

January 20, 2009

TO: Members of the MAG Transportation Review Committee

FROM: Tom Callow, City of Phoenix Chair

SUBJECT: MEETING NOTIFICATION AND TRANSMITTAL OF TENTATIVE AGENDA

Thursday, January 29, 2009, 10:00 a.m.
MAG Office, Suite 200, Saguaro Room
302 North 1st Avenue, Phoenix

A meeting of the MAG Transportation Review Committee (TRC) will be held at the time and place noted above. **Please park in the garage under the building. Bring your ticket to the meeting as parking will be validated. Bicycles can be locked in the rack at the entrance to the parking garage.**

The next meeting of the MAG Transportation Review Committee will be held at the time and place noted above. Committee members or their proxies may attend **in person, via videoconference or by telephone conference call**. Those attending video conference must notify the MAG site three business days prior to the meeting. Those attending by telephone conference call please contact MAG offices for conference call instructions.

Pursuant to Title II of the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA), MAG does not discriminate on the basis of disability in admissions to or participation in its public meetings. Persons with a disability may request a reasonable accommodation, such as a sign language interpreter, by contacting Christina Hopes at the MAG Office. Requests should be made as early as possible to allow time to arrange the accommodation.

Please be advised that under procedures adopted by the MAG Regional Council on June 26, 1996, all MAG committees need to have a quorum in order to conduct business. A quorum is a simple majority of the membership or twelve people for the MAG TRC. If you are unable to attend the meeting, please make arrangements for a proxy from your jurisdiction to represent you. If you have any questions or need additional information, please contact Eric Anderson or Christina Hopes at (602) 254-6300.

TENTATIVE AGENDA

1. Call to Order
2. Approval of Draft December 4, 2008 Minutes
3. Call to the Audience

An opportunity will be provided to members of the public to address the Transportation Review Committee on items not scheduled on the agenda that fall under the jurisdiction of MAG, or on items on the agenda for discussion but not for action. Citizens will be requested not to exceed a three minute time period for their comments. A total of 15 minutes will be provided for the Call to the Audience agenda item, unless the Transportation Review Committee requests an exception to this limit.

4. Transportation Director's Report

Recent transportation planning activities and upcoming agenda items for the MAG Management Committee will be reviewed by the Transportation Director.

COMMITTEE ACTION REQUESTED

2. Approve Draft minutes of the December 4, 2008 meeting.
3. For information and discussion.
4. For information and discussion.

CONSENT AGENDA

5. FY 2009 Design Assistance Program Funding

On May 28, 2008, the MAG Regional Council approved funding for the FY 2009 Design Assistance Program. For FY 2009, \$150,000 was allocated to fund pedestrian facility design projects, and \$250,000 was allocated to fund bicycle/shared-use facilities design projects. Seven MAG Member Agencies submitted eight projects requesting \$646,000 in funding. On January 20, 2009, the MAG Pedestrian Working Group and the MAG Bicycle Task Force reviewed and ranked the projects submitted for funding consideration from the FY 2009 Design Assistance Program.

5. For information, discussion, and possible recommendation to approve selected projects for funding through the FY 2009 Design Assistance Program.

Please refer to Attachment One for a memorandum and table of ranked projects for funding consideration.

ITEMS TO BE HEARD

6. TRC Guidelines for Recommending Projects for Federal Funding

The Draft MAG Federal Fund Programming Principles for fiscal year (FY) 2009 advise the Transportation Review Committee (TRC) on guidelines for recommending projects to be selected and programmed in the competitive project selection process for MAG Federal Funds. At the September 2008 TRC meeting, committee members suggested a working group to discuss potential guidelines in more detail. The TRC Working Group met on October 23, 2008 and January 6, 2009. The TRC Working Group is proposing Draft Guidelines, which are attached for review and possible action. An update will be provided at the Committee meeting. Please refer to Attachment Two.

7. PM-10 Pave Unpaved Road Projects

The MAG Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) allocates all future MAG Federal Funds to specific modes and, in some cases, identifies specific projects for the funds. For PM-10 Pave Unpaved Road projects, the RTP and MAG Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) identifies the funding source of Congestion Mitigation Air Quality (CMAQ) but does not specify individual projects. Requests for CMAQ funds expected to be available for PM-10 Pave Unpaved Road projects in FY 2011 and FY2012 have been received, reviewed by the Street Committee, and ranked by the Air Quality Technical Advisory Committee (AQTAC). The attachments for this agenda item include a summary transmittal, a memorandum from the Chair of the AQTAC, a ranked list of

6. For information, discussion and possible action to approve the Draft Transportation Review Committee Federally Funded Project Selection Guidelines.

7. For information, discussion, and possible action to recommend a list of PM-10 Pave Unpaved Road projects to be programmed with CMAQ funds in 2011 and 2012, and to be included in the DRAFT FY 2010-2014 MAG TIP.

proposed projects, project review sheets from the Street Committee, and a list of the current CMAQ funded projects in the TIP. The TRC's role is to review the evaluation and analysis completed by the TACs and recommend projects to be selected and programmed with CMAQ funds based on guidelines established for project selection. Details are provided in Attachment Three.

8. Status of Local Sponsored Federal Funded Projects

MAG Staff will provide member agencies with an update on the status of local sponsored federal funded projects for FY 2009 and FY 2010 projects. Please see Attachment Four.

9. Member Agency Update

This section of the agenda will provide Committee members with an opportunity to share information regarding a variety of transportation-related issues within their respective communities.

10. Next Meeting Date

The next regular TRC meeting will be scheduled Thursday, February 26, 2009 at 10:00 a.m. in the MAG Office, Saguaro Room, pending approval of the consent agenda.

8. For information and discussion.

9. For information and discussion.

10. For information.

DRAFT MINUTES OF THE
MARICOPA ASSOCIATION OF GOVERNMENTS
TRANSPORTATION REVIEW COMMITTEE

December 4, 2008

Maricopa Association of Governments Office
302 North First Avenue, Suite 200, Saguaro Room
Phoenix, Arizona

MEMBERS ATTENDING

Phoenix: Tom Callow	*Litchfield Park: Mike Cartsonis
ADOT: Kwi-Sung Kang for Floyd Roehrich	Maricopa County: John Hauskins
*Avondale: David Fitzhugh	Mesa: Brent Stoddard for Scott Butler
*Buckeye: Scott Lowe	*Paradise Valley: Robert M. Cicarelli
*Chandler: Patrice Kraus	Peoria: David Moody
El Mirage: Pat Dennis for Lance Calvert	*Queen Creek: Mark Young
*Fountain Hills: Randy Harrel	RPTA: Bryan Jungwirth
*Gila Bend: Vacant	Scottsdale: Dave Meinhart for Mary O'Connor
Gila River: Sreedevi Samudrala for David White	Surprise: Randy Overmyer
Gilbert: Stephanie Prybyl for Tami Ryall	Tempe: Carlos de Leon
Glendale: Terry Johnson	*Valley Metro Rail: John Farry
*Goodyear: Cato Esquivel	*Wickenburg: Gary Edwards
*Guadalupe: Jim Ricker	Youngtown: Lloyce Robinson

EX-OFFICIO MEMBERS ATTENDING

Regional Bicycle Task Force: Jim Hash, City of Mesa	*Pedestrian Working Group: Brandon Forrey, City of Peoria
*Street Committee: Darryl Crossman, City of Litchfield Park	*Transportation Safety Committee: Kerry Wilcoxon, City of Phoenix
*ITS Committee: Mike Mah	
*Members neither present nor represented by proxy.	+ - Attended by Videoconference # - Attended by Audioconference

OTHERS PRESENT

Eric Anderson, MAG	Bob Antilla, Valley Metro/RPTA
Monique de los Rios-Urban, MAG	Steven Hall, ADOT
Bob Hazlett, MAG	Wylie Bearup, City of Phoenix
Roger Herzog, MAG	Ray Dovalina, City of Phoenix
Steve Tate, MAG	Tom Remes, City of Phoenix
Eileen Yazzie, MAG	Christopher Ames

1. Call to Order

Mr. Tom Callow from the City of Phoenix called the meeting to order at 10:12 a.m.

2. Approval of October 23, 2008 Draft Minutes

Mr. Callow asked if there were any changes or amendments to the meeting minutes, and there were none. Mr. David Moody from City of Peoria moved to approve the minutes. Mr. Randall Overmyer from the City of Surprise seconded the motion, and the minutes were subsequently approved by unanimous voice vote of the Committee.

3. Call to the Audience

Mr. Callow announced that a request to speak card had been submitted by Mr. Christopher Ames from the Town of Gilbert. Mr. Callow welcomed Mr. Ames and invited him to speak before the Committee.

Mr. Ames provided a compilation on non-emergency contact numbers for various law enforcement agencies throughout the County. He encouraged the Committee to disseminate the information to their communities in an effort to reduce the number of non-emergency calls directed to 911. Mr. Anderson thanked Mr. Ames and acknowledged the importance of his efforts. Mr. Anderson also commented that MAG would likely post the information provided to the MAG website.

4. Transportation Director's Report

Mr. Callow invited Mr. Eric Anderson from MAG to present the Transportation Director's Report. Mr. Anderson announced that the October revenues for the Regional Area Road Fund (RARF) were down 10.1 percent from the previous fiscal year (FY). He added that year-to-date RARF revenues were 9.6 percent lower than FY 2007 and reported a negative growth for 12 of the last 12 months.

Mr. Anderson reported that the Arizona Department of Transportation (ADOT) released the revised RARF revenue forecast. According to the revised forecast, the cumulative revenue projections decreased \$1.1 billion over the life of the tax. Mr. Anderson announced that ADOT also revised the Highway User Revenue Fund (HURF) forecast. He reported that the revised HURF forecast was \$1.8 billion lower than the previously forecasted.

Mr. Anderson cautioned that the reduced revenue forecast would have a notable impact on the Freeway Life Cycle Program. The impact of the revised forecasts included a decrease of over \$600 million in RARF revenues and \$800 million in HURF revenues over the life of the freeway program. He added that the reduced revenue forecast would also impact ADOT's ability to bond.

Mr. Anderson reminded the Committee that the revised forecasts were based on a panel discussion conducted by ADOT in August. He referenced the meltdown of the financial market and increased fears of a global recession, which occurred after the panel convened. Mr. Anderson informed the Committee that ADOT was cautioning that the forecast may need to be revised again in light of the economic changes that have occurred since August. He explained that future revisions to the ADOT revenue forecasts could be even lower.

Continuing on, Mr. Anderson reported that the price of oil was dropping. He stated that economic slowdown on a national and global scale were having a positive effect on construction pricing. He anticipated improved construction pricing on bids over the next few months.

Mr. Anderson informed the Committee that MAG begun an electronic delivery service called GovDelivery, which enabled the Committee, Member Agency Staff, and the public to receive materials and updates from MAG electronically. He announced that Committee members had the option of receiving agenda packets electronically adding that Committee members could continue to receive all materials mailed to them if desired.

Mr. Callow asked if there were any questions or comments about this agenda item. There were none, and this concluded the Transportation Director's Report.

5. Project Changes – Amendments, and Administrative Modifications to the FY 2008-2012 MAG Transportation Improvement Program

Mr. Callow announced that a replacement summary transmittal and table had been provided to the Committee. He announced that Phoenix project (PHX07-317) referenced in the summary transmittal and table provided in the agenda mail out was not voted on at the ITS Committee, and as a result, would not move forward at this time. Mr. Callow announced that the replacement materials did not include project PHX07-317. He also announced that the revised materials provided additional information about two ADOT projects voted on the previous evening by the MAG Regional Council.

Mr. Callow asked if there were any questions about the agenda item, and there were none. Mr. Moody motioned to approve the project changes as presented in the revised summary table and handout. Mr. David Meinhart from City of Scottsdale seconded, and the agenda item was approved by a unanimous voice vote of the Committee members in attendance.

6. Transportation Review Committee 2009 Meeting Schedule

Mr. Callow announced the Transportation Review Committee meeting schedule for 2009. He asked if there were any questions or comments. There were none, and Mr. Callow moved on to the next item on the agenda.

7. Development of the FY 2009-2014 MAG Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) and the FY 2010 Arterial Life Cycle Program (ALCP)

Mr. Callow invited Ms. Eileen Yazzie, MAG Transportation Programming Manager, to present on the development of the FY 2009 -2014 Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) and the FY 2010 Arterial Life Cycle Program. Ms. Yazzie announced that the MAG TIP/ALCP Data Entry System was available on the MAG website.

Ms. Yazzie informed the Committee that the data entry system would allow member agencies to update project information and add new projects in the TIP from FY 2009 to FY 2014. In addition, the data entry system would allow users to update project information for ALCP projects programmed from FY 2009 to 2026. She announced that the TIP/ALCP Data Entry System was a Microsoft Access file and stated that each member agency could download a file specific to their jurisdiction to update project data.

Next, Ms. Yazzie announced that *Safe, Accountable, Flexible, Efficient Transportation Equity Act: A Legacy for Users Act* (SAFETEA-LU) established new federal requirements that impact the TIP. First, SAFETEA-LU requires that TIP reports project costs in year of expenditure (YOE) dollars. For that reason, the TIP/ALCP Data Entry System prompts users to indicate if project cost estimates include inflation. Ms. Yazzie informed the Committee that MAG Staff would keep all data records that specify the original and inflated costs for future updates.

Continuing on, Ms. Yazzie summarized the types of projects that should be included in the TIP. She stated that all projects funded with federal funds and all regionally significant projects that are funded with federal or non-federal funds should be listed in the TIP. She explained that MAG defines a regionally significant project as a project that is on a road that:

- Serves regional transportation needs
- Is greater than one-half mile in length, or is on a freeway, freeway ramp, or roadway that carries traffic over or under a freeway at an interchange; and,
- Alters the number of striped through-lanes available for motor vehicle use, affecting the MAG transportation model.

Fixed guideway transit facilities (i.e., trackage for light rail service, or dedicated busways) that serve regional transportation needs also meet the definition of a regionally significant project and also should be included in the TIP. She explained that information to be updated included project cost, schedule, status, and elements for all projects to be programmed in FY 2010 to 2014. In addition, project information should be provided for any new regionally significant projects during that time period.

Next, Ms. Yazzie addressed updating projects programmed in the Arterial Life Cycle Program. She reported that updating ALCP projects differed from the TIP Update in that the regional reimbursements are “locked.” As a result, project change requests for ALCP projects are handled separately. She explained that project data for ALCP projects programmed from FY 2010 to FY 2026 should be updated.

Ms. Yazzie informed that Committee that the two deadlines to submit project updates had been established. A deadline of January 9, 2009 had been established for any project to be programmed in the FY 2010 - 2014 TIP, including ALCP projects programmed during that time period. A second deadline of February 6, 2009 had been established for any ALCP project programmed for FY 2015 to 2026.

Mr. Callow asked if there were any questions or comments. Mr. Bryan Jungwirth from Valley Metro/RPTA asked if all modes were to be included in the TIP and if the reimbursements would be locked for all projects. Ms. Yazzie explained that all modes would be included in the TIP; however, only the reimbursements for ALCP projects would be locked. She continued, explaining that MAG Staff coordinated with Bob Antilla from RPTA on updating transit projects in the TIP, including fixed guideway projects as well as projects programmed in the Transit Life Cycle Program. Mr. Jungwirth asked if Member Agencies should submit project updates for transit projects to MAG or to Mr. Antilla. Ms. Yazzie stated that project updates for all transit project should be directed to Mr. Antilla although the information would be incorporated into the Transportation Improvement Program.

Mr. Callow asked if there were any additional questions or comments. There were none, and Mr. Callow moved on to the next item on the agenda.

8. Status Report on the Performance Measurement Framework and Congestion Management Update Study

Then, Mr. Callow invited Ms. Monique de los Rios-Urban from MAG to present a status report on the Performance Measurement Framework and Congestion Management Update Study. Ms. de los Rios-Urban informed the Committee that the study was a 13-month project, which began in April 2008. She explained that the project team established consisted of MAG Staff and consultants from PBS&J Consultants, Cambridge Systematics, and the University of Washington. Ms. de los Rios-Urban also reported that the project team wanted the study to be a collaborative effort. Toward that end, a Technical Advisory Group (TAG) comprised of staff from various MAG Member Agencies was created.

Ms. de los Rios-Urban announced that the study would be conducted in three Phases. She stated that the main objective of the study was to develop a performance measurement framework to evaluate regional strategies at the system and corridor level. Other objectives for the study included compliance with legislative requirements both at the state and federal levels as well as updating congestion management strategies to facilitate system evaluation referenced to performance measures.

Ms. de los Rios-Urban reported that Phase I of the project included the initiation of the TAG and a best practices assessment. She informed the Committee that a draft version of the best practices report was available to download from the MAG website. She announced that Phase II included the development of a performance framework and implementation plans. In addition, Phase II consisted of an assessment of data sources and the development of reporting methodologies and visualization tools.

In conclusion, Ms. de los Rios-Urban announced that in Phase III the project team would update the congestion management process for the region. The activities for Phase III would include the identification of strategies, evaluation tools and reporting methodologies.

Mr. Callow asked if there were any questions or comments about the Performance Measurement Framework and Congestion Management Update Study. There were none, and Mr. Callow continued on to the member agency update.

9. Member Agency Update

Mr. Callow asked members of the Committee if they would like to provide updates; address any issues or concerns regarding transportation at the regional level; and asked if any members in attendance would like to address recent information that was relevant to transportation within their respective communities. There were none, and Mr. Callow moved to the next agenda item.

10. Next Meeting Date

Mr. Callow informed members in attendance that the next meeting of the Committee would be held on January 29, 2008. There being no further business, Mr. Callow adjourned the meeting at 10:30 a.m.

ATTACHMENT ONE

January 20, 2009

TO: Transportation Review Committee

FROM: Maureen DeCindis, Transportation Planner III

SUBJECT: Design Assistance Program

The FY 2009 MAG Unified Planning Work Program and Annual Budget, approved by the MAG Regional Council in May 2008, includes \$150,000 for the Pedestrian Design Assistance Program and \$250,000 for the Bicycle/Shared-Use Design Assistance Program. The design programs allow MAG member agencies to apply for funding for the design portion of bicycle or pedestrian projects.

For FY 2009, seven MAG Member Agencies submitted eight projects requesting \$646,000 in funding. On January 20, 2009, the MAG Regional Bicycle Task Force and the MAG Pedestrian Working Group recommended projects for approval. Please refer to the attached table for the ranking of the projects.

DESIGN ASSISTANCE PROGRAM 2009
Regional Bicycle Task Force and the Pedestrian Working Group
Technical Rankings

Available Funding for Bicycle Projects: \$250,000

Bicycle Projects	Rank	Recommended Funding	Notes
Tempe/Mesa: Rio Salado Shared-Use Path	1	\$ 142,000	
Buckeye: BID Canal	2	\$ 58,000	
Glendale: Neighborhood Access Improve	3	\$ 50,000	
Surprise: Bell Road Multi-Use Trail	4	\$ -	Project submitted did not meet the AASHTO Guidelines for Multi-Use Paths
Gilbert: Galveston Off-Road System	---	---	Removed from consideration by the Town of Gilbert
Total		\$ 250,000	

Available Funding for Pedestrian Projects: \$150,000

Pedestrian Projects	Rank	Recommended Funding	Notes
Phoenix: Historical Garfield District	1	\$ 80,000	
Fountain Hills: Saguaro Blvd Sidewalk Gap	2	\$ 70,000	
Glendale: Sahuaro Ranch Regional Park	3	\$ -	Insufficient regional funds to apply towards a third project
Totals		\$ 150,000	

ATTACHMENT TWO



**MARICOPA
ASSOCIATION of
GOVERNMENTS**

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

January 16, 2009

TO: *Members of the Transportation Review Committee*

FROM: *Eileen O. Yazzie, Transportation Programming Manager*

SUBJECT: *DRAFT TRANSPORTATION REVIEW COMMITTEE PROGRAMMING GUIDELINES*

The Transportation Review Committee (TRC) requested a Working Group at the September 2008 TRC Meeting to develop TRC Guidelines for recommending projects to be programmed with Federal Funds. The Working Group met in October 2008 and earlier this month. The attached Draft Guideline document was developed at these meetings and is on the agenda for information, discussion, and possible action to approve the Draft TRC Federal Fund Project Selection Guidelines.

For further information or questions, please contact me at eyazzie@mag.maricopa.gov or at 602.254.6300.

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

MAG Transportation Review Committee DRAFT Guidelines for Recommending Projects to be Programmed with Federal Funds (CMAQ Funds)

Members of the Transportation Review Committee may use the following information, provided by MAG staff, as guidance to recommend projects to be programmed with federal funds:

1. The rank ordered project application list from the Technical Advisory Committees (TAC).
2. The calculated emission reduction and corresponding cost-effectiveness for proposed Congestion Mitigation Air Quality (CMAQ) funded projects (Quantitative Analyses) and its role in the TAC review process.
3. Project Review information sheets from the TACs and how the project(s) relate to the MAG RTP funding allocations, Goals, and Priority Criteria (Qualitative Assessment). The Project Review information sheets include information from the project application, and project information that was discussed at the TAC meetings.
4. A list of CMAQ funded projects in the current approved MAG Transportation Improvement Program (TIP).

Appendix A - The US Department of Transportation FHWA Final Guidance on the Congestion Mitigation and Air Quality (CMAQ) Program - Section VII. Project Selection Process – General Conditions

Appendix B - The funding allocation recommendations from the MAG Regional Transportation Plan (RTP).

Appendix C - The MAG RTP Goals.

Appendix D - The MAG RTP Priority Criteria.

APPENDIX A

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION, Federal Highway Administration
[FHWA Docket No. FHWA–2006–26383]
Publication of Final Guidance on the Congestion Mitigation and Air Quality Improvement (CMAQ) Program
<http://www.fhwa.dot.gov/environment/cmaq08gm.htm>

VIII. PROJECT SELECTION PROCESS-GENERAL CONDITIONS

Proposals for CMAQ funding should include a precise description of the project, providing information on its size, scope, location, and timetable. Also, an assessment of the project's expected emission reduction benefits is required prior to project selection to better inform the selection of CMAQ projects (See Below).

A. Air Quality Analysis

1. Quantitative Analyses

Quantified emissions benefits (i.e., emissions reductions) and disbenefits (i.e., emissions increases) should be included in all project proposals, except where it is not possible to quantify emissions benefits (see Qualitative Assessment, below). Benefits and disbenefits should be included for all pollutants for which the area is in nonattainment or maintenance status. Benefits should be listed in a consistent fashion (i.e., kg/day) across projects to allow accurate comparison during the project selection process.

State and local transportation and air quality agencies conduct CMAQ-project air quality analyses with different approaches, analytical capabilities, and technical expertise. The SAFETEA-LU encourages State DOTs and MPOs to consult with State and local air quality agencies about the estimated emission reductions from CMAQ proposals.¹ However, while no single method is specified, every effort must be taken to ensure that determinations of air quality benefits are credible and based on a reproducible and logical analytical procedure.

2. Qualitative Assessment

Although quantitative analysis of air quality impacts is required for almost all project types, an exception to this requirement will be made when it is not possible to accurately quantify emissions benefits. In these cases, a qualitative assessment based on a reasoned and logical determination that the project or program will decrease emissions and contribute to attainment or maintenance of a NAAQS is acceptable.

¹ 23 U.S.C. §149(e) (SAFETEA-LU §1808(e))

Public education, marketing, and other outreach efforts, which can include advertising alternatives to SOV travel, employer outreach, and public education campaigns, may fall into this category. The primary benefit of these activities is enhanced communication and outreach that is expected to influence travel behavior, and thus air quality.

3. Analyzing Groups of Projects

In some situations, it may be more appropriate to examine the impacts of comprehensive strategies to improve air quality by grouping projects. For example, transit improvements coupled with demand management to reduce SOV use in a corridor might best be analyzed together. Other examples include linked signalization projects, transit improvements, marketing and outreach programs, and ridesharing programs that affect an entire region or corridor.

4. Tradeoffs

As noted above, emissions benefits should be calculated for all pollutants for which an area is in nonattainment or maintenance status. Some potential projects may lead to benefits for one pollutant and increased emissions for another, especially when the balance involves precursors such as NO_x and VOC. States and MPOs should consult with relevant air agencies to weigh the net benefits of the project.

APPENDIX B

RTP 2007 Update PERCENTAGE DISTRIBUTION OF REGIONAL REVENUES: FY 2008-2028 (Percentage of Funding Source Total)

Sources	Uses						Total
	Highways/ Freeways	Arterial Streets	Bus Transit	Light Rail Transit	Bicycle/ Ped.	Air Quality	
Proposition 400: Half Cent Sales Tax Extension (RARF)	56.2%	10.5%	18.9%	14.4%			100.0%
ADOT Funds (Includes HURF and Federal)	100.0%						100.0%
STAN (Funds)	100.0%						100.0%
Federal Transit (5307 Funds)			100.0%				100.0%
Federal Transit (5309 Funds)			17.0%	83.0%			100.0%
Federal Highway (MAG STP)	20.4%	79.6%					100.0%
Federal Highway (MAG CMAQ)	19.1%	13.4%	3.0%	32.9%	17.0%	14.6%	100.0%
Total	58.8%	9.6%	17.0%	13.4%	0.7%	0.6%	100.0%

APPENDIX C

RTP Goals and Objectives

A goal is a general statement of purpose that represents a long-term desired end to a specific state of affairs. It is generally measurable by qualitative means. By identifying broad goals that are both visionary and practical, and which respond to the values of the region, the focus of the planning process can be more readily communicated to the public. The goals, in turn, can be defined in greater detail by specifying multiple objectives for each goal.

An objective is very similar to a goal, as it represents a desired end to a specific state of affairs. However, an objective is an intermediate result that must be realized to reach a goal. The definition of an objective is usually more focused than that of a goal and is typically more subject to being measured. Objectives can be further assessed through performance measures that are identified for each objective.

Certain goals and objectives are related to the way in which the regional transportation system is performing overall. Others may be used to evaluate individual components of the overall transportation system or to evaluate proposed projects. They can also serve as the basis to monitor how the transportation system performs as the RTP is implemented. In addition, goals and objectives relate to the planning process and the importance of accountability during the development and implementation of the plan. Individual goals with their supporting objectives are listed below.

Goal 1: System Preservation and Safety

Transportation infrastructure that is properly maintained and safe, preserving past investments for the future.

- **Objective 1A:** Provide for the continuing preservation and maintenance needs of transportation facilities and services in the region, eliminating maintenance backlogs.
- **Objective 1B:** Provide a safe and secure environment for the traveling public, addressing roadway hazards, pedestrian and bicycle safety, and transit security.

Goal 2: Access and Mobility

Transportation systems and services that provide accessibility, mobility and modal choices for residents, businesses and the economic development of the region.

- **Objective 2A:** Maintain an acceptable and reliable level of service on transportation and mobility systems serving the region, taking into account performance by mode and facility type.
- **Objective 2B:** Provide residents of the region with access to jobs, shopping, educational, cultural, and recreational opportunities and provide employers with reasonable access to the workforce in the region.
- **Objective 2C:** Maintain a reasonable and reliable travel time for moving freight into, through and within the region, as well as provide high-quality access between intercity freight transportation corridors and freight terminal locations, including intermodal facilities for air, rail and truck cargo.

- **Objective 2D:** Provide the people of the region with transportation modal options necessary to carry out their essential daily activities and support equitable access to the region's opportunities.
- **Objective 2E:** Address the needs of the elderly and other population groups that may have special transportation needs, such as non-drivers or those with disabilities.

Goal 3: Sustaining the Environment

Transportation improvements that help sustain our environment and quality of life.

- **Objective 3A:** Identify and encourage implementation of mitigation measures that will reduce noise, visual and traffic impacts of transportation projects on existing neighborhoods.
- **Objective 3B:** Encourage programs and land use planning that advance efficient trip-making patterns in the region.
- **Objective 3C:** Make transportation decisions that are compatible with air quality conformity and water quality standards, the sustainable preservation of key regional ecosystems and desired lifestyles.

Goal 4: Accountability and Planning

Transportation decisions that result in effective and efficient use of public resources and strong public support.

- **Objective 4A:** Make transportation investment decisions that use public resources effectively and efficiently, using performance-based planning.
- **Objective 4B:** Establish revenue sources and mechanisms that provide consistent funding for regional transportation and mobility needs.
- **Objective 4C:** Develop a regionally balanced plan that provides geographic equity in the distribution of investments.
- **Objective 4D:** Recognize previously authorized corridors that are currently in the adopted MAG Long-Range Transportation Plan; i.e., Loop 303 and the South Mountain Corridor.
- **Objective 4E:** Achieve broad public support for needed investments in transportation infrastructure and resources for continuing operations of transportation and mobility services.

APPENDIX D

RTP Priority Criteria

Arizona Revised Statute 28-6354.B directs MAG to develop criteria to establish the priority of corridors, corridor segments, and other transportation projects. These criteria include public and private funding participation; the consideration of social and community impacts; the establishment of a complete transportation system for the region; the construction of projects to serve regional transportation needs; the construction of segments to provide connectivity on the regional system; and other relevant criteria for regional transportation.

As part of the regional transportation planning process, MAG has applied these kinds of criteria, both for the development and the implementation of the Regional Transportation Plan (RTP). The RTP was developed through a performance-base process that evaluated alternatives relative to a range of performance measures. Also, specific criteria were considered as part of the process to schedule the implementation of transportation projects throughout the duration of the planning period. The discussion below describes how the criteria applied in the RTP planning process correspond to the categories included in ARS 28-6354.B.

Extent of Local Public and Private Funding Participation

A higher level of local public and private funding participation in the RTP benefits the region by leveraging regional revenues and helping ensure local government commitment to the success of the regional program. The extent of local public and private funding participation is addressed in a number of ways in the MAG transportation planning process.

- **Project Matching Requirements** - In developing funding allocations among the various RTP components and project types, local matching requirements have been established. The local matching requirements in the RTP are:
 - 30 percent major street projects, including ITS elements.
 - 30 percent bicycle and pedestrian projects.
 - For air quality and transit projects involving Federal funds, minimum Federal match requirements were assumed. Depending on the specific project funding mix, this match may be provided from regional revenue sources.
- **Private Funding Participation** - As part of the policies and procedures developed for the Arterial Street Life Cycle Program, private funding participation is recognized as applicable local match for half-cent funds for street and intersections projects. This policy helps free local monies that may then be applied to additional transportation improvements.
- **Local Government Incentives** - In the Arterial Street Life Cycle Program, incentives to make efficient use of regional funds have been established by ensuring that project savings by local governments may be applied to new projects in the jurisdiction that achieved those savings.

Social and Community Impacts

Regional transportation improvements can have both beneficial and negative social and community impacts. It is important to conduct a thorough assessment of these impacts, to ensure that they are taken into account in the decision-making process. The MAG planning effort assesses social and community impacts at each key stage of the transportation planning and programming process. In addition, it should be noted that similar efforts are carried out by the agencies implementing specific transportation improvement projects.

- **Public Participation and Community Outreach** - An aggressive citizen participation and outreach program is conducted to obtain public views on the potential community and social impacts of transportation improvements. In particular, input is sought regarding the possible impacts of specific transportation alternatives on the community's social values and physical structure.
- **Social Impact Assessment** - The social impact of transportation options is evaluated as part of the Title VI/Environmental Justice assessment. In this assessment, potential transportation impacts are evaluated for key communities of concern, including minority populations, low-income populations, aged populations, mobility disability populations, and female head of household populations. In addition, community goals are taken into account by basing future travel demand estimates, on local land use plans.
- **Corridor and Community Impact Assessment** - Corridor-level analyses are conducted, which assess the possible social and community impacts of alternative facility alignments based on neighborhood factors such as noise, air quality and land use. Community impacts of transportation facilities are further analyzed by assessing air quality effects through the emissions analysis of plan alternatives, as well as conducting a Federally required air quality conformity analysis of the RTP. In addition, the process for annually updating the Regional Transportation Improvement Program includes project air quality scores, which reflect the potential community impacts of the projects.

Establishment of a Complete Transportation System for the Region

The RTP calls for major investments in all elements of the regional transportation system over the next several decades. It is critical that these expenditures result in a complete and integrated transportation network for the region. The MAG planning process responds directly to this need by conducting transportation planning at the system level, giving priority to segments that can lead to a complete transportation system as quickly as possible, and maintaining a life cycle programming process for all the major modes.

- **System Level Planning Approach** - The regional planning effort is conducted at the system level, taking into account all transportation modes in all parts of the MAG geographic area. This systems level approach is applied in identifying and analyzing alternatives, as well as specifying the final RTP. In this way, the complete transportation needs of the region, as a whole, are identified and addressed in the planning process.
- **Project Development Process and Project Readiness** - The implementation of regional transportation projects requires a complex development process. This process involves extensive corridor assessments, environmental studies, and engineering concept analyses. This is followed by right-of-way acquisition and final design work, before actual

construction may begin. For a variety of reasons, certain projects may progress through this process more rapidly than others. By moving forward, where possible, on those projects with the highest level of readiness for construction, important transportation improvements can be delivered as quickly as possible.

- **Progress on Multiple Projects** - Major needs for transportation improvements exist throughout the MAG Region. The scheduling of projects is aimed at proceeding with improvements to the transportation network throughout the planning period in all areas of the region. This will lead toward a complete and functioning regional transportation system that benefits all parts of the MAG Region.
- **Revenues, Expenditures and Life Cycle Programming** - Cash flow patterns from revenue sources limit the amount of work that can be accomplished within a given period of time. Project expenditures need to be scheduled to accommodate these cash flows. Life cycle programs have been established that take these conditions into account and implement the projects in the RTP for the major transportation modes: freeways/highways, arterial streets, and transit. The life cycle programs provide a budget process that ensures that the estimated cost of the program of improvements does not exceed the total amount of revenues available. This ensures that a complete transportation system for the region will be developed within available revenues.

As part of the life cycle programming process, consideration is given to bonding a portion of cash flows to implement projects that provide critical connections earlier than might otherwise be possible. This has to be weighed against the reduction in total revenues available for constructing projects, which results from interest costs.

Construction of Projects to Serve Regional Transportation Needs

The resources to implement the RTP are drawn from regional revenue sources and should address regional transportation needs. Transportation projects that serve broad regional needs should have a higher priority than those that primarily only serve a local area. At the same time, the nature of regional transportation needs varies across the MAG Region and the same type of transportation solution does not apply everywhere in the region. Enhancing the arterial network may represent the most pressing regional need in one part of the region, whereas adding new freeway corridors may be the key need in another; and expanding transit capacity may represent the best approach in yet another area. The process to develop the RTP recognized that this was the nature of regional transportation needs in the MAG Region. As a result, the RTP is structured to respond to different types of needs in different parts of the MAG Region.

Although the modal emphasis of the transportation improvements identified in the RTP varies from area to area, the effects of these improvements can be assessed using common measures of system performance and regional mobility. The measures that were utilized for this purpose are described below. These criteria were applied in the development of the RTP to evaluate alternatives and establish implementation priorities. They can also be applied in the future to evaluate potential adjustments to the priority of corridors, corridor segments, and other transportation projects and services.

