

**REVISED**

**MARICOPA ASSOCIATION OF GOVERNMENTS**

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

**DATE:**

January 21, 2015

**SUBJECT:**

Arterial Life Cycle Program Project Changes Technical Review: Black Mountain Boulevard

**SUMMARY:**

The Arterial Life Cycle Program (ALCP) is the financial management tool for the arterial street component of the Regional Transportation Plan (RTP). Management of the program is guided by the ALCP Policies and Procedures, which were approved by the MAG Regional Council on May 28, 2014. The Policies and Procedures require Lead Agencies to present proposed substitute projects or changes in project scope to MAG Street Committee for a technical review and recommendation for approval. On January 13, 2015 the MAG Street Committee recommended that the Black Mountain Boulevard scope be expanded to include improvements north of Deer Valley Road to Pinnacle Peak Road; the Street Committee also requested that the item be heard at the Transportation Review Committee.

The Black Mountain Boulevard project was part of the original Proposition 400 ballot approved by voters in 2004. The original project limits included ramps extending north off of State Route 51 to Black Mountain Boulevard and Mayo Drive. In 2011, the limits were extended one-quarter of a mile north to Deer Valley Road.

The project will be constructed as a joint effort between the City of Phoenix and the Arizona Department of Transportation. Construction will be broken into two separate phases; phase I includes roadway improvements at Pinnacle High School, construction of a roundabout, and construction of a new roadway from Rough Rider Road (north of Deer Valley Road) to Pinnacle Peak Road. The construction of a new roadway from Rough Rider Road to Pinnacle Peak Road represents the proposed scope expansion. Phase II includes construction of the ramps and a pedestrian overpass with fencing along the roadway.

Additional detail on the requested change can be found on the project change form. The form summarizes current and planned facility features, ALCP project budgets, project cost estimates. In addition, the form addresses:

- (1) The reason for and feasibility of the requested change;
- (2) How the change would improve safety/mobility and reduce congestion; and,
- (3) The benefit to the MAG Region.

Excerpts from the ALCP Policies and Procedures have also been attached for your review.

Since the original mail out, the project cost estimates in the project change form have been refined.

**PUBLIC INPUT:**

The City of Phoenix held a number of public meetings dating as far back as 2011 to discuss the Black Mountain Boulevard project. The public has been supportive of extending the project to Pinnacle Peak Road.

**PROS & CONS:**

PROS: The project will provide alternative access to the Desert Ridge shopping center and help alleviate traffic congestion on the Loop 101 Freeway at the Tatum Boulevard and Cave Creek Road exits.

CONS: None.

**TECHNICAL & POLICY IMPLICATIONS:**

TECHNICAL: Expansion of the project limits to Pinnacle Peak Road will provide alternative access to the Desert Ridge Shopping Center and help to alleviate congestion on the Loop 101 Freeway at the SR-51 interchange and Tatum Boulevard/Cave Creek Road exits.

POLICY: Section 220 of the ALCP Policies requires the technical recommendation of the Street Committee on proposed substitute projects or project scope changes for ALCP Projects.

**ACTION NEEDED:**

Recommend approval of the proposed change to extend the limits of the Black Mountain Boulevard project from Deer Valley Road to Pinnacle Peak Road and incorporation of the new limits as an amendment to the FY 2014-2018 MAG Transportation Improvement Program, the FY 2015 Arterial Life Cycle Program, and as appropriate, to the 2035 Regional Transportation Plan.

**PRIOR COMMITTEE ACTIONS:**

On January 13, 2015 the MAG Street Committee recommended that the Black Mountain Boulevard scope be expanded to include improvements north of Deer Valley Road to Pinnacle Peak Road; the Street Committee also requested that the item be heard at the Transportation Review Committee.

MEMBERS ATTENDING

- Maria Deeb, Mesa, Chair
- Chris Hauser, El Mirage, Vice Chair
- Susan Anderson, ADOT
- \* Emile Schmid, Apache Junction
- Paul Lopez for Avondale
- Jose Heredia, Buckeye
- Warren White for Dan Cook, Chandler
- @Aryan Lirange, FHWA
- # Wayne Costa, Florence
- Tim Oliver, Gila River Indian Community
- Greg Smith, Gilbert
- Purab Adabala for Bob Darr, Glendale
- # Hugh Bigalk, Goodyear
- \* David Gue, Litchfield Park
- \* Bill Fay, City of Maricopa
- \* Jack M. Lorbeer, Maricopa County
- \* James Shano, Paradise Valley
- Jenny Grote, Phoenix
- # Scott Bender, Pinal County
- Ben Wilson, Peoria
- # Janet Martin, Queen Creek
- Jennifer Jack, Salt River Pima-Maricopa Indian Community
- Todd Taylor for Phil Kercher, Scottsdale
- Dana Owsiany, Surprise
- \* Isaac Chivera, Tempe
- \* Jason Earp, Tolleson
- Grant Anderson, Youngtown

**CONTACT PERSON:**

John Bullen, Transportation Planner II, (602) 254-6300.

