application are added to the FY 2011-2015 MAG Transportation Improvement Program.

### MEMBERS ATTENDING

Peoria: David Moody  
ADOT: Robert Samour for Floyd Roehrich  
Avondale: David Fitzhugh  
\* Buckeye: Scott Lowe  
Chandler: Dan Cook for Patrice Kraus  
El Mirage: Lance Calvert  
Fountain Hills: Randy Harrel  
Gila Bend: Eric Fitzer  
\* Gila River: Sreedevi Samudrala for Doug Torres  
\* Gilbert: Tami Ryall  
Glendale: Terry Johnson  
Goodyear: Romina Korkes for Cato Esquivel  
Guadalupe: Gino Turrubiarres  
Litchfield Park: Paul Ward for Woody Scoutten  
Maricopa County: John Hauskins  
Mesa: Jeff Martin for Scott Butler  
\* Paradise Valley: Bill Mead  
Phoenix: Rick Naimark  
Queen Creek: Tom Condit  
RPTA: Bob Antilla for Bryan Jungwirth  
Scottsdale: Dave Meinhart  
Surprise: Bob Beckley  
\* Tempe: Chris Salomone  
Valley Metro Rail: John Farry  
Wickenburg: Rick Austin  
Youngtown: Grant Anderson for Lloyce Robinson

### EX-OFFICIO MEMBERS ATTENDING

\* Bicycle/Pedestrian Committee: Peggy Rubach  
\* ITS Committee: Nicolaas Swart  
\* Street Committee: Dan Cook  
\* Transportation Safety Committee: Julian Dresang

\* Members neither present nor represented by proxy.  
# - Attended by Audioconference  
+ - Attended by Videoconference

Air Quality Technical Advisory Committee (AQTAC): On November 30, 2010, the AQTAC recommended to forward a ranked list of paving projects, as shown in the attachment to the MAG Transportation Review Committee.

### MEMBERS ATTENDING

Doug Kukino, Glendale, Chairman  
Larry Person, Scottsdale, Vice Chair  
\* Sue McDermott, Avondale  
\* Elizabeth Biggins-Ramer, Buckeye  
# Jim Weiss, Chandler  
# Jamie McCullough, El Mirage  
Kurt Sharp, Gilbert  
\* Cato Esquivel, Goodyear  
# Scott Bouchie, Mesa  
# Janet Ramsey for William Mattingly, Peoria  
Phil McNeely, Phoenix  
# Antonio DeLaCruz, Surprise  
Oddvar Tveit, Tempe  
Grant Anderson for Mark Hannah, Youngtown  
Ramona Simpson, Queen Creek  
\* American Lung Association of Arizona  
Grant Smedley, Salt River Project  
Brian O'Donnell, Southwest Gas Corporation  
Mark Hajduk, Arizona Public Service  
\* Gina Grey, Western States Petroleum Assn.  
\* Valley Metro/RPTA  
\* Dave Berry, Arizona Motor Transport Assn.  
Jeannette Fish, Maricopa County Farm Bureau  
Steve Trussell for Russell Bowers, Arizona Rock Products Association  
Amy Bratt, Greater Phoenix Chamber of Commerce  
# Amanda McGennis, Associated General Contractors  
Spencer Kamps, Homebuilders Association of Central Arizona  
Mannie Carpenter, Valley Forward  
\* Erin Taylor, University of Arizona Cooperative Extension  
Beverly Chenausky, Arizona Department of Transportation

Leonard Montenegro for Diane Arnst, Arizona  
Department of Environmental Quality  
\* Environmental Protection Agency  
Jo Crumbaker, Maricopa County Air Quality  
Department

# Duane Yantorno, Arizona Department of  
Weights and Measures  
Ed Stillings, Federal Highway Administration  
\* Judi Nelson, Arizona State University  
# Christopher Horan, Salt River Pima-Maricopa  
Indian Community

\*Members neither present nor represented by proxy.

#Participated via telephone conference call.

+Participated via video conference call.

MAG Street Committee: The MAG Street Committee met on November 16, 2010 and completed a final review of paving projects submitted for CMAQ funding.

#### MEMBERS ATTENDING

Dan Cook, Chandler, Chairman  
Lupe Harriger, ADOT  
\* Charles Andrews, Avondale  
\* Jose Heredia, Buckeye  
\* Lance Calvert, El Mirage  
\* Tony Rodriguez,  
Gila River Indian Community  
Kurt Sharp, Gilbert  
Bob Darr, Glendale  
Hugh Bigalk, Goodyear  
Gino Turrubiates, Guadalupe  
Paul Ward for Darryl Crossman, Litchfield Park  
Chris Plumb, Maricopa County

Ken Hall, Mesa  
\* Andrew Cooper, Jr., Paradise Valley  
Chris Kmetty for Ben Wilson, Peoria  
Shane L. Silsby, Phoenix  
Janet Martin, Queen Creek  
\* Elaine Cabrera, Salt River Pima-Maricopa  
Indian Community  
Phil Kercher, Scottsdale  
Nicholas Mascia, Surprise  
Robert Yabes for Shelly Seyler, Tempe  
\* Jason Earp, Tolleson  
Grant Anderson, Youngtown

\* Members neither present nor represented by Proxy.