- **Facility/Service Performance Measures** - Facility performance measures focus on the amount of travel on specific facilities, the usage of transportation services, the degree of

congestion, and other indicators of the level of service as provided:

- Accident rate per million miles of passenger travel.
- Travel time between selected origins and destinations.
- Peak period delay by facility type and geographic location.
- Peak hour speed by facility type and geographic location.
- Number of major intersections at level of service "E" or worse.
- Miles of freeways with level of service "E" or worse during peak period.
- Average Daily Traffic on freeways/highways and arterials
- Total transit ridership by route and transit mode.
- Cost effectiveness: trips served per dollar invested.

- **Mobility Measures** - Mobility measures focus on the availability of transportation facilities and services, as well as the range of service options as provided:

- Percentage of persons within 30 minutes travel time of employment by mode.
- Jobs and housing within one-quarter mile distance of transit service.
- Percentage of workforce that can reach their workplace by transit within one hour with no more than one transfer.
- Per Capita Vehicle Miles of Travel (VMT) by facility type and mode.
- Households within one-quarter mile of transit.
- Transit share of travel (by transit sub-mode).
- Households within five miles of park-and-ride lots or major transit centers

Construction of Segments that Provide Connectivity with other Elements of the Regional Transportation System

The phasing of the development of the transportation network should be done in a logical sequence, so that maximum possible system continuity, connectivity and efficiency are maintained. In the RTP, Appropriately located transportation facilities around the region enhance the general mobility throughout the region. To the extent possible, facility construction and transportation service should be sequenced to result in a continuous and coherent network and to avoid gaps and isolated segments, bottlenecks and dead-end routes. Segments that allow for the connection of existing portions of the transportation system should be given a higher priority than segments that do not provide connectivity.

Other relevant criteria developed by the regional planning agency

As part of the RTP, a series of objectives for the regional transportation network were identified. Two key objectives were to achieve broad public support for the needed investments, and to develop a regionally balanced plan that provides geographic equity in the distribution of investments. Specific criteria related to these objectives are:

- Transportation decisions that result in effective and efficient use of public resources and strong public support.
- Geographic distribution of transportation investments.
- Inclusion of committed corridors.

ATTACHMENT THREE

December 18, 2008

TO: Members of the MAG Transportation Review Committee

FROM: John Kross, Queen Creek, Chair of the MAG Air Quality Technical Advisory Committee

SUBJECT: MAG AIR QUALITY TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
RECOMMENDATIONS ON A RANKING OF PROPOSED PM-10
PAVING UNPAVED ROAD PROJECTS FOR FY 2011 AND FY 2012
CMAQ FUNDING

On December 11, 2008, the MAG Air Quality Technical Advisory Committee (AQTAC) made recommendations on a ranking of Proposed PM-10 Paving Unpaved Road Projects for FY 2011 and FY 2012 CMAQ funding to the MAG Transportation Review Committee (see attachment). The AQTAC made a recommendation to forward the complete list of proposed PM-10 Paving Unpaved Road Projects for FY 2011 CMAQ funding and to fund projects on the list through the Salt River Pima - Maricopa Indian Community project. In addition, the AQTAC made a recommendation to forward the complete list of proposed PM-10 Paving Unpaved Road Projects for FY 2012 CMAQ funding and to fund projects on the list through the City of Phoenix project.

Since the AQTAC meeting, the table has been revised for the Tempe paving project to accurately reflect the mileage used in the cost-effectiveness calculation reviewed by the Committee. The revision did not change the ranking of the projects. It is anticipated that the MAG Transportation Review Committee may make a recommendation on these projects for inclusion in the FY 2010-2014 MAG Transportation Improvement Program.

The paving of dirt road projects support 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. The FY 2008-2012 MAG Transportation Improvement Program identifies \$3,658,362 in FY 2011 CMAQ funding and \$5,004,000 in FY 2012 CMAQ funding for Paving Unpaved Road Projects.

For FY 2011, twenty-two projects requesting approximately \$14.0 million in CMAQ funds were evaluated. Also, for FY 2012, eleven projects requesting approximately \$9.4 million in federal funds were evaluated. Project applications were due by September 19, 2008. MAG staff conducted an evaluation of the proposed projects for estimated emission reductions and corresponding cost-effectiveness for FY 2011 and FY 2012 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

MAG Air Quality Technical Advisory Committee Recommendation
Ranking of Proposed PM-10 Paving Unpaved Road Projects For FY 2011 CMAQ Funding
 \$3,658,362 available in FY 2011 of the FY 2008-2012 MAG Transportation Improvement Program

Agency	Location	Project Description	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 (CMAQ dollars / metric ton)	CMAQ Funds Requested	Local Funds	Total Cost *
Fort McDowell Yavapai Nation	Hiawatha Hood Rd, SR-87 to 3 miles north (FMYN Phase 3)	Pave approximately 24 feet wide dirt road with an expected minimum cross-section of 4 inches of AC on up to 12 inches of subgrade, as determined by the geotechnical report. Anything more than that would be regarded as more than "paving of a dirt road" and FMYN will provide the additional costs. This roadway leads from State Route 87 north for over ten miles and is the primary access point for several Tribal Enterprises, which generate a lot of recreational and heavy truck traffic. 3 miles	Pave unpaved road	2011	3.0	0.00	0.00	1157.77	1157.77	\$179	\$1,122,877	\$67,873	\$1,190,750
Gilbert	Ryan Road Pavement Project	The Town of Gilbert plans to pave Ryan Road between Greenfield Road and 164th Street (approximately 2,580 feet).	Pave unpaved road	2011	0.5	0.00	0.00	108.91	108.91	\$275	\$162,760	\$9,840	\$172,600
Buckeye	North Watson Road and MC85 Phase I and Phase II	This project proposes to pave two lanes of 3" thick asphalt concrete on 4" of crushed aggregate North Watson Road, ~ 0.25 mile in length north. Phase II will be a continuation of the phase I project where Phase I is the environmental, utility and right of way clearance and Phase II is the construction and implementation of the plan.	Pave unpaved road	2011	0.2	0.00	0.00	40.80	40.80	\$291	\$64,456	\$3,896	\$68,352
Fort McDowell Yavapai Nation	Mustang Way, 1.5 miles north of Fort McDowell Rd, 4 miles north to the northern boundary (Rio Verde) (FMYN Phase 4)	Pave approximately 24 feet wide dirt road with a minimum depth of 3 inches of AC on up to 8 inches of subgrade, as determined by the geotechnical report. This roadway is the continuation of Fort McDowell Road (a MCDOT maintained facility), and connects to the rural community of Rio Verde approximately 5.5 miles north of where Fort McDowell Road currently ends. 4 miles	Pave unpaved road	2011	4.0	0.00	0.00	751.99	751.99	\$291	\$1,187,709	\$71,791	\$1,259,500
El Mirage	Westside Downtown Alley Paving Project	Paving existing unpaved alleys in the west side of the downtown area (West of El Mirage Road). The project termini is generally Santa Fe Lane to the north, Thunderbird Avenue to the south, 5th Avenue to the west, and El Mirage Road to the east. Alleys to be 16' edge to edge chip and seal with dust proof surface (millings) to edge of alley ROW.	Pave unpaved alleys	2011	1.7	0.00	0.00	67.70	67.70	\$604	\$222,000	\$24,500	\$246,500
Salt River Pima-Maricopa Indian Community	SRP-MIC Pave Dirt Roads Program, Phase 1: McDonald Road and Mesa Drive	Pre-design, design and construction portion of phase 1 of up to 7 miles of dirt roads within the Salt River Pima-Maricopa Indian Community boundaries.	Pave unpaved road	2011	1.8	0.00	0.00	276.35	276.35	\$625	\$938,285	\$56,715	\$995,000
Subtotal											\$3,698,087		
Amount Available											\$3,658,362		
Balance											-\$39,725		

MAG Air Quality Technical Advisory Committee Recommendation
Ranking of Proposed PM-10 Paving Unpaved Road Projects For FY 2011 CMAQ Funding
 \$3,658,362 available in FY 2011 of the FY 2008-2012 MAG Transportation Improvement Program

Agency	Location	Project Description	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 (CMAQ dollars / metric ton)	CMAQ Funds Requested	Local Funds	Total Cost *
Maricopa County	17th Avenue, Maddock Road to Joy Ranch Road	Paving of an unpaved road in the PM-10 nonattainment area. Dust mitigation, including: Application of 2 inches of asphaltic concrete pavement on compacted native soil; thickened edges as appropriate; and 20 to 24-foot roadway width.	Pave unpaved road	2011	0.5	0.00	0.00	66.24	66.24	\$825	\$296,830	\$17,942	\$314,772
Buckeye	7th Street-Norton Drive from Beloat Road (South)	This project proposes to pave two lanes of 3" thick asphalt concrete on 4" of crushed aggregate on 7th Street, ~ 0.5 mile in length south from Beloat avenue. This road feeds the Town Waste Water Treatment Plant and Fire Training Facility and future Police Training Facility.	Pave unpaved road	2011	0.4	0.00	0.00	25.70	25.70	\$847	\$118,169	\$7,143	\$125,312
Maricopa County	88th Avenue, Deer Valley Road to Williams Road	Paving of an unpaved road in the PM-10 nonattainment area.	Pave unpaved road	2011	0.5	0.00	0.00	67.15	67.15	\$984	\$358,670	\$21,680	\$380,350
Maricopa County	White Wing Road, 171st Avenue (Cotton Lane) to 163rd Avenue (Sarival Avenue)	Paving of an unpaved road in the PM-10 nonattainment area. Dust mitigation, including: Application of 2 inches of asphaltic concrete pavement on compacted native soil; thickened edges as appropriate; and 20 to 24-foot roadway width.	Pave unpaved road	2011	1.0	0.00	0.00	126.45	126.45	\$1,002	\$687,885	\$41,580	\$729,465
Maricopa County	87th Avenue, Deer Valley Road to Peoria CL (Via Montoya Rd)	Paving of an unpaved road in the PM-10 nonattainment area.	Pave unpaved road	2011	0.3	0.00	0.00	25.43	25.43	\$1,348	\$186,146	\$11,252	\$197,398
Phoenix +	2011 CMAQ Alley Dust Proofing	This project will dust proof approximately 41 miles of unstabilized alleys within the City of Phoenix using a 3/8" Fractured Aggregate Surface Treatment (FAST) which provides a single application of rubberized asphalt and precoated chips to existing dirt alleys. Clearing, grubbing and subgrade preparation will be required for application of the material.	Pave unpaved alleys	2011	41.2	0.00	0.00	248.61	248.61	\$1,488	\$2,008,445	\$190,000	\$2,198,445
Surprise	Paving Dove Valley Road from 203rd Ave. to 187th Ave	This project will consist of paving approximately two miles of Dove Valley Road located between 203rd Ave. to 187th Ave. The improvements will consist of constructing cut off walls for minor drainage purposes. This project will reduce dust emission in this area.	Pave unpaved road	2011	2.0	0.00	0.00	114.11	114.11	\$1,544	\$956,800	\$68,200	\$1,025,000
Maricopa County	Briles Road, Reems Road (155th Ave) to end of maintenance (151st Ave)	Paving of an unpaved road in the PM-10 nonattainment area.	Pave unpaved road	2011	0.5	0.00	0.00	27.02	27.02	\$2,166	\$317,731	\$19,205	\$336,936

MAG Air Quality Technical Advisory Committee Recommendation
Ranking of Proposed PM-10 Paving Unpaved Road Projects For FY 2011 CMAQ Funding
 \$3,658,362 available in FY 2011 of the FY 2008-2012 MAG Transportation Improvement Program

Agency	Location	Project Description	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 (CMAQ dollars / metric ton)	CMAQ Funds Requested	Local Funds	Total Cost *
Tempe	Alley Stabilization	The city of Tempe has an ongoing alley reconstruction program which includes removing soil fines and old soil material and replacing with recycled asphalt (RAP). Approximately 130 miles of unpaved alleys remain. Funding this project will allow the city of Tempe to accelerate its stabilization program in order to reduce PM 10 emissions.	Pave unpaved alleys	2011	25.0	0.00	0.00	150.86	150.86	\$2,346	\$1,921,824	\$768,850	\$2,690,674
Youngtown	Youngtown Pave Dirt Alleys, Phase 1	Pre-design, design and paving of approximately 3.8 miles of dirt alleyways within the Town of Youngtown	Pave unpaved alleys	2011	3.8	0.00	0.00	67.70	67.70	\$3,005	\$1,104,959	\$66,790	\$1,171,749
Avondale	McDowell Road, Avondale Blvd.to 107th Avenue	Starting at a point 800 ft west of 107th Ave and ending at a point 2600 ft west of 107th Ave there exists approx 1800 ft (.34 miles) of insufficient unpaved shoulder; the existing shoulders vary from 2 to 2.5 feet. Based upon dust that occurs when vehicular traffic pulls off the road and when the farmers pull off, the City would like to expand the shoulder width to 5-foot MCDOT criteria (Roadway Design Guidelines) Due to exist lane widths, there are no opportunities to re-stripe the roadway.	Pave unpaved shoulders	2011	0.34	0.00	0.00	3.54	3.54	\$7,115	\$136,800	\$8,373	\$145,173
Buckeye ++	Shoulder Paving Beloat Road from Miller to Rainbow	This project proposes to pave two shoulders of 2" thick asphalt concrete w/4" Aggregate base course on Beloat Road, ~ 3 miles in length (east-west).	Pave unpaved shoulders	2011	3	0.00	0.00	10.67	10.67	\$8,200	\$475,000	\$28,712	\$503,712
Avondale	Van Buren Street-99th Avenue to the Aqua Fria River	Along Van Buren Street there are six segments of roadway (1.44 Miles) from 99th Avenue west to the Aqua Fria River of insufficient unpaved shoulder where the exist paved shoulder is non-existent or it is does not meet the min width of 5 ft (MCDOT-Rdwy Design Manual). Due to exist lane widths, there is no opportunity to re-stripe the roadway.	Pave unpaved shoulders	2011	1.44	0.00	0.00	8.36	8.36	\$12,582	\$571,300	\$34,538	\$605,838
Avondale	Avondale Blvd-McDowell Road to Encanto	Starting at a McDowell Road and ending at Encanto there exists approximately 2600 ft (.39 miles) of insufficient unpaved shoulder on the Westside of Avondale Blvd. where the exist paved shoulder is non-existent or it does not meet the min width of 5 ft (MCDOT-Rdwy Design Manual). Due to exist lane widths, there is no opportunity to re-stripe the roadway.	Pave unpaved shoulders	2011	0.39	0.00	0.00	2.05	2.05	\$14,175	\$157,600	\$9,557	\$167,157

MAG Air Quality Technical Advisory Committee Recommendation
Ranking of Proposed PM-10 Paving Unpaved Road Projects For FY 2011 CMAQ Funding
 \$3,658,362 available in FY 2011 of the FY 2008-2012 MAG Transportation Improvement Program

Agency	Location	Project Description	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 (CMAQ dollars / metric ton)	CMAQ Funds Requested	Local Funds	Total Cost *
Avondale	Vermeersch/127th Avenue	Both shoulders of Vermeersch are non-existent causing a dust problem which has been a source of complaints and which has been documented by the County's AIR Quality Unit. A large number of trucks from the local quarry is the mainpoint of the dust. Shoulders would be installed from Lower Buckeye to Broadway. In addition, additional pavement will be added at all driveway locations (up to the right of way line).	Pave unpaved shoulders	2011	1.2	0.00	0.00	1.81	1.81	\$93,760	\$922,488	\$55,761	\$978,249
Goodyear	165th Ave from Watkins to Durango	This segment is currently 18.58' wide with curb and gutter on the east side, we propose to pave 6' of shoulder on the west half of the road to meet the city's typical cross section of a two lane road, this will provide two travel lanes preventing vehicles from driving on the dirt shoulder causing dust.	Pave unpaved shoulders	2011	0.25	0.00	0.00	0.04	0.04	\$576,621	\$124,462	\$7,523	\$131,985
Total											\$14,043,196		

+Phoenix project contains 4.4 miles of alleys to be paved within 1.0 mile of PM-10 monitors.

+ Buckeye project contains a 1-mile segment within 1.0 mile of a PM-10 monitor.

* Costs shown are only for construction portion of project.

MAG Air Quality Technical Advisory Committee Recommendation
Ranking of Proposed PM-10 Paving Unpaved Road Projects For FY 2012 CMAQ Funding
 \$5,004,000 available in FY 2012 of the FY 2008-2012 MAG Transportation Improvement Program

Agency	Location	Project Description	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 (CMAQ dollars / metric ton)	CMAQ Funds Requested	Local Funds	Total Cost *
Salt River Pima-Maricopa Indian Community	SRP-MIC Pave Dirt Roads Program, Phase 3: Dobson Road and Center Street	Design and construction portion of phase 3 of up to a total of 7 miles of dirt roads within the Salt River Pima-Maricopa Indian Community boundaries.	Pave unpaved road	2012	1.8	0.00	0.00	289.99	289.99	\$587	\$924,140	\$55,860	\$980,000
Gilbert	Walnut Road Pavement Project	The Town of Gilbert plans to pave Walnut Road between 162nd Street and 164th Street (approximately 1,290 feet).	Pave unpaved road	2012	0.3	0.00	0.00	27.23	27.23	\$589	\$87,038	\$5,262	\$92,300
El Mirage	Eastside Downtown Alley Paving Project	Paving existing unpaved alleys in the east side of the downtown area (East of El Mirage Road). The project termini is generally Grand Ave to the north, Thunderbird Avenue to the south, El Mirage Road to the west, and El Frio Street to the east. Alleys to be 16' edge to edge chip and seal with dust proof surface (millings) to edge of alley ROW.	Pave unpaved alleys	2012	2.2	0.00	0.00	86.02	86.02	\$602	\$281,000	\$31,100	\$312,100
Salt River Pima-Maricopa Indian Community	SRP-MIC Pave Dirt Roads Program, Phase 2: McDonald Road and Alma School Road	Design and construction portion of phase 2 of up to a total of 7 miles of dirt roads within the Salt River Pima-Maricopa Indian Community boundaries.	Pave unpaved road	2012	1.6	0.00	0.00	269.21	269.21	\$655	\$957,145	\$57,855	\$1,015,000
Gilbert	Bonanza Road Pavement Project	The Town of Gilbert plans to pave Bonanza Road between 156th Street and 157th Street (approximately 730 feet).	Pave unpaved road	2012	0.2	0.00	0.00	10.89	10.89	\$901	\$53,279	\$3,221	\$56,500
Surprise	Paving Dove Valley Road from 163rd Ave. to 179th Ave	This project will consist of paving approximately two miles of Dove Valley Road located between 163rd Ave. to 179th Ave. The improvements will consist of constructing cut off walls for minor drainage purposes. This project will reduce dust emission in this area.	Pave unpaved road	2012	2.0	0.00	0.00	114.11	114.11	\$1,544	\$956,800	\$68,200	\$1,025,000
Phoenix +	2012 CMAQ Alley Dust Proofing	This project will dust proof approximately 40 miles of unstabilized alleys within the City of Phoenix using a 3/8" Fractured Aggregate Surface Treatment (FAST) which provides a single application of rubberized asphalt and pre-coated chips to existing dirt alleys. Clearing, grubbing and subgrade preparation will be required for application of the material.	Pave unpaved alleys	2012	40.0	0.00	0.00	238.31	238.31	\$1,553	\$2,009,471	\$190,000	\$2,199,471
Subtotal											\$5,268,873		
Amount Available											\$5,004,000		
Balance											-\$264,873		

MAG Air Quality Technical Advisory Committee Recommendation
Ranking of Proposed PM-10 Paving Unpaved Road Projects For FY 2012 CMAQ Funding
 \$5,004,000 available in FY 2012 of the FY 2008-2012 MAG Transportation Improvement Program

Agency	Location	Project Description	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 (CMAQ dollars / metric ton)	CMAQ Funds Requested	Local Funds	Total Cost *
Fort McDowell Yavapai Nation	Hiawatha Hood Rd, 3 miles north to 7 miles north (FMYN Phase 6)	Pave approximately 24 feet wide dirt road with an expected minimum cross-section of 4 inches of AC on up to 12 inches of subgrade, as determined by the geotechnical report. This segment continues the paving of Hiawatha Hood Rd that was requested as Priority One. 4 miles	Pave unpaved road	2012	4.0	0.00	0.00	131.66	131.66	\$1,674	\$1,197,139	\$72,361	\$1,269,500
Fort McDowell Yavapai Nation	Ironwood, Harquahala and Sandtrap Rds (FMYN Phase 5)	Pave approximately 24 feet wide dirt road with a minimum depth of 3 inches of AC on 8 inches of subgrade, as determined by the geotechnical report. Anything more than that would be regarded as more than "paving of a dirt road" and FMYN will provide the additional costs. These are three separate roadways in the same southern area of the FMYN and all three connect at both ends to existing paved roadways. 3.6 miles.	Pave unpaved road	2012	3.6	0.00	0.00	104.95	104.95	\$2,075	\$1,182,522	\$71,478	\$1,254,000
Salt River Pima-Maricopa Indian Community	SRP-MIC Pave Dirt Roads Program, Phase 4: Mesa Drive and Roadrunner Road	Pre-design, design and construction portion of phase 1 of up to 7 miles of dirt roads within the Salt River Pima-Maricopa Indian Community boundaries.	Pave unpaved road	2012	2.0	0.00	0.00	65.83	65.83	\$2,453	\$876,990	\$53,010	\$930,000
Youngtown	Youngtown Pave Dirt Alleys, Phase 2	Pre-design, design and paving of approximately 3.1 miles of dirt alleyways within the Town of Youngtown	Pave unpaved alleys	2012	3.1	0.00	0.00	41.88	41.88	\$3,955	\$899,489	\$54,370	\$953,859
Total											\$9,425,013		

† Phoenix project contains 1.6 miles of alleys to be paved within 1.1 miles of PM-10 monitors in the Salt River Area.

* Costs shown are only for construction portion of project.

All CMAQ funded projects are either included in the approved 08-12 MAG TIP, or approved by Regional Council to be included in a Draft TIP (2013 Projects).

TRC January 2009

Projects are sorted by Agency, Fiscal Year, then Mode.

AVONDALE									
Mode	TIPIDN	Agency	Location	Work_Type	Fiscal Year	Federal Type	Federal Cost	Local Cost	Total Cost
Bicycle	AVN12-816	Avondale	Thomas Rd (Alignment): Rancho Santa Fe Blvd to 119th Ave	Pre-design and design for a multi-use path, bridge with lighting and landscaping	2012	CMAQ	\$ 700,000	\$ 300,000	\$ 1,000,000
ITS	AVN13-901	Avondale	McDowell Rd form 99th Ave to Avondale Blvd (2 miles) plus 1/8 mile on 99th Ave from McDowell Rd north to the first signalized shopping center location	Proposed project is to furnish and install 2 1/8 miles of fiber optic cable, conduit, interdict, associated equipment at 9 traffic signals and one CCTV camera	2013	CMAQ	\$ 753,467	\$ 433,626	\$ 1,187,093

TOWN OF BUCKEYE									
Mode	TIPIDN	Agency	Location	Work_Type	Fiscal Year	Federal Type	Federal Cost	Local Cost	Total Cost
AQ or TDM	BKY07-703	Buckeye	Various Locations: Yuma Rd, Miller Rd	Pave dirt roads	2009	CMAQ	\$ 42,350	\$ 42,350	\$ 84,700
AQ or TDM	BKY07-704	Buckeye	Various Locations: MC-85/Monroe, Southern Ave, Apache Rd	Pave dirt shoulders	2009	CMAQ	\$ 113,000	\$ 113,000	\$ 226,000
ITS	BKY10-801	Buckeye	Miller Rd: Hazen Rd to I-10 and Monroe Rd (MC-85): Miller Rd to Apache Rd	Interconnect traffic signals	2010	CMAQ	\$ 210,000	\$ 90,000	\$ 300,000
Pedestrian	BKY12-802	Buckeye	Downtown Buckeye	Construct sidewalks, curb and gutter	2010	CMAQ	\$ 221,550	\$ 94,950	\$ 316,500
Pedestrian	BKY13-901	Buckeye	Town of Buckeye	Alarcon Blvd and Kino Place Pedestrian Corridor Project	2013	CMAQ	\$ 400,000	\$ 174,572	\$ 574,572

CAVE CREEK									
Mode	TIPIDN	Agency	Location	Work_Type	Fiscal Year	Federal Type	Federal Cost	Local Cost	Total Cost
AQ or TDM	CVK07-601	Cave Creek	Townwide	Pave dirt roads program - Construct	2009	CMAQ	\$ 250,000	\$ 15,000	\$ 265,000

CHANDLER									
Mode	TIPIDN	Agency	Location	Work_Type	Fiscal Year	Federal Type	Federal Cost	Local Cost	Total Cost
AQ or TDM	CHN07-601	Chandler	Commonwealth Ave: Hamilton St to Ithica	Pave dirt road	2009	CMAQ	\$ 325,000	\$ 1,075,000	\$ 1,400,000
Bicycle	CHN08-610C	Chandler	Loop 101 (Price Freeway) at Galveston Street	Construct multi-use path and bridge over the Loop 101 (Price Freeway) at Galveston Street	2009	CMAQ	\$ 1,164,992	\$ 1,315,808	\$ 2,480,800
ITS	CHN06-214	Chandler	Citywide	Install variable message signs	2009	CMAQ	\$ 377,200	\$ 22,800	\$ 400,000
ITS	CHN09-802	Chandler	Chandler Blvd: Delaware St to Gilbert Rd	Install fiber-optic cable traffic signal interconnection	2009	CMAQ	\$ 309,653	\$ 185,347	\$ 495,000
Pedestrian	CHN11-710	Chandler	Western Canal bike path at Dobson Rd, Alma School Rd and Arizona Ave	Install three pedestrian actuated crossing signals	2009	CMAQ	\$ 271,000	\$ 117,000	\$ 388,000
AQ or TDM	CHN13-901	Chandler	Various Locations in the City of Chandler	Paving dirt alleys	2010	CMAQ	\$ 350,000	\$ 589,000	\$ 939,000
ITS	CHN10-613	Chandler	Buffalo St at Colorado St	Upgrade, retrofit and integrate TMC equipment	2010	CMAQ	\$ 425,000	\$ 575,000	\$ 1,000,000
ITS	CHN11-704	Chandler	Arizona Ave: Pecos Rd to Riggs Rd	Install fiber-optic cable for interconnecting traffic signals (4 out of 5 miles)	2011	CMAQ	\$ 344,050	\$ 455,950	\$ 800,000
Pedestrian	CHN08-606	Chandler	Consolidated Canal multi-use pathway at Germann and Pecos Rds	Install two pedestrian actuated signals (phase I)	2011	CMAQ	\$ 229,600	\$ 147,400	\$ 377,000
Bicycle	CHN12-805	Chandler	Chandler Blvd at Price Rd/Loop 101 (Pima Fwy) TI	Extend bicycle lane through the interchange (phase 2). Provide Additional Westbound Left Turn at the Intersection for Dual Left Turns	2012	CMAQ	\$ 938,889	\$ 1,888,111	\$ 2,827,000

EL MIRAGE									
Mode	TIPIDN	Agency	Location	Work_Type	Fiscal Year	Federal Type	Federal Cost	Local Cost	Total Cost
AQ or TDM	ELM09-802	El Mirage	125th Ave and 127th Ave: Varney Rd to Peoria Ave	Pave unpaved roads	2009	CMAQ	\$ 381,031	\$ 1,102,252	\$ 1,483,283
AQ or TDM	ELM13-903	El Mirage	Dysart Ranchettes area: Varney Rd, Peoria Ave, Dysart Rd, El Mirage	Paving dirt roads	2010	CMAQ	\$ 1,250,000	\$ 1,750,000	\$ 3,000,000

FT. MCDOWELL - YAVAPAI

Mode	TIPIDN	Agency	Location	Work_Type	Fiscal Year	Federal Type	Federal Cost	Local Cost	Total Cost
AQ or TDM	FTM09-903	Fort McDowell	Various Locations on Fort McDowell Yavapai Nation	Pave dirt road	2009	CMAQ	\$ 475,000	\$ 30,000	\$ 505,000
AQ or TDM	FTM13-901	Fort McDowell	Various Locations on Fort McDowell Yavapai Nation	Paving dirt roads	2010	CMAQ	\$ 700,000	\$ 1,650,000	\$ 2,350,000

FOUNTAIN HILLS

Mode	TIPIDN	Agency	Location	Work_Type	Fiscal Year	Federal Type	Federal Cost	Local Cost	Total Cost
Pedestrian	FTH09-602	Fountain Hills	Fountain Hills Blvd: Fayette Dr to Fountain Hills Middle School	Design and construct 8 foot wide detached sidewalks	2009	CMAQ	\$ 354,200	\$ 151,800	\$ 506,000
Pedestrian	FTH11-701	Fountain Hills	Fountain Hills Blvd: Shea Blvd to Crystal Point Dr	Design and construct new sidewalk	2011	CMAQ	\$ 300,000	\$ 1,058,000	\$ 1,358,000
Pedestrian	FTH11-801	Fountain Hills	Shea Blvd: 142nd St to Eagle Mountain Pkwy	Construct 12-ft multi-use path (Scottsdale section) and 8-ft sidewalk (Fountain Hills section)	2012	CMAQ	\$ 273,000	\$ 117,000	\$ 390,000

GILBERT									
Mode	TIPIDN	Agency	Location	Work Type	Fiscal Year	Federal Type	Federal Cost	Local Cost	Total Cost
Bicycle	GLB09-601C	Gilbert	Western-Powerline Trail: Cooper Rd to Gilbert Rd (phase III)	Construct multi-use path and pedestrian amenities	2009	CMAQ	\$ 614,405	\$ 320,595	\$ 935,000
ITS	GLB13-905	Gilbert	Guadalupe Rd, Higley Rd, Williams Field Rd	Gilbert ATMS Fiber East Ring Project - Phase I (Design)	2009	CMAQ	\$ 122,234	\$ 63,000	\$ 185,234
ITS	GLB13-906	Gilbert	Higley Rd, Recker Rd, Guadalupe Rd, Elliot Rd, Warner Rd, Ray Rd, Williams Field Rd	Gilbert ATMS Fiber East Ring Project - Phase II (Design)	2009	CMAQ	\$ 122,234	\$ 63,000	\$ 185,234
Bicycle	GLB10-602C	Gilbert	Western-Powerline Trail: Gilbert Rd to Lindsay Rd (phase II)	Construct multi-use path and pedestrian amenities	2010	CMAQ	\$ 614,405	\$ 320,595	\$ 935,000
Pedestrian	GLB11-731	Gilbert	Town of Gilbert Heritage District	Design and construct sidewalks, landscaping and other pedestrian improvements	2011	CMAQ	\$ 420,000	\$ 180,000	\$ 600,000
Bicycle	GLB12-809	Gilbert	Town of Gilbert	Design and construct bicycle crossings	2012	CMAQ	\$ 490,000	\$ 210,000	\$ 700,000
Bicycle	GLB13-902	Gilbert	Consolidated canal and Ray Rd., eastern canal & Williams Field rd, western powerline & McQueen Rd, Western Powerline & Val Vista Rd, western powerline & Greenfield rd, and western powerline & Recker Rd	Gilbert Bicycle Crossing Safety and improvement demonstration Phase II Project	2013	CMAQ	\$ 583,000	\$ 255,000	\$ 838,000
ITS	GLB13-904	Gilbert	Pecos Rd.-Greenfield to Power Rd, Power Rd-Pecos to Queen Creek Rd, Germann Rd-Power to Sossaman Rd	The proposed project will install approximately five miles of fiber optic cable and associated communications hardware to complete a high-bandwidth, non-leased interconnection between the Traffic Operations Centers in the Towns of Gilbert and Queen Creek.	2013	CMAQ	\$ 137,690	\$ 59,010	\$ 196,700

GLENDALE									
Mode	TIPIDN	Agency	Location	Work Type	Fiscal Year	Federal Type	Federal Cost	Local Cost	Total Cost
Bicycle	GLN09-609	Glendale	Skunk Creek at Union Hills Drive	Design and construct multi-use underpass under Union Hills Dr	2009	CMAQ	\$ 147,228	\$ 161,772	\$ 309,000
ITS	GLN13-903	Glendale	Olive Ave: 67th Ave to 59th ave	ITS Fiber and 1 CCTV Camera	2009	CMAQ	\$ 449,149	\$ 219,493	\$ 668,642
AQ or TDM	GLN07-779	Glendale	Various Locations: Camelback Rd, Litchfield Rd, Olive Ave, Greenway Rd, 83rd Ave, 75th Ave	Pave dirt shoulders	2010	CMAQ	\$ 133,035	\$ 133,035	\$ 266,070
AQ or TDM	GLN08-605	Glendale	Glendale Ave: Loop 101 to Luke AFB	Pave access points	2010	CMAQ	\$ 63,000	\$ 27,000	\$ 90,000
Bicycle	GLN06-201	Glendale	Bell Rd at Skunk Creek (between 67th Ave and 75th Ave)	Widen existing bridge to provide pedestrian and bicycle access across bridge	2010	CMAQ	\$ 424,350	\$ 440,000	\$ 864,350
Pedestrian	GLN07-311	Glendale	Alley 250 ft north of Glendale Ave: 58th Ave to 57th Dr	Design and construct alley improvements and pedestrian walkway	2010	CMAQ	\$ 75,000	\$ 75,000	\$ 150,000
Pedestrian	GLN09-610	Glendale	Downtown alley north of Glendale Ave between 57th Ave and 57th Dr	Transform existing service alleyway into a safe environment for pedestrian circulation and limited vehicular traffic	2010	CMAQ	\$ 240,721	\$ 103,166	\$ 343,887
Bicycle	GLN11-702	Glendale	New River (East Bank): Northern Ave to Bethany Home Rd	Construct multi-use path and underpasses, with landscaping, lighting, parking and pedestrian facilities	2011	CMAQ	\$ 1,000,000	\$ 3,917,120	\$ 4,917,120
ITS	GLN12-804	Glendale	Various locations	Deployment of ITS	2012	CMAQ	\$ 771,664	\$ 331,969	\$ 1,103,633
Bicycle	GLN13-902	Glendale	East embankment of New river, from Bethany Home Rd. to Northern Ave	New River Multi-Use Path improvements-10-foot wide, concrete cement, paved pathway	2013	CMAQ	\$ 1,000,000	\$ 472,000	\$ 1,472,000
ITS	GLN13-901	Glendale	59th Ave between Northern and Bethany Home: Glendale Ave. between 51st Ave. and 67th Ave; Peoria Ave. between 47th Ave. and 67th Ave.	Variable message signs; ITS Conduit and Fiber	2013	CMAQ	\$ 753,437	\$ 428,081	\$ 1,181,518