**ARTERIAL LIFE CYCLE PROGRAM  
REQUEST TO SUBSTITUTE PROJECT OR CHANGE SCOPE OF PROJECT**

Name of Original Project	Black Mountain Blvd: SR-51 and Loop 101/Pima Fwy to Deer Valley Road
--------------------------	--

Lead Agency	Phoenix
-------------	---------

RTP ID	ACI-BMT-10-03
--------	---------------

RTP Project Budget	\$22,529,772
--------------------	--------------

Request Date	12/15/2014
--------------	------------

Name of Rescoped/ Substitute Project	Black Mountain Blvd: SR-51 and Loop 101/Pima Fwy to Pinnacle Peak Road
---	--

**ORIGINAL PROJECT SCHEDULE**

WORK PHASE	WORK FISCAL YEAR	REIMBURSEMENT FISCAL YEAR	PROGRAMMED REIMBURSEMENT	CURRENT FUND TYPE
Design	2011-2015	2011, 2013-2014	\$3,887,625	MAG-STP
ROW	2014	2014	\$1,402,030	MAG-STP
Construction	2013-2016	2014/2015	\$17,240,117	MAG-STP
<b>TOTALS</b>			<b>\$22,529,772</b>	

Description of Rescoped/ Substitute Project	Expand scope of ALCP project to include half street improvements from Rough Rider Road to Pinnacle Peak Road.
--	---

**RESCOPED/SUBSTITUTE PROJECT BUDGET**

WORK PHASE	WORK FISCAL YEAR	TOTAL COST	LOCAL SHARE	ALCP SHARE	FREEWAY SHARE	REGIONAL %
<b>SEGMENT (1) - Design and ROW ONLY</b>						
Design	2011-2015	\$ 5,262,896	\$ 913,271	\$ 4,349,625	\$ -	82.65%
ROW	2013-2014	\$ 1,952,900	\$ 585,870	\$ 1,367,030	\$ -	70.00%
<b>SUBTOTAL</b>		<b>\$ 7,215,796</b>	<b>\$ 1,499,141</b>	<b>\$ 5,716,655</b>	<b>\$ -</b>	<b>79.22%</b>
<b>SEGMENT (2) - SR-51 to Deer Valley Drive</b>						
Construction	2013-16	\$ 27,553,698	\$ 9,180,108	\$ 15,173,514	\$ 3,200,076	66.68%
<b>SUBTOTAL</b>		<b>\$ 27,553,698</b>	<b>\$ 9,180,108</b>	<b>\$ 15,173,514</b>	<b>\$ 3,200,076</b>	<b>66.68%</b>
<b>SEGMENT (3) -Deer Valley Drive to Pinnacle Peak</b>						
Construction	2015-2016	\$ 2,458,912	\$ 819,309	\$ 1,639,603	\$ -	66.68%
<b>SUBTOTAL</b>		<b>\$ 2,458,912</b>	<b>\$ 819,309</b>	<b>\$ 1,639,603</b>	<b>\$ -</b>	<b>66.68%</b>
<b>COMPLETE PROJECT</b>						
<b>Total</b>		<b>\$ 37,228,406</b>	<b>\$ 11,498,558</b>	<b>\$ 22,529,772</b>	<b>\$ 3,200,076</b>	<b>69.11%</b>

SEGMENT (1) - SR-51 to Deer Valley Road			
CURRENT FACILITY FEATURES (RESCOPED/SUBSTITUTE PROJECT)			
Total Lanes	0	Average Daily Traffic	n/a
North/South Lanes	0	V/C Ratio	n/a
East/West Lanes	0	Bus Pullouts	none
Length of Facility	0	Bicycle Facilities	none
PLANNED FACILITY FEATURES (RESCOPED/SUBSTITUTE PROJECT)			
Total Lanes	6	Bus Pullouts	none
North/South Lanes	6	Bicycle Facilities	bike lanes
East/West Lanes	0	Pedestrian Facilities	sidewalk/ped bridge
Length of Facility	1.2	Paved Shoulders/Curbs	none
SEGMENT (2) - Deer Valley Road to Pinnacle Peak Road			
CURRENT FACILITY FEATURES (RESCOPED/SUBSTITUTE PROJECT)			
Total Lanes	0	Average Daily Traffic	n/a
North/South Lanes	0	V/C Ratio	n/a
East/West Lanes	0	Bus Pullouts	none
Length of Facility	1.0	Bicycle Facilities	none
PLANNED FACILITY FEATURES (RESCOPED/SUBSTITUTE PROJECT)			
Total Lanes	2	Bus Pullouts	none
North/South Lanes	2	Bicycle Facilities	bike lane
East/West Lanes	0	Pedestrian Facilities	partial sidewalk
Length of Facility	1.0	Paved Shoulders/Curbs	none

