

RTA Next

Review and Assessment of Proposed Named Projects

The following technical review was performed by Pima Association of Governments' (PAG) staff on the projects that were submitted by the jurisdictions to date. The purpose of this review and assessment was to perform an initial review on the projects submitted and check for consistency, plus identify any special items or issues that warrant further clarification and/or evaluation by the Technical Management Committee (TMC). Following the TMC discussion, project submittals that appear to be missing or contain mislabeled key information and elements may be modified at the request of the submitting jurisdiction.

Cost Estimates

The cost estimates included with the project submittals are high level, preliminary estimates and are subject to additional review and adjustment as the draft plan evolves. However, several of the projects include features that have traditionally been underestimated in terms of cost and/or complexity (i.e. bridge estimates, drainage improvements, right-of-way acquisition, railroad crossings, etc.) and are noteworthy as warranting further attention.

Later in the plan development process, a more detailed scope and cost review will be performed, and cost estimates may be modified at that time.

Sonoran Corridor

The Sonoran Corridor is a project being led by the Arizona Department of Transportation (ADOT) and is currently going through a Tier 1 Environmental Impact Statement (EIS). The draft EIS document is currently undergoing a series of reviews with the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) and the various cooperating agencies and is anticipated to be distributed during the month of September 2020.

It is premature to assume a preferred alternative, or even a build alternative at this time; thus, a \$1 cost estimate placeholder is used. Based on a very preliminary phasing analysis done by PAG staff, an initial phase from the Alvernon Way/Aerospace Parkway to the Rita Road Interchange is estimated to cost approximately \$380M.

This information is subject to change as the project activities continue.

Missing, Incomplete or Overlapping Segments

The following project submittals appear to stop at jurisdictional boundaries rather than more functional or logical termini, resulting in potential gaps, or incomplete segments:

- ✓ Moore Road, La Cholla Boulevard to La Cañada Drive. Consider beginning the project at Thornydale Road, or possibly even Dove Mountain Boulevard.

- ✓ Colossal Cave Road #1, I-10 to Mary Ann Cleveland Way. Consider including the segment within all jurisdictional boundaries.
- ✓ Mary Ann Cleveland Way, Vista del Lago to Colossal Cave Road. Consider beginning the project at Houghton Road.
- ✓ Thornydale, Cortaro Road to Camino del Norte. Consider extending the terminus to Tangerine Road.
- ✓ Alvernon Way, Aerospace Parkway to Valencia Road. Consider including the segments within all jurisdictional boundaries.
- ✓ Linda Vista Boulevard, Hartman Lane to Thornydale Road. Consider beginning the project at West Marana Center Boulevard intersection.
- ✓ Drexel Road, Cardinal Avenue to Mission Road. Consider extending the terminus east of the west branch of the Santa Cruz River and including the bridge.
- ✓ Ina Road, Canyon del Oro Wash to Paseo del Norte. Consider extending the terminus to connect to Oracle Road.
- ✓ Palo Verde Road, Bilby Road to 44th Street. Consider beginning the project at Valencia Road.
- ✓ Old Nogales Highway, Continental Road to Nogales Highway. Consider beginning the project at Abrego Drive.
- ✓ 36th Street Overpass, 4th Avenue to Tyndall Avenue. Consider extending the terminus to Park Avenue.
- ✓ Twin Peaks Road, Saguaro Highlands to Silverbell Road. Duplicate project submittal. Consider keeping the version with more improvement elements.

Missing or Incomplete Information

The following project submittals appear to be missing, or contain mislabeled key information and elements:

- ✓ Projects I-10 #1, #2, #5: These projects identify 2 existing lanes, and 3 once complete (single direction only). Should this be corrected to reflect the total number of lanes, (i.e. 4 and 6)?
- ✓ Project I-10 #3: (traffic interchange ramps). This project identifies 0 existing lanes, and 0 once complete (ramp improvement only). Should this be corrected to reflect the total number of lanes on I-10 as part of project #6, (i.e. 6 and 8)?
- ✓ Project #4: 6th Avenue traffic interchange. This project captures the number of lanes on 6th Avenue. (Assume it's OK?).
- ✓ Project I-10 #6: This project identifies 3 existing lanes, and 4 once complete (single direction only). Should this be corrected to reflect the total number of lanes, (i.e. 6 and 8)?
- ✓ Projects I-10 #10, #11, #12, #13: These projects identify 2 existing lanes, and 3 once complete (single lane only). Should this be corrected to reflect the total number of lanes, (i.e. 4 and 6)?
- ✓ Projects I-10 #14, #15: These projects identify 3 existing lanes, and 4 once complete (single lane only). Should this be corrected to reflect the total number of lanes, (i.e. 6 and 8)?

- ✓ Project #16: (Kolb Road Express Lanes). This project captures the number of express lanes to be added to Kolb Road, from 0 to 2. (Assume it's OK?)
- ✓ Projects I-10 #17, #18: These projects identify 4 existing lanes, and 5 once complete (single lane only). Should this be corrected to reflect the total number of lanes, (i.e. 8 and 10)?
- ✓ Project SR 210, Stage 1: This project is all ramps. Leave this as 0 lanes before, and 0 lanes after?
- ✓ Project SR 210, Stage 2: This project identifies 3 existing lanes, and 5 once complete (single direction only). Should this be corrected to reflect the total number of lanes, (i.e. 6 and 10)?
- ✓ Project SR 210, Stage 3: This project identifies 0 existing lanes, and 4 once complete (single direction only). Should this be corrected to reflect the total number of existing lanes on Alvernon, (i.e. 6, and the final number to be built, i.e. 8)?
- ✓ Avra Valley Road is labeled as a 2-lane existing road going to a 2-lane future road. Should this be revised to be 0 lanes in the existing condition?
- ✓ Irvington Road, Ajo Highway to Mission Road. The exiting roadway is 2 lanes for approximately 4.5 miles, with the first mile being the new connection to Ajo Highway. Should this be corrected to show it as an existing 2-lane facility?

Single Purpose/Function

The following project submittals appear to be focused on addressing a single purpose/function. These may be better suited as possible categorical projects instead of named projects on the ballot.

- ✓ La Canada Drive; Canada Hills to Community Center - Pedestrian Facility
- ✓ Camino Potam - Add Sidewalks
- ✓ Camino Cocoim - Add Sidewalks and Bike Lanes
- ✓ 4th Avenue Trolley Line
- ✓ 10th Avenue Bike Path

Administrative Corrections

A few project submittals appear to contain minor errors associated with the data entry. Those administrative corrections have been made to the cost estimates in coordination with the submitting jurisdiction. In addition, PAG staff developed a “modification tracking” tool to properly track any corrections that are made during the plan development process.

Following the TMC discussion, project submittals that appear to need additional modifications may be corrected at the request of the submitting jurisdiction.