GOODYEAR										
Mode	TIPIDN	Agency	Location	Work_Type	Fiscal Year	Federal Type	Federal Cost	Local Cost	Total Cost	
AQ or TDM	GDY07-302	Goodyear	Chandler Heights Rd: Rainbow Valley Rd to one mile west	Pave dirt road	2009	CMAQ	\$ 255,600	\$ 170,400	\$ 426,000	
ITS	GDY13-902	Goodyear	Various locations	Purchase Dynamic Message Signs	2009	CMAQ	\$ 166,304	\$ 200,000	\$ 366,304	
Bicycle	GDY11-714	Goodyear	Estrella Pkwy: Gila River Bridge to Yuma Rd	Design and construct on-road bike lane	2011	CMAQ	\$ 78,994	\$ 33,855	\$ 112,849	
ITS	GDY11-713	Goodyear	Citywide	Implement traffic signal system, including installation of ITS backbone and communications equipment	2011	CMAQ	\$ 700,000	\$ 1,000,000	\$ 1,700,000	
Bicycle	GDY12-802	Goodyear	Yuma Rd: Estrella Pkwy to Litchfield Rd	Construct 6-ft bicycle path and signing	2012	CMAQ	\$ 251,300	\$ 107,700	\$ 359,000	
ITS	GDY12-801	Goodyear	McDowell Rd: Sarival Rd to Litchfield Rd	Design and construct fiber-optic interconnection for traffic signals and video	2012	CMAQ	\$ 588,809	\$ 255,541	\$ 844,350	
ITS	GDY13-901	Goodyear	Citywide	Design and construction of fiber optic interconnect in existing conduit for traffic management through video surveillance and data collection	2013	CMAQ	\$ 700,000	\$ 891,256	\$ 1,591,256	

LITCHFIELD PARK										
Mode	TIPIDN	Agency	Location	Work_Type	Fiscal Year	Federal Type	Federal Cost	Local Cost	Total Cost	
AQ or TDM	LPK08-801	Litchfield Park	Various locations	Pave unpaved alleys	2009	CMAQ	\$ 530,979	\$ 227,562	\$ 758,541	
Bicycle	LPK05-101C	Litchfield Park	Litchfield Rd Bypass at Wigwam Boulevard	Construct bicycle underpass	2009	CMAQ	\$ 886,420	\$ 53,850	\$ 940,270	
Bicycle	LPK13-901	Litchfield Park	Litchfield Rd to Wigwam Blvd Intersection	Pedestrian/bicycle underpass at Litchfield Rd and Wigwam Blvd Phase II	2013	CMAQ	\$ 800,000	\$ 471,000	\$ 1,271,000	

MARICOPA COUNTY									
Mode	TIPIDN	Agency	Location	Work Type	Fiscal Year	Federal Type	Federal Cost	Local Cost	Total Cost
Bicycle	MMA09-610	Maricopa County	Rio Verde Dr: Forest Rd to 136th St alignment	Pave shoulders to include a bicycle lane	2009	CMAQ	\$ 507,500	\$ 932,500	\$ 1,440,000
ITS	MMA09-607	Maricopa County	Bell Rd: Loop 303 (Estrella Fwy) to Loop 101 (Agua Fria Fwy)	Construct ITS Improvements	2009	CMAQ	\$ 1,000,000	\$ 500,000	\$ 1,500,000
ITS	MMA09-810	Maricopa County	Glendale, Peoria and Scottsdale City Limits	Establish REACT arterial incident response teams in Glendale, Peoria and Scottsdale	2009	CMAQ	\$ 852,479	\$ 386,380	\$ 1,238,859
ITS	MMA10-815	Maricopa County	99th Ave: Olive Ave to Bell Rd	Install conduit and fiber-optic cable to connect existing and planned ITS field devices	2010	CMAQ	\$ 492,962	\$ 657,038	\$ 1,150,000
ITS	MMA10-611	Maricopa County	MCDOT Traffic Management Center	Design and construct TMC upgrade	2010	CMAQ	\$ 735,000	\$ 362,500	\$ 1,097,500
Bicycle	MMA11-724	Maricopa County	Forrest Rd: McDowell Mountain Rd to Rio Verde Dr	Add paved dirt shoulder and bike lane on both sides	2011	CMAQ	\$ 400,000	\$ 130,000	\$ 530,000
ITS	MMA11-722	Maricopa County	5 different locations	Upgrade traffic signals, including CCTV facilities	2011	CMAQ	\$ 100,000	\$ 150,000	\$ 250,000
ITS	MMA11-723	Maricopa County	Bell Rd: Loop 303 (Estrella Fwy) to 75th Ave	Construct Dynamic Message Signs and fibre optic conduit and cable	2011	CMAQ	\$ 382,200	\$ 459,670	\$ 841,870
ITS	MMA12-818	Maricopa County	Olive Ave: Litchfield Rd to Loop 101 (Agua Fria Fwy) ITS	Construct and install new conduit and new fiber-optic cable to connect existing and planned ITS field devices	2012	CMAQ	\$ 504,086	\$ 760,914	\$ 1,265,000
ITS	MMA12-820	Maricopa County	Regionwide	Upgrade regional archived data server (RADS) equipment	2012	CMAQ	\$ 67,992	\$ 29,508	\$ 97,500
ITS	MMA13-901	Maricopa County	Southwest Valley, 99th Ave to Cotton Ln to include McDowell Rd, Van Buren St, MC85/Buckeye	Develop a multi-agency Operations Plan that will support coordinated arterial operations, freeway/arterial coordination, incident management and traveler information. This Operations Plan will include agency roles and responsibility, equipment operation	2013	CMAQ	\$ 35,000	\$ 15,000	\$ 50,000
ITS	MMA13-902	Maricopa County	Regionwide this project will enhance traveler information on key arterials throughout the region	Develop and implement arterial ATIS Enhancements, building on the previous Phase I efforts 511 enhancements, and other key projects.	2013	CMAQ	\$ 277,083	\$ 150,000	\$ 427,083

MARICOPA COUNTY - CONTINUED

Mode	TIPIDN	Agency	Location	Work Type	Fiscal Year	Federal Type	Federal Cost	Local Cost	Total Cost
ITS	MMA13-903	Maricopa County	Sun Valley Parkway, I-10 to Bell Rd Connection	Implement a wireless communications system and CCTV on Sun Valley Parkway. Traffic signals will already be in place, and the wireless communications will provide interconnect and coordination capability. This communications network will connect and	2013	CMAQ	\$ 387,917	\$ 210,000	\$ 597,917
ITS	MMA13-904	Maricopa County	DMS installations in the EB and WB direction at each of the following intersections: McDowell Rd and Avondale Blvd, McDowell Rd and Estrella Pkwy, MC85 and Avondale Blvd, MC85 and Estrella Pkwy	Install arterial DMS and associated conduit, pull boxes, fiber optic cable, communication equipment and electrical service equipment	2013	CMAQ	\$ 700,000	\$ 300,000	\$ 1,000,000

MESA										
Mode	TIPIDN	Agency	Location	Work Type	Fiscal Year	Federal Type	Federal Cost	Local Cost	Total Cost	
ITS	MES08-807	Mesa	ITS Signal Conversions - Phase 3 (Mesa Dr. & Main St.)	Expand fiber-optic network and link 11 traffic signals to the Mesa TMC	2009	CMAQ	\$ 646,773	\$ 1,383,977	\$ 2,030,750	
ITS	MES04-125C	Mesa	Superstition Mall area: Southern Ave, Power Rd, and Superstition Spring Blvd.	Install real-time adaptive signal system	2009	CMAQ	\$ 788,810	\$ 581,190	\$ 1,370,000	
ITS	MES09-809	Mesa	Along sections of Broadway, Dobson, Alma School and Baseline Rds	Establish fiber-optic link on Broadway Rd and connect to west ITS loop	2009	CMAQ	\$ 651,254	\$ 992,746	\$ 1,644,000	
Pedestrian	MES09-605	Mesa	Grand St: Broadway Rd to 6th Ave (Nuestro neighborhood phase 1)	Improve pedestrian facilities	2009	CMAQ	\$ 441,041	\$ 189,018	\$ 630,059	
Street	MES07-315	Mesa	Southern Ave at Country Club Dr	Add 1 right turn lane and three bus pullouts.	2009	CMAQ	\$ 910,000	\$ 3,437,000	\$ 4,347,000	
Bicycle	MES08-603	Mesa	Longmore: Broadway Rd to Main St (EVIT)	Design and construct bicycle path to connect Broadway Rd with Main St and the Light Rail Station	2010	CMAQ	\$ 1,082,739	\$ 886,036	\$ 1,968,775	
Bicycle	MES06-203C	Mesa	Pepper Pl: Lewis St to Robson St	Construct multi-use path	2010	CMAQ	\$ 305,961	\$ 93,039	\$ 399,000	
Bicycle	MES07-314	Mesa	South Canal: Val Vista Dr to Greenfield Rd	Construct multi-use path. Development of multi-use path system (MUP). This project is part of the recommendations outlined by the Parks and Recreation Master Plan 2025, adopted by the City Council and Mesa Residents in 2002.	2010	CMAQ	\$ 541,800	\$ 232,200	\$ 774,000	
Bicycle	MES10-608	Mesa	South Canal: McDowell Rd to Val Vista Dr	Construct new multi-use path on the north bank	2010	CMAQ	\$ 852,505	\$ 568,337	\$ 1,420,842	
ITS	MES08-604	Mesa	Loop 202 (Red Mtn Fwy)	Design and install fiber optic cable and end evises and complete connections at network hubs	2010	CMAQ	\$ 838,700	\$ 359,400	\$ 1,198,100	
ITS	MES10-810	Mesa	Baseline Rd, Southern Ave, Dobson and Alma School Rds	Establish fiber optic link with arterial streets near US-60 (Superstition Fwy)	2011	CMAQ	\$ 709,973	\$ 1,893,027	\$ 2,603,000	
ITS	MES11-703	Mesa	Various locations	Install fiber-optic communications and upgrade traffic signal controllers	2011	CMAQ	\$ 700,000	\$ 500,000	\$ 1,200,000	
Pedestrian	MES08-602R	Mesa	Lewis St: First St to Main Library	Construct pedestrian improvements	2011	CMAQ	\$ 253,673	\$ 83,717	\$ 337,390	

MESA-CONTINUED									
Mode	TIPIDN	Agency	Location	Work Type	Fiscal Year	Federal Type	Federal Cost	Local Cost	Total Cost
Pedestrian	MES11-701	Mesa	MCC Connector: Library to Centennial Center	Design and construct Town Center pathway extension	2011	CMAQ	\$ 269,658	\$ 115,568	\$ 385,226
ITS	MES12-815	Mesa	ITS Signal Conversions - Phase 5 (University Dr.)	Improve existing fiber-optic communications systems and install communications network and ITS devices	2012	CMAQ	\$ 659,994	\$ 1,934,406	\$ 2,594,400
Pedestrian	MES12-814	Mesa	Fiesta Pathway (1/4 Mile south of Southern Ave): Extension to the Tempe Canal	Construct pedestrian refuge and shelters for the Fiesta Pathway	2012	CMAQ	\$ 998,870	\$ 428,087	\$ 1,426,957
Bicycle	MES13-905	Mesa	consolidated canal, 8th Street to Lindsay Road	Complete the design and construction of a 10-foot wide concrete pathway	2013	CMAQ	\$ 1,099,000	\$ 471,000	\$ 1,570,000
ITS	MES13-902	Mesa	West side mid-city (initial deployment), West city limits to Country Club, University to Broadway-but project has city-wide potential	Upgrade central traffic control system software to accommodate a lite version of adaptive control	2013	CMAQ	\$ 318,182	\$ 150,000	\$ 468,182
ITS	MES13-906	Mesa	Ten intersection with highest crash rates within City of Mesa. This project has city-wide potential.	This project will implement video and acoustic sensors in the field to automatically detect and alert traffic operations staff os suspected crash or traffic impeding events. The communications will be facilitated using existing traffic controller cabinets	2013	CMAQ	\$ 381,818	\$ 180,000	\$ 561,818

PARADISE VALLEY									
Mode	TIPIDN	Agency	Location	Work_Type	Fiscal Year	Federal Type	Federal Cost	Local Cost	Total Cost
ITS	PVY09-601	Paradise Valley	Various locations (12 intersections)	Install video detection systems	2009	CMAQ	\$ 89,600	\$ 38,400	\$ 128,000
Pedestrian	PVY13-901	Paradise Valley	Lincoln Drive south side of roadway, between Invergordon Road and eastern Town limits west of Scottsdale Rd	Lincoln Drive sidewalk improvement, south side, Invergordon Rd to Eastern Town limits. Construct a 6' wide colored concrete sidewalk, replace substandard driveway entrances and intersection access ramps, plant landscaping adjacent to new sidewalk	2013	CMAQ	\$ 441,000	\$ 189,000	\$ 630,000

PEORIA									
Mode	TIPIDN	Agency	Location	Work_Type	Fiscal Year	Federal Type	Federal Cost	Local Cost	Total Cost
ITS	PEO13-904	Peoria	Within the city of Peoria, connecting existing traffic signals to the central system using a hybrid wireless fiber system. 35 additional signals will be connected with this project.	Existing traffic signals within the city of Peoria will be connected to the fiber backbone, and back to central with either fiber or wireless. This connection will allow the city to manage the signals in a manner to reduce congestion, delay, and improve	2009	CMAQ	\$ 296,548	\$ 225,000	\$ 521,548
Pedestrian	PEO08-602	Peoria	84th Ave: Peoria Ave to Monroe St	Design and construct at-grade pedestrian improvements	2009	CMAQ	\$ 1,164,057	\$ 1,013,030	\$ 2,177,087
Bicycle	PEO11-701	Peoria	New River Trail at Peoria and Olive Aves	Acquire right of way, design and construct roadway underpass crossings	2011	CMAQ	\$ 700,000	\$ 820,000	\$ 1,520,000
ITS	PEO11-702	Peoria	Various locations	Design and construct extension to fibre optic backbone and install CCTV cameras	2011	CMAQ	\$ 700,000	\$ 500,000	\$ 1,200,000
Bicycle	PEO13-902	Peoria	Trail gap between Northern Ave. and Olive Ave	Northern to Olive multi-use path	2013	CMAQ	\$ 700,000	\$ 300,600	\$ 1,000,600
ITS	PEO13-901	Peoria	83rd Ave beginning at Lone Cactus Dr and continuing north to Jomax Rd	Installation of Conduit, pull boxes, fiber, and CCTV cameras to connect signals to Central, and monitor traffic and provide real time traffic management on this segment of 83rd Ave	2013	CMAQ	\$ 700,000	\$ 300,000	\$ 1,000,000

PHOENIX									
Mode	TIPIDN	Agency	Location	Work Type	Fiscal Year	Federal Type	Federal Cost	Local Cost	Total Cost
AQ or TDM	PHX07-740	Phoenix	Various Locations	Pave dirt roads	2009	CMAQ	\$ 1,978,650	\$ 1,978,650	\$ 3,957,300
AQ or TDM	PHX07-741	Phoenix	Various Locations	Pave dirt shoulders	2009	CMAQ	\$ 1,525,304	\$ 1,525,304	\$ 3,050,608
AQ or TDM	PHX09-871	Phoenix	Various locations	Pave unpaved alleys	2009	CMAQ	\$ 466,667	\$ 200,000	\$ 666,667
AQ or TDM	PHX09-872	Phoenix	Various locations	Pave unpaved roads	2009	CMAQ	\$ 1,050,000	\$ 450,000	\$ 1,500,000
ITS	PHX07-317	Phoenix	Downtown Phoenix	Design parking management system (phase 3)	2009	CMAQ	\$ 400,000	\$ 100,000	\$ 500,000
ITS	PHX09-624	Phoenix	Various locations	Construct regional ITS fiber optic backbone, phase B-1	2009	CMAQ	\$ 665,000	\$ -	\$ 665,000
Pedestrian	PHX12-859	Phoenix	Hatcher St: 3rd St to 5th St	Construct 8-ft sidewalk, 3-ft shoulder and landscaping	2009	CMAQ	\$ 840,000	\$ 360,000	\$ 1,200,000
Street	PHX07-308	Phoenix	16th St at Glendale Ave	Widen intersection	2009	CMAQ	\$ 800,000	\$ 1,520,000	\$ 2,320,000
AQ or TDM	PHX13-904	Phoenix	Various Locations in the City of Phoenix: 44 miles of dirt alleys	Paving dirt alleys	2010	CMAQ	\$ 1,200,000	\$ 920,000	\$ 2,120,000
Bicycle	PHX09-619	Phoenix	19th Ave at Greenway Rd	Construct multi-use path and bridge (phase 2)	2010	CMAQ	\$ 1,010,000	\$ 1,424,100	\$ 2,434,100
Bicycle	PHX07-315	Phoenix	7th Ave at the ACDC Canal	Construct multi-use underpass	2010	CMAQ	\$ 1,750,000	\$ 1,158,300	\$ 2,908,300
ITS	PHX10-633	Phoenix	Various locations	Construct regional ITS fiber optic backbone, phase B-2	2010	CMAQ	\$ 665,000	\$ -	\$ 665,000
Street	PHX07-316	Phoenix	7th St at McDowell Rd	Widen intersection	2010	CMAQ	\$ 1,256,000	\$ 2,244,000	\$ 3,500,000
ITS	PHX11-739	Phoenix	Various locations	Construct regional ITS telecommunications expansion	2011	CMAQ	\$ 700,000	\$ 500,000	\$ 1,200,000
Bicycle	PHX13-901	Phoenix	Nevitt Park and Western Canal (northwest of 46th St and Vineyard Rd)	Design and construct Nevitt park Bicycle & Pedestrian Bridge Crossing	2013	CMAQ	\$ 522,000	\$ 224,000	\$ 746,000
Pedestrian	PHX13-903	Phoenix	32nd St (Washington St to McDowell Rd)	Phase I: Design 32nd St Pedestrian Enhancement (Washington St to McDowell Rd)	2013	CMAQ	\$ 373,000	\$ 161,000	\$ 534,000

QUEEN CREEK									
Mode	TIPIDN	Agency	Location	Work Type	Fiscal Year	Federal Type	Federal Cost	Local Cost	Total Cost
AQ or TDM	QNC07-746	Queen Creek	Hunt Highway: Power Rd to Ellsworth	Pave dirt shoulders	2009	CMAQ	\$ 204,893	\$ 204,893	\$ 409,786
AQ or TDM	QNC07-745	Queen Creek	Chandler Heights Rd: Power Rd to Hawes Rd	Pave dirt shoulders	2009	CMAQ	\$ 111,691	\$ 111,691	\$ 223,382
ITS	QNC08-803	Queen Creek	Queen Creek town center	Construct ITS infrastructure and traffic management system	2009	CMAQ	\$ 550,221	\$ 917,100	\$ 1,467,321
ITS	QNC11-783	Queen Creek	Townwide	Design and construct/implement ITS hardware and software	2011	CMAQ	\$ 490,000	\$ 300,000	\$ 790,000
ITS	QNC12-804	Queen Creek	Ellsworth Rd: Sierra Park Blvd to Empire Blvd (Hunt Hwy)	Construct traffic signal/CCTV system	2012	CMAQ	\$ 254,235	\$ 176,200	\$ 430,435
ITS	QNC13-902	Queen Creek	Various Locations Town-wide	Ten wireless traffic signal connections	2013	CMAQ	\$ 105,000	\$ 45,000	\$ 150,000
Pedestrian	QNC13-901	Queen Creek	Ellsworth Rd and Queen Creek Wash to Chandler Heights Blvd. and Queen Creek Wash.	Queen Creek Wash and North Bank Decomposed Granite Pedestrian Path	2013	CMAQ	\$ 525,000	\$ 225,000	\$ 750,000

SCOTTSDALE									
Mode	TIPIDN	Agency	Location	Work Type	Fiscal Year	Federal Type	Federal Cost	Local Cost	Total Cost
AQ or TDM	SCT07-606	Scottsdale	Dynamite Blvd: Pima Road to Alma School Road	Install Vertical Curb and Gutter	2009	CMAQ	\$ 500,000	\$ 500,000	\$ 1,000,000
ITS	SCT13-903	Scottsdale	South Scottsdale	Controller and cabinet replacement	2009	CMAQ	\$ 232,190	\$ 225,000	\$ 457,190
ITS	SCT09-610	Scottsdale	Scottsdale Rd: Frank Lloyd Wright Blvd to Thompson Peak Pkwy	Construct smart corridor traffic control system	2009	CMAQ	\$ 180,800	\$ 181,180	\$ 361,980
ITS	SCT09-805	Scottsdale	South Scottsdale	Replace traffic signal controllers and cabinets	2009	CMAQ	\$ 245,756	\$ 254,244	\$ 500,000
Pedestrian	SCT09-611	Scottsdale	Scottsdale Rd: Roosevelt St to Earll Dr	Upgrade sidewalks and add bicycle lanes	2009	CMAQ	\$ 2,458,415	\$ 2,577,443	\$ 5,035,858
ITS	SCT10-616	Scottsdale	McDowell Rd: Scottsdale Rd to Pima Rd	Construct smart corridor traffic control system	2010	CMAQ	\$ 350,000	\$ 350,000	\$ 700,000
Pedestrian	SCT10-617R	Scottsdale	Scottsdale Rd: Earll Dr to Chaparral Rd	Upgrade sidewalks and add bicycle lanes	2010	CMAQ	\$ 510,696	\$ 2,540,741	\$ 3,051,437
ITS	SCT11-702	Scottsdale	Scottsdale and Hayden Rds: Shea Blvd to McDowell Rd	Install detection equipment, variable message signs and software	2011	CMAQ	\$ 102,500	\$ 177,500	\$ 280,000
Pedestrian	SCT11-701	Scottsdale	McDowell Rd: Scottsdale Rd to Granite Reef Rd	Enhance sidewalks and add bicycle lanes	2011	CMAQ	\$ 600,000	\$ 3,106,743	\$ 3,706,743
Bicycle	SCT12-810	Scottsdale	Arizona Canal: Chaparral Rd to McDonald Dr	Design and construct 10-ft to 12 ft multi-use path	2012	CMAQ	\$ 1,100,000	\$ 1,208,460	\$ 2,308,460

SCOTTSDALE-CONTINUED

Mode	TIPIDN	Agency	Location	Work_Type	Fiscal Year	Federal Type	Federal Cost	Local Cost	Total Cost
ITS	SCT12-808	Scottsdale	Area enclosing Shea Blvd to Carefree Hwy and 56th St to 136th St	Install dynamic message signs	2012	CMAQ	\$ 249,054	\$ 250,946	\$ 500,000
ITS	SCT12-813	Scottsdale	South Scottsdale	Replace traffic signal controllers and cabinets	2012	CMAQ	\$ 249,054	\$ 250,946	\$ 500,000
Bicycle	SCT13-901	Scottsdale	Along the Arizona Canal from McDonald Drive to the Indian Bend Wash	Arizona Canal Path: McDonald to IBW/Share-use path	2013	CMAQ	\$ 1,100,000	\$ 1,241,660	\$ 2,341,660
ITS	SCT13-902	Scottsdale	citywide	last mile connections from city Fiber Network	2013	CMAQ	\$ 350,000	\$ 350,000	\$ 700,000

SURPRISE									
Mode	TIPIDN	Agency	Location	Work_Type	Fiscal Year	Federal Type	Federal Cost	Local Cost	Total Cost
AQ or TDM	SUR09-820	Surprise	Rural Area West of 219th Ave between Pinnacle Peak & Deer Valley	Pave unpaved roads	2009	CMAQ	\$ 1,602,302	\$ 686,700	\$ 2,289,002
ITS	SUR10-613	Surprise	Bell Rd: US-60 (Grand Ave) to Surprise Traffic Management Center	Construct fiber optic interconnection of traffic signals, cameras and VMS	2010	CMAQ	\$ 150,000	\$ 150,000	\$ 300,000
ITS	SUR10-614	Surprise	Greenway Rd: US-60 (Grand Ave) to Cotton Ln	Construct fiber optic interconnection of traffic signals, cameras and VMS	2010	CMAQ	\$ 500,000	\$ 500,000	\$ 1,000,000
ITS	SUR11-715	Surprise	Peoria Ave: Litchfield Rd to Jackrabbit Rd	Design and construct fibre optic cable interconnection of existing and future ITS facilities	2011	CMAQ	\$ 700,000	\$ 1,000,000	\$ 1,700,000
Pedestrian	SUR11-714	Surprise	Bell Rd: US-60 (Grand Ave) to 114th Ave	Design, acquire right of way and construct a multi-use path	2011	CMAQ	\$ 1,000,000	\$ 500,000	\$ 1,500,000
ITS	SUR12-818	Surprise	Bell Rd: Loop 303 (Estrella Fwy) to Jackrabbit Trl (195th Ave)	Design and connect traffic signals, CCTV cameras and changeable message signs	2012	CMAQ	\$ 996,217	\$ 1,203,783	\$ 2,200,000
Pedestrian	SUR12-817	Surprise	Bell Rd: 141st Ave to Loop 303	Construct sidewalks	2012	CMAQ	\$ 892,500	\$ 382,500	\$ 1,275,000
ITS	SUR13-901	Surprise	Cotton Lane from Peoria Ave to Bell Rd	Optical Fiber interconnect of signals, TV cameras, dynamic message signs, and connection to ITS Fibert Backbone	2013	CMAQ	\$ 753,437	\$ 1,500,000	\$ 2,253,437

TEMPE									
Mode	TIPIDN	Agency	Location	Work Type	Fiscal Year	Federal Type	Federal Cost	Local Cost	Total Cost
ITS	TMP13-903	Tempe	Citywide	Develop ITS and Communications Strategic Plan	2009	CMAQ	\$ 96,041	\$ 49,500	\$ 145,541
Pedestrian	TMP08-602	Tempe	College Ave: Superstition Fwy (US 60) to Apache Blvd	Design and construct pedestrian facilities	2009	CMAQ	\$ 2,550,000	\$ 951,000	\$ 3,501,000
ITS	TMP10-803	Tempe	Citywide	Install video detection system	2010	CMAQ	\$ 305,568	\$ 138,969	\$ 444,537
Pedestrian	TMP10-620	Tempe	Broadway Rd: Rural Rd to Mill Ave	Construct pedestrian and bicycle facilities improvements	2010	CMAQ	\$ 2,571,780	\$ 2,571,780	\$ 5,143,560
ITS	TMP11-702	Tempe	Various locations	Install fibre-optic connection between ADOT FMS backbone and signal cabinets at 22 interchanges	2011	CMAQ	\$ 100,294	\$ 81,126	\$ 181,420
Pedestrian	TMP11-701	Tempe	University Dr: Priest Dr to SPRR	Improve bicycle and pedestrian facilities	2011	CMAQ	\$ 1,100,000	\$ 5,425,080	\$ 6,525,080
ITS	TMP12-804	Tempe	Citywide	Design and construct fiber-optic cable installations	2012	CMAQ	\$ 242,528	\$ 118,643	\$ 361,171
ITS	TMP12-806	Tempe	Light Rail Transit Corridor in Tempe	Install CCTV monitoring stations	2012	CMAQ	\$ 285,456	\$ 139,643	\$ 425,099
Pedestrian	TMP12-805	Tempe	Hardy Dr: University Dr to Broadway Rd	Pedestrian and bicycle improvements	2012	CMAQ	\$ 1,193,891	\$ 1,451,239	\$ 2,645,130
Bicycle	TMP13-901	Tempe	I-10 at Alameda Drive-City of Tempe	I-10 at Alameda bicycle and pedestrian bridge (Bicycle and Pedestrian Bridge over I-10 freeway at Alameda Drive)	2013	CMAQ	\$ 1,200,000	\$ 2,599,380	\$ 3,799,380
ITS	TMP13-902	Tempe	City Wide	Procure and install traffic control cabinets and hardware-Phase 1 of 3	2013	CMAQ	\$ 539,000	\$ 231,000	\$ 770,000

January 16, 2009

TO: Members of the MAG Transportation Review Committee

FROM: Eileen O. Yazzie, Transportation Programming Manager

SUBJECT: RECOMMENDATION FOR PM-10 PAVE UNPAVED ROAD PROJECTS TO BE PROGRAMMED WITH FEDERAL FUNDS

As per the Draft MAG Federal Fund Programming Principles (Principles), the MAG Transportation Review Committee's role is to review the evaluation and analysis completed by the Technical Advisory Committees (TAC), and recommend projects to be selected and programmed with Federal funds based on guidelines established for project selection.

BACKGROUND

The due date for PM-10 Pave Unpaved Road Project Applications was September 19, 2008. There was a total of thirty-nine on-time and complete applications submitted. Upon review of the applications per federal eligibility requirements, six applications have been removed from the MAG Committee Process. Remaining are twenty two PM-10 Pave Unpaved Road Project applications in federal fiscal year (FFY) 2011, and eleven applications in FFY 2012. In FFY 2011, there is \$3.658 million of CMAQ funds available to be programmed for the requested \$14 million in proposed projects. In FFY 2012, there is \$5.004 million of CMAQ funds available to be programmed for the requested \$9.4 million in proposed projects.

The PM-10 Pave Unpaved Road Project Applications were presented and reviewed at the MAG Street Committee for a qualitative assessment. The Street Committee met three times during October and November 2008 to complete this task. As per the Principles, 'the project sponsor can answer clarification questions and has the opportunity to clarify information on the application, if the committee would like further clarification on project information contained in the application.' Detailed notes of the project presentations, Committee discussion points, and project sponsor clarified information are contained in the Project Review Sheets, which are attached and in alphabetic order.

Once the Street Committee completed their review of PM-10 Pave Unpaved Road Project Applications, the projects moved forward to the MAG Air Quality Technical Advisory Committee (AQTAC) for their review and consideration of the expected emission reduction and cost effectiveness evaluation done by MAG staff. Attached is a memorandum from the Chair of the AQTAC with tables that provide the approved ranking of proposed PM-10 Paving

Unpaved Road Projects for CMAQ funding for both FFY 2011 and FFY2012. This ranking is based on a cost effectiveness evaluation as shown in the ranked list of projects.

The final attachment of the memorandum is a list of Federal fund programmed projects in the approved 2008-2012 MAG TIP, or ones that were approved by the Regional Council to be included in a Draft TIP (2013 projects). This is included per the TRC Guidelines for recommending projects to be programmed with federal funds.

An overview will be presented at the TRC meeting. If you need additional information or have questions, please contact me at (602) 254.6300 or at eyazzie@mag.maricopa.gov.

Street Committee - Paving Review Sheet for Avondale Project 1		
Project Name:		McDowell Road, Avondale Blvd.to 107th Avenue
Description of Project:		Starting at a point 800 ft west of 107th Ave and ending at a point 2600 ft west of 107th Ave there exists approx 1800 ft (.34 miles) of insufficient unpaved shoulder; the existing shoulders vary from 2 to 2.5 feet. Based upon dust that occurs when vehicular traffic pulls off the road and when the farmers pull off, the City would like to expand the shoulder width to 5-foot MCDOT criteria (Roadway Design Guidelines) Due to exist lane widths, there are no opportunities to re-stripe the roadway.
Year of Requested Funds (2011 or 2012):		2011
Project Application Link:		http://www.mag.maricopa.gov/pdf/PM-10_FY2009-Applications/Avondale%20Pave%201%20-%20McDowell.pdf
Category	Project Data	SAMPLE Data Adequacy Questions
1 Average Daily Traffic	ADT: 20,434.00	- Is the ADT estimate based on a sound methodology? - Does the ADT estimate seem reasonable?
2 Right-of-Way Cost	Cost: \$0.00 Cost/Mi = \$0.00	- Does the project require the purchase of ROW? - Is the ROW cost estimate reasonable? Per mile? - Does the ROW cost estimate appear to be complete? - Does ROW cost estimate reflect the project description in the application?
3 Utilities Cost	Cost: \$0.00 Cost/Mi = \$0.00	- Does the project require the relocation of utilities? - Is cost for utilities reasonable? Per mile? - Does the cost to relocate utilities reflect the project description in the application? - Have all the utilities in the project been addressed?
4 Construction Cost	Cost: \$127,173 Cost/Mi = \$374,038.24	- Is the construction cost estimate reasonable? Per mile? - Does the construction cost estimate appear to be complete? - Does construction cost estimate reflect the project description in the application?
5 Design Schedule	Programmed: FY 2009 Months to Complete: 31	- Are there any special features or challenges with the project that would require longer then average lead time for design - Does the design phase begin early enough to ensure the construction phase of the project will be obligated in the year
6 ROW Schedule	Programmed: None Months to Complete: None	- Does the project need to include a ROW phase? - Are there any special features or challenges with the project that would require longer then average lead time to complete - Does the ROW phase begin early enough to ensure the construction phase of the project will be obligated in the year

Presentation at Street Committee Meeting #1
Sue McDermott, City Engineer for City of Avondale presented. Priority 1 is an unpaved shoulder on McDowell Road. The limits are from 800 feet west of 107th Avenue and extend 3.5 miles heading west. The project includes saw cutting 1 -2 feet and then install 5 foot shoulder. The shoulder is either nonexistent or beyond repair. Currently McDowell along this road, the ADT along this road has about 20K done by a consultant. There are no known utility or environmental problems. The 5 foot shoulder meets MCDOTs design guidelines. We are continuing to revise the cost estimate, and will submit a new one to MAG in the near future.
Discussion, Questions, and Answers at Street Committee Meeting #1
Question: In the project description, it states that there are opportunities to restripe, is this correct? Answer: No, there are no opportunities to restripe, and the application project description should have the word 'no' in there. Question: The paving is 5 foot shoulder width? Answer: Yes

Items needed for clarification by the Applicant for Street Committee Meeting #2
The City of Avondale needed to revise the cost estimate, and will submit a new one to MAG.
Clarified information, Comments from Applicant for Street Committee #2
Further clarification on the paving: the width of the shoulder is 5 feet. The Engineer's estimate assumed that 2 feet of pavement would be sawcut and removed hence for estimating purposes, 7 total feet was used for the estimate. The project's estimate was checked and the new estimate is attached seperately. The new estimate came to \$127,173.00 from the old \$177,878. This Project's Priority has changed from No. 1 to Priority No. 4. Futher clarification on the widths of the existing shoulders: the existing shoulders vary from 2 to 2.5 feet. Based upon dust that occurs when vehicular traffic pulls off the road and when the farmers pull off, the City would like to expand the shoulder width to 5-foot MCDOT criteria (Roadway Design Guidelines). MAG Staff did a site visit on 11-7-08.

