



# TRANSPORTATION ADVISORY COMMITTEE AGENDA

<b>Date:</b>	June 3, 2021
<b>Time:</b>	10 a.m.
<b>Location:</b>	<b>Zoom Meeting</b>
<b>Call-in No.</b>	<a href="https://us02web.zoom.us/j/82316976919?pwd=K3c5V2lKeUhEQnY3NmxDdGFocUkzdz09">https://us02web.zoom.us/j/82316976919?pwd=K3c5V2lKeUhEQnY3NmxDdGFocUkzdz09</a>
	Meeting ID: 823 1697 6919 Passcode: 033674

**Individuals wishing to participate in the meeting telephonically may do so by contacting Randy Heiss at (520) 432-5301 Extension 202. Contact must be made at least 48 hours before the meeting in order to obtain the call-in information. Please note that the option to participate telephonically may not be available unless requested as instructed above.**

**Si necesita acomodaciones especiales o un intérprete para esta conferencia, deben ponerse en contacto con Randy Heiss al número (520) 432-5301, Extensión 202, por lo menos setenta y dos (72) horas antes de la conferencia.**

<b>Voting TAC Members</b>	Michael Bryce– Graham County (Chair) Lance Henrie – Safford Mark Hoffman – ADOT MPD Michelle Johnson – Benson Jesus Haro – Bisbee Rudy Perez – Clifton Jackie Watkins – Cochise County	Dave Swietanski – Douglas John Basteen – Duncan Reed Larson - Greenlee County Juan Guerra – Nogales Sean Lewis – Pima Barney Bigman – San Carlos Apache Tribe (SCAT) Leonard Fontes – Santa Cruz County	Tom Palmer - Thatcher (Vice Chair) William Teeters – Willcox Regina Duran - Tombstone Ronald Robinson –Patagonia
<b>Guests, Staff, and Other Expected Attendees</b>	Chris Vertrees, SEAGO John Merideth, SEAGO Jennifer Henderson – ADOT Mark Henige - ADOT		

**Shaded areas indicate items for possible action.**

ITEM	SUBJECT	PRESENTER	PAGE
1.	Call to Order and Introductions	Michael	N/A
2.	Call to the Public	Michael	N/A
3.	Approval of Minutes of March 18, 2021	Michael	3-5
4.	STBG Ledger Report	Chris	6-8
5.	TIP Report <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Possible TIP Amendment(s)</li> <li>Possible Administrative Amendments</li> </ul>	Chris	9-10
6.	SEAGO STBG Project Programming Procedures Scoring Matrix	Chris	11-12
7.	RTAC Regional Project List Discussion	Chris	13-19
8.	SEAGO TAC In-person Meeting Discussion	Chris	20
9.	ADOT LPA Section Updates	Jennifer Mark	N/A
10.	District Engineers' Report <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Status of State Highway Projects</li> <li>Quarterly Project Report</li> </ul>	TBD	N/A

11.	Regional Local Program Reports <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Status of Local Projects <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ STP Projects</li> <li>○ Update on Enhancement Projects</li> <li>○ Update on HSIP Projects</li> <li>○ Update on all Planning Studies</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	Towns, Cities, Counties, & ADOT	N/A
12.	Items for General Discussion	All	N/A
13.	Next Meeting Date: May 20, 2021	Michael	N/A
14.	<b>Adjourn</b>	Michael	N/A

**Direction may be given to SEAGO staff on any item on the agenda**



# SEAGO TRANSPORTATION ADVISORY COMMITTEE

## DRAFT MEETING MINUTES FOR MARCH 18, 2021

<b>Date:</b>	March 18, 2021		
<b>Time:</b>	10 a.m.		
<b>Location:</b>	Zoom Conference - SEAGO		
<b>Voting TAC Members Present</b>	Michael Bryce, Graham County (Chair) Michelle Johnson, Benson Tom Palmer, Thatcher Mark Hoffman, ADOT Brad Simmons, Cochise County	Lance Henrie, Safford Dave Swietanski, Douglas Juan Guerra, Nogales Leonard Fontes, Santa Cruz County John Basteen, Duncan	
<b>Guests, Staff, and Other Attendees</b>	Chris Vertrees, SEAGO John Merideth, SEAGO Jennifer Henderson, ADOT Chanse Frenette, Douglas		

### 1. Call to Order and Introductions

Chair Michael Bryce called the meeting to order at 10:02 a.m. Chris Vertrees conducted a roll call of members and guests that were participating on Zoom and on the phone.

