

MINUTES OF THE
MARICOPA ASSOCIATION OF GOVERNMENTS
STREET COMMITTEE

Tuesday, October 13, 2015 10:00 a.m.
MAG Offices, Suite 300,
302 North First Avenue, Phoenix, Arizona 85003

MEMBERS ATTENDING

Maria Angelica Deeb, Mesa, Chair	Lee Jimenez, Maricopa County
Chris Hauser, El Mirage, Vice Chair	Mike Gillespie, Litchfield Park
Eric Boyles for Susan Anderson, ADOT	* James Shano, Paradise Valley
Emile Schmid, Apache Junction	Jenny Grote, Phoenix
David Janover, Avondale	Scott Bender, Pinal County
* Jose Heredia, Buckeye	Ben Wilson, Peoria
Kevin Lair, Chandler	* Janet Martin, Queen Creek
@Aryan Lirange, FHWA	Jennifer Jack, Salt River Pima-Maricopa Indian Community
Morris Taylor for Wayne Costa, Florence	* Phil Kercher, Scottsdale
Tim Oliver, Gila River Indian Community	Dana Owsiany, Surprise
* Greg Smith, Gilbert	German Piedrahita, Tempe
Patrick Sage, Glendale	* Jason Earp, Tolleson
# Luke Albert for Hugh Bigalk, Goodyear	Grant Anderson, Youngtown
Bill Fay, City of Maricopa	

* Members neither present nor represented by Proxy
Members attending by phone
@Ex-officio member, non voting member

OTHERS PRESENT

Paul Ward, Award Consulting	Bill Hahn, Maricopa County
Warren White, Chandler	Mark Glock, Phoenix
Alfonso Rodriguez, Fort McDowell Yavapai Nation	Chaun Hill, MAG
Erika McCalvin, Fort McDowell Yavapai Nation	Teri Kennedy, MAG
Gregory McDowell, Gila River Indian Community	David Massey, MAG
	Stephen Tate, MAG

1. Call to Order

Chair Maria Deeb called the meeting to order at 10:00 a.m.

2. Introductions and Attendance

A roll call of members attending the meeting was conducted. The following member agencies were not represented at the meeting: Buckeye, Gilbert, Paradise Valley, Queen Creek, Scottsdale and Tolleson.

3 Approval of the October 13, 2015 Meeting Minutes

Ms. Jenny Grote moved the approval of the minutes. Mr. Kevin Lair seconded the motion. All members present, except for Mr. Patrick Sage, voted to approve the minutes. Mr. Sage abstained from voting as he had not been present at September meeting.

4. Transportation Programming Manager's Report

Ms. Teri Kennedy began her report by welcoming new members: Mr. Michael Gillespie, Mr. Kevin Lair and Mr. Patrick Sage.

She then proceeded to brief the Committee on the process for reviewing project applications. She noted that the projects' applications are grouped into street sweeper, paving and Pinal County Surface Transportation Program (STP) categories. Each group will be addressed as a separate agenda item and, as appropriate, a Committee action to forward the application to the MAG Air Quality Technical Committee for evaluation.

She then identified funding levels for each group: \$1.08 million for street sweepers, \$13.08 million for paving and \$1.62 million for Pinal County STP projects. Funding for street sweepers is available in federal fiscal year (FFY) 2016 in non attainment areas for particulate matter. Funding for paving projects is available for FFY 2018, FFY 2019 and FFY 2020 in non attainment areas for particulate matter. Funding for Pinal County STP projects is available for FFY 2018 and FFY 2020 in parts of Pinal County that are part of the MAG planning area.

There will be no presentation on street sweeper applications, however staff will read off the name of the application and allow for Committee questions. A presentation of up to five minutes will be provided by member agency staff for each paving application. The presentation material used for these presentations will be based on material included in the applications as selected by MAG staff. Up to ten minutes will be available for questions on each application.