	Segment Location	Segment Work Description	Type of Paving For the Segment
1	McDowell Road, Southside of McDowell starting at a point 800 feet west of 107th Avenue and ending at a point 2600 feet west of 107th Avenue	The existing pavement will be saw cut 2 feet and a paved shoulder (Minimum 5 feet per MCDOT Roadway Design Manual) will be constructed.	The paved shoulder's structural section will adhere to the approved City of Avondale's mix design for arterial road which consists of: 5-inches of AC on 12-inches of AB Hot Mix Design

Street Committee - Paving Review Sheet for Avondale Project 3		
Project Name:		Van Buren Street-99th Avenue to the Aqua Fria River
Description of Project:		Along Van Buren Street there are six segments of roadway (1.44 Miles) from 99th Avenue west to the Aqua Fria River of insufficient unpaved shoulder where the exist paved shoulder is non-existent or it is does not meet the min width of 5 ft (MCDOT-Rdwy Design Manual). Due to exist lane widths, there is no opportunity to re-stripe the roadway.
Year of Requested Funds (2011 or 2012):		2011
Project Application Link:		http://www.mag.maricopa.gov/pdf/PM-10_FY2009-Applications/Avondale%20Pave%203%20-%20Van%20Buren.pdf
	Category	Project Data
1	Average Daily Traffic	ADT: 9,909.94 - Is the ADT estimate based on a sound methodology? - Does the ADT estimate seem reasonable?
2	Right-of-Way Cost	Cost: \$0.00 Cost/Mi = \$0.00 - Does the project require the purchase of ROW? - Is the ROW cost estimate reasonable? Per mile? - Does the ROW cost estimate appear to be complete? - Does ROW cost estimate reflect the project description in the application?
3	Utilities Cost	Cost: \$0.00 Cost/Mi = \$0.00 - Does the project require the relocation of utilities? - Is cost for utilities reasonable? Per mile? - Does the cost to relocate utilities reflect the project description in the application? - Have all the utilities in the project been addressed?
4	Construction Cost	Cost: \$559,838 Cost/Mi = \$388,776.40 - Is the construction cost estimate reasonable? Per mile? - Does the construction cost estimate appear to be complete? - Does construction cost estimate reflect the project description in the application?
5	Design Schedule	Programmed: FY 2009 Months to Complete: 31 - Are there any special features or challenges with the project that would require longer then average lead time for design - Does the design phase begin early enough to ensure the construction phase of the project will be obligated in the year
6	ROW Schedule	Programmed: None Months to Complete: None - Does the project need to include a ROW phase? - Are there any special features or challenges with the project that would require longer then average lead time to complete - Does the ROW phase begin early enough to ensure the construction phase of the project will be obligated in the year
Presentation at Street Committee Meeting #1		
Another Shoulder paving project along Van Buren Street with sixth segments from 99th Ave to the Agua Fria River that total about 1.9 miles. Segment one is .23 miles of pave shoulder on the north side. Segment 2 includes .26 miles on north side, segment 3 is .26 miles, segment 4 is .5 miles, segment 5 is .46 miles shoulder, segment 6 is .25 miles. As with other projects, saw cut 1- 2 feet of existing edge and install 5 feet shoulders. Van Buren has a range of ADT: 8K to 12K. The existing shoulders are either non existent or beyond repair. This project does meet Avondale's specs and Maricopa County's roadway design.		
Discussion, Questions, and Answers at Street Committee Meeting #1		
Question: Looking at the costs, there are some difference between the McDowell (application 1) and Van Buren applications, which are for both shoulders. What are the differences? Answer: Not sure, we can look into it what the differences are, and we are looking at revising our cost estimates.		
Items needed for clarification by the Applicant for Street Committee Meeting #2		
Please review cost estimates.		
Clarified information, Comments from Applicant for Street Committee #2		
Based upon subsequent field investigations, segment 4 was removed from the project and the Engineer's Estimate was revised accordingly. The new length of project is 1.44 miles or 7603 linear feet and contains five (5) segments. The new Engineer's estimate was calculated to be \$559,838 or \$388,776/mile (construction-no design costs) from the old \$825,542 or \$421,195/mile. MAG Staff did a site visit on 11-7-08		

	Segment Location	Segment Work Description	Type of Paving For the Segment
1	North side of Van Buren Street starting at 99th Avenue and ending 1200 feet west of 99th Avenue	The existing pavement will be saw cut 2 feet and a paved shoulder (Minimum 5 feet per MCDOT Roadway Design Manual) will be constructed.	The paved shoulder's structural section will adhere to the approved City of Avondale's mix design for arterial road which consists of: 5-inches of AC on 12-inches of AB Hot Mix Design
2	North side of Van Buren Street, Starting 1300 ft west off 99th Avenue and ending 2665 ft west of 99th Avenue	The existing pavement will be saw cut 2 feet and a paved shoulder (Minimum 5 feet per MCDOT Roadway Design Manual) will be constructed	The paved shoulder's structural section will adhere to the approved City of Avondale's mix design for arterial road which consists of: 5-inches of AC on 12-inches of AB Hot Mix Design
3	Southside of Van Buren Street-Starting at 107th Avenue and ending 1350 feet east of 107th Avenue	The existing pavement will be saw cut 2 feet and a paved shoulder (Minimum 5 feet per MCDOT Roadway Design Manual) will be constructed	The paved shoulder's structural section will adhere to the approved City of Avondale's mix design for arterial road which consists of: 5-inches of AC on 12-inches of AB Hot Mix Design
4	North side of Van Buren Street, starting at 107th Avenue and ending at 111th Avenue	The existing pavement will be saw cut 2 feet and a paved shoulder (Minimum 5 feet per MCDOT Roadway Design Manual) will be constructed	The paved shoulder's structural section will adhere to the approved City of Avondale's mix design for arterial road which consists of: 5-inches of AC on 12-inches of AB Hot Mix Design
5	Southside of Van Buren Street, starting at Avondale Blvd. and ending at 2435 feet east of Avondale Blvd	The existing pavement will be saw cut 2 feet and a paved shoulder (Minimum 5 feet per MCDOT Roadway Design Manual) will be constructed	The paved shoulder's structural section will adhere to the approved City of Avondale's mix design for arterial road which consists of: 5-inches of AC on 12-inches of AB Hot Mix Design
6	North side of Van Buren Street, starting at El Mirage Road and ending 1300 feet east of El Mirage Road	The existing pavement will be saw cut 2 feet and a paved shoulder (Minimum 5 feet per MCDOT Roadway Design Manual) will be constructed	The paved shoulder's structural section will adhere to the approved City of Avondale's mix design for arterial road which consists of: 5-inches of AC on 12-inches of AB Hot Mix Design

Street Committee - Paving Review Sheet for Avondale Project 4		
Project Name:		Vermeersch/127th Avenue
Description of Project:		Both shoulders of Vermeersch are non-existent causing a dust problem which has been a source of complaints and which has been documented by the County's AIR Quality Unit. A large number of trucks from the local quarry is the main point of the dust. Shoulders would be installed from Lower Buckeye to Broadway. Both sides Vermeersch/127th Avenue will be constructed. In addition, additional pavement will be added at all driveways locations (up to the right-of-way line) and
Year of Requested Funds (2011 or 2012):		2011
Project Application Link:		http://www.mag.maricopa.gov/pdf/PM-10_FY2009-Applications/Avondale%20Pave%204%20-%20Vermeersch.pdf
Category	Project Data	SAMPLE Data Adequacy Questions
1 Average Daily Traffic	ADT: 1,220.00	- Is the ADT estimate based on a sound methodology? - Does the ADT estimate seem reasonable?
2 Right-of-Way Cost	Cost: \$0.00 Cost/Mi = \$0.00	- Does the project require the purchase of ROW? - Is the ROW cost estimate reasonable? Per mile? - Does the ROW cost estimate appear to be complete? - Does ROW cost estimate reflect the project description in the application?
3 Utilities Cost	Cost: \$0.00 Cost/Mi = \$0.00	- Does the project require the relocation of utilities? - Is cost for utilities reasonable? Per mile? - Does the cost to relocate utilities reflect the project description in the application? - Have all the utilities in the project been addressed?
4 Construction Cost	Cost: \$931,665.50 Cost/Mi = \$776,387.92	- Is the construction cost estimate reasonable? Per mile? - Does the construction cost estimate appear to be complete? - Does construction cost estimate reflect the project description in the application?
5 Design Schedule	Programmed: FY 2009 Months to Complete: 31	- Are there any special features or challenges with the project that would require longer than average lead time for design - Does the design phase begin early enough to ensure the construction phase of the project will be obligated in the year
6 ROW Schedule	Programmed: None Months to Complete: None	- Does the project need to include a ROW phase? - Are there any special features or challenges with the project that would require longer than average lead time to complete - Does the ROW phase begin early enough to ensure the construction phase of the project will be obligated in the year
Presentation at Street Committee Meeting #1		
Another pave unpaved shoulder on Vermeesch, looking to pave a total of 2.4 miles. Extra paving at all entrances and driveways up to the city's right of way is part of the project. The ADT is just over 1,200, 30% are trucks coming from local quarry. This project does meet Avondale's specs and Maricopa County's roadway design.		
Discussion, Questions, and Answers at Street Committee Meeting #1		
Question: Avondale verbal discription sounds like there is more going on than just paving shoulders, it is suggested to expand the project description to include this, which may explain why the cost is so high. Please deliniate that in the application. Answer: Yes we can do that, this entire road is not in good condition, so there would be additional work needed. Question: were the complaints about the dust coming from the shoulders or the trucks using the road. Answer: Both. Question: Have you approached the trucking company to see if they would cost share? Answer: There was discussion with the trucking company, there were not willing to cost share, we're going to ask again. Lower ADT, but there is high truck. Does it need more work than the shoulder? Answer: Yes, it does, we're looking into this.		
Items needed for clarification by the Applicant for Street Committee Meeting #2		
Please review project description, the applicant may want to update it based on the presentation and why the costs are higher than the other paving shoulder projects.		
Clarified information, Comments from Applicant for Street Committee #2		
Estimate was revisited and the costs are in line with other shoulder projects (Both sides Vermeersch/127th Avenue will be constructed versus 1 side for the other projects) In addition, additional pavement will be added at all driveways locations (up to the right-of-way line) and entrances to greatly reduce dust particulates. MAG Staff did a site visit on 11-7-08		

	Segment Location	Segment Work Description	Type of Paving For the Segment
1	Vermeersch/127th Avenue	City will bear the costs of repairing the roadway. City requesting funding for the installation of the shoulders. The existing pavement will be saw cut 2 feet and a paved shoulder (Minimum 5 feet per MCDOT Roadway Design Manual) will be constructed	The paved shoulder's structural section will adhere to the approved City of Avondale's mix design for arterial road which consists of: 5-inches of AC on 12-inches of AB Hot Mix Design

Street Committee - Paving Review Sheet for Avondale Project 5

Project Name:		Avondale Blvd-McDowell Road to Encanto	
Description of Project:		Starting at a McDowell Road and ending at Encanto there exists approximately 2600 ft (.39 miles) of insufficient unpaved shoulder on the Westside of Avondale Blvd. where the exist paved shoulder is non-existent or it does not meet the min width of 5 ft (MCDOT-Rdwy Design Manual). Due to exist lane widths, there is no opportunity to re-stripe the roadway.	
Year of Requested Funds (2011 or 2012):		2011	
Project Application Link:		http://www.mag.maricopa.gov/pdf/PM-10_FY2009-Applications/Avondale%20Pave%205%20-%20Avondale.pdf	
Category	Project Data	SAMPLE Data Adequacy Questions	
1	Average Daily Traffic ADT: 10,302.00	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Is the ADT estimate based on a sound methodology? - Does the ADT estimate seem reasonable? 	
2	Right-of-Way Cost Cost: \$0.00 Cost/Mi = \$0.00	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Does the project require the purchase of ROW? - Is the ROW cost estimate reasonable? Per mile? - Does the ROW cost estimate appear to be complete? - Does ROW cost estimate reflect the project description in the application? 	
3	Utilities Cost Cost: \$0.00 Cost/Mi = \$0.00	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Does the project require the relocation of utilities? - Is cost for utilities reasonable? Per mile? - Does the cost to relocate utilities reflect the project description in the application? - Have all the utilities in the project been addressed? 	
4	Construction Cost Cost: \$155,657 Cost/Mi = \$399,120.50	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Is the construction cost estimate reasonable? Per mile? - Does the construction cost estimate appear to be complete? - Does construction cost estimate reflect the project description in the application? 	
5	Design Schedule Programmed: FY 2009 Months to Complete: 31	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Are there any special features or challenges with the project that would require longer then average lead time for design - Does the design phase begin early enough to ensure the construction phase of the project will be obligated in the year 	
6	ROW Schedule Programmed: None Months to Complete: None	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Does the project need to include a ROW phase? - Are there any special features or challenges with the project that would require longer then average lead time to complete - Does the ROW phase begin early enough to ensure the construction phase of the project will be obligated in the year 	

Presentation at Street Committee Meeting #1

Unpaved shoulder project on west side of Avondale Blvd from McDowell to Encanto, about a 1/2 mile long, install 5 foot wide shoulder. The existing shoulder is either non-existent or beyond repair. Currently Avondale Blvd is a major arterial and has an ADT of just over 10K. There are no environmental and ROW or utilities impacts or conflicts as well. This project does meet Avondale's specs and Maricopa County's roadway design.

Discussion, Questions, and Answers at Street Committee Meeting #1

Question: Where you are doing your shoulder paving projects, are you including or marking these as striped bike lane? Answer: Right now, is there an opportunity to re-stripe, but we did not take into account any bike lanes. Comment: A committee member is working on a project right now that will stripe the shoulder as a bike lane so it can serve two purposes. Answer: We can look into striping it as bicycle lane, if there is connectivity.

Items needed for clarification by the Applicant for Street Committee Meeting #2

Please see if shoulder could be striped as bicycle lane.

Clarified information, Comments from Applicant for Street Committee #2

Staff is open to stripe this segment as a bike lane. In final design, a more comprehensive inspection would take place. There is 528 linear feet of existing curb and gutter that is located along this segment Palm Lane south. Due potential drainage problems, this segment was removed from this project and the engineer's estimate was modified. The new project length is now .39 miles or 2060 linear feet. Project Construction Cost has changed from \$229,755 to \$155,657. MAG Staff did a site visit on 11-7-08

Segment Location	Segment Work Description	Type of Paving For the Segment
------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------------

1	Starting at a McDowell Road and ending at Encanto there exists approximately 2600 ft (.39 miles) of insufficient unpaved shoulder on the Westside of Avondale Blvd. where the exist paved shoulder is non-	The existing pavement will be saw cut 2 feet and a paved shoulder (Minimum 5 feet per MCDOT Roadway Design Manual) will be constructed	The paved shoulder's structural section will adhere to the approved City of Avondale's mix design for arterial road which consists of: 5-inches of AC on 12-inches of AB Hot Mix Design
---	--	--	---

Street Committee - Paving Review Sheet for Buckeye Project 4

Project Name:		North Watson Road and MC85 Phase I and Phase II	
Description of Project:		This project proposes to pave two lanes of 3" thick asphalt concrete on 4" of crushed aggregate North Watson Road, ~ 0.25 mile in length north. Phase II will be a continuation of the phase I project where Phase I is the environmental, utility and right of way clearance and Phase II is the construction and implementation of the plan.	
Year of Requested Funds (2011 or 2012):		2011	
Project Application Link:		http://www.mag.maricopa.gov/pdf/PM-10_FY2009-Applications/Buckeye%20Pave%204%20-%20N.%20Watson.pdf	
Category		Project Data	
SAMPLE Data Adequacy Questions			
1	Average Daily Traffic	ADT: 289.00	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Is the ADT estimate based on a sound methodology? - Does the ADT estimate seem reasonable?
2	Right-of-Way Cost	Cost: \$0.00 Cost/Mi = \$0.00	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Does the project require the purchase of ROW? - Is the ROW cost estimate reasonable? Per mile? - Does the ROW cost estimate appear to be complete? - Does ROW cost estimate reflect the project description in the application?
3	Utilities Cost	Cost: \$0.00 Cost/Mi = \$0.00	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Does the project require the relocation of utilities? - Is cost for utilities reasonable? Per mile? - Does the cost to relocate utilities reflect the project description in the application? - Have all the utilities in the project been addressed?
4	Construction Cost	Cost: \$68,352.00 Cost/Mi = \$310,690.91	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Is the construction cost estimate reasonable? Per mile? - Does the construction cost estimate appear to be complete? - Does construction cost estimate reflect the project description in the application?
5	Design Schedule	Programmed: FY 2009 Months to Complete: 31	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Are there any special features or challenges with the project that would require longer then average lead time for design - Does the design phase begin early enough to ensure the construction phase of the project will be obligated in the year
6	ROW Schedule	Programmed: FY 2009 Months to Complete: 31	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Does the project need to include a ROW phase? - Are there any special features or challenges with the project that would require longer then average lead time to complete - Does the ROW phase begin early enough to ensure the construction phase of the project will be obligated in the year

Presentation at Street Committee Meeting #1

Scott Lowe, Public Works Director presented. Watson road will eventually be a gateway road into Buckeye with the I-10 interchange. This project is paving 2 lanes of traffic, about 1.5 miles from PM-10 monitor. About \$115K is the total cost.

Discussion, Questions, and Answers at Street Committee Meeting #1

Question: A Street Committee member asked if all applicants could answer the questions on how the ADT was calculated, if the cost estimate was completed by a registered engineer, and is inflation included in the cost estimate? Answer: The counts for this project were done by hand and that a registered engineer devised the construction cost estimate. Question: Another member asked if the Ford dealership (adjacent to the project) could contribute funds to the project because it is believed that they would contribute to the traffic? Answer: The member agency answered that the traffic from dealership is actually on MC-85, and the vast majority of the traffic on the proposed street is by the residents. Question/Comment: A Committee member commented that the ADT of 289 seemed high. Answer: The applicant responded that they can go back and validate the ADT number. Maricopa County commented to the committee that if there is a dirt road in their community that is owned by Maricopa County, the County will be more than happy to come out and do counts on that road free of charge. Also, Buckeye canal is just to the north of this road who are also users of the road.

Items needed for clarification by the Applicant for Street Committee Meeting #2

Validate/Verify the ADT number.

Clarified information, Comments from Applicant for Street Committee #2

15 minute Peak AM (7am-10am) hand counts were completed. The highest 15 min value was converted to an hourly flow rate; the peak hourly flow rate was converted to an ADT based upon a peak hour spreading factor (k-factor) of 0.0833. The ADT of 289 was validated.

	Segment Location	Segment Work Description	Type of Paving For the Segment
1	From MC85 to ~1240' North on Watson Road	Grading and reshaping of sub grade with compaction of up to 4" of crushed granular base. Placement of 2 lanes of 3" compacted asphaltic concrete.	Flexible pavement construction consisting of asphaltic cement concrete over crushed aggregate base course.

Street Committee - Paving Review Sheet for Buckeye Project 2		
Project Name:		Shoulder Paving Beloat Road from Miller to Rainbow
Description of Project:		This project proposes to pave two shoulders of 2" thick asphalt concrete w/4" Aggregate base course on Beloat Road, ~ 3 miles in length (east-west).
Year of Requested Funds (2011 or 2012):		2011
Project Application Link:		http://www.mag.maricopa.gov/pdf/PM-10_FY2009-Applications/Buckeye%20Pave%202%20-%20Beloat.pdf
Category	Project Data	SAMPLE Data Adequacy Questions
1 Average Daily Traffic	ADT: 2,873.00	- Is the ADT estimate based on a sound methodology? - Does the ADT estimate seem reasonable?
2 Right-of-Way Cost	Cost: \$0.00 Cost/Mi = \$0.00	- Does the project require the purchase of ROW? - Is the ROW cost estimate reasonable? Per mile? - Does the ROW cost estimate appear to be complete? - Does ROW cost estimate reflect the project description in the application?
3 Utilities Cost	Cost: \$0.00 Cost/Mi = \$0.00	- Does the project require the relocation of utilities? - Is cost for utilities reasonable? Per mile? - Does the cost to relocate utilities reflect the project description in the application? - Have all the utilities in the project been addressed?
4 Construction Cost	Cost: \$503,712.00 Cost/Mi = \$167,904.00	- Is the construction cost estimate reasonable? Per mile? - Does the construction cost estimate appear to be complete? - Does construction cost estimate reflect the project description in the application?
5 Design Schedule	Programmed: FY 2009 Months to Complete: 31	- Are there any special features or challenges with the project that would require longer then average lead time for design - Does the design phase begin early enough to ensure the construction phase of the project will be obligated in the year
6 ROW Schedule	Programmed: FY 2009 Months to Complete: 31	- Does the project need to include a ROW phase? - Are there any special features or challenges with the project that would require longer then average lead time to complete - Does the ROW phase begin early enough to ensure the construction phase of the project will be obligated in the year

Presentation at Street Committee Meeting #1

Scott Lowe, Pubic Works Director presented. The project is a shoulder paving project that is comprised of 3 segments of shoulders for a total of 3 miles, located about a mile from the PM-10 monitor. Rural road with unpaved dirt shoulders. About \$576K total project costs. All right of way is owned by the Town, south side has an irrigation canal. The Wastewater treatment plant is about 1/2 mile south of the road.

Discussion, Questions, and Answers at Street Committee Meeting #1

Question: For shoulder paving projects, what is the actual width for this project? Answer: 6 feet wide, on the 2nd page/reverse side of the project review sheet, in the segment work description, it states this.

Items needed for clarification by the Applicant for Street Committee Meeting #2

All questions and comments were answered at Street Committee Meeting #1. There are no outstanding questions.

	Segment Location	Segment Work Description	Type of Paving For the Segment
1	From Miller Road to Apache Road ~5280' on Beloat	Grading and reshaping of sub grade with compaction of up to 4" of crushed granular base. Placement of shoulders on each side of road with 2" compacted asphaltic concrete on shoulder ways 6' wide.	Flexible pavement construction consisting of asphaltic cement concrete over crushed aggregate base course.

2	From Apache Road to Watson Road ~5280' on Beloit	Grading and reshaping of sub grade with compaction of up to 4" of crushed granular base. Placement of shoulders on each side of road with 2" compacted asphaltic concrete on shoulder ways 6' wide.	Flexible pavement construction consisting of asphaltic cement concrete over crushed aggregate base course.
3	From Watson Road to Rainbow Road ~5280' on Beloit	Grading and reshaping of sub grade with compaction of up to 4" of crushed granular base. Placement of shoulders on each side of road with 2" compacted asphaltic concrete on shoulder ways 6' wide.	Flexible pavement construction consisting of asphaltic cement concrete over crushed aggregate base course.

Street Committee - Paving Review Sheet for Buckeye Project 1

Project Name:	7th Street - Norton Drive from Beloat Road (South)
Description of Project:	This project proposes to pave two lanes of 3" thick asphalt concrete on 4" of crushed aggregate on 7th Street, about 0.5 mile in length south from Beloat avenue. This road feeds the Town Waste Water Treatment Plant and Fire Training Facility and future Police Training Facility

Year of Requested Funds (2011 or 2012):	2011
Project Application Link:	http://www.mag.maricopa.gov/pdf/PM-10_FY2009-Applications/Buckeye%20Pave%201%20-%207th%20Street.pdf

	Category	Project Data	SAMPLE Data Adequacy Questions
1	Average Daily Traffic	ADT: 96.00	- Is the ADT estimate based on a sound methodology? - Does the ADT estimate seem reasonable?
2	Right-of-Way Cost	Cost: \$0.00 Cost/Mi = \$0.00	- Does the project require the purchase of ROW? - Is the ROW cost estimate reasonable? Per mile? - Does the ROW cost estimate appear to be complete? - Does ROW cost estimate reflect the project description in the application?
3	Utilities Cost	Cost: \$0.00 Cost/Mi = \$0.00	- Does the project require the relocation of utilities? - Is cost for utilities reasonable? Per mile? - Does the cost to relocate utilities reflect the project description in the application? - Have all the utilities in the project been addressed?
4	Construction Cost	Cost: \$125,312.00 Cost/Mi = \$313,280.00	- Is the construction cost estimate reasonable? Per mile? - Does the construction cost estimate appear to be complete? - Does construction cost estimate reflect the project description in the application?
5	Design Schedule	Programmed: FY 2009 Months to Complete: 31	- Are there any special features or challenges with the project that would require longer then average lead time for design - Does the design phase begin early enough to ensure the construction phase of the project will be obligated in the year
6	ROW Schedule	Programmed: FY 2009 Months to Complete: 31	- Does the project need to include a ROW phase? - Are there any special features or challenges with the project that would require longer then average lead time to complete - Does the ROW phase begin early enough to ensure the construction phase of the project will be obligated in the year

Presentation at Street Committee Meeting #1

Scott Lowe, Public Works Director presented. This project is just south of Beloat Rd; 7th Street is the road that the waste water treatment plan is located on. This is a well traveled road. This is also near the Buckeye/Glendale firefighting training facility. Heavy duty trucks everyday with regular vehicles with waste water, 2 lanes of traffic, south center of the Town, approx. 1.5 miles from PM-10 monitor, unpaved Rural Road. All of the ROW is owned by the Town and there are irrigation canals on either side.

Discussion, Questions, and Answers at Street Committee Meeting #1

Question: what was the cost of the project? About \$180K total. On the Project Review sheet, it notes that the Construction costs are \$125K. MAG Staff did note that the design costs are not included on the project review sheet, the total cost of the project is \$177,825. Question: Regarding ADT, what type of vehicles use the road? Answer: The traffic counts are mostly fire trucks and other city vehicles going to and from the fire training facilities and waste water treatment facility.

Items needed for clarification by the Applicant for Street Committee Meeting #2

All questions and comments were answered at Street Committee Meeting #1. There are no outstanding questions.

	Segment Location	Segment Work Description	Type of Paving For the Segment
1	From Beloat Road to ~2200' South on 7th Street	Grading and reshaping of sub grade with compaction of up to 4" of crushed granular base. Placement of 2 lanes of 3" compacted asphaltic concrete.	Flexible pavement construction consisting of asphaltic cement concrete over crushed aggregate base course.

Street Committee - Paving Review Sheet for El Mirage Project 1			
Project Name:		Eastside Downtown Alley Paving Project	
Description of Project:		Paving existing unpaved alleys in the east side of the downtown area (East of El Mirage Road). The project termini is generally Grand Ave to the north, Thunderbird Avenue to the south, El Mirage Road to the west, and El Frio Street to the east. Alleys to be 16' edge to edge chip and seal with dust proof surface (millings) to edge of alley ROW.	
Year of Requested Funds (2011 or 2012):		2012	
Project Application Link:		http://www.mag.maricopa.gov/pdf/PM-10_FY2009-Applications/El%20Mirage%20Pave%201%20-%20East%20Alleys.pdf	
	Category	Project Data	SAMPLE Data Adequacy Questions
1	Average Daily Traffic	ADT: 66.00	- Is the ADT estimate based on a sound methodology? - Does the ADT estimate seem reasonable?
2	Right-of-Way Cost	Cost: \$0.00 Cost/Mi = \$0.00	- Does the project require the purchase of ROW? - Is the ROW cost estimate reasonable? Per mile? - Does the ROW cost estimate appear to be complete? - Does ROW cost estimate reflect the project description in the application?
3	Utilities Cost	Cost: \$0.00 Cost/Mi = \$0.00	- Does the project require the relocation of utilities? - Is cost for utilities reasonable? Per mile? - Does the cost to relocate utilities reflect the project description in the application? - Have all the utilities in the project been addressed?
4	Construction Cost	Cost: \$297,973 Cost/Mi = \$137,950.50	- Is the construction cost estimate reasonable? Per mile? - Does the construction cost estimate appear to be complete? - Does construction cost estimate reflect the project description in the application?
5	Design Schedule	Programmed: FY 2011 Months to Complete: 24	- Are there any special features or challenges with the project that would require longer then average lead time for design - Does the design phase begin early enough to ensure the construction phase of the project will be obligated in the year
6	ROW Schedule	Programmed: None Months to Complete: None	- Does the project need to include a ROW phase? - Are there any special features or challenges with the project that would require longer then average lead time to complete - Does the ROW phase begin early enough to ensure the construction phase of the project will be obligated in the year
Presentation at Street Committee Meeting #1			
Lance Calvert from El Mirage presented. El Mirage submitted 2 applications for paving their downtown neighborhood alleys and the applications are split between the west and east side of El Mirage Road. There will be base core work and chip and seal surface. The location of the alleys are less than 2 miles away from an air quality monitor. Traffic counts were completed using tube counters and it came to 66 ADT. We did a representative sample and is fairly dense for residential. Many multi family and single family use the alleys. We were surprised how much traffic that where going through the alleys. Cost estimate for our standard, 6 inches of AB, and chip and seal surfaces. Based on information on some of the other applications from the phoenix and Goodyear applications, we could substantially reduce our costs if we use other technologies.			
Discussion, Questions, and Answers at Street Committee Meeting #1			
Question/Comment: Thanks for mentioning possibly using different technologies, it does look like you have a wider cross section than Phoenix. Question: With the higher ADT, are you assuming that the residents are using these? Yes, in addition to single family, we have multi family housing too that use the alley as access to the property. As a general comment, through these presentations, we are learning from our peers.			
Items needed for clarification by the Applicant for Street Committee Meeting #2			
All questions and comments were answered at Street Committee Meeting #1. There are no outstanding questions.			
Clarified information, Comments from Applicant for Street Committee #2			
Project Construction costs were changed from \$441,144 to \$297,873			

	Segment Location	Segment Work Description	Type of Paving For the Segment
1	Generally begins at Thunderbird Road and continues north to Grand Avenue along all alleys with uniform cross section.	See standard cross section attached. Work to included; minor excavation/grading, sub grade preparation, utility adjustments, Aggregate Base &/or Millings, and a paved chip and seal surface.	Base Course construction and chip and seal surface

Street Committee - Paving Review Sheet for El Mirage Project 2

Project Name:		Westside Downtown Alley Paving Project
Description of Project:		Paving existing unpaved alleys in the west side of the downtown area (West of El Mirage Road). The project termini is generally Santa Fe Lane to the north, Thunderbird Avenue to the south, 5th Avenue to the west, and El Mirage Road to the east. Alleys to be 16' edge to edge chip and seal with dust proof surface (millings) to edge of alley ROW.
Year of Requested Funds (2011 or 2012):		2011
Project Application Link:		http://www.mag.maricopa.gov/pdf/PM-10_FY2009-Applications/El%20Mirage%20Pave%20%20-%20West%20Alleys.pdf
	Category	Project Data
1	Average Daily Traffic	ADT: 66.00 - Is the ADT estimate based on a sound methodology? - Does the ADT estimate seem reasonable?
2	Right-of-Way Cost	Cost: \$0.00 Cost/Mi = \$0.00 - Does the project require the purchase of ROW? - Is the ROW cost estimate reasonable? Per mile? - Does the ROW cost estimate appear to be complete? - Does ROW cost estimate reflect the project description in the application?
3	Utilities Cost	Cost: \$0.00 Cost/Mi = \$0.00 - Does the project require the relocation of utilities? - Is cost for utilities reasonable? Per mile? - Does the cost to relocate utilities reflect the project description in the application? - Have all the utilities in the project been addressed?
4	Construction Cost	Cost: \$234,715 Cost/Mi = \$138,067.60 - Is the construction cost estimate reasonable? Per mile? - Does the construction cost estimate appear to be complete? - Does construction cost estimate reflect the project description in the application?
5	Design Schedule	Programmed: FY 2010 Months to Complete: 24 - Are there any special features or challenges with the project that would require longer than average lead time for design? - Does the design phase begin early enough to ensure the construction phase of the project will be obligated in the year?
6	ROW Schedule	Programmed: None Months to Complete: None - Does the project need to include a ROW phase? - Are there any special features or challenges with the project that would require longer than average lead time to complete? - Does the ROW phase begin early enough to ensure the construction phase of the project will be obligated in the year?

Presentation at Street Committee Meeting #1

Project 2 is west of El Mirage Road, and has the same characteristics. Question: When looking at cost of these alleys, don't forget the scale of the project when looking or comparing 4 miles to 40 miles. Will these become part of the O & M of the street department? Yes

Discussion, Questions, and Answers at Street Committee Meeting #1

Question: When looking at cost of these alleys, don't forget the scale of the project when looking or comparing 4 miles to 40 miles. Will these become part of the O & M of the street department? Yes

Items needed for clarification by the Applicant for Street Committee Meeting #2

All questions and comments were answered at Street Committee Meeting #1. There are no outstanding questions.

Clarified information, Comments from Applicant for Street Committee #2

Project Construction costs were changed from \$347,940 to \$234,715.

	Segment Location	Segment Work Description	Type of Paving For the Segment
1	Generally begins 450' south of Ventura St and continues north to Santa Fe Ln along all alleys with uniform cross section.	See standard cross section attached. Work to included; minor excavation/grading, sub grade preparation, utility adjustments, Aggregate Base &/or Millings, and a paved chip and seal surface.	Base Course construction and chip and seal surface

Street Committee - Paving Review Sheet for Fort McDowell Yavapai Nation Project 1		
Project Name:		Fort McDowell Yavapai Nation (FMYN): Hiawatha Hood Rd, SR-87 to 3 miles north (FMYN Phase 3)
Description of Project:		Pave approx. 24 feet wide dirt road with an expected minimum cross-section of 4 inches of AC on up to 12 inches of subgrade, as determined by the geotechnical report. Anything more than that would be regarded as more than "paving of a dirt road" and FMYN will provide the additional costs. This roadway leads from State Route 87 north for over ten miles and is the primary access point for several Tribal Enterprises, which generate a lot of recreational and heavy truck traffic. 3 miles
Year of Requested Funds (2011 or 2012):		2011
Project Application Link:		http://www.mag.maricopa.gov/pdf/PM-10_FY2009-Applications/Ft%20McDowell%20Pave%201.pdf
Category	Project Data	SAMPLE Data Adequacy Questions
1 Average Daily Traffic	ADT: 635.00	- Is the ADT estimate based on a sound methodology? - Does the ADT estimate seem reasonable?
2 Right-of-Way Cost	Cost: \$0.00 Cost/Mi = \$0.00	- Does the project require the purchase of ROW? - Is the ROW cost estimate reasonable? Per mile? - Does the ROW cost estimate appear to be complete? - Does ROW cost estimate reflect the project description in the application?
3 Utilities Cost	Cost: \$0.00 Cost/Mi = \$0.00	- Does the project require the relocation of utilities? - Is cost for utilities reasonable? Per mile? - Does the cost to relocate utilities reflect the project description in the application? - Have all the utilities in the project been addressed?
4 Construction Cost	Cost: \$890,000.00 Cost/Mi = \$296,666.67	- Is the construction cost estimate reasonable? Per mile? - Does the construction cost estimate appear to be complete? - Does construction cost estimate reflect the project description in the application?
5 Design Schedule	Programmed: FY 2009 Months to Complete: 31	- Are there any special features or challenges with the project that would require longer then average lead time for design - Does the design phase begin early enough to ensure the construction phase of the project will be obligated in the year
6 ROW Schedule	Programmed: FY 2010 Months to Complete: 24	- Does the project need to include a ROW phase? - Are there any special features or challenges with the project that would require longer then average lead time to complete - Does the ROW phase begin early enough to ensure the construction phase of the project will be obligated in the year

Presentation at Street Committee Meeting #1

Alfonso Rodriguez, North of SRP-MIC and east of Fountain Hills. About 50 miles of road to be paved and about 19 miles are in their short term paving program. Ft. McDowell has been one of the first tribal communities to received CMAQ funds for a paving project and has taken a year to get the IGA approved for another federal aid project. The community's transportation budget is very small and basically made up of tribal funds. The application involves about 14 miles of paving applications and design concept report. They monitor PM-10 air quality and the impact on air quality from the rest of valley very closely; they have a very stringent monitoring.