### 2. Call to the Public

Chairman Bryce made a Call to the Public and no one spoke.

### 3. Approval of January 21, 2021 Meeting Minutes

Chairman Bryce asked the TAC to review the minutes for needed corrections. Michael Bryce asked for a motion to approve the January 21, 2021, Meeting Minutes.

**MOTION:** Tom Palmer moved to approve

**SECOND:** Mark Hoffman

**ACTION: APPROVED UNANIMOUSLY**

### 4. STBG Ledger Report

Chris Vertrees referred the TAC to the STBG Ledger Report located on page 6 of their packet. Chris noted that SEAGO STBG is fully committed through FFY2024. We currently need to loan \$177,096 in apportionments and OA so that it is available to repay ADOT for our Safford 20<sup>th</sup> Avenue loan due in FY22.

If there are no significant changes in population data from the 2020 Census we should have \$423,199 in apportionments and \$370,421 in OA available for programming/loan in FY25.

### 5. TIP Report

Chris advised the TAC that the SEAGO Region 2022-2026 TIP needs be submitted to ADOT by **July 1, 2021**. Due to the SEAGO TAC, Administrative Council, and Executive Board schedules, and the forty-five (45) day public participation process, the 2022-2026 Draft TIP needs to be approved at this meeting for submission to our Administrative and Executive Committees.

Chris advised the TAC that the following adjustments to the 2021-2025 TIP were made in the drafting of the 2022-2026 TIP:

- All projects listed as Obligated in 2020 section of the TIP have been removed.
- All FY 2021 projects that are expected to obligate by June 30, 2021, have been moved to the Obligated in 2021 section of the TIP.

Chris also advised the TAC that he received an email from Jackie Watkins and ADOT Traffic Safety Section concerning **CCH 21-01 – Cochise County (Charleston, Double Adobe, Barataria Rds - E & C Rumble Strips)**. The memo advised that this project need to be moved to FY23 for design and FY24 for construction.

Chairman Bryce asked the TAC for a motion to approve the Draft FY22 TIP for Public Comment.

**MOTION:** Tom Hoffman moved to approve  
**SECOND:** Michelle Johnson  
**ACTION: APPROVED UNANIMOUSLY**

Following approval of the Draft FY22 TIP for Public Comment, Chris asked the TAC to also approve the **CCH 21-01 – Cochise County (Charleston, Double Adobe, Barataria Rds - E & C Rumble Strips)** change in the FY21 TIP.

Chairman Bryce asked the TAC for a motion to approve the amendment to the FY21 TIP.

**MOTION:** Brad Simmons moved to approve  
**SECOND:** Leonard Fontes  
**ACTION: APPROVED UNANIMOUSLY**

## 6. SEAGO STBG Project Programming Procedures and Scoring Matrix

Chris referred the TAC to page 9-19 of their TAC Packet (STBG Project Programming Procedures). Chris advised the TAC that at our last meeting, I advised I would bring our STBG Application scoring form/matrix forward at our March meeting for your review and approval. He advised that the form was on page 19 of their packet. The TAC agreed with the scoring criteria, however a consensus could not be reached concerning whether to weight the criteria. After discussion, Chris was directed to create a survey for the TAC to prioritize the scoring criteria to be used in our next STBG application cycle.

## 7. SEAGO Traffic Count Program Update

Chris referred the TAC to pages 20-30 of their packet. Chris advised the TAC that SEAGO kicked off the project on March 2, 2021, with 11 locations in Graham County. We currently have the capacity to count 13 locations at a time. Our priority is to address the counting gaps identified by ADOT in the attached spreadsheet. Chris advised that our goal is to complete approximately 100 counts in the Graham area by June 30, 2021. Chris advised that the Graham County area count locations have been mapped on GIS and are available at: <https://arcg.is/1f1mr5>. Chris advised that we plan to move to Santa Cruz/Nogales in July. Chris asked the TAC to review the attached Traffic Count Location/Gap spreadsheet and advise if any of these locations are a priority to you.

## 8. LPA Section Updates

Jennifer Henderson provided updates for the ADOT LPA section.

**11. District Engineer's Report**

There was no staff present from the Southeast and Southcentral Districts to provide project updates.

**12. Regional Program Reports**

Those in attendance reported their current status of local projects and issues.