The Pinal County STP applications will be presented last. Up to five minutes will be provided for each presenter. The materials used for the presentation were prepared by the presenters. The Committee may ask questions after each presentation. The selection of projects for funding will be based on criteria and policies that were developed by the managers of member agencies in the Pinal County as approved by the Regional Council.

Prior to the meeting, members were requested to submit questions to help clarify applications and these questions have been compiled for the use of all members. Presenters are expected to respond to these questions in their presentations.

Ms. Kennedy ended by noting that after the meeting, member agencies may amend their applications to reflect the comments and input of the Committee. The November meeting will address the final applications. Application data from this meeting will be forwarded to the MAG Air Quality Technical Committee for use in developing and approving CMAQ cost effectiveness scores.

5. Review of MAG PM-10 Certified Street Sweeper Applications for Federal Funding

Ms. Kennedy noted that MAG received nine street sweeper applications and that MAG will have a little over one million dollars available.

Mr. Tate then started listing the sweepers and member responded to questions in the summary as follows:

Apache Junction application:

Mr. Emile Schmid indicated that the sweeper that is to be replaced meets requirements for replacements and that its relatively low mileage does not reflect heavy use of the sweeper to clear debris from storms. He added that the sweeper is 11 years old.

Added features on the sweeper to be purchased by Apache Junction are standard and their removal from the sweeper would increase the costs.

Chandler application.

Mr. Kevin Lair noted that the sweeper to be replaced is 9 years old, suffers from metal fatigue, has electrical issues and spends an excessive amount of time in the shop for repair. The sweeper is used to sweep both residential and arterial roadways.

It was noted that the application included training and that training is not eligible for federal reimbursement. In response, it was noted that manufacturers typically provide training free of charge and that the inclusion of training in the application is not intended as a cost item.

It was noted that the application does not indicate that it is used for sweeping collector and residential streets. It was indicated that the sweeper is used for only arterial streets.

Glendale application:

It was noted that the summary does not provide the ADT per lane. It was indicated that the ADT per lane is 1000.

It was also asked what the proposed sweeper frequency of the proposed sweeper will be. It was indicated that Glendale will provide an update after the meeting.

Mesa application:

The application indicates that the sweeper will sweep “other” facilities. A description of the “other” facilities was requested.

Chair Maria Deeb indicated that the sweeper is somewhat smaller than other sweepers and that, in addition to sweeping roadways, it would be used to sweep parking structures, special medians and the area from the light rail tracks to the travel lanes.

Peoria applications:

The application also indicates that the sweeper will sweep “other” facilities. A description of the “other” facilities was requested.

Mr. Ben Wilson indicated that he would need to provide a response after the meeting.

In response to a question concerning the sweeper to be replaced in the second Peoria application, Mr. Ben Wilson noted that the sweeper to be replaced would be eight years old by November and that it currently had 8,582 hours of service and 73,673 miles of service.

Phoenix applications:

There were no questions concerning the Phoenix applications.

It was requested by Mr. Grant Anderson that the summary table include information about sweepers to be replaced. Mr. Tate indicated he would include the information in the table.

Mr. Bill Fay asked if the Committee would rank applications for funding at the meeting.

Ms. Kennedy provided background information. She indicated that the role of the Committee today is to provide a technical review of the data provided for air quality scoring. This data would be provided to the MAG Air Quality Technical Advisory Committee (AQTAC) for use in calculating and approving air quality scores for the applications. Thereafter, the list of sweepers as scored by the AQTAC will be forwarded to MAG Management Committee for their review and recommendation for funding.

Ms. Jenny Grote suggested that some member agencies may desire to request additional sweepers and that Phoenix might desire to acquire a smaller format sweeper similar to that requested by Mesa. She noted that additional funding for the sweepers might be forthcoming from the MAG closeout.

It was noted by the Chair that MAG could not accept new applications at this time. Ms. Kennedy stated that MAG has only enough to fund about six sweepers this year, but that an additional round of funding for sweepers would be available next August.

Scottsdale Application.

There were no questions concerning this question.