Discussion, Questions, and Answers at Street Committee Meeting #1

Question: Change the proejct title to the segment name. Answer: Yes, that can be done. How was the ADT calculated for each application? Answer: yes, we had a consultant organize the data. Question: What is the width roadway? Answer: That will have to be determined by the DCR. We have to use both the BIA and federal standards. Question/Comment: Without having the width of the roadway, how were the cost estimates were determined? Answer: It was determined by the consultant. Question/Comment: It would be helpful if there was more description about what type of paving, based on the Maricopa County cost estimates, these seem relatively low. Question: Where do these roads lead to? Answer: They used for local traffic, they are somewhat of a rural community. Question/Comment: It might be helpful to see where the roads connect to. Question/Comment: It's hard to determine where the roads are from the maps and if they connect to other roads that relate to ADT. This will be helpful for the next review committee.

Items needed for clarification by the Applicant for Street Committee Meeting #2

Please change the project name to include the location. Please provide the width/cross section of the roadway to be paved. Please explain what type of paving is to be done. The committee also thought it would be helpful to have a more detailed location map, aerial photo that would explain the relation of the road to others roadways and ADT.

Clarified information, Comments from Applicant for Street Committee #2

The revised Project Name is Fort McDowell Yavapai Nation (FMYN): Hiawatha Hood Rd, SR-87 to 3 miles north (FMYN Phase 3). All of the FMYN requests are the subject of a Design Concept Report that is currently underway to determine the precise details of the needed roadway width and cross-section. The expected need is to pave approx. 24 feet wide dirt road with an expected minimum cross-section of 4 inches of AC on up to 12 inches of subgrade, as determined by the geotechnical report. Anything more than that would be regarded as more than "paving of a dirt road" and FMYN will provide the additional costs. This roadway leads from State Route 87 north for over ten miles and is the primary access point for several Tribal Enterprises, which generate a lot of recreational and heavy truck traffic. These enterprises will be sharing the additional costs needed to upgrade the roadway to an appropriate cross-section. This project is FMYN's Number One Priority.

	Segment Location	Segment Work Description	Type of Paving For the Segment
1	Hiawatha Hood Rd: SR-87 to 3 miles north	The expected need is to pave approx. 24 feet wide dirt road with an expected minimum cross-section of 4 inches of AC on up to 12 inches of subgrade, as determined by the geotechnical report.	A minimum 4 inches of AC is anticipated to be necessary

Street Committee - Paving Review Sheet for Fort McDowell Yavapai Nation Project 2			
Project Name:		Fort McDowell Yavapai Nation (FMYN): Mustang Way, 1.5 miles north of Fort McDowell Rd, 4 miles north to the northern boundary (Rio Verde) (FMYN Phase 4)	
Description of Project:		Pave approx. 24 feet wide dirt road with a minimum depth of 3 inches of AC on up to 8 inches of subgrade, as determined by the geotechnical report. This roadway is the continuation of Fort McDowell Road (a MCDOT maintained facility), and connects to the rural community of Rio Verde approximately 5.5 miles north of where Fort McDowell Road currently ends. 4 miles	
Year of Requested Funds (2011 or 2012):		2011	
Project Application Link:		http://www.mag.maricopa.gov/pdf/PM-10_FY2009-Applications/F1%20McDowell%20Pave%202.pdf	
	Category	Project Data	SAMPLE Data Adequacy Questions
1	Average Daily Traffic	ADT: 307.00	- Is the ADT estimate based on a sound methodology? - Does the ADT estimate seem reasonable?
2	Right-of-Way Cost	Cost: \$0.00 Cost/Mi = \$0.00	- Does the project require the purchase of ROW? - Is the ROW cost estimate reasonable? Per mile? - Does the ROW cost estimate appear to be complete? - Does ROW cost estimate reflect the project description in the application?
3	Utilities Cost	Cost: \$0.00 Cost/Mi = \$0.00	- Does the project require the relocation of utilities? - Is cost for utilities reasonable? Per mile? - Does the cost to relocate utilities reflect the project description in the application? - Have all the utilities in the project been addressed?
4	Construction Cost	Cost: \$940,000.00 Cost/Mi = \$235,000.00	- Is the construction cost estimate reasonable? Per mile? - Does the construction cost estimate appear to be complete? - Does construction cost estimate reflect the project description in the application?
5	Design Schedule	Programmed: FY 2009 Months to Complete: 31	- Are there any special features or challenges with the project that would require longer then average lead time for design - Does the design phase begin early enough to ensure the construction phase of the project will be obligated in the year
6	ROW Schedule	Programmed: FY 2010 Months to Complete: 24	- Does the project need to include a ROW phase? - Are there any special features or challenges with the project that would require longer then average lead time to complete - Does the ROW phase begin early enough to ensure the construction phase of the project will be obligated in the year

Presentation at Street Committee Meeting #1

Alfonso Rodriguez, North of SRP-MIC and east of Fountain Hills. About 50 miles of road to be paved and about 19 miles are in their short term paving program. Ft. McDowell has been one of the first tribal communities to received CMAQ funds for a paving project and has taken a year to get the IGA approved for another federal aid project. The community's transportation budget is very small and basically made up of tribal funds. The application involves about 14 miles of paving applications and design concept report. They monitor PM-10 air quality and the impact on air quality from the rest of valley very closely; they have a very stringent monitoring.

Discussion, Questions, and Answers at Street Committee Meeting #1

Question: Change the proejct title to the segment name. Answer: Yes, that can be done. How was the ADT calculated for each application? Answer: yes, we had a consultant organize the data. Question: What is the width roadway? Answer: That will have to be determined by the DCR. We have to use both the BIA and federal standards. Question/Comment: Without having the width of the roadway, how were the cost estimates were determined? Answer: It was determined by the consultant. Question/Comment: It would be helpful if there was more description about what type of paving, based on the Maricopa County cost estimates, these seem relatively low. Question: Where do these roads lead to? Answer: They used for local traffic, they are somewhat of a rural community. Question/Comment: It might be helpful to see where the roads connect to. Question/Comment: It's hard to determine where the roads are from the maps and if they connect to other roads that relate to ADT. This will be helpful for the next review committee.

Items needed for clarification by the Applicant for Street Committee Meeting #2

Please change the project name to include the location. Please provide the width/cross section of the roadway to be paved. Please explain what type of paving is to be done. The committee also thought it would be helpful to have a more detailed location map, aerial photo that would explain the relation of the road to others roadways and ADT.

Clarified information, Comments from Applicant for Street Committee #2

The revised Project Name is Fort McDowell Yavapai Nation (FMYN): Mustang Way, 1.5 miles north of Fort McDowell Rd, 4 miles north to the northern boundary (Rio Verde) (FMYN Phase 4). All of the FMYN requests are the subject of a Design Concept Report that is currently underway to determine the precise details of the needed roadway width and cross-section. The expected need is to pave approx. 24 feet wide dirt road with a minimum depth of 3 inches of AC on up to 8 inches of subgrade, as determined by the geotechnical report. Anything more than that would be regarded as more than "paving of a dirt road" and FMYN will provide the additional costs. This roadway is the continuation of Fort McDowell Road (a MCDOT maintained facility), and connects to the rural community of Rio Verde approximately 5.5 miles north of where Fort McDowell Road currently ends. FMYN has already paved this roadway to a point

approximately 1.5 miles north of Fort McDowell Rd. The current dirt road is used by traffic accessing farms, residences and other tribal enterprises and cut-through Rio Verde traffic. This

	Segment Location	Segment Work Description	Type of Paving For the Segment
1	Mustang Way	The expected need is to pave approx. 24 feet wide dirt road with a minimum depth of 3 inches of AC on up to 8 inches of subgrade, as determined by the geotechnical report.	A minimum 3 inches of AC is anticipated to be necessary

Street Committee - Paving Review Sheet for Fort McDowell Yavapai Nation Project 3

Project Name:		Fort McDowell Yavapai Nation (FMYN): Ironwood, Harquahala and Sandtrap Rds (FMYN Phase 5)	
Description of Project:		Pave approx. 24 feet wide dirt road with a minimum depth of 3 inches of AC on 8 inches of subgrade, as determined by the geotechnical report. Anything more than that would be regarded as more than "paving of a dirt road" and FMYN will provide the additional costs. These are three separate roadways in the same southern area of the FMYN and all three connect at both ends to existing paved roadways. 3.6 miles	
Year of Requested Funds (2011 or 2012):		2012	
Project Application Link:		http://www.mag.maricopa.gov/pdf/PM-10_FY2009-Applications/Ft%20McDowell%20Pave%203.pdf	
Category		Project Data	
1	Average Daily Traffic	ADT: 43.89	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Is the ADT estimate based on a sound methodology? - Does the ADT estimate seem reasonable?
2	Right-of-Way Cost	Cost: \$0.00 Cost/Mi = \$0.00	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Does the project require the purchase of ROW? - Is the ROW cost estimate reasonable? Per mile? - Does the ROW cost estimate appear to be complete? - Does ROW cost estimate reflect the project description in the application?
3	Utilities Cost	Cost: \$0.00 Cost/Mi = \$0.00	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Does the project require the relocation of utilities? - Is cost for utilities reasonable? Per mile? - Does the cost to relocate utilities reflect the project description in the application? - Have all the utilities in the project been addressed?
4	Construction Cost	Cost: \$920,000.00 Cost/Mi = \$255,555.56	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Is the construction cost estimate reasonable? Per mile? - Does the construction cost estimate appear to be complete? - Does construction cost estimate reflect the project description in the application?
5	Design Schedule	Programmed: FY 2010 Months to Complete: 36	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Are there any special features or challenges with the project that would require longer then average lead time for design - Does the design phase begin early enough to ensure the construction phase of the project will be obligated in the year
6	ROW Schedule	Programmed: FY 2011 Months to Complete: 24	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Does the project need to include a ROW phase? - Are there any special features or challenges with the project that would require longer then average lead time to complete - Does the ROW phase begin early enough to ensure the construction phase of the project will be obligated in the year

Presentation at Street Committee Meeting #1

Alfonso Rodriguez, North of SRP-MIC and east of Fountain Hills. About 50 miles of road to be paved and about 19 miles are in their short term paving program. Ft. McDowell has been one of the first tribal communities to received CMAQ funds for a paving project and has taken a year to get the IGA approved for another federal aid project. The community's transportation budget is very small and basically made up of tribal funds. The application involves about 14 miles of paving applications and design concept report. They monitor PM-10 air quality and the impact on air quality from the rest of valley very closely; they have a very stringent monitoring.

Discussion, Questions, and Answers at Street Committee Meeting #1

Question: Change the project title to the segment name. Answer: Yes, that can be done. How was the ADT calculated for each application? Answer: yes, we had a consultant organize the data. Question: What is the width roadway? Answer: That will have to be determined by the DCR. We have to use both the BIA and federal standards. Question/Comment: Without having the width of the roadway, how were the cost estimates were determined? Answer: It was determined by the consultant. Question/Comment: It would be helpful if there was more description about what type of paving, based on the Maricopa County cost estimates, these seem relatively low. Question: Where do these roads lead to? Answer: They used for local traffic, they are somewhat of a rural community. Question/Comment: It might be helpful to see where the roads connect to. Question/Comment: It's hard to determine where the roads are from the maps and if they connect to other roads that relate to ADT. This will be helpful for the next review committee.

Items needed for clarification by the Applicant for Street Committee Meeting #2

Please change the project name to include the location. Please provide the width/cross section of the roadway to be paved. Please explain what type of paving is to be done. The committee also thought it would be helpful to have a more detailed location map, aerial photo that would explain the relation of the road to others roadways and ADT.

Clarified information, Comments from Applicant for Street Committee #2

The revised Project Name is Fort McDowell Yavapai Nation (FMYN): Ironwood, Harquahala and Sandtrap Rds (FMYN Phase 5). All of the FMYN requests are the subject of a Design Concept Report that is currently underway to determine the precise details of the needed roadway width and cross-section. The expected need is to pave approx. 24 feet wide dirt road with a minimum depth of 3 inches of AC on 8 inches of subgrade, as determined by the geotechnical report. Anything more than that would be regarded as more than "paving of a dirt road" and FMYN will provide the additional costs. These are three separate roadways in the same southern area of the FMYN and all three connect at both ends to existing paved roadways. Ironwood Rd is a small 0.4 mile segment that connects Toh Vee Circle to Fort McDowell Rd. it is the primary access for four residences and is used by cut-through traffic when the Casino is busy. Harquahala Rd is also known as Bada Wy Ya Ln and connects to Fort McDowell Rd at both the southern and northern ends. It is a 1.4 mile long loop road that serves residences and farms east of Fort McDowell Road and west of the Verde River. Sandtrap Rd is very similar except it is further south of Harquahala Rd and is approx. 1.8 miles long. It also connects to Fort McDowell Rd. These three small roadways is FMYN's Number Three Priority..

	Segment Location	Segment Work Description	Type of Paving For the Segment
1	Sandtrap Road	The expected need is to pave approx. 24 feet wide dirt road with a minimum depth of 3 inches of AC on 8 inches of subgrade, as determined by the geotechnical report. Anything more than that would be regarded as more than "paving of a dirt road" and FMYN will provide the additional costs.	A minimum 3 inches of AC is anticipated to be necessary
2	Ironwood Road	The expected need is to pave approx. 24 feet wide dirt road with a minimum depth of 3 inches of AC on 8 inches of subgrade, as determined by the geotechnical report. Anything more than that would be regarded as more than "paving of a dirt road" and FMYN will provide the additional costs.	A minimum 3 inches of AC is anticipated to be necessary
3	Harquahala Rd	The expected need is to pave approx. 24 feet wide dirt road with a minimum depth of 3 inches of AC on 8 inches of subgrade, as determined by the geotechnical report. Anything more than that would be regarded as more than "paving of a dirt road" and FMYN will provide the additional costs.	A minimum 3 inches of AC is anticipated to be necessary

Street Committee - Paving Review Sheet for Fort McDowell Yavapai Nation Project 4		
Project Name:		Fort McDowell Yavapai Nation (FMYN): Hiawatha Hood Rd, 3 miles north to 7 miles north (FMYN Phase 6).
Description of Project:		Pave approx. 24 feet wide dirt road with an expected minimum cross-section of 4 inches of AC on up to 12 inches of subgrade, as determined by the geotechnical report. This segment continues the paving of Hiawatha Hood Rd that was requested as Priority One. 4 miles
Year of Requested Funds (2011 or 2012):		2012
Project Application Link:		http://www.mag.maricopa.gov/pdf/PM-10_FY2009-Applications/Ft%20McDowell%20Pave%204.pdf
Category	Project Data	SAMPLE Data Adequacy Questions
1 Average Daily Traffic	ADT: 50.00	- Is the ADT estimate based on a sound methodology? - Does the ADT estimate seem reasonable?
2 Right-of-Way Cost	Cost: \$0.00 Cost/Mi = \$0.00	- Does the project require the purchase of ROW? - Is the ROW cost estimate reasonable? Per mile? - Does the ROW cost estimate appear to be complete? - Does ROW cost estimate reflect the project description in the application?
3 Utilities Cost	Cost: \$0.00 Cost/Mi = \$0.00	- Does the project require the relocation of utilities? - Is cost for utilities reasonable? Per mile? - Does the cost to relocate utilities reflect the project description in the application? - Have all the utilities in the project been addressed?
4 Construction Cost	Cost: \$940,000.00 Cost/Mi = \$235,000.00	- Is the construction cost estimate reasonable? Per mile? - Does the construction cost estimate appear to be complete? - Does construction cost estimate reflect the project description in the application?
5 Design Schedule	Programmed: FY 2010 Months to Complete: 36	- Are there any special features or challenges with the project that would require longer then average lead time for design - Does the design phase begin early enough to ensure the construction phase of the project will be obligated in the year
6 ROW Schedule	Programmed: FY 2011 Months to Complete: 24	- Does the project need to include a ROW phase? - Are there any special features or challenges with the project that would require longer then average lead time to complete - Does the ROW phase begin early enough to ensure the construction phase of the project will be obligated in the year

Presentation at Street Committee Meeting #1

Alfonso Rodriguez, North of SRP-MIC and east of Fountain Hills. About 50 miles of road to be paved and about 19 miles are in their short term paving program. Ft. McDowell has been one of the first tribal communities to received CMAQ funds for a paving project and has taken a year to get the IGA approved for another federal aid project. The community's transportation budget is very small and basically made up of tribal funds. The application involves about 14 miles of paving applications and design concept report. They monitor PM-10 air quality and the impact on air quality from the rest of valley very closely; they have a very stringent monitoring.

Discussion, Questions, and Answers at Street Committee Meeting #1

Question: Change the proejct title to the segment name. Answer: Yes, that can be done. How was the ADT calculated for each application? Answer: yes, we had a consultant organize the data. Question: What is the width roadway? Answer: That will have to be determined by the DCR. We have to use both the BIA and federal standards. Question/Comment: Without having the width of the roadway, how were the cost estimates were determined? Answer: It was determined by the consultant. Question/Comment: It would be helpful if there was more description about what type of paving, based on the Maricopa County cost estimates, these seem relatively low. Question: Where do these roads lead to? Answer: They used for local traffic, they are somewhat of a rural community. Question/Comment: It might be helpful to see where the roads connect to. Question/Comment: It's hard to determine where the roads are from the maps and if they connect to other roads that relate to ADT. This will be helpful for the next review committee.

Items needed for clarification by the Applicant for Street Committee Meeting #2

Please change the project name to include the location. Please provide the width/cross section of the roadway to be paved. Please explain what type of paving is to be done. The committee also thought it would be helpful to have a more detailed location map, aerial photo that would explain the relation of the road to others roadways and ADT.

Clarified information, Comments from Applicant for Street Committee #2

The revised Project Name is Fort McDowell Yavapai N ation (FMYN): Hiawatha Hood Rd, 3 miles north to 7 miles north (FMYN Phase 6). All of the FMYN requests are the subject of a Design Concept Report that is currently underway to determine the precise details of the needed roadway width and cross-section. The expected need is to pave approx. 24 feet wide dirt road with an expected minimum cross-section of 4 inches of AC on up to 12 inches of subgrade, as determined by the geotechnical report. Anything more than that would be regarded as more than "paving of a dirt road" and FMYN will provide the additional costs. This segment continues the paving of Hiawatha Hood Rd that was requested as Priority One. The roadway is the primary access for some tribal enterprises which generate a lot of recreational and heavy truck traffic. These enterprises will be sharing the additional costs needed to upgrade the roadway to an appropriate cross-section. This project is FMYN's Number Four Priority.

	Segment Location	Segment Work Description	Type of Paving For the Segment
1	Hiawatha Hood Road: from 3 miles north of SR-87 to 7 miles north	The expected need is to pave approx. 24 feet wide dirt road with an expected minimum cross-section of 4 inches of AC on up to 12 inches of subgrade, as determined by the geotechnical report. Anything more than that would be regarded as more than "paving of a dirt road" and FMYN will provide the additional costs.	A minimum 3 inches of AC is anticipated to be necessary

Street Committee - Paving Review Sheet for Gilbert Project 1

Project Name:	Bonanza Road Pavement Project
Description of Project:	The Town of Gilbert plans to pave Bonanza Road between 156th Street and 157th Street (approximately 730 feet).

Year of Requested Funds (2011 or 2012):	2012
Project Application Link:	http://www.maq.maricopa.gov/pdf/PM-10_FY2009-Applications/Gilbert%20Pave%201%20-%20Bonanza.pdf

	Category	Project Data	SAMPLE Data Adequacy Questions
1	Average Daily Traffic	ADT: 120.00	- Is the ADT estimate based on a sound methodology? - Does the ADT estimate seem reasonable?
2	Right-of-Way Cost	Cost: \$0.00 Cost/Mi = \$0.00	- Does the project require the purchase of ROW? - Is the ROW cost estimate reasonable? Per mile? - Does the ROW cost estimate appear to be complete? - Does ROW cost estimate reflect the project description in the application?
3	Utilities Cost	Cost: \$0.00 Cost/Mi = \$0.00	- Does the project require the relocation of utilities? - Is cost for utilities reasonable? Per mile? - Does the cost to relocate utilities reflect the project description in the application? - Have all the utilities in the project been addressed?
4	Construction Cost	Cost: \$38,900.00 Cost/Mi = \$259,333.33	- Is the construction cost estimate reasonable? Per mile? - Does the construction cost estimate appear to be complete? - Does construction cost estimate reflect the project description in the application?
5	Design Schedule	Programmed: FY 2011 Months to Complete: 24	- Are there any special features or challenges with the project that would require longer than average lead time for design - Does the design phase begin early enough to ensure the construction phase of the project will be obligated in the year
6	ROW Schedule	Programmed: None Months to Complete: None	- Does the project need to include a ROW phase? - Are there any special features or challenges with the project that would require longer than average lead time to complete - Does the ROW phase begin early enough to ensure the construction phase of the project will be obligated in the year

Presentation at Street Committee Meeting #1

Stephanie Prybyl the Town's Intergovernmental Representative presented. Planning to pave from 156 to 157th street about 730 feet, and about 1.5 miles away from the Higley monitor. In the greater picture, this is in the Southeast portion of the Town. It is unpaved and uneven, manual count through engineering department was 120 ADT. This project is to be paved with 2.5 inches of asphalt and per the Town's standards, curb and gutter is required and the future speed limit will be 25 mph. This project is part of the PM-10 plan not in the CIP. They own the ROW and utilities.

Discussion, Questions, and Answers at Street Committee Meeting #1

Question: How was the ADT collected and what is the width of the project? Response: The ADT was a hand count by a Town engineer, and the applicant would have to go into the application and review for the width.

Items needed for clarification by the Applicant for Street Committee Meeting #2

The width/cross section of the proposed pave road.

Clarified information, Comments from Applicant for Street Committee #2

The width of the Bonanza Road Pavement project is 30 ft. The curb that will be constructed with this project is a 'Ribbon' curb, which complies with Town standards.

Segment Location	Segment Work Description	Type of Paving For the Segment
------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------------

1	Bonanza Road between 156th Street and 157th Street	The Town plans to pave this segment - 30 feet wide.	2.5" of asphalt over 8" of ABC
---	--	---	--------------------------------

Street Committee - Paving Review Sheet for Gilbert Project 2

Project Name:		Ryan Road Pavement Project	
Description of Project:		The Town of Gilbert plans to pave Ryan Road between Greenfield Road and 164th Street (approximately 2,580 feet).	
Year of Requested Funds (2011 or 2012):		2011	
Project Application Link:		http://www.mag.maricopa.gov/pdf/PM-10_FY2009-Applications/Gilbert%20Pave%20%20-%20Ryan.pdf	
Category	Project Data	SAMPLE Data Adequacy Questions	
1 Average Daily Traffic	ADT: 360.00	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Is the ADT estimate based on a sound methodology? - Does the ADT estimate seem reasonable? 	
2 Right-of-Way Cost	Cost: \$0.00 Cost/Mi = \$0.00	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Does the project require the purchase of ROW? - Is the ROW cost estimate reasonable? Per mile? - Does the ROW cost estimate appear to be complete? - Does ROW cost estimate reflect the project description in the application? 	
3 Utilities Cost	Cost: \$0.00 Cost/Mi = \$0.00	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Does the project require the relocation of utilities? - Is cost for utilities reasonable? Per mile? - Does the cost to relocate utilities reflect the project description in the application? - Have all the utilities in the project been addressed? 	
4 Construction Cost	Cost: \$137,600.00 Cost/Mi = \$275,200.00	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Is the construction cost estimate reasonable? Per mile? - Does the construction cost estimate appear to be complete? - Does construction cost estimate reflect the project description in the application? 	
5 Design Schedule	Programmed: FY 2010 Months to Complete: 24	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Are there any special features or challenges with the project that would require longer than average lead time for design? - Does the design phase begin early enough to ensure the construction phase of the project will be obligated in the year? 	
6 ROW Schedule	Programmed: None Months to Complete: None	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Does the project need to include a ROW phase? - Are there any special features or challenges with the project that would require longer than average lead time to complete? - Does the ROW phase begin early enough to ensure the construction phase of the project will be obligated in the year? 	

Presentation at Street Committee Meeting #1

Stephanie Prybyl the Town's Intergovernmental Representative presented. Planning to pave about 2,580 feet, and about 2.5 miles away from the Higley monitor. In the greater picture, this is in the Southeast portion of the Town. It is unpaved and uneven, this application has a range of 240 to 480 and we can split this down the middle and say there is a 300 ADT. This project is to be paved with 2.5 inches of asphalt and per the Town's standards, curb and gutter is required and the future speed limit will be 25 mph. This project is part of the PM-10 plan not the CIP. They own the ROW and utilities.

Discussion, Questions, and Answers at Street Committee Meeting #1

After the 3rd Gilbert project was presented, a committee member asked for clarification regarding both of the projects that had a range of ADT. The middle was redetermined to be 360 and Gilbert agreed to use that as their ADT. Question: Had a question about the ADT, noting that the lots were very large and were not connector streets, and the ADT seemed high. Answer: The Town of Gilbert needs to verify that these are accurate.

Items needed for clarification by the Applicant for Street Committee Meeting #2

Please verify that the ADT is accurate.

Clarified information, Comments from Applicant for Street Committee #2

The width of the Ryan Road Pavement project is 25 ft. The curb that will be constructed with this project is a 'Ribbon' curb, which complies with Town standards. The cost estimates and ADT were verified with the Town staff and are good to use.

Segment	Segment Location	Segment Work Description	Type of Paving For the Segment
1	Ryan Road between Greenfield Road and 164th Street	The Town plans to pave this segment - 25 feet wide.	2.5" of asphalt over 8" of ABC

Street Committee - Paving Review Sheet for Gilbert Project 3

Project Name:	Walnut Road Pavement Project
Description of Project:	The Town of Gilbert plans to pave Walnut Road between 162nd Street and 164th Street (approximately 1,290 feet).

Year of Requested Funds (2011 or 2012):	2012
Project Application Link:	http://www.mag.maricopa.gov/pdf/PM-10_FY2009-Applications/Gilbert%20Pave%203%20-%20Walnut.pdf

Category	Project Data	SAMPLE Data Adequacy Questions
1 Average Daily Traffic	ADT: 180.00	- Is the ADT estimate based on a sound methodology? - Does the ADT estimate seem reasonable?
2 Right-of-Way Cost	Cost: \$0.00 Cost/Mi = \$0.00	- Does the project require the purchase of ROW? - Is the ROW cost estimate reasonable? Per mile? - Does the ROW cost estimate appear to be complete? - Does ROW cost estimate reflect the project description in the application?
3 Utilities Cost	Cost: \$0.00 Cost/Mi = \$0.00	- Does the project require the relocation of utilities? - Is cost for utilities reasonable? Per mile? - Does the cost to relocate utilities reflect the project description in the application? - Have all the utilities in the project been addressed?
4 Construction Cost	Cost: \$68,800.00 Cost/Mi = \$275,200.00	- Is the construction cost estimate reasonable? Per mile? - Does the construction cost estimate appear to be complete? - Does construction cost estimate reflect the project description in the application?
5 Design Schedule	Programmed: FY 2011 Months to Complete: 24	- Are there any special features or challenges with the project that would require longer then average lead time for design - Does the design phase begin early enough to ensure the construction phase of the project will be obligated in the year
6 ROW Schedule	Programmed: None Months to Complete: None	- Does the project need to include a ROW phase? - Are there any special features or challenges with the project that would require longer then average lead time to complete - Does the ROW phase begin early enough to ensure the construction phase of the project will be obligated in the year

Presentation at Street Committee Meeting #1

Stephanie Prybyl the Town's Intergovernmental Representative presented. Planning to pave between 162 to 164th Street about 1,290 feet, and about 3.5 miles away from the Higley monitor. In the greater picture, this is in the Southeast portion of the Town. It is unpaved and uneven, this application has a range of 120 to 240 ADT and we can split this down the middle and say there is a 130 ADT. This project is to be paved with 2.5 inches of asphalt and per the Town's standards, curb and gutter is required and the future speed limit will be 25 mph. This project is part of the PM-10 plan not the CIP. They own the ROW and utilities.

Discussion, Questions, and Answers at Street Committee Meeting #1

After the 3rd Gilbert project was presented, a committee member asked for clarification regarding both of the projects that had a range of ADT. Answer: The middle was redetermined to be 180 and Gilbert agreed to use that as their ADT. Question: A committee member noted that the ADT of 180 seemed high. Answer: The Town of Gilbert needs to reverify that these are accurate. Question: Another committee member asked if curb and gutter was eligible for paving projects. Answer: MAG Staff did clarify that if it was a component of the project, that yes, it is eligible. Question/Comment: A committee member asked Gilbert to relook at their estimates for the project as the total project cost looks low. Answer: They would review the costs.

Items needed for clarification by the Applicant for Street Committee Meeting #2

Please review the ADT and the total costs of the project based on the questions and discussion.

Clarified information, Comments from Applicant for Street Committee #2

The width of the Walnut Road Pavement project is 21 ft. The curb that will be constructed with this project is a 'Ribbon' curb, which complies with Town standards. The cost estimates and ADT were verified with the Town staff and are good to use.

Segment Location	Segment Work Description	Type of Paving For the Segment
------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------------

1	Walnut Road between 162nd Street and 164th Street	The Town plans to pave this segment - 21 feet wide.	2.5" of asphalt over 8" of ABC
---	---	---	--------------------------------

Street Committee - Paving Review Sheet for Goodyear Project 1		
Project Name:		165th Ave from Watkins to Durango
Description of Project:		This segment is currently 18.58' wide with curb and gutter on the east side, we propose to pave 6' of shoulder on the west half of the road to meet the city's typical cross section of a two lane road, this will provide two travel lanes preventing vehicles from driving on the dirt shoulder causing dust.
Year of Requested Funds (2011 or 2012):		2011
Project Application Link:		http://www.mag.maricopa.gov/pdf/PM-10_FY2009-Applications/Goodyear%20Pave%201%20-%20165th%20Ave.pdf
Category	Project Data	SAMPLE Data Adequacy Questions
1 Average Daily Traffic	ADT: 192.00	- Is the ADT estimate based on a sound methodology? - Does the ADT estimate seem reasonable?
2 Right-of-Way Cost	Cost: \$0.00 Cost/Mi = \$0.00	- Does the project require the purchase of ROW? - Is the ROW cost estimate reasonable? Per mile? - Does the ROW cost estimate appear to be complete? - Does ROW cost estimate reflect the project description in the application?
3 Utilities Cost	Cost: \$0.00 Cost/Mi = \$0.00	- Does the project require the relocation of utilities? - Is cost for utilities reasonable? Per mile? - Does the cost to relocate utilities reflect the project description in the application? - Have all the utilities in the project been addressed?
4 Construction Cost	Cost: \$109,987 Cost/Mi = \$439,948.00	- Is the construction cost estimate reasonable? Per mile? - Does the construction cost estimate appear to be complete? - Does construction cost estimate reflect the project description in the application?
5 Design Schedule	Programmed: FY 2010 Months to Complete: 24	- Are there any special features or challenges with the project that would require longer then average lead time for design - Does the design phase begin early enough to ensure the construction phase of the project will be obligated in the year
6 ROW Schedule	Programmed: None Months to Complete: None	- Does the project need to include a ROW phase? - Are there any special features or challenges with the project that would require longer then average lead time to complete - Does the ROW phase begin early enough to ensure the construction phase of the project will be obligated in the year

Presentation at Street Committee Meeting #1

Ron Sievwright - Goodyear Public Works Dept. Street Superintendent presented that the project is a 1/4 mile stretch of roadway. Currently 1/2 of the cross section is paved about 18 feet. The ADT was collected by a machine count and is 192. The land west of the segment is a county island. We are not looking to improve that side of the street. The project is listed in one of our CIPs. The current improvement of this project does not allow 2 vehicles to travel down at the same time. The southbound travel lane brings a great deal of dust. What we are proposing to do is pave an additional 21 feet of asphalt, put in curb and gutter on the west side. There are also current street light on the west side. The cost estimate was done with the engineering department.

Discussion, Questions, and Answers at Street Committee Meeting #1

Question: Trying to get clarification about what the project is, the numbers related to project width in the application are not consistent. Answer: The additional pavement will be 20.5 feet not 9. Question: What is the current segment width? Answer: The current section is 17, the City would like to then cut in 1 foot, then add an additional 20.5 feet to make it full collector road. Question/Comment: The total width would be 40 feet with curb and gutter on both sides? Answer: It will go to 3 lanes, 2 lanes with a center turn lane in the middle. It currently is 18 feet. Question/Comment: It was suggested to clarify in the application the project and segment work descriptions. They do not match. The application does not mention the total width, nor the turning lane. Answer: Yes, we are willing to clarify the information.

Items needed for clarification by the Applicant for Street Committee Meeting #2

It was suggested to clarify in the application the project name, project description, and segment work descriptions; they do not match and need to encompass the paving of the road. The application does not mention the total width, nor the middle turning lane.

Clarified information, Comments from Applicant for Street Committee #2

Due to the unique nature of the current condition of the road and the suggested paving improvements, a site visit by MAG staff was complete (11-7-08), and the project was reviewed with FHWA. FHWA recommended that the turning lane is removed from the project, and that the additional pavement would complete a typical 2 lane cross section for this type of street/road in Goodyear. The Segment Work Description and cost estimate was updated. The construction cost changed from \$125,000 to \$109,987.

	Segment Location	Segment Work Description	Type of Paving For the Segment
1	165th Ave from Durango St to Watkins Rd	This segment is currently 18.58' wide with curb and gutter on the east side, we propose to pave 6' of shoulder on the west half of the road to meet the city's typical cross section of a two lane road, this will provide two travel lanes preventing vehicles from driving on the dirt shoulder causing dust.	Segment will be treated with 9" of aggregate base compacted and then topped with 3" of asphalt.

Street Committee - Paving Review Sheet for Maricopa County Project 1		
Project Name:		17th Avenue, Maddock Road to Joy Ranch Road
Description of Project:		Paving of an unpaved road in the PM-10 nonattainment area. Dust mitigation, including: Application of 2 inches of asphaltic concrete pavement on compacted native soil; thickened edges as appropriate; and 20 to 24-foot roadway width.
Year of Requested Funds (2011 or 2012):		2011
Project Application Link:		http://www.mag.maricopa.gov/pdf/PM-10_FY2009-Applications/Maricopa%20County%20Pave%201%20-
Category	Project Data	SAMPLE Data Adequacy Questions
1 Average Daily Traffic	ADT: 215.00	- Is the ADT estimate based on a sound methodology? - Does the ADT estimate seem reasonable?
2 Right-of-Way Cost	Cost: \$530,000.00 Cost/Mi = \$1,060,000.00	- Does the project require the purchase of ROW? - Is the ROW cost estimate reasonable? Per mile? - Does the ROW cost estimate appear to be complete? - Does ROW cost estimate reflect the project description in the application?
3 Utilities Cost	Cost: \$0.00 Cost/Mi = \$0.00	- Does the project require the relocation of utilities? - Is cost for utilities reasonable? Per mile? - Does the cost to relocate utilities reflect the project description in the application? - Have all the utilities in the project been addressed?
4 Construction Cost	Cost: \$262,310.00 Cost/Mi = \$524,620.00	- Is the construction cost estimate reasonable? Per mile? - Does the construction cost estimate appear to be complete? - Does construction cost estimate reflect the project description in the application?
5 Design Schedule	Programmed: FY 2009 Months to Complete: 31	- Are there any special features or challenges with the project that would require longer then average lead time for design - Does the design phase begin early enough to ensure the construction phase of the project will be obligated in the year
6 ROW Schedule	Programmed: FY 2009 Months to Complete: 31	- Does the project need to include a ROW phase? - Are there any special features or challenges with the project that would require longer then average lead time to complete - Does the ROW phase begin early enough to ensure the construction phase of the project will be obligated in the year

Presentation at Street Committee Meeting #1

Chris Plumb with Maricopa County's Planning Division presented. All of the 5 projects are budgeted in the County's TIP. There are over 500 unpaved dirt roads, these five are seen from the County's perspective as good candidates since there are not significant utilities, drainage, and environmental issues. The County will be using 2 inch of pavement, the total cost of the project is \$869K and we are asking for \$262K in federal funds. The ADT was counted in July and August of this year with rubber hoses.

