



TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE (TAC) REGULAR MEETING AGENDA

Sierra Vista Metropolitan Planning Organization
Technical Advisory Committee (TAC)
Regular Meeting
Thursday, August 27, 2015
2:00 PM

Public Works, Pete Castro Center
Main Conference Room
401 Giulio Cesare Avenue
Sierra Vista, AZ 85635

Web: www.SVMPO.org
Email: SVMPO@SierraVistaAZ.gov

SVMPO TAC MEMBERS:

(One or more members may participate via teleconference)

Chair	Karen Riggs, Highway & Floodplain Director, Cochise County Designated Alternate: Karen Lamberton, Transportation Planner, Cochise County
Vice-Chair	Sharon Flissar, Director Public Works, City of Sierra Vista
Member	(VACANT), City Engineer
Member	Matt McLachlan, Director Community Development, City of Sierra Vista
Member	Mark Hoffman, Arizona Department of Transportation

STAFF:

SVMPO Administrator	Dan Coxworth
---------------------	--------------

1. CALL TO ORDER AND ROLL CALL

2. CALL TO THE PUBLIC

Although not required, please let the Chair know before the meeting begins if you wish to speak during the Call to the Public about anything that is NOT on the agenda.

3. ACCEPTANCE OF THE AGENDA

4. ACCEPTANCE OF MEETING MINUTES (ATTACHED)

TAC Regular Meeting of July 8, 2015

5. ANNOUNCEMENTS AND UPDATES

Announcements and/or updates may be provided by TAC Members, SVMPO Administrator or other invitees.

PRESENTATION / DISCUSSION / POSSIBLE ACTION

6. DISCUSSION: LONG RANGE TRANSPORTATION PLAN - TRANSIT CHAPTER,
Dan Coxworth

Summary: Review and discussion of the draft Transit Chapter of the Long Range Transportation Plan. Link to the draft chapter: http://www.svmpto.org/wp-content/uploads/2015/08/SVMPO_Transit.pdf

7. DISCUSSION: TITLE VI & LIMITED ENGLISH PROFICIENCY (LEP) PLAN
Dan Coxworth

Summary: A requirement of the MPO. Draft Title VI Plan and Limited English Proficiency (LEP) Plan for review and comments by the TAC. The Plan was placed in a 30-day public review comment period and will be reviewed by the Board at their next regular scheduled meeting on September 23. Link to the draft plan: <http://www.svmpto.org/wp-content/uploads/2015/08/SVMPO-Title-VI-Plan-2016.pdf>

7. FUTURE AGENDA ITEMS
TAC

8. UPCOMING SCHEDULED MEETINGS
➤ SVMPO Board Meeting – Sept. 23, 2015, 3:30 p.m., City Hall

9. ADJOURNMENT OF REGULAR MEETING



TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE (TAC) REGULAR MEETING MINUTES

Sierra Vista Metropolitan Planning Organization
Technical Advisory Committee (TAC)
Regular Meeting
Wednesday, July 8, 2015
8:30 AM

Public Works, Pete Castro Center
Main Conference Room
401 Giulio Cesare Avenue
Sierra Vista, AZ 85635

Web: www.SVMPO.org
Email: SVMPO@SierraVistaAZ.gov

SVMPO TAC MEMBERS:

Chair	Karen Riggs, Highway & Floodplain Director, Cochise County
Vice-Chair	Sharon Flissar, City Engineer, City of Sierra Vista
Member	Scott Dooley, Public Works Director, City of Sierra Vista
Member	(VACANT), Director Community Development, City of Sierra Vista
Member	Mark Hoffman, Arizona Department of Transportation (Via teleconference)

STAFF:

Designated Alternate:	Karen Lamberton, Transportation Planner, Cochise County
SVMPO Administrator	Dan Coxworth
Minutes	Helen Lee, Administrative Secretary, City of Sierra Vista
	Jason Hafner, Arizona Department of Transportation
	Drew Spear, Dibble Engineering (via teleconference)
	Kevin Perko, Dibble Engineering (via teleconference)

ALSO PRESENT:

Mayor Rick Mueller, SVMPO Board of Directors Chair
Bruce Piepho, Citizen
Tricia Gerodette, Citizen
Patsy Molinari, Citizen
Chris G. Braswell, Citizen
Greg Cameron

1. CALL TO ORDER AND ROLL CALL

Vice Chair Flissar called the meeting to order at 8:37 a.m. SVMPO Administrator Coxworth conducted the roll call.

2. CALL TO THE PUBLIC

Bruce Piepho, Citizen, submitted an analysis rebuttal (see attachment) for the SVMPO to use at its discretion, and includes questions posed by the public.

Tricia Gerodette, Citizen, asked about three reports included on the SVMPO website and how they will be addressed in future agendas.

Chris G. Braswell, Citizen, asked for the SVMPO TAC to make sure the organization represents the political will of the constituents, and cautioned overdevelopment and sprawl.

Patsy Molinari, Citizen, submitted a letter (see attachment) and spoke against the Buffalo Soldier Trail DCR methodology and public participation processes.