MAG Street Committee: The MAG Street Committee met on October 12, 2010 and had member agencies present and review the paving projects submitted for CMAQ funding.

#### MEMBERS ATTENDING

Dan Cook, Chandler, Chairman  
Lupe Harriger, ADOT  
Charles Andrews, Avondale  
Jose Heredia, Buckeye  
Lance Calvert, El Mirage  
\* Tony Rodriguez,  
Gila River Indian Community  
Kurt Sharp, Gilbert  
Bob Darr, Glendale  
Hugh Bigalk, Goodyear  
Gino Turrubiates, Guadalupe  
Paul Ward for Darryl Crossman, Litchfield Park  
\* Tanya Glass for Chris Plumb, Maricopa Co.

Ken Hall, Mesa  
\* Andrew Cooper, Jr., Paradise Valley  
Ben Wilson, Peoria  
Shane L. Silsby, Phoenix  
Janet Martin, Queen Creek  
\* Elaine Cabrera, Salt River Pima-Maricopa  
Indian Community  
Phil Kercher, Scottsdale  
Nicholas Mascia, Surprise  
Robert Yabes for Shelly Seyler, Tempe  
\* Jason Earp, Tolleson  
Grant Anderson, Youngtown

\* Members neither present nor represented by Proxy.

#### **CONTACT PERSON:**

Eileen Yazzie or Stephen Tate, (602) 254-6300



302 North 1st Avenue, Suite 300 ▲ Phoenix, Arizona 85003  
Phone (602) 254-6300 ▲ FAX (602) 254-6490  
E-mail: mag@mag.maricopa.gov ▲ Web site: www.mag.maricopa.gov

December 1, 2010

TO: Members of the MAG Transportation Review Committee

FROM: Doug Kukino, Glendale, Chair of the MAG Air Quality Technical Advisory Committee

SUBJECT: MAG AIR QUALITY TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION ON A RANKING OF PROPOSED PM-10 PAVING UNPAVED ROAD PROJECTS FOR FY 2014 CMAQ FUNDING

On November 30, 2010, the MAG Air Quality Technical Advisory Committee (AQTAC) made a recommendation on a ranking of Proposed PM-10 Paving Unpaved Road Projects for FY 2014 CMAQ funding to the MAG Transportation Review Committee (see attachment). The AQTAC considered the proposed projects listed in order of cost effectiveness and listed in order of PM-10 emission reductions. It is anticipated that the MAG Transportation Review Committee may make a recommendation on these projects for inclusion in the FY 2011-2015 MAG Transportation Improvement Program (TIP).

For FY 2014, fourteen projects requesting approximately \$9.2 million in CMAQ funds were evaluated. Project applications were due by September 16, 2010. An amount of \$4,898,000 in CMAQ funding is available in FY 2014 of the FY 2011-2015 MAG TIP.

The paving of dirt road, alley, and shoulder projects supports committed measures in the MAG Five Percent Plan for PM-10. Also, the Regional Transportation Plan assumes the annual paving of at least ten miles of unpaved roads to reduce fugitive dust.

On October 12 and November 16, 2010, the MAG Street Committee conducted a review of the PM-10 Paving Unpaved Road project applications. MAG staff conducted an evaluation of the proposed projects, including any revised information from the Street Committee, for estimated emission reductions and corresponding cost-effectiveness for FY 2014 CMAQ funding.

If you have any questions, please contact Dean Giles, MAG, at (602) 254-6300.

Attachment

A Voluntary Association of Local Governments in Maricopa County

City of Apache Junction ▲ City of Avondale ▲ Town of Buckeye ▲ Town of Carefree ▲ Town of Cave Creek ▲ City of Chandler ▲ City of El Mirage ▲ Fort McDowell Yavapai Nation ▲ Town of Fountain Hills ▲ Town of Gila Bend  
Gila River Indian Community ▲ Town of Gilbert ▲ City of Glendale ▲ City of Goodyear ▲ Town of Guadalupe ▲ City of Litchfield Park ▲ Maricopa County ▲ City of Mesa ▲ Town of Paradise Valley ▲ City of Peoria ▲ City of Phoenix  
Town of Queen Creek ▲ Salt River Pima-Maricopa Indian Community ▲ City of Scottsdale ▲ City of Surprise ▲ City of Tempe ▲ City of Tolleson ▲ Town of Wickenburg ▲ Town of Youngtown ▲ Arizona Department of Transportation