Discussion, Questions, and Answers at Street Committee Meeting #1

Question: A Committee member asked if the project is connecting any roads together. Answer: The presenter stated that yes, it's a major north/south movement road, connecting 2 paved roads, there are housing developments, and an ostrich farm; there are about 20-25 houses that use this as their main road. Question/Comment: A Committee member discussed a 2 inches is pretty minimal, and the total project costs seem to be higher than other applications. Answer: Maricopa County stated that their cost for paving, including everything, is about \$600K a mile. All of the projects proposed by Maricopa County have been scoped with an engineering firm.

Items needed for clarification by the Applicant for Street Committee Meeting #2

All questions and comments were answered at Street Committee Meeting #1. There are no outstanding questions.

Segment Location	Segment Work Description	Type of Paving For the Segment
1 17th Avenue, from Maddock Road to Joy Ranch Road	Dust mitigation, including: Application of 2 inches of asphaltic concrete pavement on compacted native soil; thickened edges as appropriate; and 20 to 24-foot roadway width. We will expect to pave only the disturbed prism (working within the right-of-way).	Dust mitigation, including: Application of 2 inches of asphaltic concrete pavement on compacted native soil; thickened edges as appropriate; and 20 to 24-foot roadway width.

Street Committee - Paving Review Sheet for Maricopa County Project 2

Project Name:		87th Avenue, Deer Valley Road to Peoria CL (Via Montoya Rd)
Description of Project:		Paving of an unpaved road in the PM-10 nonattainment area.
Year of Requested Funds (2011 or 2012):		2011
Project Application Link:		http://www.mag.maricopa.gov/pdf/PM-10_FY2009-Applications/Maricopa%20County%20Pave%20-%20Briles.pdf
Category	Project Data	SAMPLE Data Adequacy Questions
1	Average Daily Traffic ADT: 164.00	- Is the ADT estimate based on a sound methodology? - Does the ADT estimate seem reasonable?
2	Right-of-Way Cost Cost: \$0.00 Cost/Mi = \$0.00	- Does the project require the purchase of ROW? - Is the ROW cost estimate reasonable? Per mile? - Does the ROW cost estimate appear to be complete? - Does ROW cost estimate reflect the project description in the application?
3	Utilities Cost Cost: \$19,008.00 Cost/Mi = \$76,032.00	- Does the project require the relocation of utilities? - Is cost for utilities reasonable? Per mile? - Does the cost to relocate utilities reflect the project description in the application? - Have all the utilities in the project been addressed?
4	Construction Cost Cost: \$161,330.00 Cost/Mi = \$645,320.00	- Is the construction cost estimate reasonable? Per mile? - Does the construction cost estimate appear to be complete? - Does construction cost estimate reflect the project description in the application?
5	Design Schedule Programmed: FY 2009 Months to Complete: 31	- Are there any special features or challenges with the project that would require longer than average lead time for design - Does the design phase begin early enough to ensure the construction phase of the project will be obligated in the year
6	ROW Schedule Programmed: FY 2010 Months to Complete: 24	- Does the project need to include a ROW phase? - Are there any special features or challenges with the project that would require longer than average lead time to complete - Does the ROW phase begin early enough to ensure the construction phase of the project will be obligated in the year

Presentation at Street Committee Meeting #1

Chris Plumb with Maricopa County's Planning Division presented. The project is located in Section 15, a county island NW of Peoria. The County did a joint project with Peoria on 89th, where this is on 87th Ave. The ADT was counted in July and August 2008, with rubber hoses, 87th Ave has 164 ADT. Out of a total project cost of \$228K, the County is asking for \$186K federal.

Discussion, Questions, and Answers at Street Committee Meeting #1

There were no questions or discussion.

Items needed for clarification by the Applicant for Street Committee Meeting #2

All questions and comments were answered at Street Committee Meeting #1. There are no outstanding questions.

Segment Location	Segment Work Description	Type of Paving For the Segment
1 87th Avenue, from Deer Valley Road to Peoria CL (Via Montoya Rd)	Dust mitigation, including: Application of 2 inches of asphaltic concrete pavement on compacted native soil; thickened edges as appropriate; and 20 to 24-foot roadway width. We will expect to pave only the disturbed prism (working within the right-of-way).	Dust mitigation, including: Application of 2 inches of asphaltic concrete pavement on compacted native soil; thickened edges as appropriate; and 20 to 24-foot roadway width.

Street Committee - Paving Review Sheet for Maricopa County Project 3

Project Name:		88th Avenue, Deer Valley Road to Williams Road
Description of Project:		Paving of an unpaved road in the PM-10 nonattainment area.
Year of Requested Funds (2011 or 2012):		2011
Project Application Link:		http://www.mag.maricopa.gov/pdf/PM-10_FY2009-Applications/Maricopa%20County%20Pave%203%20-
	Category	Project Data
1	Average Daily Traffic	ADT: 218.00 - Is the ADT estimate based on a sound methodology? - Does the ADT estimate seem reasonable?
2	Right-of-Way Cost	Cost: \$0.00 Cost/Mi = \$0.00 - Does the project require the purchase of ROW? - Is the ROW cost estimate reasonable? Per mile? - Does the ROW cost estimate appear to be complete? - Does ROW cost estimate reflect the project description in the application?
3	Utilities Cost	Cost: \$0.00 Cost/Mi = \$0.00 - Does the project require the relocation of utilities? - Is cost for utilities reasonable? Per mile? - Does the cost to relocate utilities reflect the project description in the application? - Have all the utilities in the project been addressed?
4	Construction Cost	Cost: \$316,958.00 Cost/Mi = \$633,916.00 - Is the construction cost estimate reasonable? Per mile? - Does the construction cost estimate appear to be complete? - Does construction cost estimate reflect the project description in the application?
5	Design Schedule	Programmed: FY 2009 Months to Complete: 31 - Are there any special features or challenges with the project that would require longer than average lead time for design - Does the design phase begin early enough to ensure the construction phase of the project will be obligated in the year
6	ROW Schedule	Programmed: FY 2009 Months to Complete: 31 - Does the project need to include a ROW phase? - Are there any special features or challenges with the project that would require longer than average lead time to complete - Does the ROW phase begin early enough to ensure the construction phase of the project will be obligated in the year

Presentation at Street Committee Meeting #1

Chris Plumb with Maricopa County's Planning Division presented. This is very similar to the 87th Avenue project. This project is in an area that is flood prone.

Discussion, Questions, and Answers at Street Committee Meeting #1

There were no questions or discussion.

Items needed for clarification by the Applicant for Street Committee Meeting #2

All questions and comments were answered at Street Committee Meeting #1. There are no outstanding questions.

	Segment Location	Segment Work Description	Type of Paving For the Segment
1	88th Avenue, from Deer Valley Road to Williams Road	Dust mitigation, including: Application of 2 inches of asphaltic concrete pavement on compacted native soil; thickened edges as appropriate; and 20 to 24-foot roadway width.	Dust mitigation, including: Application of 2 inches of asphaltic concrete pavement on compacted native soil; thickened edges as appropriate; and 20 to 24-foot roadway width.

Street Committee - Paving Review Sheet for Maricopa County Project 4		
Project Name:		Briles Road, Reems Road (155th Ave) to end of maintenance (151st Ave)
Description of Project:		Paving of an unpaved road in the PM-10 nonattainment area.
Year of Requested Funds (2011 or 2012):		2011
Project Application Link:		http://www.mag.maricopa.gov/pdf/PM-10_FY2009-Applications/Maricopa%20County%20Pave%204%20-
Category	Project Data	SAMPLE Data Adequacy Questions
1 Average Daily Traffic	ADT: 85.00	- Is the ADT estimate based on a sound methodology? - Does the ADT estimate seem reasonable?
2 Right-of-Way Cost	Cost: \$0.00 Cost/Mi = \$0.00	- Does the project require the purchase of ROW? - Is the ROW cost estimate reasonable? Per mile? - Does the ROW cost estimate appear to be complete? - Does ROW cost estimate reflect the project description in the application?
3 Utilities Cost	Cost: \$23,761.00 Cost/Mi = \$47,522.00	- Does the project require the relocation of utilities? - Is cost for utilities reasonable? Per mile? - Does the cost to relocate utilities reflect the project description in the application? - Have all the utilities in the project been addressed?
4 Construction Cost	Cost: \$276,820.00 Cost/Mi = \$553,640.00	- Is the construction cost estimate reasonable? Per mile? - Does the construction cost estimate appear to be complete? - Does construction cost estimate reflect the project description in the application?
5 Design Schedule	Programmed: FY 2009 Months to Complete: 31	- Are there any special features or challenges with the project that would require longer then average lead time for design - Does the design phase begin early enough to ensure the construction phase of the project will be obligated in the year
6 ROW Schedule	Programmed: FY 2010 Months to Complete: 24	- Does the project need to include a ROW phase? - Are there any special features or challenges with the project that would require longer then average lead time to complete - Does the ROW phase begin early enough to ensure the construction phase of the project will be obligated in the year

Presentation at Street Committee Meeting #1
Chris Plumb with Maricopa County's Planning Division presented. This project has traffic of 85 cars a day. This is one of the projects that Maricopa County have had in their planning documents for at least 10 years; there are no significant problems regarding environmental, utilities, or right of way. This is a project they would like to do.

Discussion, Questions, and Answers at Street Committee Meeting #1
Question/Comment: A committee member suggested relooking at there cost per mile for this project as it seemed high. Answer: The applicant then discussed that the project/road does cross 4 washes. Maricopa County stated that since 1984, Maricopa County has paved 431 miles and has kept data on what the exact costs are for paving per mile. This data suggests that \$600K is accurate. If costs are lower, other agencies may be doing something different, paving a different width, a different depth, etc.. Question/Comment: A committee member was also comparing this application to other paving roads. Answer: This \$600K also includes everything, includes 50 feet right of way, clear zone, minimum pavement width,etc. A local street with 2 inches of AC should last 20 years.

Items needed for clarification by the Applicant for Street Committee Meeting #2
All questions and comments were answered at Street Committee Meeting #1. There are no outstanding questions.

Segment Location	Segment Work Description	Type of Paving For the Segment
1 Briles Road, from Reems Rd (155th Ave) to end of maintenance (151st Ave)	Dust mitigation, including: Application of 2 inches of asphaltic concrete pavement on compacted native soil; thickened edges as appropriate; and 20 to 24-foot roadway width.	Dust mitigation, including: Application of 2 inches of asphaltic concrete pavement on compacted native soil; thickened edges as appropriate; and 20 to 24-foot roadway width.

Street Committee - Paving Review Sheet for Maricopa County Project 5

Project Name:	White Wing Rd: 171st Ave (Cotton Lane) to 163rd Ave (Sarival Ave)
Description of Project:	Starting at a point 800 ft west of 107th Ave and ending at a point 2600 ft west of 107th Ave there exists approx 1800 ft (.34 miles) of insufficient unpaved shoulder where the exist paved shoulder is non-existent or it is does not meet the min width of 5 ft (MCDOT-Rdwy Design Manual). Due to exist lane widths, there are opportunities to re-stripe the roadway.

Year of Requested Funds (2011 or 2012):	2011
Project Application Link:	http://www.mag.maricopa.gov/pdf/PM-10_FY2009-Applications/Maricopa%20County%20Pave%205%20-%20White%20Wing.pdf

	Category	Project Data	SAMPLE Data Adequacy Questions
1	Average Daily Traffic	ADT: 205.00	- Is the ADT estimate based on a sound methodology? - Does the ADT estimate seem reasonable?
2	Right-of-Way Cost	Cost: \$0.00 Cost/Mi = \$0.00	- Does the project require the purchase of ROW? - Is the ROW cost estimate reasonable? Per mile? - Does the ROW cost estimate appear to be complete? - Does ROW cost estimate reflect the project description in the application?
3	Utilities Cost	Cost: \$0.00 Cost/Mi = \$0.00	- Does the project require the relocation of utilities? - Is cost for utilities reasonable? Per mile? - Does the cost to relocate utilities reflect the project description in the application? - Have all the utilities in the project been addressed?
4	Construction Cost	Cost: \$607,888.00 Cost/Mi = \$607,888.00	- Is the construction cost estimate reasonable? Per mile? - Does the construction cost estimate appear to be complete? - Does construction cost estimate reflect the project description in the application?
5	Design Schedule	Programmed: FY 2009 Months to Complete: 31	- Are there any special features or challenges with the project that would require longer then average lead time for design (e.g. - Does the design phase begin early enough to ensure the construction phase of the project will be obligated in the year
6	ROW Schedule	Programmed: FY 2009 Months to Complete: 31	- Does the project need to include a ROW phase? - Are there any special features or challenges with the project that would require longer then average lead time to complete a - Does the ROW phase begin early enough to ensure the construction phase of the project will be obligated in the year

Presentation at Street Committee Meeting #1

Chris Plumb with Maricopa County's Planning Division presented. This project has traffic of 200 cars per day. Total project costs are just over \$779K; this street has a number of houses and lot splits. In addition, all of the projects add up to 2.75 miles, total federal costs is \$1.8 million, 88th Avenue is the top priority project and so is 87th Avenue.

Discussion, Questions, and Answers at Street Committee Meeting #1

Question/Comment: A committee member suggested that other communities may want to suggest priorities like Maricopa County for other committees that rank and recommend project selection. Another committee member agreed that the costs seemed high, but suggested that other communities can look at the County's historical records to see if the lower costs are actual correct, or if they should be higher. Question/Comment: Another committee member suggested that applicants could/should be prepared to discuss their priorities at the Transportation Review Committee. Answer: The applicant also added that just 2 weeks ago, the County updated their construction costs per unit, all Maricopa County consultants are using the same cost estimate sheet, based on as-built cost from historical files - bridges, culverts, etc. Mr. Plumb has offered to share the excel cost sheet with other communities. Question/Comment: Another Committee member suggested that it would be good for this to be shared and e-mailed to other Street Committee members. Another Committee member noted the key difference between paving an arterial and a rural road. Question/Comment: Another Committee member asked if drainage is included? Answer: Yes, they are homogenized.

The applications that Maricopa County has put forth do not include projects that have substantial drainage issues like box culverts, etc.

Items needed for clarification by the Applicant for Street Committee Meeting #2

All questions and comments were answered at Street Committee Meeting #1. There are no outstanding questions.

PC	Segment Location	Segment Work Description	Type of Paving For the Segment
1	White Wing Road, from 171st Avenue (Cotton Lane) to 163rd Avenue (Sarival Avenue)	Paving of an unpaved road in the PM-10 nonattainment area. Dust mitigation, including: Application of 2 inches of asphaltic concrete pavement on compacted native soil; thickened edges as appropriate; and 20 to 24-foot roadway width. We will expect to pave only the disturbed prism (working within the right-of-way).	Dust mitigation, including: Application of 2 inches of asphaltic concrete pavement on compacted native soil; thickened edges as appropriate; and 20 to 24-foot roadway width.

Street Committee - Paving Review Sheet for Phoenix Project 1

Project Name:		2011 CMAQ Alley Dust Proofing
Description of Project:		This project will dust proof approximately 41 miles of unstabilized alleys within the City of Phoenix using a 3/8" Fractured Aggregate Surface Treatment (FAST) which provides a single application of rubberized asphalt and pre-coated chips to existing dirt alleys. Clearing, grubbing and sub grade preparation will be required for application of the material.
Year of Requested Funds (2011 or 2012):		2011
Project Application Link:		http://www.mag.maricopa.gov/pdf/PM-10_FY2009-Applications/Phoenix%20Pave%201%20-%2040%20miles%20alleys.pdf
	Category	Project Data
1	Average Daily Traffic	ADT: 10.00 - Is the ADT estimate based on a sound methodology? - Does the ADT estimate seem reasonable?
2	Right-of-Way Cost	Cost: \$0.00 Cost/Mi = \$0.00 - Does the project require the purchase of ROW? - Is the ROW cost estimate reasonable? Per mile? - Does the ROW cost estimate appear to be complete? - Does ROW cost estimate reflect the project description in the application?
3	Utilities Cost	Cost: \$0.00 Cost/Mi = \$0.00 - Does the project require the relocation of utilities? - Is cost for utilities reasonable? Per mile? - Does the cost to relocate utilities reflect the project description in the application? - Have all the utilities in the project been addressed?
4	Construction Cost	Cost: \$1,998,445.00 Cost/Mi = \$48,505.95 - Is the construction cost estimate reasonable? Per mile? - Does the construction cost estimate appear to be complete? - Does construction cost estimate reflect the project description in the application?
5	Design Schedule	Programmed: FY 2010 Months to Complete: 24 - Are there any special features or challenges with the project that would require longer than average lead time for design - Does the design phase begin early enough to ensure the construction phase of the project will be obligated in the year
6	ROW Schedule	Programmed: None Months to Complete: None - Does the project need to include a ROW phase? - Are there any special features or challenges with the project that would require longer than average lead time to complete - Does the ROW phase begin early enough to ensure the construction phase of the project will be obligated in the year

Presentation at Street Committee Meeting #1

Chris Turner-Noteware, Street Transportation for the City of Phoenix presented. Annually, the City of Phoenix provides \$450K in the CIP for dust proofing program. To-date, the City has dust proofed 426 miles of alleys, and still has over 300 that need to be done. The 2011 and 2012 applications continue the paving alley/dust proofing program. A typical cross section of the alley: 11 foot wide, and applies a 3/8 inch Fractured Aggregate Surface Treatment (FAST) rubberized asphalt treatment to an existing compacted service. Both projects do not have any existing environmental, right of way, nor utility issues based on our preliminary review. The city of Phoenix breaks down the segments into quarter sections. The 2011 applications proposed 33 quarter section totals to about 41 miles. The 2011 averages about 2.5 miles from air quality monitor. We will utilize local funds in the design process.

Discussion, Questions, and Answers at Street Committee Meeting #1

There were no questions.

Items needed for clarification by the Applicant for Street Committee Meeting #2

All questions and comments were answered at Street Committee Meeting #1. There are no outstanding questions.

3	Quarter Section 03-26	The alley segments will be dust proofed using a 3/8" Fractured Aggregate Surface Treatment (FAST) which provides a single application of rubberized asphalt and precoated chips to existing dirt alleys. Clearing, grubbing and sub grade preparation will be required for application of the material. Work will be done within the existing alleyway and ground disturbance will be minimal.	3/8" Fractured Aggregate Surface Treatment (FAST) which provides a single application of rubberized asphalt and precoated chips.
4	Quarter Section 03-27	The alley segments will be dust proofed using a 3/8" Fractured Aggregate Surface Treatment (FAST) which provides a single application of rubberized asphalt and precoated chips to existing dirt alleys. Clearing, grubbing and sub grade preparation will be required for application of the material. Work will be done within the existing alleyway and ground disturbance will be minimal.	3/8" Fractured Aggregate Surface Treatment (FAST) which provides a single application of rubberized asphalt and precoated chips.
5	Quarter Section 03-28	The alley segments will be dust proofed using a 3/8" Fractured Aggregate Surface Treatment (FAST) which provides a single application of rubberized asphalt and precoated chips to existing dirt alleys. Clearing, grubbing and sub grade preparation will be required for application of the material. Work will be done within the existing alleyway and ground disturbance will be minimal.	3/8" Fractured Aggregate Surface Treatment (FAST) which provides a single application of rubberized asphalt and precoated chips.
6	Quarter Section 1-29	The alley segments will be dust proofed using a 3/8" Fractured Aggregate Surface Treatment (FAST) which provides a single application of rubberized asphalt and precoated chips to existing dirt alleys. Clearing, grubbing and sub grade preparation will be required for application of the material. Work will be done within the existing alleyway and ground disturbance will be minimal.	3/8" Fractured Aggregate Surface Treatment (FAST) which provides a single application of rubberized asphalt and precoated chips.
7	Quarter Section 1-37	The alley segments will be dust proofed using a 3/8" Fractured Aggregate Surface Treatment (FAST) which provides a single application of rubberized asphalt and precoated chips to existing dirt alleys. Clearing, grubbing and sub grade preparation will be required for application of the material. Work will be done within the existing alleyway and ground disturbance will be minimal.	3/8" Fractured Aggregate Surface Treatment (FAST) which provides a single application of rubberized asphalt and precoated chips.

8	Quarter Section 2-30	The alley segments will be dust proofed using a 3/8" Fractured Aggregate Surface Treatment (FAST) which provides a single application of rubberized asphalt and precoated chips to existing dirt alleys. Clearing, grubbing and sub grade preparation will be required for application of the material. Work will be done within the existing alleyway and ground disturbance will be minimal.	3/8" Fractured Aggregate Surface Treatment (FAST) which provides a single application of rubberized asphalt and precoated chips.
9	Quarter Section 10-29	The alley segments will be dust proofed using a 3/8" Fractured Aggregate Surface Treatment (FAST) which provides a single application of rubberized asphalt and precoated chips to existing dirt alleys. Clearing, grubbing and sub grade preparation will be required for application of the material. Work will be done within the existing alleyway and ground disturbance will be minimal.	3/8" Fractured Aggregate Surface Treatment (FAST) which provides a single application of rubberized asphalt and precoated chips.
10	Quarter Section 10-30	The alley segments will be dust proofed using a 3/8" Fractured Aggregate Surface Treatment (FAST) which provides a single application of rubberized asphalt and precoated chips to existing dirt alleys. Clearing, grubbing and sub grade preparation will be required for application of the material. Work will be done within the existing alleyway and ground disturbance will be minimal.	3/8" Fractured Aggregate Surface Treatment (FAST) which provides a single application of rubberized asphalt and precoated chips.
11	Quarter Section 10-31	The alley segments will be dust proofed using a 3/8" Fractured Aggregate Surface Treatment (FAST) which provides a single application of rubberized asphalt and precoated chips to existing dirt alleys. Clearing, grubbing and sub grade preparation will be required for application of the material. Work will be done within the existing alleyway and ground disturbance will be minimal.	3/8" Fractured Aggregate Surface Treatment (FAST) which provides a single application of rubberized asphalt and precoated chips.
12	Quarter Section 10-32	The alley segments will be dust proofed using a 3/8" Fractured Aggregate Surface Treatment (FAST) which provides a single application of rubberized asphalt and precoated chips to existing dirt alleys. Clearing, grubbing and sub grade preparation will be required for application of the material. Work will be done within the existing alleyway and ground disturbance will be minimal.	3/8" Fractured Aggregate Surface Treatment (FAST) which provides a single application of rubberized asphalt and precoated chips.

13	Quarter Section 10-35	The alley segments will be dust proofed using a 3/8" Fractured Aggregate Surface Treatment (FAST) which provides a single application of rubberized asphalt and precoated chips to existing dirt alleys. Clearing, grubbing and sub grade preparation will be required for application of the material. Work will be done within the existing alleyway and ground disturbance will be minimal.	3/8" Fractured Aggregate Surface Treatment (FAST) which provides a single application of rubberized asphalt and precoated chips.
14	Quarter Section 11-24	The alley segments will be dust proofed using a 3/8" Fractured Aggregate Surface Treatment (FAST) which provides a single application of rubberized asphalt and precoated chips to existing dirt alleys. Clearing, grubbing and sub grade preparation will be required for application of the material. Work will be done within the existing alleyway and ground disturbance will be minimal.	3/8" Fractured Aggregate Surface Treatment (FAST) which provides a single application of rubberized asphalt and precoated chips.
15	Quarter Section 11-34	The alley segments will be dust proofed using a 3/8" Fractured Aggregate Surface Treatment (FAST) which provides a single application of rubberized asphalt and precoated chips to existing dirt alleys. Clearing, grubbing and sub grade preparation will be required for application of the material. Work will be done within the existing alleyway and ground disturbance will be minimal.	3/8" Fractured Aggregate Surface Treatment (FAST) which provides a single application of rubberized asphalt and precoated chips.
16	Quarter Section 11-35	The alley segments will be dust proofed using a 3/8" Fractured Aggregate Surface Treatment (FAST) which provides a single application of rubberized asphalt and precoated chips to existing dirt alleys. Clearing, grubbing and sub grade preparation will be required for application of the material. Work will be done within the existing alleyway and ground disturbance will be minimal.	3/8" Fractured Aggregate Surface Treatment (FAST) which provides a single application of rubberized asphalt and precoated chips.
17	Quarter Section 11-36	The alley segments will be dust proofed using a 3/8" Fractured Aggregate Surface Treatment (FAST) which provides a single application of rubberized asphalt and precoated chips to existing dirt alleys. Clearing, grubbing and sub grade preparation will be required for application of the material. Work will be done within the existing alleyway and ground disturbance will be minimal.	3/8" Fractured Aggregate Surface Treatment (FAST) which provides a single application of rubberized asphalt and precoated chips.

18	Quarter Section 11-37	The alley segments will be dust proofed using a 3/8" Fractured Aggregate Surface Treatment (FAST) which provides a single application of rubberized asphalt and precoated chips to existing dirt alleys. Clearing, grubbing and sub grade preparation will be required for application of the material. Work will be done within the existing alleyway and ground disturbance will be minimal.	3/8" Fractured Aggregate Surface Treatment (FAST) which provides a single application of rubberized asphalt and precoated chips.
19	Quarter Section 11-40	The alley segments will be dust proofed using a 3/8" Fractured Aggregate Surface Treatment (FAST) which provides a single application of rubberized asphalt and precoated chips to existing dirt alleys. Clearing, grubbing and sub grade preparation will be required for application of the material. Work will be done within the existing alleyway and ground disturbance will be minimal.	3/8" Fractured Aggregate Surface Treatment (FAST) which provides a single application of rubberized asphalt and precoated chips.
20	Quarter Section 12-34	The alley segments will be dust proofed using a 3/8" Fractured Aggregate Surface Treatment (FAST) which provides a single application of rubberized asphalt and precoated chips to existing dirt alleys. Clearing, grubbing and sub grade preparation will be required for application of the material. Work will be done within the existing alleyway and ground disturbance will be minimal.	3/8" Fractured Aggregate Surface Treatment (FAST) which provides a single application of rubberized asphalt and precoated chips.
21	Quarter Section 12-35	The alley segments will be dust proofed using a 3/8" Fractured Aggregate Surface Treatment (FAST) which provides a single application of rubberized asphalt and precoated chips to existing dirt alleys. Clearing, grubbing and sub grade preparation will be required for application of the material. Work will be done within the existing alleyway and ground disturbance will be minimal.	3/8" Fractured Aggregate Surface Treatment (FAST) which provides a single application of rubberized asphalt and precoated chips.
22	Quarter Section 12-37	The alley segments will be dust proofed using a 3/8" Fractured Aggregate Surface Treatment (FAST) which provides a single application of rubberized asphalt and precoated chips to existing dirt alleys. Clearing, grubbing and sub grade preparation will be required for application of the material. Work will be done within the existing alleyway and ground disturbance will be minimal.	3/8" Fractured Aggregate Surface Treatment (FAST) which provides a single application of rubberized asphalt and precoated chips.

23	Quarter Section 12-39	The alley segments will be dust proofed using a 3/8" Fractured Aggregate Surface Treatment (FAST) which provides a single application of rubberized asphalt and precoated chips to existing dirt alleys. Clearing, grubbing and sub grade preparation will be required for application of the material. Work will be done within the existing alleyway and ground disturbance will be minimal.	3/8" Fractured Aggregate Surface Treatment (FAST) which provides a single application of rubberized asphalt and precoated chips.
24	Quarter Section 13-13	The alley segments will be dust proofed using a 3/8" Fractured Aggregate Surface Treatment (FAST) which provides a single application of rubberized asphalt and precoated chips to existing dirt alleys. Clearing, grubbing and sub grade preparation will be required for application of the material. Work will be done within the existing alleyway and ground disturbance will be minimal.	3/8" Fractured Aggregate Surface Treatment (FAST) which provides a single application of rubberized asphalt and precoated chips.
25	Quarter Section 13-35	The alley segments will be dust proofed using a 3/8" Fractured Aggregate Surface Treatment (FAST) which provides a single application of rubberized asphalt and precoated chips to existing dirt alleys. Clearing, grubbing and sub grade preparation will be required for application of the material. Work will be done within the existing alleyway and ground disturbance will be minimal.	3/8" Fractured Aggregate Surface Treatment (FAST) which provides a single application of rubberized asphalt and precoated chips.
26	Quarter Section 13-36	The alley segments will be dust proofed using a 3/8" Fractured Aggregate Surface Treatment (FAST) which provides a single application of rubberized asphalt and precoated chips to existing dirt alleys. Clearing, grubbing and sub grade preparation will be required for application of the material. Work will be done within the existing alleyway and ground disturbance will be minimal.	3/8" Fractured Aggregate Surface Treatment (FAST) which provides a single application of rubberized asphalt and precoated chips.
27	Quarter Section 14-13	The alley segments will be dust proofed using a 3/8" Fractured Aggregate Surface Treatment (FAST) which provides a single application of rubberized asphalt and precoated chips to existing dirt alleys. Clearing, grubbing and sub grade preparation will be required for application of the material. Work will be done within the existing alleyway and ground disturbance will be minimal.	3/8" Fractured Aggregate Surface Treatment (FAST) which provides a single application of rubberized asphalt and precoated chips.

28	Quarter Section 14-35	The alley segments will be dust proofed using a 3/8" Fractured Aggregate Surface Treatment (FAST) which provides a single application of rubberized asphalt and precoated chips to existing dirt alleys. Clearing, grubbing and sub grade preparation will be required for application of the material. Work will be done within the existing alleyway and ground disturbance will be minimal.	3/8" Fractured Aggregate Surface Treatment (FAST) which provides a single application of rubberized asphalt and precoated chips.
29	Quarter Section 14-36	The alley segments will be dust proofed using a 3/8" Fractured Aggregate Surface Treatment (FAST) which provides a single application of rubberized asphalt and precoated chips to existing dirt alleys. Clearing, grubbing and sub grade preparation will be required for application of the material. Work will be done within the existing alleyway and ground disturbance will be minimal.	3/8" Fractured Aggregate Surface Treatment (FAST) which provides a single application of rubberized asphalt and precoated chips.
30	Quarter Section 15-13	The alley segments will be dust proofed using a 3/8" Fractured Aggregate Surface Treatment (FAST) which provides a single application of rubberized asphalt and precoated chips to existing dirt alleys. Clearing, grubbing and sub grade preparation will be required for application of the material. Work will be done within the existing alleyway and ground disturbance will be minimal.	3/8" Fractured Aggregate Surface Treatment (FAST) which provides a single application of rubberized asphalt and precoated chips.
31	Quarter Section 17-11	The alley segments will be dust proofed using a 3/8" Fractured Aggregate Surface Treatment (FAST) which provides a single application of rubberized asphalt and precoated chips to existing dirt alleys. Clearing, grubbing and sub grade preparation will be required for application of the material. Work will be done within the existing alleyway and ground disturbance will be minimal.	3/8" Fractured Aggregate Surface Treatment (FAST) which provides a single application of rubberized asphalt and precoated chips.
32	Quarter Section 17-12	The alley segments will be dust proofed using a 3/8" Fractured Aggregate Surface Treatment (FAST) which provides a single application of rubberized asphalt and precoated chips to existing dirt alleys. Clearing, grubbing and sub grade preparation will be required for application of the material. Work will be done within the existing alleyway and ground disturbance will be minimal.	3/8" Fractured Aggregate Surface Treatment (FAST) which provides a single application of rubberized asphalt and precoated chips.

33	Quarter Section 17-15	The alley segments will be dust proofed using a 3/8" Fractured Aggregate Surface Treatment (FAST) which provides a single application of rubberized asphalt and pre-coated chips to existing dirt alleys. Clearing, grubbing and sub grade preparation will be required for application of the material. Work will be done within the existing alleyway and ground disturbance will be minimal.	3/8" Fractured Aggregate Surface Treatment (FAST) which provides a single application of rubberized asphalt and pre-coated chips.
----	-----------------------	---	---

Street Committee - Paving Review Sheet for Phoenix Project 2

Project Name:		2012 CMAQ Alley Dust Proofing	
Description of Project:		This project will dust proof approximately 40 miles of unstabilized alleys within the City of Phoenix using a 3/8" Fractured Aggregate Surface Treatment (FAST) which provides a single application of rubberized asphalt and precoated chips to existing dirt alleys. Clearing, grubbing and subgrade preparation will be required for application of the material.	
Year of Requested Funds (2011 or 2012):		2012	
Project Application Link:		http://www.mag.maricopa.gov/pdf/PM-10_FY2009-Applications/Phoenix%20Pave%20%20-%2041%20miles%20alleys.pdf	
Category	Project Data	SAMPLE Data Adequacy Questions	
1 Average Daily Traffic	ADT: 10.00	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Is the ADT estimate based on a sound methodology? - Does the ADT estimate seem reasonable? 	
2 Right-of-Way Cost	Cost: \$0.00 Cost/Mi = \$0.00	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Does the project require the purchase of ROW? - Is the ROW cost estimate reasonable? Per mile? - Does the ROW cost estimate appear to be complete? - Does ROW cost estimate reflect the project description in the application? 	
3 Utilities Cost	Cost: \$0.00 Cost/Mi = \$0.00	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Does the project require the relocation of utilities? - Is cost for utilities reasonable? Per mile? - Does the cost to relocate utilities reflect the project description in the application? - Have all the utilities in the project been addressed? 	
4 Construction Cost	Cost: \$1,999,471.00 Cost/Mi = \$50,619.52	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Is the construction cost estimate reasonable? Per mile? - Does the construction cost estimate appear to be complete? - Does construction cost estimate reflect the project description in the application? 	
5 Design Schedule	Programmed: FY 2011 Months to Complete: 24	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Are there any special features or challenges with the project that would require longer then average lead time for design - Does the design phase begin early enough to ensure the construction phase of the project will be obligated in the year 	
6 ROW Schedule	Programmed: None Months to Complete: None	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Does the project need to include a ROW phase? - Are there any special features or challenges with the project that would require longer then average lead time to complete - Does the ROW phase begin early enough to ensure the construction phase of the project will be obligated in the year 	

Presentation at Street Committee Meeting #1

Chris Turner-Noteware, Street Transportation for the City of Phoenix. Annually, the City of Phoenix provides \$450K in the CIP for dust proofing program. To-date, the City has dust proofed 426 miles of alleys, and still has over 300 that need to be done. The 2012 application continue the paving alley/dust proofing program. A typical cross section of the alley: 11 foot wide, and applies a 3/8 inch Fractured Aggregat Surface Treatment (FAST) rubberized asphalt treatment to an existing compacted service. Both projects do not have any existing environmental, right of way, nor utility issues based on our preliminary review. The city of Phoenix breaks down the segments into quarter sections. The 2012 applications proposed 18 quarter section totals to about 40 miles. The 2012 application averages about 4 miles from air quality monitor. The City of Phoenix is planning to utilize local funds in the design process. The City of Phoenix will be using all of the funds in the annual CIP program and looking for the federal funds to add to that.