Please explain the reason for requesting to substitute or rescope the original project.	The City is requesting to expand the scope to Pinnacle Peak Road because of the improved access and circulation for the roadway network as opposed to the original scope limits. In addition, building the additional half street to Pinnacle also improves level of service at the 101 offramps at Tatum and CaveCreek Road. Finally, the public supported this addition.
---	--

What technical documents and supporting analysis are available to demonstrate the feasibility of the requested project?	The design team for this project has done level of service studies for this scope expansion. The material has been presented to the public and was approved through the formal Environmental Assessment Process with the passing of the Record of Decision in October 2013.
---	---

Description of how the requested project would improve mobility/safety and reduce congestion.	The expanded scope improves mobility, safety and congestion for not the roadway network (Black Mountain Blvd, Deer Valley, Tatum Rd and Cave Creek Road), the Loop 101 Tatum Road/Cave Creek Off-ramps, and the north-to-west to west interchange ramp from State Route-51 to westbound Loop 101 freeway.
---	---

Requested Project's Benefit to the MAG Region?	With inclusion of the added scope, the project will help to alleviate traffic congestion and the bottle-neck situation on the Loop 101 freeway at both Tatum Blvd and Cave Creek Road.
--	--

# Original Project Limits





## ARTERIAL LIFE CYCLE PROGRAM POLICIES AND PROCEDURES EXCERPTS

The Arterial Life Cycle Program (ALCP) Policies and Procedures approved by the MAG Regional Council on December 28, 2014 require Lead Agencies to present proposed substitute projects or changes in project scope to MAG Street Committee for a technical review and recommendation before the request will be presented through the MAG Committee Process for approval. Key excerpts from the Policies regarding the program, proposed substitute projects, and changes in project scope are provided below. The complete version of the ALCP Policies and Procedures may be downloaded from the MAG website at: <http://www.azmag.gov/ALCP>

### SECTION 100: PROGRAM OBJECTIVES

A. The ALCP has five key objectives:

1. Effective and Efficient Implementation of the RTP: Facilitate the effective and efficient implementation of the arterial component of the RTP. In support of this objective, the Program should:
  - a. Ensure Projects are implemented in a manner consistent with the RTP, including any updates or amendments;
  - b. Include the means to track Project implementation against requirements established in the RTP and the ALCP; and,
  - c. Be administratively simple.
2. Fiscal Integrity: Ensure the fiscal integrity of the regionally funded arterial component of the RTP. In support of this objective, the Program should:
  - a. Establish comprehensive financial and reporting requirements for each Project; and
  - b. Coordinate with the RTP and the other modal programs on key financial, accounting and reporting policies, procedures and practices.
3. Accountability: Provide the means to track and ensure effective and efficient Project implementation. In support of this objective, the Program should:
  - a. Employ comprehensive Project Agreements, or other legal instruments, that detail agency roles and responsibilities in the implementation of specific Projects; and
  - b. Provide the means within each Project Agreement, Project Overview and Project Reimbursement Request to track Project implementation, performance and successful completion of individual Projects and the Program.
4. Transparency: Provide members of the public, elected officials, stakeholders, participating agencies and others with ready access to information on the Program and on each Project. In support of this objective, the Program should:
  - a. Include substantial public and stakeholder consultation as part of the implementation process for each Project; and
  - b. Require that material project changes to Projects in the Program be subject to public and stakeholder involvement through the MAG Committee Process.

5. Compliance: Comply with all applicable federal, state and local requirements in the implementation of Projects.
- B. Consistency with the RTP generally means that an ALCP Project meets Project the eligibility requirements specified in Section 300, the Project regional reimbursement is fiscally constrained, and the reimbursement is in the original RTP phase.
- C. The Program must be flexible and allow adjustments as needed in support of meeting the key objectives.