**November 30, 2010 MAG Air Quality Technical Advisory Committee Recommendation  
Ranking of Proposed PM-10 Paving Unpaved Road Projects for FY 2014 CMAQ Funding**

\$4,898,000 available in FY 2014

Agency	Location	Work Type	FY	Length (miles)	Emission Reduction Weighted TOG(kg/day)	Emission Reduction Weighted NOx(kg/day)	Emission Reduction Weighted PM10(kg/day)	Emission Reduction Weighted Total(kg/day)	Cost Effectiveness (\$/metric ton)	CMAQ Funds Requested
Maricopa County	Various Low Volume Roads : White Wing Rd, Cotton Ln to Sarival Ave; 167th Ave, Dixileta Dr to Windstone Tr; 168th Ave, Dixileta Dr to Windstone Tr; Dove Valley Rd, 171st Ave to Sarival Ave; Montgomery Rd, 171st Ave to Sarival Ave	Pave Dirt Roads	2014	4.00	0.00	0.00	368.81	368.81	\$558	\$1,117,455
Scottsdale	Pave Dirt Roads: Via Dona Rd, Scottsdale Rd to Pima Rd; Hayden Rd, Dynamite to Via Dona; Pinnacle Vista Dr, 64th St to 69th St; Quail Track Dr, 60th St to 62nd St; Windmill Dr, North of Arroyo Honda to south of Stage coach Pass; Peak View (Via Dona), 66th St to 69th St	Pave Dirt Roads	2014	3.74	0.00	0.00	244.96	244.96	\$953	\$1,267,904
Phoenix	Various alleys located between Cholla St to Sweetwater Ave from 35th Ave to 23rd Ave; Bethany Home Rd to Maryland Ave from 35th Ave to 23rd Ave; and Camelback Rd to Maryland Ave from 7th St to 24th St.	Pave Dirt Alleys	2014	30.20	0.00	0.00	114.78	114.78	\$1,659	\$1,033,934
Chandler	In the area bounded by Dobson Rd, Warner Rd, Alma School Rd and Knox Rd, and Alma School Rd, Knox Rd, Arizona Ave and Ray Rd.	Pave Dirt Alleys	2014	12.80	0.00	0.00	48.65	48.65	\$2,806	\$741,198
Tempe	Evergreen - The area bounded by Broadway Rd, the Price Fwy, Southern Ave, and the eastern city limits	Pave Dirt Alleys	2014	4.54	0.00	0.00	22.43	22.43	\$3,958	\$482,057
Fountain Hills	Fountain Hills Blvd, Segundo Dr to Pinto Dr	Pave Dirt Shoulders	2014	2.30	0.00	0.00	12.81	12.81	\$3,671	\$255,364
<b>Subtotal</b>										<b>\$4,897,912</b>
<b>Amount Available</b>										<b>\$4,898,000</b>
<b>Balance</b>										<b>\$88</b>
Peoria#2	67th Ave, Hatfield Rd to Happy Valley Rd; Jomax Rd, Termar Blvd to 83rd Ave; Jomax Rd	Pave Dirt Shoulders	2014	2.92	0.00	0.00	10.97	10.97	\$2,501	\$149,030
Peoria#1	Various locations on Castle Hot Springs Rd and New River Rd	Pave Dirt Shoulders	2014	23.32	0.00	0.00	44.74	44.74	\$4,331	\$1,052,186

**November 30, 2010 MAG Air Quality Technical Advisory Committee Recommendation  
Ranking of Proposed PM-10 Paving Unpaved Road Projects for FY 2014 CMAQ Funding**

Agency	Location	Work Type	FY	Length (miles)	Emission Reduction Weighted TOG(kg/day)	Emission Reduction Weighted NOx(kg/day)	Emission Reduction Weighted PM10(kg/day)	Emission Reduction Weighted Total(kg/day)	Cost Effectiveness (\$/metric ton)	CMAQ Funds Requested
Tempe	Escalante - The area bounded by University Dr, the Price Freeway, Apache Blvd, and Smith Rd.	Pave Dirt Alleys	2014	1.72	0.00	0.00	8.50	8.50	\$4,372	\$201,750
Buckeye#2	Various alleys in the area bounded by Monroe Ave/MC85, 1st St, Buckeye Canal, and 7th St.	Pave Dirt Alleys	2014	1.08	0.00	0.00	9.97	9.97	\$6,869	\$372,000
Buckeye#3	Various alleys in the area bounded by Monroe Ave/MC85, 9th St, Irwin Ave, and 5th St.	Pave Dirt Alleys	2014	1.07	0.00	0.00	8.43	8.43	\$7,315	\$335,000
Buckeye#1	Various alleys in the area bounded by Monroe Ave/MC85, 7th St, Central Ave, and 1st Ave.	Pave Dirt Alleys	2014	0.89	0.00	0.00	6.75	6.75	\$9,282	\$340,000
Litchfield Park	Litchfield Rd, Wigwam Blvd to Camelback Rd	Install curb and gutter	2014	1.10	0.00	0.00	3.33	3.33	\$16,934	\$306,475
Guadalupe	Various Alleys	Pave Dirt Alleys	2014	1.64	0.00	0.00	6.23	6.23	\$46,009	\$1,557,274
<b>Total</b>										<b>\$9,211,627</b>

Following the November 30, 2010 MAG Air Quality Technical Advisory Committee meeting, Maricopa County DOT confirmed the Average Weekday Traffic to use for evaluating the five road segments. A revised cost effectiveness is provided.