**13. Items for General Discussion**

Chris Vertrees stated that he will get a survey out concerning our STBG Scoring Priorities and we will be reviewing our STBG Project Scoring Matrix/Criteria at our next meeting. Chris advised if any public comment is received concerning our FY22 TIP, we will need to discuss at our May meeting.

**14. Next Meeting Date:** May 20, 2021.

***Meeting adjourned at 12:01 p.m.***

DRAFT



# TAC PACKET

---

**TO:** SEAGO TAC  
**FROM:** CHRIS VERTREES, TRANSPORTATION PROGRAM ADMINISTRATOR  
**DATE:** MAY 26, 2021  
**RE:** SEAGO STBG LEDGER

---

Attached is the SEAGO 2021-2025 STBG Ledger. ***STBG funds are subject to “Use or Lose” each fiscal year.*** Several changes to our Ledger have occurred since our last meeting. Below are the changes and actions that have been taken to protect our STBG funding:

- 1) **\$5,875 in STBG funds** were returned to SEAGO from our FY15 Traffic Count Program;
- 2) **\$180,331 in STBG funds** were returned to SEAGO from our Davis Road MP 9.9 project;
- 3) **\$64,479, in HSIP funding** was returned to SEAGO from our Nogales Citywide Sign Replacement Project;
- 4) The returned HSIP funding allowed us the opportunity **to use \$52,778 in Obligation Authority (OA)** to cover our remaining \$52,778 in unused STBG Apportionments;
- 5) This left us with \$13,701 in HSIP funding. It was transferred to be used on a SEAGO Region HSIP project (***Pendleton Drive Dip at Sonoita Creek Wash***);
- 6) This actions left us with **\$416,079 in STBG Apportionments and OA**. These funds were loaned to ADOT with repayment in FY22.
- 7) Our Ledger has been zeroed out for FY21.

**Attachments:** SEAGO STBG Ledger

SEAGO-ADOT STBG Loan Agreement

SEAGO  
STBG Ledger 2021-2025  
May 25, 2021

Action	94.9% *	Projected Fed Funds *		Cumulative Balance		
		OA Rate	Apportionment	OA	Apportionment	OA
STBGP Carry Forward FY 2020	94.9%		\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
FY 2021 Allocation*	94.9%		\$909,856	\$857,078	\$909,856	\$857,078
STBG ADOT Loan Repayments (IN)			\$183,599	\$183,599	\$1,093,455	\$1,040,677
Loan Funds from ADOT for Safford 20th Ave. (IN)			\$2,800,000	\$2,800,000	\$3,893,455	\$3,840,677
Safford: 20th Avenue			-\$3,653,581	-\$3,653,581	\$239,874	\$187,096
Regional Traffic Count Program- Final Voucher Savings			\$5,875	\$5,875	\$245,749	\$192,971
Davis Road MP 9.9 - Voucher Savings			\$180,330	\$180,330	\$426,079	\$373,301
Nogales Sign Replacement HSIP Savings - OA Applied			\$0	\$52,778	\$426,079	\$426,079
STBG Loan Out to ADOT			-\$416,079	-\$416,079	\$10,000	\$10,000
Tech Transfer (LTAP)			-\$10,000	-\$10,000	\$0	\$0
FY 2021 Balance					\$0	\$0
FY 2022 Allocation	94.9%		\$909,856	\$857,078	\$909,856	\$857,078
STBG Loan In from ADOT			\$416,709	\$416,709	\$1,326,565	\$1,273,787
Partial repayment Safford 20th Ave. Loan (OUT)			-\$971,396	-\$971,396	\$355,169	\$302,391
Tech Transfer (LTAP)			-\$10,000	-\$10,000	\$345,169	\$292,391
STBG Loan Out (?) - Repay in FY2024			-\$292,391	-\$292,391	\$52,778	\$0
FY 2022 Balance					\$52,778	\$0
FY 2023 Allocation	94.9%		\$909,856	\$857,078	\$909,856	\$857,078
Repay SVMPO Loan (OUT) for Thatcher Part 2			-\$395,617	-\$395,617	\$514,239	\$461,461
Partial Repayment Safford 20th Ave. Loan (OUT)			-\$451,461	-\$451,461	\$62,778	\$10,000
Tech Transfer (LTAP)			-\$10,000	-\$10,000	\$52,778	\$0
FY 2023 Balance					\$52,778	\$0
FY 2024 Allocation	94.9%		\$909,856	\$857,078	\$909,856	\$857,078
Partial repayment Safford 20th Ave. Loan (OUT)			-\$847,078	-\$847,078	\$62,778	\$10,000
Tech Transfer (LTAP)			-\$10,000	-\$10,000	\$52,778	\$10,000
FY 2024 Balance					\$52,778	\$0
FY2025 Allocation	94.9%		\$909,856	\$857,078	\$909,856	\$857,078
Final Repayment Safford 20th Ave. Loan (OUT)			-\$529,435	-\$529,435	\$380,421	\$327,643
FY22 Loan Repayment			\$292,391	\$292,391	\$672,812	\$620,034
Tech Transfer (LTAP)			-\$10,000	-\$10,000	\$662,812	\$610,034
FY 2024 Balance					\$662,812	\$610,034