It was noted that the ranking of sweepers for funding is based on the cost-effectiveness score of the sweeper.

The Chair noted that the Apache Junction sweeper application indicated a high frequency of sweeping, but that the Apache Junction description of the use of the sweeper stressed that it was used for storm events.

Mr. Schmid indicated that Apache Junction area was subject to frequent runoff from the Superstition Mountains that resulted in the high frequency of usage.

Mr. Grant Anderson moved to forward the summary of the discussion from the meeting on the PM-10 Certified Street Sweeper applications evaluated by the Street Committee to the MAG Air Quality Technical Advisory Committee. Ms. Grote seconded the motion.

6. Review of Paving of Unpaved Roads Applications for Federal Funding

Mr. Tate indicated that seventeen paving applications had been received and that one application had been withdrawn. Presentations are limited to five minutes each with up to ten minutes of questioning to follow. Each presentation will use a slide show developed by MAG staff from materials included in paving applications.

Chandler applications:

Mr. Kevin Lair presented all three Chandler paving applications as a single item. He indicated that the Chandler paving applications were for alleys and included removal of up to six inches of existing material with replacement by crushed asphalt which is then covered by a sealant.

Project costs include cuts and removal of unwanted material, compaction of the subgrade, placement and processing of crushed asphalt and the addition of a sealant. Chandler has roughly 130 miles of alleys with 65 miles paved. The Chandler applications request funding to pave 12.0 miles in 2018, 14.5 miles in 2019 and 12.0 miles in 2020.

The Chair noted that the cost per mile in the summary table for paving projects showed a large variance. Mr. Lair indicated that the variance could be due to inflation contingencies and other factors, but would need to provide a response after the meeting.

Mr. Bill Fay noted that a number of communities had closed off alleys rather than pave them. Ms. Grote noted that Phoenix had experienced problems with closing alleys as they tend to become dumping grounds for trash and the police see them as creating security problems for residents.

Mr. Grant Anderson asked how Chandler will address drainage issues from alley paving. Mr. Lair indicated that the natural ground on the side of the alleys is left undisturbed to allow for adequate drainage.

El Mirage application:

Vice Chair Chris Hauser presented the El Mirage application:

He noted that the application requested funding to pave alleys in El Mirage and two streets. All facilities to be paved are open to traffic. Paving would consist of two inches on native soil with millings on the shoulder to address drainage. The application includes removable bollards for alleys, but these may not be included if during design it is determined that their inclusion would make the paving project ineligible for federal funding.

The two streets to be paved are in an industrial area. Both were at one time paved, but the paving has deteriorated to loose gravel and dirt.

It was noted that the schedule only allowed one year to complete the design and clearance review process, but it was felt that the job so simple that the project could complete the process earlier. It was indicated that programming to a later year would be acceptable if it was felt that too little time was allotted for design.

Fort McDowell Yavapai Nation application:

Mr. Alfonso Rodriguez presented the application.

Mr. Rodriguez noted that the Nation, working closely with a number of partners, had successfully completed a number of paving projects using the FHWA/ADOT process.

The Nation's proposal was to pave twelve foot lanes with three inches asphalt on four inches of aggregate base material on all three roads to be paved. A Maricopa edge would be used. A design concept report has been completed for the project and the project neither impacts the waters of the US nor is it anticipated to have major drainage issues.

The Chair noted that the cost estimate for the project was relatively high on a per mile basis. Mr. Rodriguez noted that the cost reflected initial cost estimates.

City of Maricopa applications:

Mr. Rob Dolson presented on all three applications:

He indicated that the sections to be paved are graded on a monthly basis and that the city proposed to double chip seal the roads on ten inches of aggregate base material. The roadways will have a three inch crown.

Mr. Anderson asked whether the treatment would stand up well to drainage issues in the area. Mr. Fay indicated that similar treatments had worked well in El Mirage and at ADOT.

Mr. Fay went on to indicate that the expected life of the roadways is at least ten years.