**Project: Buckeye #1**

<b>Applicant</b>	Buckeye
<b>Project</b>	Pave Dirt Alleys - Group One

**Presentation**

Scott Lowe, Public Works Director, did one presentation on three applications for paving dirt alleys. Each application totals about a mile of alleys. All alleys are located in the downtown historic area. The alleyways are mainly utility and residential. The garbage collection no longer takes place in the alley. They do have water and sewer running through the alley. The PM-10 monitor is about a mile away.

**Questions & Discussion**

A question was raised on why there were three separate applications. Buckeye explained that it is much easier to lead three different projects. They feel that it would inconvenience their residents if all of the alleys were disrupted at once. As far as priority, it follows the names of the applications: one, two, three.

Questions #2: Are there utilities located in the alley, and are they owned by the Town? The underground utilities of natural gas, irrigation, and water & sewer, are owned by the Town and the gas line is owned by SW Gas. The City of El Mirage just went through a paving alley project and ran into problems with the utility depths.

Has the Town of Buckeye evaluated the depths of the utilities? Buckeye does know the location of all of the utilities and we can make determinations if they are in good enough shape to go through paving construction. They believe that the alleys are in good condition since utility trucks use the alley at the moment.

What do you think the lifecycle of the 2 inch concrete on native? Buckeye feels pretty confident on a long lifecycle due to the nature of the native soil.

All three applications total 48 segments? That is correct. Additional information provided by MAG Staff: each application will be reviewed and scored by the AQ TAC individually.

**Outstanding questions needing information for November meeting**

All questions were answered at the first Street Committee meeting.

**Project: Buckeye #2**

<b>Applicant</b>	Buckeye
<b>Project</b>	Pave Dirt Alleys - Group Two

**Presentation**

Scott Lowe, Public Works Director, did one presentation on three applications for paving dirt alleys. Each application totals about a mile of alleys. All alleys are located in the downtown historic area. The alleyways are mainly utility and residential. The garbage collection no longer takes place in the alley. They do have water and sewer running through the alley. The PM-10 monitor is about a mile away.

**Questions & Discussion**

A question was raised on why there were three separate applications. Buckeye explained that it is much easier to lead three different projects. They feel that it would inconvenience their residents if all of the alleys were disrupted at once. As far as priority, it follows the names of the applications: one, two, three.

Questions #2: Are there utilities located in the alley, and are they owned by the Town? The underground utilities of natural gas, irrigation, and water & sewer, are owned by the Town and the gas line is owned by SW Gas. The City of El Mirage just went through a paving alley project and ran into problems with the utility depths.

Has the Town of Buckeye evaluated the depths of the utilities? Buckeye does know the location of all of the utilities and we can make determinations if they are in good enough shape to go through paving construction. We believe that they are in good condition since utility trucks use the alley at the moment.

What do you think the lifecycle of the 2 inch concrete on native? Buckeye feels pretty confident on a long lifecycle due to the nature of the native soil.

All three applications total 48 segments? That is correct. Additional information provided by MAG Staff: each application will be reviewed and scored by the AQ TAC individually.

**Outstanding questions needing information for November meeting**

All questions were answered at the first Street Committee meeting.

**Project: Buckeye #3**

<b>Applicant</b>	Buckeye
<b>Project</b>	Pave Dirt Alleys - Group Three

**Presentation**

Scott Lowe, Public Works Director, did one presentation on three applications for paving dirt alleys. Each application totals about a mile of alleys. All alleys are located in the downtown historic area. The alleyways are mainly utility and residential. The garbage collection no longer takes place in the alley. They do have water and sewer running through the alley. The PM-10 monitor is about a mile away.

**Questions & Discussion**

A question was raised on why there were three separate applications. Buckeye explained that it is much easier to lead three different projects. They feel that it would inconvenience their residents if all of the alleys were disrupted at once. As far as priority, it follows the names of the applications: one, two, three.

Questions #2: Are there utilities located in the alley, and are they owned by the Town? The underground utilities of natural gas, irrigation, and water & sewer, are owned by the Town and the gas line is owned by SW Gas. The City of El Mirage just went through a paving alley project and ran into problems with the utility depths.

