

Work Plan Methodology

District 1: Local Road Repair Program

District 1 Representatives: Reggie Drout and Chris De Simone

Goal of the Work Plan: To ensure all persons in District 1 have access to safe roads through an equitable distribution of funding allocated for the Local Road Repair Program.

Objectives: (established from the white paper program overview provided by PC/DOT)

- 1.1 Receive public input
- 1.2 Select a prioritization method for District 1 roadways that maximizes use of road repair funds
- 1.3 Recommend selection of roads by year (Years 1 and 2) to the Transportation Advisory Committee
- 1.4 Confirm selection of roads adheres to funding distribution
- 1.5 Recommend alternate roadways in the event issues arise with other chosen roadway

Methodology:

1. **Data Collection:** To design a local road improvement repair plan based on public input from District 1 residents through a variety of data collection methods including but not limited to: public hearings, Call to the Public at TAC meetings, telephone calls and/or online submissions for road repair submitted to District 1 and/or PC/DOT office, among other venues.
2. **Criteria Rating and Ranking System:** Obtain data from PC Department of Transportation indicating pavement characteristics and factors affecting pavement condition.
 - a. TAC Subcommittee meeting: Robert Lane (PC/DOT) requested reps to identify criteria needed to make their road selections. Reggie Drout requested the following information:
 - i. Log of accidents and injuries on roads in District 1 over a specified period of time;
 - ii. County liability reports indicating where liability was assessed to the county as a result of accident/injury to persons and/or vehicles associated with roads in District 1; and
 - iii. List of District 1 road service programs (which roads in District 1 were serviced at what time and the degree of service applied to that road, how the roads were treated, etc.)

Consideration to Criteria Request: Carmine DeBonnis and Robert Lane (Pima County) stated the requested criteria would be difficult to come up with; however, they use the Average Daily Traffic (ADT) method based on the number of buildings (vs. people) count for traffic flow study. Reggie Drout indicated this method ignores the human aspect of what's really going on in traffic flow studies.

DEC 18 17 PM 04:32 PC CLK OF RD

3. **Substitution Plan for Staff Proposed Roadways:** staff recommended selecting specific roads based on Paser 5 status (roads with FAIR designation). District 1 reps reviewed staff recommendation selections. Alternate plan was developed by:

- a. **Alternate Selection Criteria #1:** *What roads would make the greatest impact for: a) safety especially as it relates to the elderly and disabled persons; and b) equitable distribution;*
- b. **Alternate Selection Criteria #2:**

Step 1: DOT staff provided a copy of the Road Repair Modification Report form to District reps.

Step 2: Reps were asked to identify which Year 1 roads they recommend for inclusion while at the same time identifying which roads should be removed to make way for the substitute roads. All Year 1 roads were identified from the staff recommendation list for removal. Factor to consider was how much funding was available for roads excluded from the staff recommendation list.

Step 3: After determining how much funding was available, road prioritization was determined based on safety and maximum utilization of funds. Objective was to look at all roads “collectively” and not just FAIR roads as recommended by the staff.

Step 4: A blending of failed (Paser 4 and 3) roads were recommended for the alternate list. Second objective was to determine if there were any groups of housing sections that could be accomplished for the remaining available funds (vs. only completing certain sections of a housing development). All housing groups were evaluated as to the total funds required to repair the sections and not just one section within the collective development. Additionally, funds needed to be allocated throughout the District.

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: Sunday, December 17, 2017 12:06 PM
To: District1
Subject: Fw: road plan reconsideration

On Wednesday, December 13, 2017 8:45 PM, [REDACTED] wrote:

Dear Supervisor Valadez:

I received a message from your receptionist, Sofia, today, that honestly was a little disturbing. She said you relayed to her that you don't have a problem with our particular plan for road revisions, but that your problem is with our District 1 Supervisor, because you believe her plans are politically motivated.

Let me get this right--you don't have a problem with the revised road plan in general and you don't have a problem with our specific plan. You have a problem with our Supervisor's political motivations, which have no effect on this issue. When I talked with you yesterday after the meeting, you and Supervisor Bronson were both in agreement that you had no problem with District 4's plan, but were opposed to District 1's plan.

You were willing to reconsider your vote, but only for District 4. Since finding that we're from District 1, you declined to submit the request for reconsideration for the next agenda, that you both encouraged me to submit yesterday. If there's been some mistake on Sofia's part in relaying this message, please let me know, because I'm very confused.

You received a copy of my comments to the Board yesterday. I stated that fair resource allocation policy must be adopted, to prevent any Member from voting based on disapproval of another Member. That includes disliking another Member's attributed political motivations, as long as they don't factor into the issue at hand. That would be prejudice, and is clearly against the ethics policy of Pima County.

Mr. Valadez, let's get beyond this. I want something better. I want a fair decision for our constituents. Our Advisory Committee Representatives are willing to revise our plan even further, to be more in compliance with the Department of Transportation. We're awaiting your approval to continue.

A sense of justice can't be taught in law school, but solid principles, built on logic, continue to guide the ethics of our public government. Let's work this out, because we've got to compromise. Prejudice should not remain the deciding factor in this case.

Thanks,

[REDACTED]