3. ACCEPTANCE OF THE AGENDA

Vice Chair Flissar asked for a motion to accept the agenda of the July 8, 2015 SVMPO TAC Regular Meeting, as written. Chair Riggs so moved and Member Dooley seconded. The motion passed unanimously, 4/0.

4. ACCEPTANCE OF MEETING MINUTES (ATTACHED)

TAC Regular Meeting of June 11, 2015

Vice Chair Flissar asked for a motion to accept the Minutes of the June 11, 2015 Regular Meeting of the SVMPO TAC, as amended. Chair Riggs so moved and Member Dooley seconded.

The following revisions were requested:

- Page 4
 - 4th paragraph - remove redundant period at end.
 - Item 8, 2nd paragraph, first line – change “March 27rd” to “March 2016”
- Page 5
 - 2nd paragraph, 1st line – change “creator” to spreadsheet.
 - 5th paragraph – change “go bad” to “lacked sufficient capacity”
 - 9th paragraph – change “she develops for the County” to “she develops the cost estimates for the County”
 - 10th paragraph , 1st line – omit cost “per square mile”
 - 11th paragraph, 2nd line – replace “the” with “Sierra Vista”
 - 12th paragraph – change “eight required planning factors” to “eight federal required planning factors”

The motion carried unanimously, 4/0.

5. ANNOUNCEMENTS AND UPDATES

- Jason Hafner, ADOT LPA Section, stated that he was assigned to help the SVMPO initiate projects and will be available to help answer questions and get feedback. He has been assigned to help with organizations in southern Arizona.
- Mr. Coxworth participated in a webinar presented by ADOT for roads that have lane departure accidents. ADOT allows funding for HSIP for rumble strips, edge lines, etc. His research did not show any roads within the MPO area that qualified; ADOT requires 20 lane departures over 5 years in the Accident Data. The TAC discussed the possibility of collaborating with the police Department to see if additional data from police reports could supplement the Accident Data by ADOT and asking for a 30-day extension. Jason Hafner agreed to follow up with ADOT.
- Mr. Coxworth announced that the Fry Boulevard Corridor Study went out on July 1st and should be back July 31st. We can then go back SEAGO, has moved forward with HSP monies, RFP will be sent to Dan to be shared with the TAC, will soon look at contractors.

PRESENTATION / DISCUSSION / ACTION

6. **DISCUSSION / ACTION: BUFFALO SOLDIER TRAIL, DESIGN CONCEPT REPORT** TAC

Mr. Coxworth explained that all members of the TAC and the Board have had time to review the BST DCR. If the TAC decides to recommend the DCR, it will go before the Board at their meeting on July 22nd.

Drew Spear, Dibble Engineering, gave a brief overview of the project and timeline. An analysis of traffic patterns for Moson Road showed heavy northbound traffic headed northbound towards Highway 90 and heavy traffic southbound in the evening.

Several alternates for connecting Buffalo Soldier Trail to Moson Rd. were presented and analyzed for feasibility. Those alternates were evaluated for utilities, wells in the area and existing home sites and keeping the Tribute specific plan. The 3 northernmost alternatives were removed from consideration due to the existence of power lines and many home sites. At the direction of the MPO and study team, alternates farther south were targeted and analyzed in detail to minimize the impact to existing homes. Those alternates were Lower Ranch Road, Connor Road and Durango Road.

The first public meeting presented alternatives to the public for participation and to determine criteria for their scoring system. During that meeting, the public was supportive of route away from the homes and not disrupting the quality of life.

Dibble then looked at state land and worked with ADOT for multimodal planning of projected traffic. A scenario in their computer system predicted that the southern alignment was most advantageous. Dibble then addressed all criteria, rated and scored each alternative and presented the scoring at the County Board of Supervisor's meeting and presented to public in April 2015. Alternate D scored the highest and

the two alternatives on Lower Ranch Road and Connor Road scored reasonably, however, scored lower under environmental criteria because both would cross a wash and require a bridge. The meeting showcased differing opinions: many opposed to have an extension, some in favor of the recommendation and others wanting another alternative. Taking everything into account, Dibble presented an implementation plan and interim for two-lane road alternative in lieu of four-lane road and recommended Alternative D, on Durango Road.

ADOT's model predicted 10-12,000 vehicles between State Route 90 through Tribute, which would call for a four-lane road all the way through Tribute and 2 lanes for the ultimate roadway. It's estimated the ultimate road will cost \$13.4 million.

Mr. Hoffman stated that he is still reviewing the DCR, will forward corrections to Mr. Coxworth, and has no comment today.

Ms. Flissar stated her corrections were grammatical, not substantive. She asked for clarification on why no curb or gutter was recommended in the drainage report. Mr. Spear replied that the assumption was that the interim roadway would be rural at first and built to urban standard at the four-lane build out.

Ms. Flissar suggested a closer look at the drainage section as written, with closer consideration for costs. She stated the Garden Canyon Wash cut off by gravel pit that the 100 year flow may not be a given and if downstream infrastructure is built there could be a change in flow. Mr. Spear explained that they didn't plan for downstream flow but sized for the worst case scenario.