Has the Town of Buckeye evaluated the depths of the utilities? Buckeye does know the location of all of the utilities and we can make determinations if they are in good enough shape to go through paving construction. We believe that they are in good condition since utility trucks use the alley at the moment.

What do you think the lifecycle of the 2 inch concrete on native? Buckeye feels pretty confident on a long lifecycle due to the nature of the native soil.

All three applications total 48 segments? That is correct. Additional information provided by MAG Staff: each application will be reviewed and scored by the AQ TAC individually.

**Outstanding questions needing information for November meeting**

All questions were answered at the first Street Committee meeting.

**Project: Chandler**

<b>Applicant</b>	Chandler
<b>Project</b>	Pave Dirt Alleys - 2 segments

**Presentation**

Luis Gamez from the City of Chandler made the presentation. The application is a request to pave 12.8 miles of dirt alleys. The closest PM-10 monitor is about 2.8 miles away from the alleys. The plan is to remove 4 inches of native, and then do 4 inches of asphalt millings, then do an asphalt mix to solidify the surface. The city does own the utilities and ROW. The ADT mainly consists of utility, city vehicles, and some residents. The City of Chandler normally does this type of paving alleys, and this is the first time they are asking for funding for this kind of project.

**Questions & Discussion**

The Town of Guadalupe indicated that they are interested in doing this type of paving with asphalt millings. Guadalupe was wondering if the Town is awarded less money, can they do something like this? Chandler explained that for a number of years that they have used left over asphalt millings to address dust. This project will go beyond that and use the asphalt as well and result in the paving of the alleys to be in place for a number of years.

Guadalupe asked if federal funds could be used to purchase just millings? It was clarified that CMAQ funds can only be used for paving, and not maintenance nor stand alone millings or gravel.

Chandler was asked if they could still do a portion of the project since it contained 2 segments with less money? Chandler responded that they could do a smaller amount of miles if a smaller amount of funding was approved.

It was noted that there is money allocated to design, is this necessary? Chandler recognized that through the federal process, documentation of design, ROW, utility, and Environmental has to be done, and the costs are related to that.

Is the cross section appropriate for the utility vehicles? Chandler believes that since it's an alley, it is appropriate, and recognizes that there could be cracks once it settles and is used.

Another question was raised on why Chandler isn't suggesting to go to full pavement? Do you have the cost breakdown of this paving method? Chandler didn't know at the time of the committee meeting, but stated that for the cost, they could get about 12-13 miles, whereas if they were doing a traditional asphalt mix, the cost would be much higher.

**Outstanding questions needing information for November meeting**

All questions were answered at the first Street Committee meeting.

MAG Staff verified the ADT for the proposed project, and it was changed from 50 to 10.

## Project: Fountain Hills



<b>Applicant</b>	Fountain Hills
<b>Project</b>	Pave Shoulder: Fountain Hills Boulevard

<b>Presentation</b>	<p>Randy Harrell from the Town of Fountain Hills. The request is to pave shoulders on Fountain Hills Blvd. About 1.4 miles of shoulders on both sides. The segment starts at Pinto Drive (just north of Shea Blvd) up to Segundo by the Town center. This road is quite steep in places, 12% at times. We have used gravel and millings, but through rain, they end up in the wash. This is also a high recreation corridor for bicyclists. We are not planning to add bike lanes at this time. The cross section is 2 inches on native since the millings and soil are pretty compact as it is.</p>
---------------------	--

<b>Questions &amp; Discussion</b>	<p>There were no questions or comments from the committee.</p>
-----------------------------------	--

<b>Outstanding questions needing information for November meeting</b>	<p>All questions were answered at the first Street Committee meeting.</p>
---	---

**Project: Guadalupe**

<b>Applicant</b>	Guadalupe
<b>Project</b>	Pave Dirt Alleys

**Presentation**

Frank Fletez, from Tri-Core Engineering (the Town's hired Engineering Company) presented. The application consists of 9 segments/alleys all converging on Calle Guadalupe. We are not expecting any problems with ROW or Environmental. There are pole utilities in some of the alleys. These are mainly SRP lines; there may need to be adjustment of power boxes. Paving of these alleys will also compliment the current project that is paving access points on Calle Guadalupe, and reduce the amount of debris and dust coming onto the main road. The Town has been active providing some millings, but there is just not enough. It is noted that the Town of Guadalupe is heavily pedestrian. Paving the alleys will not only reduce the dust, but enhance the quality of life of the residents.

**Questions & Discussion**

It was commented that the costs of the project seem relatively high; these are twice as high as Buckeyes. The cross section in the application is noted as 2 inches of aggregate base (AB) on 6 inches of AB.

Would/Can the Town of Guadalupe consider paving on native? We can consider revising the cross section. The Town has used the most recent information they have received from ADOT.