#### **SECTION 210: UPDATING ALCP PROJECTS IN THE ALCP**

- A. All ALCP Projects will be updated annually (refer to Section 200(F)2).
- B. Any necessary changes to an ALCP Project must be submitted by a written request stating the new updated schedule and budget and any other necessary justifications.
  1. Requests will be approved through the MAG Committee Process by the approval of the ALCP.
  2. Update forms will be provided by MAG.
- C. All ALCP Projects that are moved, changed or updated from their original schedule in the RTP must consider the impact of the proposed changes on other RTP Projects and on neighboring communities.
- D. MAG, the Lead Agency, and other agency(ies)/jurisdiction(s) listed in the Project Agreement must agree to the proposed changes or updates.

#### **SECTION 220: TYPES OF ALCP PROJECT UPDATES**

- A. Projects may be advanced by the Lead Agency and other agency(ies)/jurisdiction(s) listed in the Project Agreement, who must pay the costs of advancing the Project and wait for reimbursement from the Program in the fiscal year the Project or Projects are scheduled in the ALCP to receive regional funds. To do so, it is required that:
  1. In advancing a Project, the Lead Agency and other agency(ies)/jurisdiction(s) listed in the Project Agreement must bear all costs and risks associated with advance design, right-of-way acquisition, construction and any related activities for ALCP Projects.
  2. Financing costs and any other incremental costs associated with the advancement are not eligible for reimbursement.
  3. The reimbursement for the advanced Project must be in the currently approved programmed ALCP.
    - a. Reimbursement for a Project will be the amount listed, plus inflation to the year the Project is programmed for reimbursement in the ALCP.
      - i. MAG Staff will use inflation factors as noted in Section 240.
  4. Upon completion of an advanced Project, all Project Reimbursement Requests must be submitted to MAG. Reimbursement payments will follow the schedule established in the currently approved ALCP.

- a. Reimbursement payments may be accelerated for projects approved for RARF Closeout Funds through the MAG Committee Process, per Section 250.
- B. Lead Agencies may segment an original RTP Project as long as the resulting Project segments would provide for the completion of the original Project as specified in the RTP.
  1. A Design Concept Report or equivalent may be used to determine major Project elements within each jurisdiction and to develop recommendations for budget allocations.
- C. Projects may be deferred at the request of the Lead Agency and other agency(ies)/jurisdiction(s) listed in the Project Agreement and/or MAG.
  1. If a Project is deferred, other Projects will be moved in priority order at that time, taking into account: Project readiness, local match available and funding source preferences.
- D. A Lead Agency may exchange two Projects in the ALCP if:
  1. Project 1 is deferred from Phase I, II or III to Phase II, III, or IV, AND Project 2 is advanced from Phase II, III or IV to Phase I, II, or III.
  2. When Projects are exchanged, the advanced Project 2 may receive regional reimbursement up to the maximum of the budgeted reimbursement amount of Project 1 or the maximum budget of Project 2, whichever is less.
  3. Funding for all Projects involved in a Project exchange must be documented for the ALCP Program both before and after the proposed exchange in order to demonstrate that there will be no negative fiscal impact on the ALCP.
- E. If an original ALCP Project is deemed not feasible, a substitute Project may be proposed for substitution in the same jurisdiction as the original Project.
  1. The Lead Agency may propose a substitute Project that would use the regional funds allocated to the original Project. The substitute Project shall relieve congestion and improve mobility in the same general area addressed by the original Project, if possible.
  2. Substitute projects may not be completed prior to inclusion in the Arterial Life Cycle Program.
  3. The Lead Agency must submit a written request to MAG. The written request must include:
    - a. Justification, such as a feasibility study, level of service justification, or other documents explaining why the Project is deemed not feasible, and the description of steps to overcome any issues related to deleting the original Project from the ALCP and RTP.
    - b. How the proposed project would relieve congestion and improve mobility; and,
    - c. The proposed substitute project budget and schedule.
    - d. MAG Staff will work with jurisdictions on a case-by-case basis to ensure proper justification.
- F. An original ALCP Project can change its original Project scope due to environmental issues, public concerns, costs and other factors.

