

DRAFT

MINUTES OF THE REGULAR MEETING ROADS AND STREETS COMMITTEE TOWN OF CHINO VALLEY

MONDAY, AUGUST 10, 2020
4:00 P.M.

COUNCIL CHAMBERS
202 N. STATE ROUTE 89, CHINO VALLEY, AZ

1) **CALL TO ORDER**

Chair Corey Mendoza called the meeting to order at 4:00 p.m.

2) **ROLL CALL**

Present: Corey Mendoza, Chair; Jack Miller, Vice-Chair; Ron Romley, Secretary; James Wise, Committee Member; Wayne Napier, Committee Member

Absent: Robert Johan, Committee Member; Dean Echols, Committee Member

Staff Present: Frank Marbury, Public Works Director/Town Engineer

3) **APPROVAL OF MINUTES**

- a) Consideration and possible action to approve the July 13, 2020, regular meeting minutes.

MOVED by Secretary Ron Romley, seconded by Vice-Chair Jack Miller to approve the July 13, 2020 regular meeting minutes.

AYE: Chair Corey Mendoza, Vice-Chair Jack Miller, Secretary Ron Romley, Committee Member James Wise, Committee Member Wayne Napier

5 - 0 PASSED - Unanimously

4) **PUBLIC WORKS/TOWN ENGINEER'S REPORT**

Mr. Marbury reported that since the Meridian Parkway and Unity Road chip seal failed and was ripped out and went back gravel, the Town put down water and a product called Soil Cement, an acrylic polymer which glued down the road. It should withstand rain and traffic until the developer completed the road as part of the subdivision completion. The cost of the product was under \$10,000 for 2,000 gallons. Labor and equipment had not been calculated yet. The only unexpected cost was for base material that was needed for completion. Labor and equipment costs for use of the water truck on the road before the work was completed, was approximately \$100 per hour or \$80,000 per

year. Members discussed what constituted real time costs for equipment and men.

5) COMMITTEE CHAIR REPORT

6) CALL TO THE PUBLIC

Call to the Public is an opportunity for the public to address the Board concerning a subject that is not on the agenda. Public comment is encouraged. Individuals are limited to speak for three (3) minutes. The total time for Call to the Public may be up to 15 minutes per meeting. Board action taken as a result of public comment will be limited to directing staff to study the matter, scheduling the matter for further consideration and decision at a later date, or responding to criticism.

7) CORRESPONDENCE

8) OLD BUSINESS

- a) Discussion regarding Fiscal Year 2021 upcoming projects.

Members and Dir. Marbury discussed the following:

- Staff had modified the Committee's FY21 project recommendations. Staff took a closer look at Road 2 North. The portion of the road from Peppertree to Bright Star subdivision was narrow. To widen the road to 24 feet would be expensive and might include right-of-way issues, so Staff brought an additional option to Council to just chip seal that portion of the road. The extra money would be applied to seal coat Highlands Ranch and Mesa View subdivisions. Council chose to go with that option. Everything else was the same as was discussed in the Committee meetings.
- Between the Town budget and the CARES Act, there was \$2.4 million revenue dollars, with \$1.4 million in revenue from the CARE's Act, to apply to roadwork. The Committee wanted to concentrate the money on Road 2 North, with some type of pavement material from the highway, across Road 1 East to Peppertree. A Geotech engineer was looking at pavement sections. Pavement work would need to wait until spring because of the plans and because the ADOT traffic signal would be advertised and under construction. The Town should be under contract and ready to go when that project is complete.
- Staff was working with a contractor to get a quote for chip sealing from Peppertree to Bright Star this coming fall. There would be some patching over the wash where the asphalt had given way.
- Members asked why certain sections of Road 1 West/Road 1North to Road 2 North had been picked over other sections. Dir. Marbury explained that it was just one of many sections of the road that needed work and had been broken up into smaller parts. He reviewed sections of the recommended road repair.
- Members asked how necessary some of the recommended crack sealing sections were. Dir. Marbury explained they would only be filling if the cracks needed to be filled.
- Mr. Marbury reviewed the contract bidding and subsequent work timeframe and stated that they were hoping to get a contract approved at the second August Council meeting for the chip seal portion of Road 2 North so that the contractor could begin work as soon as possible.