It was noted that the application states that the matching funds are currently not in the Town's CIP. Will the funds be programmed if awarded? If the Town receives funding, the funds would then be programmed in the CIP.

11/16/2010 Street Committee Meeting

The representative from the Town of Guadalupe acknowledged that the project was costly relative to other alley paving projects, but indicated that the Town wished to go forward through the selection process with the application as submitted.

**Outstanding questions needing information for November meeting**

MAG staff noted that if the Town needs to revise cost and/or cross section from the Street Committees comments and questions, they can do so.

Guadalupe is leaving the proposed project as is.

**Project: Litchfield Park**

<b>Applicant</b>	Litchfield Park
<b>Project</b>	Pave Shoulder: Litchfield Road: Wigwam Boulevard to Camelback Road

**Presentation**

Paul Ward, the contracted City engineer for Litchfield Park presented that the application request is for 1.1-1.2 miles of paving curb and gutter. This is an ex-Maricopa County road, originally built as a rural road with no curb and gutter. The City put in curb and gutter on the west side of the road, but not on the east side. It is noted that there is a meandering sidewalk on the east side. The pavement edge of the road is damaged, and what is happening is that vehicles drive on the side shoulder and then track dirt back onto the roadway. The ADT for Litchfield Park Rd is 17,500. The situation of vehicles tracking out dirt onto the road, then having other vehicles kick the dirt back up in the air, this is what we want to avoid. The better option is to install curb and gutter on the edge of the roadway, and leave the dirt sholder as is.

**Questions & Discussion**

Has the paving program ever funded a stand alone curb and gutter project? We have funded other paving projects that have curb and gutter as a part of the project. MAG will verify with FHWA on the eligibility.

It was commented that the AQ TAC would most likely have to modify a unit in their cost benefit analysis for CMAQ funds. Litchfield Park noted that the benefit from doing curb and gutter is similar in nature of paving dirt shoulders from a track out perspective.

If FHWA doesn't allow the curb and gutter, would the City want to do paving of the shoulder. The City responded in that no, if it's not allowed, the City does not want to pave the dirt shoulder.

11/16/2010 Street Committee Meeting

It was indicated that FHWA staff had determined that adding curb and gutter was eligible for CMAQ funding, so the project can move forward through the project selection process. It was also noted that the, the lack of a curb and gutter on one side of the road was inherited by the City when the roadway was tranferred to the City from Maricopa County.

**Outstanding questions needing information for November meeting**

MAG Staff has verified that a stand alone curb and gutter project is CMAQ eligible.

**Project: Maricopa County**



<b>Applicant</b>	Maricopa County
<b>Project</b>	Pave Dirt Roads - 5 Segments

**Presentation**

Tamika Simmons, the Regional Project Coordination for MCDOT presented. It was noted that the original presenter for Maricopa County went home sick, and Tamika was filling in, and would gather the questions from the Committee to MCDOT for answers. MAG staff aided in the presentation of the application. The total mileage for 5 segments total 4 miles for the paving dirt roads. The ADT is 205 on each segment completed by a standard tube count. The County does own the ROW for the roads. The cross section is 2 inches of AC on native. The total budget for construction is \$950,000 for about 4 miles of unpaved roads.

**Questions & Discussion**

Can the County review the 205 ADT that is listed as the same for each different segment/street?

There is \$100,000 listed for ROW. MCDOT responded that it was believed that the ROW was needed for two segments.

The Town of El Mirage commented that the committee process needs to consider if the region wants to fund projects that need to purchase ROW.

A question was posed asking Maricopa County if they had an ordinance about private developments in the County creating dirt roads? If public policy is not in place to address limiting creation of private dirt roads, why should the region continue to fund paving of the dirt roads. Maricopa County commented that they are working on this issue in the agency, and noted that the roads in this application are not private; they are public.

It is noted that utilities is a significant portion of the overall budget and is more than design. This causes concern of the viability of the project.

11/16/2010 Street Committee Meeting:

Maricopa County provided revised traffic count information for all segments submitted in their application. It was indicated by the County that the project might require some minor right-of-way acquisitions, but this was expected to be very small - in the range of \$100,000. It was also noted that the County had been paving dirt roads with CMAQ funds for a number of years and had found that that the standard costs used to be stable and reliable.

**Outstanding questions needing information for November meeting**

Can the County review the 205 ADT that is listed as the same for each different segment?

The County modified the ADT per segment.

**Project: Peoria 1**



<b>Applicant</b>	Peoria
<b>Project</b>	Paving Dirt Shoulders, Project 1 - Highways & Recreation Corridor

<b>Presentation</b>
Janet Ramsey, Public Works Dept. There are 2 segments in application #1. These are old county roads, and have little or no shoulders. The AWDT doesn't encompass the traffic on the weekend use. There is high number of users/vehicles that use the roads and also pull off the road. There are no utility conflict and we own all of the right of way. Additionally, in the cross section, it mentions 12 foot shoulders in the application. That is a mistake and it should be 5 foot shoulders.