- \* Notes:
1. OA = Obligated Authority. This is the amount of money that can actually be obligated to SEAGO based upon the OA %.
  2. STBGP = Surface Transportation Block Grant Program. This amount is allocated to SEAGO based upon the 2010 population
  3. OA Rate of 94.9% is subject to change
  4. in addition to the OA Rate of 94.9%, \$6,375 of OA is taken annually for the SPR funding to the SEAGO region.
  5. STBGP Apportionments are SEAGO estimates and subject to change.
  6. Balance carry forward is no longer allowed. Excess funds must be utilized or loaned to another COG or to the State.

*This is an internal SEAGO document, and is used to provide a general overview of STBG funds for a five year period.*


COG/MPO Federal-Aid Funding Transfer or Loan Request Form

Transferring Agency **SEAGO**

Funding Type	Federal Fiscal Year	Amount		Loand or Transferred To	Project/Purpose	Transfer or Loan?	Repayment Terms/ Schedule (loans only)
		Apportionments	Obligation Authority (OA)				
STBG	FFY21	\$416,079	\$416,079	ADOT	For use on ADOT Projects	Loan	FFY22 (October 2021)
<b>TOTAL</b>		<b>\$416,079</b>	<b>\$416,079</b>				

**Transferring Agency Approval:**

The undersigned authorizes the transfer of funds identified above.

  
 \_\_\_\_\_  
 Signature

**Christopher Vertrees**

Printed Name

**Transportation Program Administrator**


Title

**4/5/2021**

Date

**Receiving Agency Approval:**

The undersigned approves the receipt of the funds and agrees to the repayment terms, if any, identified above.

DocuSigned by:  
  
 \_\_\_\_\_  
 Signature

**Elise Maza**

Printed Name

**Program/Project Funding Administrator**


Title

**5/3/2021**

Date

**ADOT Acknowledgement or Approval:**

DocuSigned by:

  
 \_\_\_\_\_  
 Signature

**Elise Maza**

Printed Name

**Program/Project Funding Administrator**

Title

**5/3/2021**

Date

Email completed form to Arizona Department of Transportation Financial Management Services at [mprogramfinance@azdot.gov](mailto:mprogramfinance@azdot.gov). Approved transfer/loan requests must be received by June 15th each year; allow two weeks for approval. Transfers generally will appear on the next ledger, depending on the date of receipt.

This request will be processed based on the amount of apportionments and obligation authority available to the loaning/transferring agency at the time of receipt, which may be different than the amount shown on the most recent ledger. Loans are to be repaid; transfers will not be repaid.

Loans of apportionments and/or obligation authority to ADOT - these loans are not guaranteed; are capped at a total, maximum of \$10 million annually; are limited to greater Arizona STP projects, in a TIP which exceed the region's available STP allocation; will be on a first come, first served basis if available; require advance approval. Every effort should be made to reprogram federal funds on projects ready to authorize by June 30th annually or to loan to other regional entities before approaching ADOT about a loan. Loans to ADOT must be approved and executed by March 31st annually.

Loans/transfers from MAG or PAG to Greater Arizona have certain restrictions, depending on the type of funding and population in the area of the project to which the loan is related. Contact Financial Management Services at 602-712-7441 for further information.





# TAC PACKET

---

**TO: SEAGO TAC**  
**FROM: CHRIS VERTREES, TRANSPORTATION PROGRAM ADMINISTRATOR**  
**DATE: MAY 26, 2021**  
**RE: SEAGO REGION TIP REPORT**

---

The SEAGO Region 2022-2026 was posted for public comment from April 5<sup>th</sup> through May 21<sup>st</sup>. No public comment was received and the TIP has been finalized. One change was made to the document that you approved at our March TAC meeting. The Willcox Bisbee Road Project has been removed from the Future Project Section of the TIP at their request. Willcox found alternative funding for the project and it has been completed.