Discussion, Questions, and Answers at Street Committee Meeting #1

Question: How was the ADT determined? Answer: The engineers estimate at about 10 vehicles a day. There is no physical counting. Question: Are these alleys stabilized? Answer: No they are not. Question: How long have you been using the FAST application and is it holding up? Answer: We have been using this application for about 5 years and it's working. Question: looking at the cross section, there are various ABC material levels, or is there some existing base?. Answer: The contractor will move through the alley and blade it, knocking down any high spots, then fill in the low spots, then compact it down. There is contingency funds if an area looks like it's not compacting for it to be removed then compacted with new material. How thick is the paving application? Answer: 3/8 of an inch, they have held up for garbage collection and other similar vehicles.

Items needed for clarification by the Applicant for Street Committee Meeting #2

All questions and comments were answered at Street Committee Meeting #1. There are no outstanding questions.

3	Quarter Section 9-25	The alley segments will be dust proofed using a 3/8" Fractured Aggregate Surface Treatment (FAST) which provides a single application of rubberized asphalt and pre-coated chips to existing dirt alleys. Clearing, grubbing and subgrade preparation will be required for application of the material. Work will be done within the existing alleyway and ground disturbance will be minimal.	3/8" Fractured Aggregate Surface Treatment (FAST) which provides a single application of rubberized asphalt and pre-coated chips.
4	Quarter Section 16-41	The alley segments will be dust proofed using a 3/8" Fractured Aggregate Surface Treatment (FAST) which provides a single application of rubberized asphalt and pre-coated chips to existing dirt alleys. Clearing, grubbing and subgrade preparation will be required for application of the material. Work will be done within the existing alleyway and ground disturbance will be minimal.	3/8" Fractured Aggregate Surface Treatment (FAST) which provides a single application of rubberized asphalt and pre-coated chips.
5	Quarter Section 16-42	The alley segments will be dust proofed using a 3/8" Fractured Aggregate Surface Treatment (FAST) which provides a single application of rubberized asphalt and pre-coated chips to existing dirt alleys. Clearing, grubbing and subgrade preparation will be required for application of the material. Work will be done within the existing alleyway and ground disturbance will be minimal.	3/8" Fractured Aggregate Surface Treatment (FAST) which provides a single application of rubberized asphalt and pre-coated chips.
6	Quarter Section 17-39+	The alley segments will be dust proofed using a 3/8" Fractured Aggregate Surface Treatment (FAST) which provides a single application of rubberized asphalt and pre-coated chips to existing dirt alleys. Clearing, grubbing and subgrade preparation will be required for application of the material. Work will be done within the existing alleyway and ground disturbance will be minimal.	3/8" Fractured Aggregate Surface Treatment (FAST) which provides a single application of rubberized asphalt and pre-coated chips.
7	Quarter Section 17-41	The alley segments will be dust proofed using a 3/8" Fractured Aggregate Surface Treatment (FAST) which provides a single application of rubberized asphalt and pre-coated chips to existing dirt alleys. Clearing, grubbing and subgrade preparation will be required for application of the material. Work will be done within the existing alleyway and ground disturbance will be minimal.	3/8" Fractured Aggregate Surface Treatment (FAST) which provides a single application of rubberized asphalt and pre-coated chips.

8	Quarter Section 17-42	The alley segments will be dust proofed using a 3/8" Fractured Aggregate Surface Treatment (FAST) which provides a single application of rubberized asphalt and precoated chips to existing dirt alleys. Clearing, grubbing and subgrade preparation will be required for application of the material. Work will be done within the existing alleyway and ground disturbance will be minimal.	3/8" Fractured Aggregate Surface Treatment (FAST) which provides a single application of rubberized asphalt and precoated chips.
9	Quarter Section 18-34	The alley segments will be dust proofed using a 3/8" Fractured Aggregate Surface Treatment (FAST) which provides a single application of rubberized asphalt and precoated chips to existing dirt alleys. Clearing, grubbing and subgrade preparation will be required for application of the material. Work will be done within the existing alleyway and ground disturbance will be minimal.	3/8" Fractured Aggregate Surface Treatment (FAST) which provides a single application of rubberized asphalt and precoated chips.
10	Quarter Section 19-37	The alley segments will be dust proofed using a 3/8" Fractured Aggregate Surface Treatment (FAST) which provides a single application of rubberized asphalt and precoated chips to existing dirt alleys. Clearing, grubbing and subgrade preparation will be required for application of the material. Work will be done within the existing alleyway and ground disturbance will be minimal.	3/8" Fractured Aggregate Surface Treatment (FAST) which provides a single application of rubberized asphalt and precoated chips.
11	Quarter Section 21-19	The alley segments will be dust proofed using a 3/8" Fractured Aggregate Surface Treatment (FAST) which provides a single application of rubberized asphalt and precoated chips to existing dirt alleys. Clearing, grubbing and subgrade preparation will be required for application of the material. Work will be done within the existing alleyway and ground disturbance will be minimal.	3/8" Fractured Aggregate Surface Treatment (FAST) which provides a single application of rubberized asphalt and precoated chips.
12	Quarter Section 21-20	The alley segments will be dust proofed using a 3/8" Fractured Aggregate Surface Treatment (FAST) which provides a single application of rubberized asphalt and precoated chips to existing dirt alleys. Clearing, grubbing and subgrade preparation will be required for application of the material. Work will be done within the existing alleyway and ground disturbance will be minimal.	3/8" Fractured Aggregate Surface Treatment (FAST) which provides a single application of rubberized asphalt and precoated chips.

13	Quarter Section 22-19	The alley segments will be dust proofed using a 3/8" Fractured Aggregate Surface Treatment (FAST) which provides a single application of rubberized asphalt and precoated chips to existing dirt alleys. Clearing, grubbing and subgrade preparation will be required for application of the material. Work will be done within the existing alleyway and ground disturbance will be minimal.	3/8" Fractured Aggregate Surface Treatment (FAST) which provides a single application of rubberized asphalt and precoated chips.
14	Quarter Section 22-20	The alley segments will be dust proofed using a 3/8" Fractured Aggregate Surface Treatment (FAST) which provides a single application of rubberized asphalt and precoated chips to existing dirt alleys. Clearing, grubbing and subgrade preparation will be required for application of the material. Work will be done within the existing alleyway and ground disturbance will be minimal.	3/8" Fractured Aggregate Surface Treatment (FAST) which provides a single application of rubberized asphalt and precoated chips.
15	Quarter Section 23-21	The alley segments will be dust proofed using a 3/8" Fractured Aggregate Surface Treatment (FAST) which provides a single application of rubberized asphalt and precoated chips to existing dirt alleys. Clearing, grubbing and subgrade preparation will be required for application of the material. Work will be done within the existing alleyway and ground disturbance will be minimal.	3/8" Fractured Aggregate Surface Treatment (FAST) which provides a single application of rubberized asphalt and precoated chips.
16	Quarter Section 23-22	The alley segments will be dust proofed using a 3/8" Fractured Aggregate Surface Treatment (FAST) which provides a single application of rubberized asphalt and precoated chips to existing dirt alleys. Clearing, grubbing and subgrade preparation will be required for application of the material. Work will be done within the existing alleyway and ground disturbance will be minimal.	3/8" Fractured Aggregate Surface Treatment (FAST) which provides a single application of rubberized asphalt and precoated chips.
17	Quarter Section 24-21	The alley segments will be dust proofed using a 3/8" Fractured Aggregate Surface Treatment (FAST) which provides a single application of rubberized asphalt and precoated chips to existing dirt alleys. Clearing, grubbing and subgrade preparation will be required for application of the material. Work will be done within the existing alleyway and ground disturbance will be minimal.	3/8" Fractured Aggregate Surface Treatment (FAST) which provides a single application of rubberized asphalt and precoated chips.

18	Quarter Section 31-22	The alley segments will be dust proofed using a 3/8" Fractured Aggregate Surface Treatment (FAST) which provides a single application of rubberized asphalt and precoated chips to existing dirt alleys. Clearing, grubbing and subgrade preparation will be required for application of the material. Work will be done within the existing alleyway and ground disturbance will be minimal.	3/8" Fractured Aggregate Surface Treatment (FAST) which provides a single application of rubberized asphalt and precoated chips.
----	-----------------------	---	--

Street Committee - Paving Review Sheet for Salt River Pima-Maricopa Indian Community Project 2

Project Name:		SRP-MIC Pave Dirt Roads Program, Phase 2: McDonald Road and Alma School Road	
Description of Project:		Pre-design, design and construction of up to 7 miles of dirt roads within the Salt River Pima-Maricopa Indian Community boundaries. Phase 2 will consist of McDonald Rd from Alma School Rd to Center St and Alma School Rd from the Arizona Canal crossing to McDonald Rd.	
Year of Requested Funds (2011 or 2012):		2012	
Project Application Link:		http://www.mag.maricopa.gov/pdf/PM-10_FY2009-Applications/SRP-MIC%20Pave%202.pdf	
	Category	Project Data	SAMPLE Data Adequacy Questions
1	Average Daily Traffic	ADT: 280(McDonald Road) 150 (Alma School Road)	- Is the ADT estimate based on a sound methodology? - Does the ADT estimate seem reasonable?
2	Right-of-Way Cost	Cost: \$0.00 Cost/Mi = \$0.00	- Does the project require the purchase of ROW? - Is the ROW cost estimate reasonable? Per mile? - Does the ROW cost estimate appear to be complete? - Does ROW cost estimate reflect the project description in the application?
3	Utilities Cost	Cost: \$0.00 Cost/Mi = \$0.00	- Does the project require the relocation of utilities? - Is cost for utilities reasonable? Per mile? - Does the cost to relocate utilities reflect the project description in the application? - Have all the utilities in the project been addressed?
4	Construction Cost	Cost: \$750,000.00 Cost/Mi = \$461,538.46	- Is the construction cost estimate reasonable? Per mile? - Does the construction cost estimate appear to be complete? - Does construction cost estimate reflect the project description in the application?
5	Design Schedule	Programmed: FY 2010 Months to Complete: 36	- Are there any special features or challenges with the project that would require longer then average lead time for design (e.g. endangered) - Does the design phase begin early enough to ensure the construction phase of the project will be obligated in the year programmed?
6	ROW Schedule	Programmed: FY 2011 Months to Complete: 24	- Does the project need to include a ROW phase? - Are there any special features or challenges with the project that would require longer then average lead time to complete a ROW phase - Does the ROW phase begin early enough to ensure the construction phase of the project will be obligated in the year programmed?

Presentation at Street Committee Meeting #1
 Jennifer Jack, engineer with SRP-MIC presented. There are two segments for this application as well. The ADT - McDonald - 185 and Alma School - 185. The project requires 3 inches of asphalt on 8 inches of ABC. It will be a 2 lane wide road, 28 feet wide. Cost estimate was prepared by a registered engineer for \$750K. The funds are committed, it is in the SRP-MIC jurisdiction and have recorded BIA right of way. There are no environmental concerns.

Discussion, Questions, and Answers at Street Committee Meeting #1
 Question: can you include the width in the segment work description. Answer: Yes Question: Are you proposing curb and gutter. Answer: We are not proposing curb and gutter, nor paving shoulders, which is consistent with the communities rural road. Question: McDonald Rd, are there plans to put a bridge over McDonald in the future to go to the 101? Answer: The bridge crossings we are working on are over the Salt River with MCDOT, upgrading Alma School at canal, and adding a crossing of canal at Dobson. Question: What kind of traffic is moving through there? Answer: Part is residential and part of heavier vehicles due to farming in the area. Question: Is three inches enough for this type of traffic. Answer: Once we move forward with the project, we will be doing a geotechnical review, and then we'll go from there. Even though there is a lot of heavy traffic in the area, there is not a high ADT.

Items needed for clarification by the Applicant for Street Committee Meeting #2
 Please update the segment description to include the width, and update the Project Name to include the segment locations. Please separate out the ADT per roadway section.

Clarified information, Comments from Applicant for Street Committee #2
 Segment description was updated with width, project name and description of project was changed. Separate ADT given for each roadway. This is the 2nd priority for SRPMIC.

Segment Location	Segment Work Description	Type of Paving For the Segment
1 McDonald Road: Alma School Rd to Center	Depending on the results of the geotechnical investigation, the existing roadway prism will be excavated, up to 8 inches of base course will be introduced and up to 3 inches of AC will be provided.	New 28' wide asphalt roadway with up to 3 inches of AC on 8 inches of base course.

2	Alma School Rd: Arizona Canal to McDonald Dr	Depending on the results of the geotechnical investigation, the existing roadway prism will be excavated, up to 8 inches of base course will be introduced and up to 3 inches of AC will be provided.	New 28' wide asphalt roadway with up to 3 inches of AC on 8 inches of base course.
---	--	---	--

Street Committee - Paving Review Sheet for Salt River Pima-Maricopa Indian Community Project 1		
Project Name:		SRP-MIC Pave Dirt Roads Program, Phase 1: McDonald Road and Mesa Drive
Description of Project:		Pre-design, design and construction of up to 7 miles of dirt roads within the Salt River Pima-Maricopa Indian Community boundaries. Phase 1 will consist of McDonald Road from Center Street to Olive Street and Mesa Drive from Chaparral Road to McDonald Road.
Year of Requested Funds (2011 or 2012):		2011
Project Application Link:		http://www.mag.maricopa.gov/pdf/PM-10_FY2009-Applications/SRP-MIC%20Pave%201.pdf
Category	Project Data	SAMPLE Data Adequacy Questions
1 Average Daily Traffic	ADT: 200 (McDonald Road) 300 (Mesa Drive)	- Is the ADT estimate based on a sound methodology? - Does the ADT estimate seem reasonable?
2 Right-of-Way Cost	Cost: \$0.00 Cost/Mi = \$0.00	- Does the project require the purchase of ROW? - Is the ROW cost estimate reasonable? Per mile? - Does the ROW cost estimate appear to be complete? - Does ROW cost estimate reflect the project description in the application?
3 Utilities Cost	Cost: \$0.00 Cost/Mi = \$0.00	- Does the project require the relocation of utilities? - Is cost for utilities reasonable? Per mile? - Does the cost to relocate utilities reflect the project description in the application? - Have all the utilities in the project been addressed?
4 Construction Cost	Cost: \$800,000.00 Cost/Mi = \$457,142.86	- Is the construction cost estimate reasonable? Per mile? - Does the construction cost estimate appear to be complete? - Does construction cost estimate reflect the project description in the application?
5 Design Schedule	Programmed: FY 2009 Months to Complete: 31	- Are there any special features or challenges with the project that would require longer then average lead time for design (e.g. endangered) - Does the design phase begin early enough to ensure the construction phase of the project will be obligated in the year programmed?
6 ROW Schedule	Programmed: FY 2011 Months to Complete: 12	- Does the project need to include a ROW phase? - Are there any special features or challenges with the project that would require longer then average lead time to complete a ROW phase - Does the ROW phase begin early enough to ensure the construction phase of the project will be obligated in the year programmed?

Presentation at Street Committee Meeting #1
 Jennifer Jack, engineer with SRP-MIC presented. This is our first time applying for these funds. The community is required to follow federal law for air quality, and we want to be good neighbors to Scottsdale, Tempe, Mesa, and Maricopa County. All of the projects in the applications are considered priority projects by Council. These are adopted by our Tribal Council to be included in our short range plan. This project consists of 2 segments used by school buses daily and other vehicles to access a main farming operation. The 2 segments combined are 1.75 miles. ADT were hand counted by a registered engineer. The project requires 3 inches of asphalt on 8 inches of ABC. It will be a 2 lane wide road, 28 feet, no curb and gutter. Cost estimate was prepared by a registered engineer for \$800K. The funds are committed, it is in the SRP-MIC jurisdiction and have recorded BIA right of way.

Discussion, Questions, and Answers at Street Committee Meeting #1
 Question/Comment: On the project name and description of project, in the project name, can you list the project names? Answer: Okay. Question: ADT is this an average of the two different segments? Answer: Yes, it is an average of both. Question: It may help to designate the ADT per each segment. Question/Comment: For phase 4 (map of green line), it doesn't show where it goes to and from. Answer: Yes, it does go to a residential area, like the other phases. This application (Phase 1) is the council's highest priority, and they go in order of priority. Question/Comment: Where is this connecting too? Does it cross the canal? Answer: We are continuing from paved roads. There is a bridge at Mesa Drive and Alma School Road over the canal.

Items needed for clarification by the Applicant for Street Committee Meeting #2
 Please change project name to include locations of project, and separate out the ADT per roadway.

Clarified information, Comments from Applicant for Street Committee #2
 Segment description was updated with width, project name and description of project was changed. Separate ADT given for each roadway. This is the 1st priority for SRPMIC.

Segment Location	Segment Work Description	Type of Paving For the Segment
1 McDonald Road: Center to Olive Street	Depending on the results of the geotechnical investigation, the existing roadway prism will be excavated, up to 8 inches of base course will be introduced and up to 3 inches of AC will be provided.	New 28' wide asphalt roadway with up to 3 inches of AC on 8 inches of base course.
2 Mesa Dr: Chaparral Rd to McDonald Dr	Depending on the results of the geotechnical investigation, the existing roadway prism will be excavated, up to 8 inches of base course will be introduced and up to 3 inches of AC will be provided.	New 28' wide asphalt roadway with up to 3 inches of AC on 8 inches of base course.

Street Committee - Paving Review Sheet for Salt River Pima-Maricopa Indian Community Project 3			
Project Name:		SRP-MIC Pave Dirt Roads Program, Phase 3: Dobson Road and Center Street	
Description of Project:		Pre-design, design and construction of up to 7 miles of dirt roads within the Salt River Pima-Maricopa Indian Community boundaries. Phase 3 will consist of Dobson Road from the Arizona Canal to Indian Bend Road and Center Street from McDonald Road to Indian Bend Road.	
Year of Requested Funds (2011 or 2012):		2012	
Project Application Link:		http://www.maq.maricopa.gov/pdf/PM-10_FY2009-Applications/SRP-MIC%20Pave%203.pdf	
Category	Project Data	SAMPLE Data Adequacy Questions	
1 Average Daily Traffic	ADT: 500 (Dobson Road) 100 (Center Street)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Is the ADT estimate based on a sound methodology? - Does the ADT estimate seem reasonable? 	
2 Right-of-Way Cost	Cost: \$0.00 Cost/Mi = \$0.00	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Does the project require the purchase of ROW? - Is the ROW cost estimate reasonable? Per mile? - Does the ROW cost estimate appear to be complete? - Does ROW cost estimate reflect the project description in the application? 	
3 Utilities Cost	Cost: \$0.00 Cost/Mi = \$0.00	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Does the project require the relocation of utilities? - Is cost for utilities reasonable? Per mile? - Does the cost to relocate utilities reflect the project description in the application? - Have all the utilities in the project been addressed? 	
4 Construction Cost	Cost: \$795,000.00 Cost/Mi = \$454,285.71	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Is the construction cost estimate reasonable? Per mile? - Does the construction cost estimate appear to be complete? - Does construction cost estimate reflect the project description in the application? 	
5 Design Schedule	Programmed: FY 2010 Months to Complete: 36	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Are there any special features or challenges with the project that would require longer then average lead time for design (e.g. endangered) - Does the design phase begin early enough to ensure the construction phase of the project will be obligated in the year programmed? 	
6 ROW Schedule	Programmed: FY 2011 Months to Complete: 24	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Does the project need to include a ROW phase? - Are there any special features or challenges with the project that would require longer then average lead time to complete a ROW phase - Does the ROW phase begin early enough to ensure the construction phase of the project will be obligated in the year programmed? 	

Presentation at Street Committee Meeting #1

Jennifer Jack, engineer with SRP-MIC presented. There are 2 segments, the first is Dobson Road from the canal to Indian Bend, and the second is on Center from McDonald to Indian Bend Rd. The first segment is a lead way into the Talking Stick resort and Casino Arizona. We are proposing curb and gutter on this project as Indian Bend has curb and gutter. A combined project length of 1.75 miles. The ADT on Dobson Rd is 440 under existing conditions of an unpaved road, and will most likely go up once it is paved, and on Center St, the ADT is 84. For Dobson, requires 3 inches of asphalt on 8 inches of ABC with curb and gutter, and for Center it's 2 inches on 6 inches of ABC with no curb and gutter. It will be \$790K. The funds are committed, it is in the SRP-MIC jurisdiction and have recorded BIA right of way.

Discussion, Questions, and Answers at Street Committee Meeting #1

Question: How is the ADT so high on Dobson Road without a connection to the canal? Answer: There is a road on the north side of the canal, so they do use this canal road. Question: Does the east portion connect to the B-line highway? It seems like there are a great deal of people cutting through and it seems like they should be connecting to a paved road. Answer: Yes, it is connecting to a paved road which connects to the Beeline. Question: Is the access on the canal legal access? Answer: I believe it has legal SRP access, it is not necessarily a public roadway. Bridge over canal at Dobson is in the short range plan. Question/Comment: A committee member suggested caution, as SRP just shut down access along Elliot Road and now the residents are cut off. Comment/Question: Peoria is going through a similar issue of residents being cut off from access to canal roads. Question/Comment: Please include the description of curb and gutter in the description of the project where applicable. Does the cost estimate include drainage costs? Answer: It's not included, after planning studies, we could include it in the local match. Question/Comment: I would also specify that drainage is not included in the project nor costs at this time.

Items needed for clarification by the Applicant for Street Committee Meeting #2

Please change project name and description to include locations of project and if they include curb, gutter, and drainage, and separate out the ADT per roadway.

Clarified information, Comments from Applicant for Street Committee #2

Segment description was updated with width, project name and description of project was changed. Separate ADT given for each roadway. This is the 3rd priority for SRPMIC. SRPMIC acknowledges that CMAQ funds do not cover the cost for drainage. SRPMIC will cover the cost of drainage facilities for Dobson Road. The extent of the drainage improvements will be determined during the project planning and design.

	Segment Location	Segment Work Description	Type of Paving For the Segment
1	Dobson Road: Arizona Canal to Indian Bend Road	Depending on the results of the geotechnical investigation, the existing roadway prism will be excavated, up to 8 inches of base course will be introduced and up to 3 inches of AC will be provided. Curb and gutter will also be needed, as well as drainage facilities.	New 32' wide asphalt roadway with curb and gutter and up to 3 inches of AC on 8 inches of base course.
2	Center: McDonald Dr to Indian Bend Rd	Depending on the results of the geotechnical investigation, the existing roadway prism will be excavated, up to 6 inches of base course will be introduced and up to 2 inches of AC will be provided.	New 28' wide asphalt roadway with up to 2 inches of AC on 6 inches of base course.

Street Committee - Paving Review Sheet for Salt River Pima-Maricopa Indian Community Project 4		
Project Name:	SRP-MIC Pave Dirt Roads Program, Phase 4: Mesa Drive and Roadrunner Road	
Description of Project:	Pre-design, design and construction of up to 7 miles of dirt roads within the Salt River Pima-Maricopa Indian Community boundaries. Phase 4 will consist of Mesa Drive from McDonald Road to Roadrunner Road and Roadrunner Road from Mesa Drive to 1/4 mile west.	
Year of Requested Funds (2011 or 2012):	2012	
Project Application Link:	http://www.mag.maricopa.gov/pdf/PM-10_FY2009-Applications/SRP-MIC%20Pave%204.pdf	
	Category	Project Data
1	Average Daily Traffic	ADT: 50.00 (Mesa Dr & Roadrunner Rd)
2	Right-of-Way Cost	Cost: \$0.00 Cost/Mi = \$0.00
3	Utilities Cost	Cost: \$0.00 Cost/Mi = \$0.00
4	Construction Cost	Cost: \$750,000.00 Cost/Mi = \$375,000.00
5	Design Schedule	Programmed: FY 2010 Months to Complete: 36
6	ROW Schedule	Programmed: FY 2011 Months to Complete: 24
SAMPLE Data Adequacy Questions		
- Is the ADT estimate based on a sound methodology?		
- Does the ADT estimate seem reasonable?		
- Does the project require the purchase of ROW?		
- Is the ROW cost estimate reasonable? Per mile?		
- Does the ROW cost estimate appear to be complete?		
- Does ROW cost estimate reflect the project description in the application?		
- Does the project require the relocation of utilities?		
- Is cost for utilities reasonable? Per mile?		
- Does the cost to relocate utilities reflect the project description in the application?		
- Have all the utilities in the project been addressed?		
- Is the construction cost estimate reasonable? Per mile?		
- Does the construction cost estimate appear to be complete?		
- Does construction cost estimate reflect the project description in the application?		
- Are there any special features or challenges with the project that would require longer then average lead time for design (e.g. endangered)		
- Does the design phase begin early enough to ensure the construction phase of the project will be obligated in the year programmed?		
- Does the project need to include a ROW phase?		
- Are there any special features or challenges with the project that would require longer then average lead time to complete a ROW phase		
- Does the ROW phase begin early enough to ensure the construction phase of the project will be obligated in the year programmed?		

Presentation at Street Committee Meeting #1

Jennifer Jack, engineer with SRP-MIC presented. There are 2 segments in this project, for a combined project length of 2 miles. The ADT is 50. The project requires 2 inches of asphalt on 6 inches of ABC. It will be a 2 lane wide road, 28 feet, no curb and gutter. Cost estimate was prepared by a registered engineer for \$750K. The funds are committed, it is in the SRP-MIC jurisdiction and have recorded BIA right of way.

Discussion, Questions, and Answers at Street Committee Meeting #1

Question/Comment: The ADT seems high? Answer: This is our default that BIA sets and we use for residential and rural roads. Question/Comment: From the map it looks like there is one resident on the road. Answer: Yes, there is one resident on Roadrunner. (Mesa Drive segment has 2 additional residences.)

Items needed for clarification by the Applicant for Street Committee Meeting #2

Please change project name to include locations of project, and separate out the ADT per roadway.

Clarified information, Comments from Applicant for Street Committee #2

Segment description was updated with width, project name and description of project was changed. ADT is the same for each segment. Although there are only 3 residences for this phase, these roads provide access to horse care and boarding facilities. This is the 4th priority for SRPMIC.

	Segment Location	Segment Work Description	Type of Paving For the Segment
1	Mesa Dr: McDonald Rd to Roadrunner Rd	Depending on the results of the geotechnical investigation, the existing roadway prism will be excavated, up to 6 inches of base course will be introduced and up to 2 inches of AC will be provided.	New 28' wide asphalt roadway with up to 2 inches of AC on 6 inches of base course.
2	Roadrunner Rd: Mesa Dr to 0.25 miles west	Depending on the results of the geotechnical investigation, the existing roadway prism will be excavated, up to 6 inches of base course will be introduced and up to 2 inches of AC will be provided.	New 28' wide asphalt roadway with up to 2 inches of AC on 6 inches of base course.

Street Committee - Paving Review Sheet for Surprise Project 2

Project Name:		Paving Dove Valley Road from 203rd Ave. to 187th Ave
Description of Project:		This project will consist of paving approximately two miles of Dove Valley Road located between 203rd Ave. to 187th Ave. The improvements will consist of constructing cut off walls for minor drainage purposes. This project will reduce dust emission in this area.
Year of Requested Funds (2011 or 2012):		2011
Project Application Link:		http://www.mag.maricopa.gov/pdf/PM-10_FY2009-Applications/Surprise%20Pave%202%20-
Category	Project Data	SAMPLE Data Adequacy Questions
1 Average Daily Traffic	ADT: 90.00	- Is the ADT estimate based on a sound methodology? - Does the ADT estimate seem reasonable?
2 Right-of-Way Cost	Cost: \$0.00 Cost/Mi = \$0.00	- Does the project require the purchase of ROW? - Is the ROW cost estimate reasonable? Per mile? - Does the ROW cost estimate appear to be complete? - Does ROW cost estimate reflect the project description in the application?
3 Utilities Cost	Cost: \$0.00 Cost/Mi = \$0.00	- Does the project require the relocation of utilities? - Is cost for utilities reasonable? Per mile? - Does the cost to relocate utilities reflect the project description in the application? - Have all the utilities in the project been addressed?
4 Construction Cost	Cost: \$890,000.00 Cost/Mi = \$445,000.00	- Is the construction cost estimate reasonable? Per mile? - Does the construction cost estimate appear to be complete? - Does construction cost estimate reflect the project description in the application?
5 Design Schedule	Programmed: FY 2009 Months to Complete: 31	- Are there any special features or challenges with the project that would require longer then average lead time for design - Does the design phase begin early enough to ensure the construction phase of the project will be obligated in the year
6 ROW Schedule	Programmed: FY 2010 Months to Complete: 24	- Does the project need to include a ROW phase? - Are there any special features or challenges with the project that would require longer then average lead time to complete - Does the ROW phase begin early enough to ensure the construction phase of the project will be obligated in the year

Presentation at Street Committee Meeting #1

Suneel Garg, who works for the Engineering Department as their CIP engineer presented. Both of the applications are on Dove Valley Road. There are plans for future master planned communities in this area. The 2011 application is for 2 miles from 203rd Avenue heading 2 miles east. The type of paving is a 28 foot pavement cross section, with 3 inches of asphalt, over 5 inches of ABC. The existing subgrade is unpaved. The schedule is to start design in 2009 and then continue with construction in 2011. The budget for design is \$175K from the General Fund. Construction includes contingency for unforeseen circumstances. Currently the city owns the ROW and looking at the cross section, no known utilities nor environmental challenges. This road is in the long range plan. This area is close to a school district, in which the school buses uses this area. This is also an alternate route for US-60 when there is construction. Very few washes as well in this area.

Discussion, Questions, and Answers at Street Committee Meeting #1

Question: The project description seems to be the same as the 2011 project, can you change the description? Answer: Yes, we can. Question: You mentioned school buses, is this a regular route, how many? Answer: This is not on a regular route. But the school district is close by so there are no bus stops. Question: How was the ADT determined? Answer: Two of the future communities did a traffic impact analysis, and they had conducted ADT studies. The 90 ADT is the current conditions, not future. Question: You may want to use aerial shots to show the residential areas. How many residents live in the area? Answer: Quite a bit. Question: Two large developments are mentioned that they will be built in the future, will this road be a major access point? Answer: The future developments will be built at a later time. Question: Are these developers going to be required to build 1/2 of the road? Answer: Dove Valley is considered to be a Road of Regional Significance in the future plan. We are not sure when they are building the development with the slow down of the economy. They will be required to build some part of the northern portion of the road. We'll mostly be doing the construction on the south side of the road. Question: It was mentioned that there was a development on the ea Answer: No, this is a rural subdivision, lot splits, trailers, etc. so this was not a true platted subdivision. Follow up question: So in the long term, this will be a 4 lane major arterial? Answer: Yes.

Items needed for clarification by the Applicant for Street Committee Meeting #2

All questions and comments were answered at Street Committee Meeting #1. There are no outstanding questions.

Segment Location	Segment Work Description	Type of Paving For the Segment
------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------------

1	Dove Valley Road from 203rd Ave. to 187th Ave	Excavate existing ground to 8 inches or deeper and replace with 3 inches of asphaltic concrete and 5 inches of aggregate base course or as dictated by the Geotechnical Engineering Report	3 inches of asphaltic concrete and 5 inches of aggregate base course
---	---	--	--

Street Committee - Paving Review Sheet for Surprise Project 1

Project Name:		Paving Dove Valley Road from 163rd Ave. to 179th Ave	
Description of Project:		This project will consist of paving approximately two miles of Dove Valley Road located between 163rd Ave. to 179th Ave. The improvements will consist of constructing cut off walls for minor drainage purposes. This project will reduce dust emission in this area.	
Year of Requested Funds (2011 or 2012):		2012	
Project Application Link:		http://www.mag.maricopa.gov/pdf/PM-10_FY2009-Applications/ Surprise%20Pave%201%20-	
Category	Project Data	SAMPLE Data Adequacy Questions	
1 Average Daily Traffic	ADT: 90.00	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Is the ADT estimate based on a sound methodology? - Does the ADT estimate seem reasonable? 	
2 Right-of-Way Cost	Cost: \$0.00 Cost/Mi = \$0.00	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Does the project require the purchase of ROW? - Is the ROW cost estimate reasonable? Per mile? - Does the ROW cost estimate appear to be complete? - Does ROW cost estimate reflect the project description in the application? 	
3 Utilities Cost	Cost: \$0.00 Cost/Mi = \$0.00	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Does the project require the relocation of utilities? - Is cost for utilities reasonable? Per mile? - Does the cost to relocate utilities reflect the project description in the application? - Have all the utilities in the project been addressed? 	
4 Construction Cost	Cost: \$890,000.00 Cost/Mi = \$445,000.00	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Is the construction cost estimate reasonable? Per mile? - Does the construction cost estimate appear to be complete? - Does construction cost estimate reflect the project description in the application? 	
5 Design Schedule	Programmed: FY 2010 Months to Complete: 36	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Are there any special features or challenges with the project that would require longer then average lead time for design - Does the design phase begin early enough to ensure the construction phase of the project will be obligated in the year 	
6 ROW Schedule	Programmed: FY 2011 Months to Complete: 24	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Does the project need to include a ROW phase? - Are there any special features or challenges with the project that would require longer then average lead time to complete - Does the ROW phase begin early enough to ensure the construction phase of the project will be obligated in the year 	

Presentation at Street Committee Meeting #1

Currently, the city owns 65 feet of right of way on the south side of the road, on the north side it is mountainous. There are quite a bit of residents in this area. Design will start in 2010 with General funds and construction will start in 2012.

Discussion, Questions, and Answers at Street Committee Meeting #1

Question: The project description seems to be the same as the 2011 project, can you change the description? Answer: Yes, we can. Question: You mentioned school buses, is this a regular route, how many? Answer: This is not on a regular route. But the school district is close by so there are no bust stops. Question: How was the ADT determined? Answer: Two of the future communities did a traffic impact analysis, and they had conducted ADT studies. The 90 ADT is the current conditions, not future. Question: You may want to use aerial shots to show the residential areas. How many residents? Answer: Quite a bit. Question: Two large developments are mentioned that they will come in the future, will this road be a major access point? Answer: The future developments will take a while before they do come in. Question: Are these developers, are they going to be required 1/2 of the road? Answer: Dove Valley is considered to be a Road of Regional Significance in the future plan. We are not sure when they are building with the slow down of the economy. They will be required to build some part of the northern portion of the road. We'll mostly be doing the construction on the south side of the road. Question: It was mentioned that there was a development on the east end, did they buy? Answer: No, this is a rural subdivision, lot splits, trailers, etc. so this was not a true platted subdivision. Follow up question: So in the long term, this will be a 4 lane major arterial? Answer: Yes.