9) NEW BUSINESS

- a) Discussion regarding future capital projects.

Members and Dir. Marbury discussed the following:

- Dir. Marbury wanted direction for a five-year outlook for a capital improvement program to include the types of roads to work on each year. Arterial roads and section line roads were about one third of the Town's mileage, but used approximately half of the cost. He asked if the Committee wanted to spend half the revenue on neighborhood roads and half on arterial or concentrate mainly on arterials, and what type of surfaces they wanted to focus on. Some members thought it was better to stick with asphalt rather than chip seal because the Town could not keep up with the necessary chip seal maintenance. Members also thought they should begin to focus on some of the side roads and do an inexpensive chip seal.
- Dir. Marbury mentioned some of the side roads that were in bad condition. Members agreed it was important to keep the good roads maintained, but that something needed to be done to fix the bad roads because they were only getting worse and could not continue to be pushed aside.
- Members discussed the use of chip seal on the side roads. In some cases, it stood up to traffic and weather, but in other cases, it fell apart quickly. Dir. Marbury said they could compare prices for chip seal and asphalt and bring the information to discuss the available tactics that could be used on the neighborhood streets. Asphalt was more expensive and the coverage area much less, but it outlasted chip seal three times longer.

b) Discussion regarding using contractors for road maintenance.

Members and Dir. Marbury discussed the following:

- A member wanted this topic on the agenda because they had a hard time paying a contractor for maintenance that could be done in-house. Members discussed earlier instances when both a contractor and Staff had contributed to roadwork and it became a finger-pointing issue when the road surface failed. If a contractor did the entire job, responsibility for any failure would not become an issue.
- A contractor was required if a construction project was at or over \$250,000. There was also the issue of when a project constituted maintenance or construction work.
- Members discussed the small four-man crew the Town had on hand. When the Town's crew was doing projects that could be done by a contractor, they were not focusing on their normal workload. A contractor had a large crew and could come in and get a project done quickly with a warranty on the work.
- Members asked what road maintenance covered and what Staff did compared to what a contractor was hired to do. Dir. Marbury explained that he liked to hire contractors for programmed maintenance or capital improvements because it was over a certain dollar amount. Programmed maintenance included chip seals, overlays, mill and fills, and rebuilds, and would typically be done by contractors. Pothole patching, ditch cleaning, road mowing, and sign installs were done in-house. Staff wanted to have large batches of hot patching contracted out in the future instead of cold mixing everything, or hire personnel that had the right experience to hot patch in-house. Staff even contracted out the highway landscape maintenance mainly for safety reasons and due to the extensive ADOT requirements. Staff typically took care of the north side of Town and the south side of Town with contracted crews, but the whole thing may be contracted out for the current fiscal year. This would free up staff to concentrate on other Town roads.
- Members wanted Staff to bring more information to the committee on the hot patch topic. They also discussed the lack of contractors in the area that provided that service. Members did not see the necessary quantity to support that business. Members discussed the downfalls of patching with cold mix compared to hot patching, which left a level surface.
- Staff was learning how to use their new traffic counters, which were usually put out when school was in session. Members wanted to see the traffic count on some roads and if the numbers validated using asphalt on certain roads. Staff said they would get the counts as well

as estimates on price and how long a chip seal would last.

- Members wanted Staff to provide cost estimates on road maintenance to the Committee. Dir. Marbury stated they would work on the cost comparisons and street counts and would bring it back in the next couple of months. Staff was also working on numbers to possibly get some road striping done.

10) FUTURE AGENDA SUGGESTIONS

Vice Chair Miller stated he would not be on the Committee with his new Mayor position and Members needed to discuss his replacement.

11) ADJOURNMENT

MOVED by Vice-Chair Jack Miller, seconded by Committee Member Wayne Napier to adjourn the meeting at 4:58 p.m.

AYE: Chair Corey Mendoza, Vice-Chair Jack Miller, Secretary Ron Romley, Committee Member James Wise, Committee Member Wayne Napier

5 - 0 PASSED - Unanimously

Submitted: August 17, 2020.

By: *Erin Deskins, Deputy Town Clerk*

Approved: MONTH DAY, 2020.