In response to a clarifying question about the time needed to design the project to obtain federal authorization, Mr. Fay indicated that he believed the schedule provided for adequate time.

It was noted that the third Maricopa application, the Farrell Road project, had a wrong cost sheet. Mr. Dolson indicated that he would check on the issue.

Maricopa County application:

Mr. Bill Hahn presented the application.

He indicated that the project was on Miller Road from Interstate 10 to an Army Reserve base on the north. The average daily traffic on the roadway is 505. The roadway meanders along a section line.

The project will realign the roadway on the section line. There are utility poles on the west that will be removed at the expense of the owning utility as the County has prior rights. The project will not impact two flood control structures in the project alignment as the roadway will be improved to be carried over the structures.

The roadway is included in the City of Buckeye's plans as a future principal arterial. The City of Buckeye supports the project.

Mr. Kraft asked whether the pavement would be sufficient to handle the type of traffic the facility is expected to carry. Mr. Hahn indicated that he believed that it is sufficient that it would consist of two inches of asphaltic concrete on six inches of aggregate.

Mr. Janover noted that the cost of the project seemed high. Mr. Hahn noted that the high cost was due to the need to elevate the road over a flood control structure and to address drainage issues. The cost estimate was developed by a consultant and cross checked by the County.

Mr. Fay noted that the roadway is used extensively by the Army Reserve on the weekends and that this generates huge clouds of dust.

Phoenix applications:

Mr. Mark Glock presented the Phoenix applications.

He noted that the City has three applications. The applications are for three years of funding and would pave 85 miles of alley, including 935 access points. The sections to be paved are selected based on citizen complaints and visual evidence of track out of dirt. The paving used is a rubberized chip seal. A 15 foot lane is paved with space on the side left unpaved to allow for drainage. The cost is \$36,400 per mile including soft costs and inflation contingency.

In response to clarifying questions, Mr. Glock indicated that the City is using an ADT of four as its estimate for traffic and that the design used is an in-house design that is very simple and has been used in the past to pave alleys.

The meeting adjourned for lunch at 11:40 AM and resumed at 12:20 PM.

Pinal County applications:

Mr. John Kraft presented the Pinal County applications.

He indicated that Pinal County was submitting three applications and that all are in the Stanfield area. The first application, Midway Road, would be double chip sealed with eight inches aggregate base for two twelve foot lanes. There are no utility conflicts to be addressed. In response to a clarifying question, he indicated that if during design it was determined that the proposed pavement treatment was inadequate, changes in pavement treatment would be made to address the issue.

The second Pinal County application is to pave 3.5 miles of Stanfield Road. A double chip seal on six inches of aggregate base would be used.

The third application was for Barns Road. This road will also be double chip sealed. This roadway is only four miles from the monitor for particulate matter.

He noted an error in the cost sheets for the projects and indicated that he would send in updated cost estimates.

Salt River Pima-Maricopa Indian Community application.

Ms. Jennifer Jack presented the application.

The project includes areas where paving will occur. The first is in the McDonald subdivision and the second is the Palm Lane subdivision in the Lehi area.

In the McDonald subdivision the residents have been trying for roughly twenty years to get their roads paved. Dust from road traffic has had adverse health consequences for residences.

Paving in the area will require the acquisition of right-of-way. Acquiring the needed right-of-way may be a challenge as the land to be purchased is owned by a large number of owners. The Community has changed its policies to allow the use of Community funds to purchase right-of-way and is in the process to acquire the needed land.

Three of the four roads in the McDonald subdivision and the roads in the Palm Lane subdivision will have a fifty foot right-of-way cross section. The other roads will have a thirty foot right-of-way cross section.

In response to clarifying questions, Ms. Jack indicated that drainage would be addressed by shallow swells along the roadway, that the environmental process through the BIA process

is underway for the right-of-way acquisitions, that the Community had 2011 traffic counts for the exterior roadway, but not the internal roads and that there is sufficient clear zones to keep objects out of the road.