Items needed for clarification by the Applicant for Street Committee Meeting #2

Please update the project description to match the project name.

Clarified information, Comments from Applicant for Street Committee #2

The project description has been updated

	Segment Location	Segment Work Description	Type of Paving For the Segment
1	Dove Valley Road from 163rd Ave. to 179th Ave	Excavate existing ground to 8 inches or deeper and replace with 3 inches of asphaltic concrete and 5 inches of aggregate base course or as dictated by the Geotechnical Engineering Report	3 inches of asphaltic concrete and 5 inches of aggregate base course

Street Committee - Paving Review Sheet for Tempe Project 1

Project Name:		Alley Stabilization
Description of Project:		The city of Tempe has an ongoing alley reconstruction program which includes removing soil fines and old soil material and replacing with recycled asphalt (RAP). Approximately 130 miles of unpaved alleys remain. Funding this project will allow the city of Tempe to accelerate its stabilization program in order to reduce PM 10 emissions.
Year of Requested Funds (2011 or 2012):		2011
Project Application Link:		http://www.mag.maricopa.gov/pdf/PM-10_FY2009-Applications/Tempe%20Pave%201.pdf
Category	Project Data	SAMPLE Data Adequacy Questions
1 Average Daily Traffic	ADT: 10.00	- Is the ADT estimate based on a sound methodology? - Does the ADT estimate seem reasonable?
2 Right-of-Way Cost	Cost: \$0.00 Cost/Mi = \$0.00	- Does the project require the purchase of ROW? - Is the ROW cost estimate reasonable? Per mile? - Does the ROW cost estimate appear to be complete? - Does ROW cost estimate reflect the project description in the application?
3 Utilities Cost	Cost: \$0.00 Cost/Mi = \$0.00	- Does the project require the relocation of utilities? - Is cost for utilities reasonable? Per mile? - Does the cost to relocate utilities reflect the project description in the application? - Have all the utilities in the project been addressed?
4 Construction Cost	Cost: \$2,690,674.00 Cost/Mi = \$107,626.96	- Is the construction cost estimate reasonable? Per mile? - Does the construction cost estimate appear to be complete? - Does construction cost estimate reflect the project description in the application?
5 Design Schedule	Programmed: None Months to Complete: None	- Are there any special features or challenges with the project that would require longer then average lead time for design - Does the design phase begin early enough to ensure the construction phase of the project will be obligated in the year
6 ROW Schedule	Programmed: None Months to Complete: None	- Does the project need to include a ROW phase? - Are there any special features or challenges with the project that would require longer then average lead time to complete - Does the ROW phase begin early enough to ensure the construction phase of the project will be obligated in the year

Presentation at Street Committee Meeting #1

John Osgood, public works - Deputy public works manager for field operations. This is one projects broken into three segments. They have had an annual program in place for the past 5 years. They grade alley for proper drainage, then apply wall to wall of recycled asphalt paving (RAP) 2 inches thick. Mr. Osgood mentioned that they have 130 miles of unpaved alleys remaining in Tempe. It's identified in the PM-10 Plan, and in city's plan to reduce dust for the PM-10 State plan for the Salt River Pima Maricopa area. The alley use: weekly trash, monthly for large trash, utilities are in alley, and access to residents. Particular for north Tempe are frequent use of alleys for move in and out. These three segments were chosen due to the proximity to the monitors and neighboring jurisdictions. They have found that stabilizing the alleys mitigates the dust.

Discussion, Questions, and Answers at Street Committee Meeting #1

Question: How many miles of alleys have been paved in the past 5 years? Response: About 30. Question/Comment: This request is for 26 miles, these seems to be a large number for one year compared to the past five years. Response: The applicant agreed and mentioned that they would contract out for these projects. General Comment about alleys: What about the MAG standards, there are a wide range of application, Phoenix has a FAST, Tempe is using RAP. Should there be a standard for the region on the alleys, a minimum life span? What is the difference between O & M and capital? MAG staff responded that they would check with specs and details regarding standards, and then discussed how chip seal applications like FAST and RAP have been approved by FHWA. Another Committee member commented that cities and towns sometimes set standards on recycled materials from other projects, and standards for those jurisdictions come about due to the availability of products. Committee members also added as a regional group if they could look into types of paving products that are cost effective and maybe have standards that would cost benefit all cities and towns, and as well what the life cycle is of these different materials that could be supported region wide. Another committee member also suggested maybe an evaluation of these alleys and a jurisdiction's trash pickup practices could be factored into an alley projects evaluation? General comment was that the idea might be able to be included in the future.

Items needed for clarification by the Applicant for Street Committee Meeting #2

All questions and comments were answered at Street Committee Meeting #1. There are no outstanding questions.

	Segment Location	Segment Work Description	Type of Paving For the Segment
1	Holdeman school area	removal of all loose soil fines, dirt, and old material that sits on top of good base material. This is done from wall to wall in the alley. A 1"-2" layer of recycled asphalt is applied as a final surface treatment.	A surface treatment of recycled asphalt
2	North Tempe	removal of all loose soil fines, dirt, and old material that sits on top of good base material. This is done from wall to wall in the alley. A 1"-2" layer of recycled asphalt is applied as a final surface treatment.	A surface treatment of recycled asphalt
3	Optimist Park area	removal of all loose soil fines, dirt, and old material that sits on top of good base material. This is done from wall to wall in the alley. A 1"-2" layer of recycled asphalt is applied as a final surface treatment.	A surface treatment of recycled asphalt

Street Committee - Paving Review Sheet for Youngtown Project 1

Project Name:		Youngtown Pave Dirt Alleys, Phase 1
Description of Project:		Pre-design, design and paving of approximately 3.7 miles of dirt alleyways within the Town of Youngtown
Year of Requested Funds (2011 or 2012):		2011
Project Application Link:		http://www.mag.maricopa.gov/pdf/PM-10_FY2009-Applications/Youngtown%20Pave%201.pdf
Category	Project Data	SAMPLE Data Adequacy Questions
1 Average Daily Traffic	ADT: 29.56	- Is the ADT estimate based on a sound methodology? - Does the ADT estimate seem reasonable?
2 Right-of-Way Cost	Cost: \$0.00 Cost/Mi = \$0.00	- Does the project require the purchase of ROW? - Is the ROW cost estimate reasonable? Per mile? - Does the ROW cost estimate appear to be complete? - Does ROW cost estimate reflect the project description in the application?
3 Utilities Cost	Cost: \$0.00 Cost/Mi = \$0.00	- Does the project require the relocation of utilities? - Is cost for utilities reasonable? Per mile? - Does the cost to relocate utilities reflect the project description in the application? - Have all the utilities in the project been addressed?
4 Construction Cost	Cost: \$858,912.00 Cost/Mi = \$183,136.89	- Is the construction cost estimate reasonable? Per mile? - Does the construction cost estimate appear to be complete? - Does construction cost estimate reflect the project description in the application?
5 Design Schedule	Programmed: FY 2009 Months to Complete: 31	- Are there any special features or challenges with the project that would require longer than average lead time for design - Does the design phase begin early enough to ensure the construction phase of the project will be obligated in the year
6 ROW Schedule	Programmed: FY 2010 Months to Complete: 24	- Does the project need to include a ROW phase? - Are there any special features or challenges with the project that would require longer than average lead time to complete - Does the ROW phase begin early enough to ensure the construction phase of the project will be obligated in the year

Presentation at Street Committee Meeting #1

Mark Hannah Public Works Manager for the Town of Youngtown presented. The Town of Youngtown is looking to pave 6.8 miles of unpaved alleys, bounded by Grand Ave and Peoria, and 111th to 115th Avenue. The engineer has given an estimate of about \$2 million to pave all of the requested alleys. The town received CDBG funds and has local funds to complete the project. The engineering firm did a manual traffic count for 24 hours for ADT; the 29 ADT is the average of all 6.8 miles. They have received 2 fines from Maricopa County for dust violations.

Discussion, Questions, and Answers at Street Committee Meeting #1

Question: What is the type of vehicles use the alley? Answer: local residents, town garbage collection, and utilities. Question: Is the ROW is owned? Answer: The town responded that the ROW is owned and utilities will not be of concern. Question/Comment: It was suggested by a committee member to change the description to not include ROW since it is owned by the Youngtown. Question/Comment: A committee member asked to verify the project lengths since the presenter was discussing 6.8 miles, and the two applications list 3.8 and 3.2, which total to 7 miles.

Items needed for clarification by the Applicant for Street Committee Meeting #2

It was suggested by a committee member to change the description to not include ROW since the ROW is owned by Youngtown. And, if Youngtown could verify the project lengths since the presenter was discussing 6.8 miles, and the two applications list 3.8 and 3.2, which total to 7 miles.

Clarified information, Comments from Applicant for Street Committee #2

The "Description of Project" should be revised to read as follows: "Pre-design, design and paving of approximately 3.7 miles of dirt alleyways within the Town of Youngtown." For clarification, all of the right-of-way for the entire project is owned by the Town of Youngtown; it is therefore anticipated that funds will not be needed for ROW acquisition costs. The Town also wishes to clarify the length of this project is approximately 3.7 miles.

	Segment Location	Segment Work Description	Type of Paving For the Segment
1	North Youngtown (Alley Numbers 1 through 7)	Temporarily remove trash cans, courtesy grading (as part of an bi-annual process operated by the Town), zero or minimal sub-grade and up to four inches of AC	Minimum 2-inch penetration and chip seal, maximum 4 inches base and 2 inches of AC, but this will be totally dependent on conditions in the different alleys
2	Central North Youngtown (Alley Numbers 8 through 19)	Temporarily remove trash cans, courtesy grading (as part of an bi-annual process operated by the Town), zero or minimal sub-grade and up to four inches of AC	Minimum 2-inch penetration and chip seal, maximum 4 inches base and 2 inches of AC, but this will be totally dependent on conditions in the different alleys

Street Committee - Paving Review Sheet for Youngtown Project 2		
Project Name:		Youngtown Pave Dirt Alleys, Phase 2
Description of Project:		Pre-design, design and paving of approximately 3.1 miles of dirt alleyways within the Town of Youngtown
Year of Requested Funds (2011 or 2012):		2012
Project Application Link:		http://www.mag.maricopa.gov/pdf/PM-10_FY2009-Applications/Youngtown%20Pave%202.pdf
Category	Project Data	SAMPLE Data Adequacy Questions
1 Average Daily Traffic	ADT: 22.35	- Is the ADT estimate based on a sound methodology? - Does the ADT estimate seem reasonable?
2 Right-of-Way Cost	Cost: \$0.00 Cost/Mi = \$0.00	- Does the project require the purchase of ROW? - Is the ROW cost estimate reasonable? Per mile? - Does the ROW cost estimate appear to be complete? - Does ROW cost estimate reflect the project description in the application?
3 Utilities Cost	Cost: \$0.00 Cost/Mi = \$0.00	- Does the project require the relocation of utilities? - Is cost for utilities reasonable? Per mile? - Does the cost to relocate utilities reflect the project description in the application? - Have all the utilities in the project been addressed?
4 Construction Cost	Cost: \$699,008.00 Cost/Mi = \$183,466.67	- Is the construction cost estimate reasonable? Per mile? - Does the construction cost estimate appear to be complete? - Does construction cost estimate reflect the project description in the application?
5 Design Schedule	Programmed: FY 2010 Months to Complete: 36	- Are there any special features or challenges with the project that would require longer then average lead time for design - Does the design phase begin early enough to ensure the construction phase of the project will be obligated in the year
6 ROW Schedule	Programmed: FY 2011 Months to Complete: 24	- Does the project need to include a ROW phase? - Are there any special features or challenges with the project that would require longer then average lead time to complete - Does the ROW phase begin early enough to ensure the construction phase of the project will be obligated in the year

Presentation at Street Committee Meeting #1

Mark Hannah Public Works Manager for the Town of Youngtown presented and explained that this project is a continuation of the first project.

Discussion, Questions, and Answers at Street Committee Meeting #1

Question/Comment: A Committee member made the same comment that right of way should be removed from project description since the town owns it all. Question/Comment: A committee member asked about if the type of pavement of composite recommended and the base is sufficient? Answer: The town said that they are actually doing core samples to verify if the base is compacted enough to move forward with this recommendation.

Items needed for clarification by the Applicant for Street Committee Meeting #2

It was suggested by a committee member to change the description to not include ROW since the ROW is owned by Youngtown. And, if Youngtown could verify the project lengths since the presenter was discussing 6.8 miles, and the two applications list 3.8 and 3.2, which total to 7 miles.

Clarified information, Comments from Applicant for Street Committee #2

The "Description of Project" should be revised to read as follows: "Pre-design, design and paving of approximately 3.1 miles of dirt alleyways within the Town of Youngtown." For clarification, all of the right-of-way for the entire project is owned by the Town of Youngtown; it is therefore anticipated that funds will not be needed for ROW acquisition costs. The Town also wishes to clarify the length of this project is approximately 3.1 miles.

Segment Location	Segment Work Description	Type of Paving For the Segment
1 South Central Youngtown (Alley Numbers 20 through 30)	Temporarily remove trash cans, courtesy grading (as part of an bi-annual process operated by the Town), zero or minimal sub-grade and up to four inches of AC	Minimum 2-inch penetration and chip seal, maximum 4 inches base and 2 inches of AC, but this will be totally dependent on conditions in the different alleys

2	South Youngtown (Alley Numbers 31 through 47)	Temporarily remove trash cans, courtesy grading (as part of an bi-annual process operated by the Town), zero or minimal sub-grade and up to four inches of AC	Minimum 2-inch penetration and chip seal, maximum 4 inches base and 2 inches of AC, but this will be totally dependent on conditions in the different alleys
---	---	---	--

ATTACHMENT FOUR

MAG Federally Funded Projects Status Report

Since October 2002, MAG staff has produced a status report on the progress of local member agency, MAG federally funded projects in the ADOT administered, federal clearance and design approval process. The information in this report is based on information obtained from the ADOT Local Governments Section and feedback from various MAG member agencies. This report includes information for projects that are sponsored by local governments in the MAG area, that are in the current and next fiscal year of the TIP, funded by CMAQ or sub allocated STP, and are classified as 'Street', 'Bicycle', 'Pedestrian', 'AQ or TDM' or 'ITS' projects.

Report Layout

Box 1	Box 2	Box 3	Box 4	Box 5																																																																																																																																			
GLB06-203B SS 637 01C CM-GLB-0(200)A Gilbert - Gilbert Town Center, Design traffic management center (phase B) and purchase further equipment Active	CMAQ \$368,401 HURF \$126,599 Total \$495,000 ITS	ADOT Contact Bill Snarr (602) 712-7025 Agency Contact Rick Hooker (480) 503-6933	<table border="1" style="width: 100%; border-collapse: collapse;"> <thead> <tr> <th style="width: 5%;">Phase</th> <th style="width: 5%;">06</th> <th style="width: 3%;">O</th> <th style="width: 3%;">N</th> <th style="width: 3%;">D</th> <th style="width: 3%;">J</th> <th style="width: 3%;">F</th> <th style="width: 3%;">M</th> <th style="width: 3%;">A</th> <th style="width: 3%;">M</th> <th style="width: 3%;">J</th> <th style="width: 3%;">J</th> <th style="width: 3%;">A</th> <th style="width: 3%;">S</th> <th style="width: 3%;">O</th> <th style="width: 3%;">N</th> <th style="width: 3%;">D</th> <th style="width: 3%;">J</th> <th style="width: 3%;">F</th> <th style="width: 3%;">M</th> <th style="width: 3%;">A</th> <th style="width: 3%;">M</th> <th style="width: 3%;">J</th> <th style="width: 3%;">J</th> <th style="width: 3%;">A</th> <th style="width: 3%;">S</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>DCR</td> <td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>Envir</td> <td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>Design</td> <td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>Bid Date</td> <td colspan="23"></td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Phase	06	O	N	D	J	F	M	A	M	J	J	A	S	O	N	D	J	F	M	A	M	J	J	A	S	DCR																											Envir																											Design																											Bid Date																								IGA under development. This is a procurement project and should obligate in 2007.
Phase	06	O	N	D	J	F	M	A	M	J	J	A	S	O	N	D	J	F	M	A	M	J	J	A	S																																																																																																														
DCR																																																																																																																																							
Envir																																																																																																																																							
Design																																																																																																																																							
Bid Date																																																																																																																																							

- Box 1. Project Identification Numbers, Location and Description Information
- Top Row: This row lists various identification numbers for the project: MAG TIP Identification Number, the ADOT Tracs Number and, the Federal Project Number
 - Middle Rows: These rows provide the location and work description of the project as it is listed in the MAG TIP.
 - Bottom Row: This row identifies the status and mode of the project. Status field values are as follows:
 - a. Abandoned. The project has been abandoned for federal funding by the sponsoring agency.
 - b. Active. The project is under active development at ADOT Local Governments.
 - c. At-Risk. The project is highly unlikely to obligate in the fiscal year it is programmed.
 - d. Authorized. The project has obligated.
 - e. Closeout Project: Project is included for closeout and is generally already designed or is procurement or design project.
 - f. Deferral Requested. The sponsoring agency has requested to defer the project.
 - g. Inactive. The project sponsor has not contacted ADOT or at most has only obtained project numbers from ADOT.
- Box 2. Project Funding Information. This box lists project funding sources and amounts as listed in the MAG TIP.
- Box 3. Contacts. This box lists contact information for ADOT Local Governments staff and the project sponsor.
- Box 4. Development Schedule. This is a simplified calendar that shows the month when key clearances and design approvals were achieved by the project. A capital 'A' in a column indicates the approval by ADOT. The columns in the calendar are as follows:
- Phase: This identifies an item to be approved. The labels in this column are as follows:
 - a. DCR - The Design Concept Report for the project
 - b. Envir. - Environmental Clearance for the project
 - c. Design - The plans, specification and estimates package for the project
 - 06: This refers to activity that was approved in FY 2006 or earlier.
 - The remainder of the columns identify months of the federal fiscal year where an approval is achieved.
 - The bottom row lists the bid date of the project. This field is not currently being maintained.
- Box 5. Summary Note: Provides a short summary note concerning the project.

Federal FY 2009 MAG Federal Projects Only

Project Identification Numbers, Location and Description Information	Project Funding	Contacts	Development Schedule																								Summary Note	
			Phase	Federal FY 2009												Federal FY 2010												
				08	O	N	D	J	F	M	A	M	J	J	A	S	O	N	D	J	F	M	A	M	J	J		A
FTH09-602 SS 660 01C CM-FTH-0(202)A Fountain Hills - Fountain Hills Blvd: Fayette Dr to Fountain Hills Middle School, Design and construct 8 foot wide detached sidewalks Active Pedestrian	CMAQ \$354,200 General Fun \$151,800 Total \$506,000	ADOT Contact Bill Snarr (602) 712-7025 Agency Contact Larry Woodland	Phase	08																						12/08/08 ADOT Local Govt: DCR approved; plans at 30%; not documents received for the environmental clearance		
DCR																												
Envir																												
Design																												
Bid Date																												
GLB04-205 SS 616 03D & 01C Gilbert - Gilbert Rd: US-60 to Guadalupe Rd; and US-60: Dobson Rd to Gilbert Rd, Install fiber & conduit along Gilbert Rd, fiber only along US-60 (joint with Mesa to link ATMS) Inactive ITS	CMAQ \$400,660 HURF \$59,840 Total \$460,500	ADOT Contact Bill Snarr (602) 712-7025 Agency Contact Rick Hooker (480) 503-6933	Phase	08																								
DCR																												
Envir																												
Design																												
Bid Date																												
GLB05-107R SS 546 03D & 01C CM-GIL-0(14)A Gilbert - Eastern Canal: Baseline Rd to Guadalupe Rd (Santan Vista Trail phase I), Design and construct multi-use path Active Bicycle	CMAQ \$549,769 HURF \$33,231 Total \$583,000	ADOT Contact Bill Snarr (602) 712-7025 Agency Contact Tami Ryall (480) 503-6765	Phase	08																					12/08/08 ADOT Local Govt: ADOT recommends that GLB05-107R, GLB06-201R and GLB07-302 be combined in the TIP			
DCR	A																											
Envir	A																											
Design																												
Bid Date																												
GLB06-201R SS 547 01C CM-GIL-(012)A Gilbert - Eastern Canal: Guadalupe Rd to Elliot Rd (Santan Vista Trail phase II), Design and construct multi-use path Active Bicycle	CMAQ \$636,000 General Fun \$159,000 Total \$795,000	ADOT Contact Bill Snarr (602) 712-7025 Agency Contact Tami Ryall (480) 503-6765	Phase	08																					12/08/08 ADOT Local Govt: ADOT recommends that GLB05-107R, GLB06-201R and GLB07-302 be combined in the TIP			
DCR	A																											
Envir	A																											
Design																												
Bid Date																												
GLB07-302 SS 548 01C CM-CHN-0(024)A Gilbert - Eastern Canal: Elliot Rd to Warner Rd (Santan Vista Trail phase III), Design and construct multi-use path Active Bicycle	CMAQ \$500,000 General Fun \$92,000 Total \$592,000	ADOT Contact Bill Snarr (602) 712-7025 Agency Contact Tami Ryall (480) 503-6765	Phase	08																					12/08/08 ADOT Local Govt: ADOT recommends that GLB05-107R, GLB06-201R and GLB07-302 be combined in the TIP			
DCR	A																											
Envir	A																											
Design																												
Bid Date																												
GLB09-601C SS 610 01C CM-GLB-0(019)A Gilbert - Western-Powerline Trail: Cooper Rd to Gilbert Rd (phase III), Construct multi-use path and pedestrian amenities Active Bicycle	CMAQ \$614,405 Impact Fees \$320,595 Total \$935,000	ADOT Contact Bill Snarr (602) 712-7025 Agency Contact	Phase	08																					This project was designed with federal funds			
DCR	A																											
Envir	A																											
Design	A																											
Bid Date																												
GLB13-905 Gilbert - Guadalupe Rd, Higley Rd, Williams Field Rd, Gilbert ATMS Fiber East Ring Project - Phase I (Design) Inactive ITS	CMAQ \$122,234 Local \$63,000 Total \$185,234	ADOT Contact Agency Contact	Phase	08																					12/08/08 ADOT Local Govt: No activity on the project			
DCR																												
Envir																												
Design																												
Bid Date																												

Federal FY 2009 MAG Federal Projects Only

Project Identification Numbers, Location and Description Information	Project Funding	Contacts	Development Schedule																								Summary Note		
			Phase	Federal FY 2009												Federal FY 2010													
				08	O	N	D	J	F	M	A	M	J	J	A	S	O	N	D	J	F	M	A	M	J	J		A	S
MMA09-607 SS 595 01C CM-MMA-(046)A Maricopa County - Bell Rd: Loop 303 (Estrella Fwy) to Loop 101 (Agua Fria Fwy), Construct ITS Improvements	CMAQ \$1,000,000 HURF \$500,000 Total \$1,500,000	ADOT Contact Agency Contact	Phase	08	O	N	D	J	F	M	A	M	J	J	A	S	O	N	D	J	F	M	A	M	J	J	A	S	12/08/08 ADOT Local Government: The project obligated in November 2008.
Authorized ITS			DCR																										
			Envir																										
			Design																										
			Bid Date																										
MMA09-610 SS701 01C CM-MMA-0(209)A Maricopa County - Rio Verde Dr: Forest Rd to 136th St alignment, Pave shoulders to include a bicycle lane	CMAQ \$507,500 HURF \$932,500 Total \$1,440,000	ADOT Contact Bill Snarr (602) 712-7025 Agency Contact Clem Ligocki (602) 506-8672	Phase	08	O	N	D	J	F	M	A	M	J	J	A	S	O	N	D	J	F	M	A	M	J	J	A	S	12/08/08 ADOT Local Governmnet: Technical document (cultural) submitted for Environmental Clearance.
Active Bicycle			DCR	A																									
			Envir																										
			Design																										
			Bid Date																										
MMA09-810 SS687 01C CM-MMA-0(206)A Maricopa County - Glendale, Peoria and Scottsdale City Limits, Establish REACT arterial incident response teams in Glendale, Peoria and Scottsdale	CMAQ \$852,479 HURF \$386,380 Total \$1,238,859	ADOT Contact Bill Snarr (602) 712-7025 Agency Contact Clem Ligocki (602) 506-8672	Phase	08	O	N	D	J	F	M	A	M	J	J	A	S	O	N	D	J	F	M	A	M	J	J	A	S	12/08/08 ADOT Local Government: Nothing received since 2/5/08
Active ITS			DCR																										
			Envir																										
			Design																										
			Bid Date																										
MES04-125C SS 563 03D&01C CM-MES-0(027)A Mesa - Country Club Dr: 8th Ave to Baseline Rd (including US-60 TT), Install real-time adaptive signal system	CMAQ \$788,810 HURF \$581,190 Total \$1,370,000	ADOT Contact John Dickson (602) 712-8683 Agency Contact Steve Ketchem (480) 644-2513	Phase	08	O	N	D	J	F	M	A	M	J	J	A	S	O	N	D	J	F	M	A	M	J	J	A	S	12/08/08 ADOT Local Govt: Project could obligate at any time
Active ITS			DCR	A																									
			Envir	A																									
			Design																										
			Bid Date																										
MES07-315 Mesa - Southern Ave at Country Club Dr, Add 1 right turn lane and three bus pullouts	CMAQ \$910,000 HURF \$3,437,000 Total \$4,347,000	ADOT Contact Agency Contact	Phase	08	O	N	D	J	F	M	A	M	J	J	A	S	O	N	D	J	F	M	A	M	J	J	A	S	Nothing new received by ADOT on project as of 2/22/2007
Inactive Street			DCR																										
			Envir																										
			Design																										
			Bid Date																										
MES08-807 Mesa - ITS Signal Conversions - Phase 3 (Mesa Dr. & Main St.), Expand fiber-optic network and link 11 traffic signals to the Mesa TMC	CMAQ \$646,773 Other \$1,573,227 Total \$2,220,000	ADOT Contact Agency Contact	Phase	08	O	N	D	J	F	M	A	M	J	J	A	S	O	N	D	J	F	M	A	M	J	J	A	S	12/08/08 ADOT Local Govt: Nothing received on the project
Inservice ITS			DCR																										
			Envir																										
			Design																										
			Bid Date																										
MES09-605 Mesa - Grand St: Broadway Rd to 6th Ave (Nuestro neighborhood phase 1), Improve pedestrian facilities	CMAQ \$441,041 HURF \$189,018 Total \$630,059	ADOT Contact Agency Contact	Phase	08	O	N	D	J	F	M	A	M	J	J	A	S	O	N	D	J	F	M	A	M	J	J	A	S	
Inservice Pedestrian			DCR																										
			Envir																										
			Design																										
			Bid Date																										

Federal FY 2010 MAG Federal Projects Only

Project Identification Numbers, Location and Description Information	Project Funding	Contacts	Development Schedule																								Summary Note																																																																																																	
			Phase	Federal FY 2009												Federal FY 2010																																																																																																												
				08	O	N	D	J	F	M	A	M	J	J	A	S	O	N	D	J	F	M	A	M	J	J		A	S																																																																																															
GLN08-605 Glendale - Glendale Ave: Loop 101 to Luke AFB, Pave access points Deferral Requested AQ or TDM	CMAQ \$63,000 Sales Tax \$27,000 Total \$90,000	ADOT Contact Jeffrey Miles (602) 712-8336 Agency Contact Mischelle Waytenko 623-930-2635	Phase	08																						DCR																							Envir																									Design																									Bid Date																									
GLN09-610 Glendale - Downtown alley north of Glendale Ave between 57th Ave and 57th Dr, Transform existing service alleyway into a safe environment for pedestrian circulation and limited vehicular traffic Active Pedestrian	CMAQ \$240,721 Sales Tax \$103,166 Total \$343,887	ADOT Contact Agency Contact	Phase	08																						DCR																							Envir																									Design																									Bid Date																									
MMA120-09C2 MAG/Multi-Agency - Northern Pkwy: Dysart Rd to SR-303, Construct roadway Active Street	STP-MAG \$6,216,000 HURF \$2,672,000 Total \$8,888,000	ADOT Contact Agency Contact	Phase	08																						DCR																								Envir																									Design																									Bid Date																								
MMA120-09RW MAG/Multi-Agency - Northern Pkwy: US-60 (Grand Ave) to Dysart Rd, Protect right of way and construct interim median Active Street	STP-MAG \$6,877,000 HURF \$3,207,000 Total \$10,084,000	ADOT Contact Agency Contact	Phase	08																						DCR																								Envir																									Design																									Bid Date																								
MMA10-611 Maricopa County - MCDOT Traffic Management Center, Design and construct TMC upgrade Active ITS	CMAQ \$735,000 HURF \$362,500 Total \$1,097,500	ADOT Contact Agency Contact	Phase	08																						DCR																								Envir																									Design																									Bid Date																								
MMA10-815 Maricopa County - 99th Ave: Olive Ave to Bell Rd, Install conduit and fiber-optic cable to connect existing and planned ITS field devices Active ITS	CMAQ \$492,962 HURF \$657,038 Total \$1,150,000	ADOT Contact Agency Contact	Phase	08																						DCR																								Envir																									Design																									Bid Date																								
MES06-203C Mesa - Pepper Pl: Lewis St to Robson St, Construct multi-use path Active Bicycle	CMAQ \$305,961 General Fun \$18,494 Total \$324,455	ADOT Contact Agency Contact	Phase	08																						DCR																								Envir																									Design																									Bid Date																								

Nothing new received by ADOT on project as of 2/22/2007

Federal FY 2010 MAG Federal Projects Only

Project Identification Numbers, Location and Description Information	Project Funding	Contacts	Development Schedule																								Summary Note		
			Phase	Federal FY 2009												Federal FY 2010													
				08	O	N	D	J	F	M	A	M	J	J	A	S	O	N	D	J	F	M	A	M	J	J		A	S
PHX100-06D Phoenix - Black Mountain Blvd: SR-51 and Loop 101 (Pima Fwy) to Deer Valley Rd, Design new roadway ramps Active Street	STP-MAG \$2,439,000 HURF \$1,138,000 Total \$3,577,000	ADOT Contact Agency Contact	Phase	08	O	N	D	J	F	M	A	M	J	J	A	S	O	N	D	J	F	M	A	M	J	J	A	S	
PHX10-633 Phoenix - Various locations, Construct regional ITS fiber optic backbone, phase B-2 Active ITS	CMAQ \$665,000 HURF \$1,835,000 Total \$2,500,000	ADOT Contact Agency Contact	Phase	08	O	N	D	J	F	M	A	M	J	J	A	S	O	N	D	J	F	M	A	M	J	J	A	S	
PHX10-845 Phoenix - Salt River; 24th Street to I-10/Tempe Drain, Construct multi-use path Active Pedestrian	CMAQ \$801,606 General Fun \$343,400 Total \$1,145,000	ADOT Contact Agency Contact	Phase	08	O	N	D	J	F	M	A	M	J	J	A	S	O	N	D	J	F	M	A	M	J	J	A	S	
SRP100-10C Salt River I.C. - Pima Rd: 0.25 miles north of McKellips Rd to Via Linda, Construct roadway widening Active Street	STP-MAG \$10,900,000 Other \$7,000,000 Total \$22,500,000	ADOT Contact Agency Contact	Phase	08	O	N	D	J	F	M	A	M	J	J	A	S	O	N	D	J	F	M	A	M	J	J	A	S	
SCT10-616 Scottsdale - McDowell Rd: Scottsdale Rd to Pima Rd, Construct smart corridor/traffic control system Active ITS	CMAQ \$350,000 Sales Tax \$350,000 Total \$700,000	ADOT Contact Agency Contact	Phase	08	O	N	D	J	F	M	A	M	J	J	A	S	O	N	D	J	F	M	A	M	J	J	A	S	
SCT10-617R Scottsdale - Scottsdale Rd: Earll Dr to Chaparral Rd, Upgrade sidewalks and add bicycle lanes Active Pedestrian	CMAQ \$510,696 Sales Tax \$2,540,741 Total \$3,051,437	ADOT Contact Agency Contact	Phase	08	O	N	D	J	F	M	A	M	J	J	A	S	O	N	D	J	F	M	A	M	J	J	A	S	
SUR10-613 Surprise - Bell Rd: US-60 (Grand Ave) to Surprise Traffic Manangement Center, Construct fiber optic interconnection of traffic signals, cameras and VMS Active ITS	CMAQ \$150,000 Impact Fees \$150,000 Total \$300,000	ADOT Contact Agency Contact	Phase	08	O	N	D	J	F	M	A	M	J	J	A	S	O	N	D	J	F	M	A	M	J	J	A	S	

Federal FY 2010 MAG Federal Projects Only

Project Identification Numbers, Location and Description Information	Project Funding	Contacts	Development Schedule																								Summary Note				
			Phase	Federal FY 2009												Federal FY 2010															
				08	O	N	D	J	F	M	A	M	J	J	A	S	O	N	D	J	F	M	A	M	J	J		A	S		
SUR10-614 Surprise - Greenway Rd: US-60 (Grand Ave) to Cotton Ln, Construct fiber optic interconnection of traffic signals, cameras and VMS	CMAQ \$500,000 Impact Fees \$500,000 Total \$1,000,000	ADOT Contact Agency Contact	Active	ITS	Phase	08	O	N	D	J	F	M	A	M	J	J	A	S	O	N	D	J	F	M	A	M	J	J	A	S	
					DCR																										
					Envir																										
					Design																										
					Bid Date																										
TMP10-620 Tempe - Broadway Rd: Rural Rd to Mill Ave, Construct pedestrian and bicycle facilities improvements	CMAQ \$2,571,780 General Fun \$2,571,780 Total \$5,143,560	ADOT Contact Agency Contact	Active	Pedestrian	Phase	08	O	N	D	J	F	M	A	M	J	J	A	S	O	N	D	J	F	M	A	M	J	J	A	S	
					DCR																										
					Envir																										
					Design																										
					Bid Date																										
TMP10-629 Tempe - Salt River: SR143 Hohokam Freeway to Priest Drive, Construct multi-use path	CMAQ \$400,000 General Fun Total \$400,000	ADOT Contact Agency Contact	Active	Pedestrian	Phase	08	O	N	D	J	F	M	A	M	J	J	A	S	O	N	D	J	F	M	A	M	J	J	A	S	
					DCR																										
					Envir																										
					Design																										
					Bid Date																										
TMP10-803 Tempe - Citywide, Install video detection system	CMAQ \$305,568 HURF \$138,969 Total \$444,537	ADOT Contact Agency Contact	Active	ITS	Phase	08	O	N	D	J	F	M	A	M	J	J	A	S	O	N	D	J	F	M	A	M	J	J	A	S	
					DCR																										
					Envir																										
					Design																										
					Bid Date																										