1. The Lead Agency must submit a written request to MAG. The written request must include justification, such as a feasibility study, level of service justification, revised budget and/or other documents explaining why the change to the original Project is required, and the description of steps to overcome any issues related to changing the original scope of the ALCP Project.
    - a. MAG Staff will work with jurisdictions on a case-by-case basis to ensure proper justification.
  2. The scope change should relieve congestion and improve mobility in the same area addressed by the original planned Project, if possible.
  3. Project scope changes may not include completed portions of a project or project segment, which are not included in an Arterial Life Cycle Program approved through the MAG Committee process.
- G. All Material Project Change requests must meet all requirements established in Sections 200, Section 210, and Section 220.
1. Before being approved through the MAG Committee Process, the requests:
    - a. Must be reviewed and approved by MAG for consistency with the ALCP Policies and Procedures and the Regional Transportation Plan goals and objectives
    - b. Will be presented by an employee of the Lead Agency to the MAG Street Committee for a technical review and recommendation. The presentation will address:
      - i. The reason(s) the original project was deemed not feasible;
      - ii. Explain how the change the original ALCP project scope or substitute project would relieve congestion and improve mobility;
      - iii. The new/revised project cost estimate; and
      - iv. Other information as requested by the MAG Street Committee.
  1. After the Streets Committee technical review and recommendation on the proposed changes, the project(s) will be brought forth through the MAG Committee Process for approval.
  2. Requests to change original ALCP project scope or substitute a project must be made by the deadline established in the ALCP Schedule published annually in the MAG Transportation Programming Guidebook.
  3. Reimbursements for substitute projects will :
    - a. Be programmed in the same fiscal year(s) as the original project
    - b. Be programmed with the same funding amount and type as the original project

## **SECTION 320: PROJECT ELIGIBILITY**

- A. To be funded or constructed under the ALCP Program, Projects must:
1. Have a scope, budget (including amounts of regional funding and local match contributions) and a schedule consistent with the Project as included in the RTP, ALCP, and as appropriate, the TIP. In addition, Projects must be consistent with federal requirements, where applicable.

2. Be considered new in keeping with voter expectations, and as such:
  - a. Cannot include costs for any pre-existing, programmed or planned element or improvement that is not part of the specific improvement Project described or included in the RTP as of November 25, 2003 or later.
  - b. Cannot have started design, acquired right-of-way or started construction before the date specified in Section 330 or the date of the Project addition to the RTP.
  - c. Must address congestion, mobility, and safety in the region.
- B. Facilities eligible for improvements under the ALCP include:
  1. Major arterials as defined in Appendix A. Major arterials include:
    - a. Roadway facilities on the regional arterial or mile arterial grid system;
    - b. Roadway facilities that connect freeways, highways or other controlled access facilities; and,
    - c. Other key arterial corridors.
  2. Intersections of eligible major arterials.
- C. All Projects must be designed to the standards agreed to by the designated local jurisdictions and the Lead Agency established in the Project Agreement.
  1. The agreed standards, which may be higher than the standards used in the local jurisdiction(s), must be specified or referenced in the Project Agreement.
  2. Standards for multi-jurisdictional Projects should be consistent to the extent feasible.
- D. The Project Overview for each Project must identify all Project components for which reimbursement of the regional share is sought from the ALCP, including the components of the Project that will be funded locally or by third parties.
- E. Each ALCP Project shall have a reimbursement timeline specified in the Project Agreement and Project Overview.
  1. Reimbursement timelines may shift due to project schedule changes and/or the availability of program funds.
- F. The MAG Committee Process has the final determination on the eligibility of any Project or Project component for reimbursement from the ALCP Program.

### **SECTION 330: REIMBURSABLE EXPENDITURES**

- A. Reimbursable items for regionally funded Projects are limited to:
  1. Design, right-of-way and construction, as required in ARS: 28-6304(C)(5) and ARS: 28-6305(A). Design Concept Reports, planning studies and related studies, such as environmental and other studies, are also eligible.
  2. Capacity Improvement Projects.
  3. Safety Improvement Projects.
  4. Projects or components directly related to capacity and safety improvements, including:

5. Intelligent Transportation Systems (ITS);
6. Signals;
7. Lighting;
8. Transit stops and pullouts, as well as queue jumper lanes, for example, for bus rapid transit;
9. Bicycle/pedestrian facilities integral to the roadway, including wide sidewalks separated from curbs;
10. Utility relocations, including under grounding of utility lines where required for safety or other reasons relating to function, and not purely for aesthetic reasons, and not otherwise considered an enhancement;
11. Drainage improvements for the Project (with limitations), such as retention basins required for the Project that would not normally be handled through County or other drainage funds, within reasonable limits (and generally not exceeding typical practice for the local jurisdiction);
12. Landscaped medians, shoulders, and other improvements within reasonable limits (and generally not exceeding typical practice for the local jurisdiction);
13. Reconstruction Projects, as identified in or supported by the RTP and as specified in Project Agreements, for eligible Project elements;
14. Access management;
15. Rubberized asphalt and concrete paving;
16. Staff time directly attributable to Project;
17. Noise, privacy and screen wall, and other buffers, if found to be necessary to meet applicable local, state or federal standards; and,
18. Public involvement and outreach activities.