

Clarifying Questions for Street Sweeper, Paving, and PC-STP Applications

1. This question concerns the Apache Junction street sweeper application.

The application includes a cost of the sweeper for items that may not be eligible (page 8 of application) for reimbursement such as rear camera and LCD monitor, AM/FM radio with CD, etc. Please detail the cost according to eligibility criteria.

2. This question concerns the Chandler street sweeper application.

The application includes the training of 3 people (page 7 of application). Can you please explain what is entailed in this factory training? Is it maintenance or in the proper use of the TYMCO Model 600? Does Chandler have other sweeper of this model/brand in their fleet?

3. This question concerns the Chandler and Phoenix alley paving applications.

Some applications state that no design is required or do not include design, however when dealing with federal aid funds, a design component is required. Has there been consideration of performing a reduced design to accommodate obtaining all certification/clearances and the review and approval of these projects?

4. This question concerns the Fort McDowell Yavapai Nation paving application.

The application needs to address jurisdictional waters or permits and include minimal drainage infrastructure. Can you please clarify how this has been addressed?

5. These questions concern the Salt River Pima-Maricopa Indian Community paving application.

- Because the ROW acquisition process has started, one can assume that the alignment was set and that all environmental considerations have been taken. Is this correct?
- Regarding Segment 7 (Ranch Drive), what consideration has been given to drainage so it is not redirected to the nearby homes (per photo in page 62).

6. This question concerns the alley paving applications from Chandler, El Mirage and Phoenix:

ADT estimates for the Chandler and the El Mirage alley segments (excluding the two El Mirages streets to be paved) are at 50. The Phoenix alley ADT estimates are all at 10.

The Chandler and El Mirage estimates appear very high for alleys. By comparison, the Salt River Pima-Maricopa Indian Community applications have ADT estimates that are mostly below 50 and these estimates are for rural subdivision roads that provide the only access to residences. Do the two cities have traffic counts on other alleys in their respective cities that would justify such high ADTs.

Clarifying Questions for Street Sweeper, Paving, and PC-STP Applications

Moreover, does such a huge variance (a factor of 5) between the Phoenix ADT estimates and the estimates from the other two cities make sense? Are there specific characteristics of the El Mirage and Chandler alleys that would cause them to have more ADT? Alternatively, are there specific characteristics of Phoenix alleys that might cause them to carry less traffic than alleys in Chandler and El Mirage?

It appears that all of the ADTs provided by the three cities are default values entered in lieu of traffic counts or some more detailed assessments. Is this assertion correct? If it is correct wouldn't it be better to use a common default ADT for all alley paving applications submitted from the three cities?

7. This question concerns the Maricopa and El Mirage paving projects.

All three applications indicate that design would begin in 2017 and construction would occur in 2018. This may leave too little time to complete the design and environmental process through ADOT as the process typically requires 18 to 24 months or more to complete.

8. These questions concern the Apache Junction and Gila River Indian Community (GRIC) STP applications:

The Apache Junction application indicates that the pavement has a rating for the section to be improved of 10/20. The GRIC application indicates that the pavement rating of the section to be improved is 55/100. The photos submitted for the two roadway sections show that the GRIC section pavement is in worse condition than the Apache Junction section.

Can both agencies provide more background on the two pavement rating systems used and when and how the ratings were calculated? For example do they use specialized equipment for measuring cracking, rutting and roughness? Are there more detailed data from the ratings systems that could be provided to provide a better picture of the pavement condition for both segments?

Is a rating of 10/20 on the rating system produced by Apache Junction system better, worse or equivalent to the rating of 55/100 on the system used by the GRIC. What is the appropriate interpretation of the two ratings? Could both the GRIC and Apache Junction elaborate?

9. These questions also concern the Apache Junction and Gila River Indian Community STP applications:

Both applications indicate that the project is the result of a community request outside the budget/CIP process. Can Apache Junction and GRIC, both provide more detail? It would be good to know what parties are requesting the project – e.g. neighborhoods – where and how they expressed their interest, what if any particular concern or interest they expressed and any other material that would help to gauge the demand for the project. The Pinal County STP evaluation policy awards points for a “yes” answer so more detail is needed.