Vice Chair Chris Hauser moved to forward the summary of the discussion from the meeting on Paving of Unpaved Road applications evaluated by the Street Committee, to the MAG Air Quality Technical Advisory Committee. Mr. John Kraft seconded the motion. The motion carried unanimously.

7. MAG Arterial Road and Bridge Applications, Proposed to be Funded with Surface Transportation Program (STP) Funds for Projects in Pinal County Within the MAG Planning Area

Mr. John Bullen of MAG staff provided an overview. He indicated that the rules governing the programming of the Pinal County STP program were approved by the Regional Council in February. The amount available for programming is approximately \$1. 6 million and that the program has six goals as follows:

- Expand capacity on existing roadways or intersections of high demand
- Maintain and preserve the region’s transportation system
- Address safety concerns in the existing roadway/intersection conditions
- Promote connectivity between high demand/capacity roadways and activity centers to advance economic viability
- Maintain consistency with stated jurisdictional policy
- Achieve a significant reduction in congestion on the region’s transportation system

Evaluation criteria are based on the six goals.

Three applications were received. One application was deemed ineligible since it was for paving and the program does not provide for paving projects.

Per the PC-STP Programming and Evaluation Policy, the MAG Street Committee is responsible for evaluating project applications as follows: “The Streets Committee will assess the application and data provided to determine its reasonableness and accuracy relative to the evaluation criteria.”

Mr. Emile Schmid briefed the Committee on the application from Apache Junction. He indicated that the project will add one through lane and bicycle lanes in both directions . It will also add consistent curb, gutter and sidewalk throughout.

He noted, that due to ADOT and MCDOT improvements, it is anticipated that the section will have increased traffic. The section includes a High School and a Hospital.

In response to clarifying questions he indicated the following:

- He indicated that the pavement data for is based on visual inspection system that results in an estimate of the remaining service life of the pavement. The pavement for the section is estimated to have a remaining service life of ten years.
- The traffic estimate for the section is based on approach counts and was initially provided as 20,000 ADT, but should be revised downward to 10,000 ADT. A detailed traffic count was not conducted due to cost considerations so estimation of K and D factors are rough estimates.

Mr. Gregory McDowell briefed the Committee on the Gila River Indian Community application. He indicated that the roadway to be improved connects State Route 87 with the Hunt Highway and that it is an important route for the Gila River Indian Community. The route has high maintenance costs and its pavement is in bad condition with extensive alligator cracking. The route does not have a shoulder and three incapacitating crashes have occurred on the route.

The proposed improvements to the facility include rehabilitating the pavement and adding a bicycle lane.

In response to clarifying questions, he indicated the following:

- The pavement rating for the facility is a Pavement Condition Index (PCI) value and is based on a visual inspection of the facility.
- The traffic estimate is based on a traffic count for the facility.

Mr. Tate noted that in the site visit for the two applications, the quality of pavement for the Indian Community appeared worse than that for the Apache Junction project, yet the Apache Junction project had a lower pavement rating. He suggested that it might be desirable to convert the two ratings to remaining service life.

Mr. Schmid sought clarification of the differences between the two rating system. He noted that the system used by Apache Junction was a visual based system that rated pavements in terms of remaining service life and asked for information on the system used by the Indian Community.

Mr. Oliver responded that the PCI was a rating of pavement quality based on visual inspection and is not based on remaining service life. Ms. Grote noted that a PCI rating of 70 is the national standard for pavement condition by agencies that use the PCI and that Phoenix used a van with special equipment that measures pavement roughness to collect the data.

Mr. Kraft asked how much funding was needed by the projects. Mr. Bullen noted that each project required the majority of the funding.

Mr. Oliver moved to forward the project ranking tool to the Transportation Review Committee for project review and selection. Mr. Lair seconded the motion. The motion carried unanimously.

8. Next Meeting Date

The next regular Street Committee meeting will be scheduled for Tuesday, November 10, 2015 at 1:00 p.m. in the MAG Offices, Ironwood Room.

Adjournment

The meeting adjourned at 1:32 PM.