<b>Questions &amp; Discussion</b>
There were no questions or comments from the committee.

<b>Outstanding questions needing information for November meeting</b>
All questions were answered at the first Street Committee meeting.

**Project: Peoria 2**

<b>Applicant</b>	Peoria
<b>Project</b>	Paving Dirt Shoulders, Project 2 - Rural – Arterial Roads.

**Presentation**

Janet Ramsey, Public Works Dept. Project application #2 has non contiguous paving shoulder needs. The project on 67th Avenue is on the west side only, and the AWDT is 26,549 as of a 2008 engineering count. The AWDT is expected to be at this level and may rise with the opening of Happy Valley Rd. Segment #2 - Jomax Rd on the southside. There is no eminent development and no development on this side. Segment #3 is Jomax Rd from 103rd Drive heading West to Lake Pleasant Parkway. There is no potential for development at this time. There are large trucks and pullout traffic. The AWDT is realatively low, but this is an area with pullout problems.

**Questions & Discussion**

There were no questions or comments from the committee.

**Outstanding questions needing information for November meeting**

All questions were answered at the first Street Committee meeting.

**Project: Phoenix**

<b>Applicant</b>	Phoenix
<b>Project</b>	2014 CMAQ Alley Dust Proofing

**Presentation**

Chris Turner-Noteware, Civil Engineer in the Streets Department gave the presentation. The City of Phoenix annually allocates \$800,000 for paving/dust-proofing alleys and roads. To date, Phoenix has paved over 426 miles of alleys, and there is still over 300 miles to be paved. Phoenix is submitting the application to continue the commitment to dustproof the alleys in the City. The 15 segments are divided into quarter mile sections; this application proposes paving 30.4 miles of alleys. The average distance from an AQ monitor is 2.9 miles, please note 5.1 miles are within 2 miles of a monitor. The typical alley cross section is 11 feet wide, and proposes 3/4 inch Fractured Aggregate Surface Treatment (FAST), utilizing rubberized asphalt and precoated chips applied to compacted native. The AWDT is 10 vehicles per day. There are no utility, ROW, and environmental concerns at the time. The design is proposed to occur in 2012 for \$60,000 of local funds. And construction in 2014 and uses \$600,000 in local and \$1,000,000 of requested federal funds. It is noted that the application requires a 15% construction administration (CA), and from the last 3 CMAQ projects the city self-administered, the CA averaged 1.3%. The City of Phoenix is committed to continue to work on the PM-10 issue. The city also chose to do a large project and application since they have received lower prices with the economy of scale.

**Questions & Discussion**

A question was raised by a non-certified agency if they could contract with the City of Phoenix rather than ADOT local governments in light of their construction administration costs? The local agency raised concern about design and construction administration requirements and fees (20% Design costs) from the ADOT Local Government section.

What is the lifespan of the treatment? At least 10 years.

**Outstanding questions needing information for November meeting**

All questions were answered at the first Street Committee meeting.

**Project: Scottsdale**

<b>Applicant</b>	Scottsdale
<b>Project</b>	Pave Unpaved Roads

**Presentation**

Jeremy Dye, Street Operations Manager, presented the application to pave 3.7 miles of unpaved roads. There are 6 segments totalling \$1.4 million. Each segment was selected as they are optimal roads concerning ROW, utilities, and ADT. Currently, each segment is part of the dust palliative program, which is applied 4 times a year. The treatment degrades throughout the year depending on the weather. This pavement would eliminate the cost of upkeep. The ADTs were collected by tube counts. Once they are paved, they would be added to the pave road maintenance program. This would also help address the dust complaints we have in this area.

**Questions & Discussion**

What does the cross-section look like? We are planning on 3 inches of 1/2 inch of conventional asphalt on 6 inches of sub-grade material.

It was noted that the locations of the projects look quite far away from a monitor. They were 21 miles away from the nearest monitor.

**Outstanding questions needing information for November meeting**

All questions were answered at the first Street Committee meeting.

**Project: Surprise**

<b>Applicant</b>	Surprise
<b>Project</b>	Pave Unpaved Shoulders at various locations

**Presentation**

Nick Mascia, City Engineer - Public Works Dept, presented on 2 dirt roads that meet at a 90 degree angle. These are just NW of Grand Avenue. 1/4 mile in total length - Carlin and Mountain View Roads. Mountain View road is a commercial collector and Carlin Road comes out of subdivision traffic. These are used to access the commercial businesses off of Grand. This is 1 1/2 miles away from one of the PM-10 monitors. The traffic impact study suggested 90 ADT for these roads. The access used is from Sun City Grand. The ROW for Carlin is owned by the city, while Mountain View is not, this would need to be acquired.