Ms. Flissar suggested updating hydrology models for Garden Canyon Wash, expressed concern that Dibble went with FIS numbers, not the City's numbers, which have been getting higher number than FIS. She stated that they do not want to under build either. Mr. Spear explained that Dibble utilized a minimum profile approach. It includes an under pass for cattle and people that would be 7 feet higher than the minimum requirement. Ms. Flissar agreed it was adequate but would like the City's hydrology numbers considered be sure.

Mr. Dooley said he had a number of comments and clarifications to put in writing later today.

Ms. Lamberton stated that the cost estimate assumes the Tribute cost, which is 20 years out. She stated the challenge of a 20 y is that although it appears we will have bulldozers out there tomorrow that it is a long phased process. She stated she would have like to see more time framing in the implementation and that she's sees it as more of a 3 to 4 phase process not 2 phase as presented. She acknowledged that the purpose of the DCR was to plan for the alignment but she would have liked to see phasing for extending some of the distance and not going all the way through to Moson Road. Mr. Dooley stated that the scope of this document doesn't go into that much detail and noted that the volume does show an immediate need for an interim road.

In response to Chair Riggs, Mr. Coxworth noted that the DCR was a planning document for a potential road that references finding from study from 2003. The creation of the MPO allowed funding to become became available to create a document on what has become stalled efforts. The City and the County elected officials will ultimately move the project forward, and this document ends the MPO involvement. The road is of importance to the County and the City, a future alignment may go forward and there are no fatal flaws within the document itself.

In response to Vice Chair Flissar, Mr. Coxworth clarified that the MPO could be involved with funding but only at the direction of the Board, which is made up of County and City officials.

Chair Riggs added that match funding would have to go through the City or the Board of Supervisors to fund the project. The TAC can recommend approval of the DCR and then would be presented to the Board. The Board could approve it or simply acknowledge it without approval. The next step would be design if funded. Mr. Coxworth clarified that an environmental study would be conducted first. Chair Riggs continued that they would need to be careful in the process to make it compatible for federal funding but with avenues available to not federalize the project to keeping efforts local. Mr. Hoffman agreed it would be beneficial to take it as far as possible using the federal dollar.

Chair Riggs stated she would like to see the top three alternates looked at closer going forward instead of focusing on the top alternate, and suggested an environmental assessment of all three. Mr. Spear replied that such environmental assessment would be more expensive but could be done on the three most feasible alternates.

Mr. Coxworth asked if it was stated that way in the DCR. Mr. Spear replied that it was not and in order to do all three, Dibble would have to do the other two alternates in more detail.

Chair Riggs stated that the Board is meeting on July 22nd and asked if the TAC was ready to make a recommendation. Vice Chair Flissar asked if anyone had any substantive comments. Chair Riggs asked if comments are in by Friday, if it gives Dibble enough time to make changes before the Board Meeting. Mr. Coxworth clarified the Board has the same document as the TAC. Chair Riggs clarified that a summary sheet of comments will be provided to the Board from the TAC.

Patsy Molinari, Citizen, expressed concerns the report contains an error of omission as it pertain to the rating of the route, her concerns that the private land owners were not given information and left out of the process. She stated that she is not against connecting BST to Moson, citing concern for the safety of Moson Road and how it could handle any additional traffic.

Tricia Gerodette, Citizen, noted that the summary and public participation choices seemed to only include the January meeting results and should have included a no build option like the 2nd meeting. She stated that the meetings did not offer a level playing field of options and the participation was not evenly tallied. Ms. Gerodette agreed that the drainage report should have considered the City's numbers and that the report was funded to help facilitate the Tribute plan.

Bruce Piepho, Citizen, expressed concerns of a 1,800 acre property that attracts traffic to Moson Road, expressed support for a connector route, referenced his previously submitted rebuttal, suggested better surfacing for Moson Road, and asked the TAC to consider public input.

In response to Chair Riggs, Mr. Coxworth announced that the public could send their comments but must be submitted by Friday.

Chair Riggs asked for a motion to recommend approval of the Buffalo Soldier Trail Design Concept Report as presented by Dibble Engineering with forthcoming suggestions from the Technical Advisory Committee. Member Dooley so moved and Vice Chair Flissar seconded. The motion carried unanimously, 4/0.

7. FUTURE AGENDA ITEMS

TAC

- *Elect a firm for Fry Blvd Study.*

- *Representation here on TAC, ongoing change in City structure. DC – by-law amendment for Board for final approval.*

8. UPCOMING SCHEDULED MEETINGS

- SVMPO TAC Meeting – August 27, 2015, Afternoon time TBD.
- SVMPO Board Meeting – July 22, 2015, 3:30 p.m., City Hall (Dibble will be present to make formal final presentation)

9. ADJOURNMENT OF REGULAR MEETING

Chair Riggs asked for a motion to adjourn. Vice Chair Flissar so moved and Member Dooley seconded. The motion passed unanimously, 4/0, at 10:08 a.m.

*Chair Karen Riggs
SVMPO Technical Advisory Committee*

Minutes prepared by:

*Helen Lee, Administrative Secretary
City of Sierra Vista*