**Questions & Discussion**

The ROW poses question on if we want these funds to be used for ROW. The city plans to acquire Mountain View with local funds.

It was pointed out that the pictures of the road look more like a dirt lot, and not a road.

What was the cross section the City is proposing to build? It looks as if Mountain View Rd has a median? Carlin will not have curb gutter, Mountain View would have the median and no curb and gutter.

Will you modify the cross section to what you are speaking about?

The road improvements are adjacent to future commercial development; does MAG/the region fund roadways that are currently not built due to development/commercial building. We normally block/barricade/install ditches on the roads where they dead end, and are not used due to gaps in developing the roads. Would this even qualify for these funds because it looks like this is new construction and not paving unpaved roads?

Surprise has barricaded and blocked traffic, but residents still find a way around.

El Mirage pointed out that they too have the same situation, and gaps have remained for 5 years.

Can you talk more about the current use of Carlin? Carlin Dr is a public road in the subdivision, but deadends at Mountain View.

These lots are obviously vacant, is the development going to construct the road? Surprise has talked with the owners and they have no intention of building the roads or developing the site in the near future. A Street Committee member echoed the concerns of constructing/paving a road that is part of a developers responsibility.

MAG Staff asked a question that if you were to go out there today, a person could actually drive on the unpaved road? Surprise responded that yes, you can see the tracks and they have tried barricades in the past.

What is the cross section of the north section of Mountain View road? 2 lane 2. From our understanding, you can not pave 4 lanes as it would be adding lane capacity, and that is not CMAQ eligible.

Surprise noted that they could pave the roadways and stripe it to 1 lane in each direction.

11/16/2010 Street Committee Meeting:

It has been determined that the project is not eligible for CMAQ funding as the surface to be paved does not conform to the FHWA definition of a public road, hence paving it would constitute the use of CMAQ to add through lane capacity.

**Outstanding questions needing information for November meeting**

MAG Staff will work with FHWA to determine eligibility.

MAG Staff did a site visit on Friday, October 15, 2010 to review the current conditions. After the site visit and review by FHWA, it was determined that this proposed project is not eligible for CMAQ funding.

Application was removed from the process prior to the 2nd Street Committee meeting.

**Project: Tempe 1**

<b>Applicant</b>	Tempe
<b>Project</b>	Escalante Neighborhood Alley Stabilization

**Presentation**

Toby Crooks, Civil Engineer in the Streets Dept, presented. The City of Tempe has a paving alley program that uses reclaimed asphalt that Tempe has. There are 2 applications. The Escalante neighborhood is 2.1 miles away from a PM10 monitoring station. The typical width of the alley is 16 feet; it's wall to wall. The applications state that we will be removing 1-2 inches, and actually we will be removing 3-4 inches of dirt as the cross section indicates. It also states that we are contributing \$50,000, but we are actually contributing \$5,000 - it's a typographical error - and the math still calculates to the total listed in the application. The typical cross section is 3 - 4 inches of reclaimed asphalt with emulsion polymer on top. The typical traffic is trash trucks, utilities, sewer, and residents and landscapers. The Evergreen neighborhood is the same process; it is only 1.4 miles away from the monitor.

**Questions & Discussion**

A question was raised if they needed both projects to move forward? Tempe answered that they submitted 2 individual applications, and both are not needed to do the projects individually.

**Outstanding questions needing information for November meeting**

All questions were answered at the first Street Committee meeting.

**Project: Tempe 2**

?	<b>Applicant</b>	Tempe
<b>Project</b>		

**Presentation**

Toby Crooks, Civil Engineer in the Streets Dept, presented. The City of Tempe has a paving alley program that uses reclaimed asphalt that Tempe has. There are 2 applications. The Escalante neighborhood is 2.1 miles away from a PM10 monitoring station. The typical width of the alley is 16 feet; it's wall to wall. The applications state that we will be removing 1-2 inches, and actually we will be removing 3-4 inches of dirt as the cross section indicates. It also states that we are contributing \$50,000, but we are actually contributing \$5,000 - it's a typographical error - and the math still calculates to the total listed in the application. The typical cross section is 3 - 4 inches of reclaimed asphalt with emulsion polymer on top. The typical traffic is trash trucks, utilities, sewer, and residents and landscapers. The Evergreen neighborhood is the same process; it is only 1.4 miles away from the monitor.

**Questions & Discussion**

A question was raised if they needed both projects to move forward? Tempe answered that they submitted 2 individual applications, and both are not needed to do the projects individually.

**Outstanding questions needing information for November meeting**

All questions were answered at the first Street Committee meeting.

# STREET SWEEPERS

Agency	Issues
Chandler	
Guadalupe	
Mesa	
Phoenix	
Phoenix	
Queen Creek	This cost estimate for the sweeper seemed relatively low in comparison to the others. Is this the correct estimate/cost?
Scottsdale	