No amendment requests for have been submitted for TAC consideration at this meeting. The FY22 TIP will be submitted to ADOT prior to the July 1, 2021, due date.

**Attachments:** SEAGO 2022-2026 TIP

SEAGO REGION  
2022- 2026 TIP

Approved By: TAC 3/18/21 Administrative Committee- 4/1/21 Executive Committee - 4/1/21

TIP YEAR Project ID	PROJECT SPONSOR	PROJECT NAME	PROJECT LOCATION	LENGTH	TYPE OF IMP - WK - STRU	Functional Classifications	LANES BEFORE	LANES AFTER	FED AID TYPE	FEDERAL FUNDS	HURF EXCHANGE	LOCAL MATCH	OTHER FUNDS	TOTAL COST
2022														
SCC 21-01	Santa Cruz County	Pendleton Drive - Roadway Dip Elimination	Pendleton Drive Dip at Sonoita Creek Wash	.25 miles	Construction	Minor Arterial	2	2	HSIP	\$424,350		\$25,650		\$450,000
CLF21-01	Town of Clifton	Chase Creek Bridge #1 Replacement	Structure# 08536 Frisco Avenue - 0.1 mile north of Junction with Park Avenue	.01 mile	Construction	Rural Local	2	2	Off System Bridge	\$726,821		\$43,933		\$770,754
GGH 21-01	Graham County	Golf Course Road, Cottonwood Wash Road - Shoulders and Rumble Strips	Golf Course Road from Hoopes Avenue to just west of 20th Avenue; Cottonwood Wash Road from Cottonwood Wash Loop to 1200 South.	5.1 miles	Construction	Major Collector	2	2	HSIP	\$1,992,408		\$112,797		\$2,105,205
GGH-BR-02	Graham County	Ft. Thomas River Structure LTAP	Ft. Thomas River Road @ Gila River		Construction	Minor Collector	2	2	Off System Bridge STP	\$602,011 \$10,000		\$36,389		\$638,400 \$10,000
		<b>TOTAL FOR 2022</b>								<b>\$3,755,590</b>		<b>\$218,769</b>		<b>\$3,974,359</b>
2023														
CCH 21-01	Cochise County	Charleston, Double Adobe, Barataria Rds - E & C Rumble Strips	Charleston Road from Tombstone to 4.8 miles south of Tombstone; Double Adobe Road from SR 80 to Frontier Road; Barataria Boulevard from Moson Road to Ranch Road.	10.7 miles	Design	Major Collector	2	2	HSIP	\$264,000		\$0		\$264,000
NOG 20-02	City of Nogales	to Nogales High School LTAP	Baffert Drive to Country Club	3 miles	Construction	N/A	N/A	N/A	CMAQ STP	\$891,135 \$10,000		\$53,865 \$0		\$945,000 \$10,000
		<b>TOTAL FOR 2023</b>								<b>\$901,135</b>		<b>\$53,865</b>		<b>\$955,000</b>
2024														
CCH 21-01	Cochise County	Charleston, Double Adobe, Barataria Rds - E & C Rumble Strips	Charleston Road from Tombstone to 4.8 miles south of Tombstone; Double Adobe Road from SR 80 to Frontier Road; Barataria Boulevard from Moson Road to Ranch Road.	10.7 miles	Construction	Major Collector	2	2	HSIP STP	\$383,940 \$10,000		\$0		\$383,940 \$10,000
		<b>TOTAL FOR 2023</b>								<b>\$10,000</b>		<b>\$0</b>		<b>\$10,000</b>
2025														
DGS17-01	City of Douglas	Chino Road Extension Phase 2	Chino Road: 9th Street to SR90	.85 miles	Design	Urban Minor Arterial	2	2	STP	\$75,440		\$4,560		\$80,000
DGS17-01	City of Douglas	Chino Road Extension Phase 2	Chino Road: 9th Street to SR90	.85 miles	Construction	Urban Minor Arterial	2	2	STP	\$2,829,000		\$171,000		\$3,000,000
		LTAP							STP	\$10,000		\$0		\$10,000
		<b>TOTAL FOR 2024</b>								<b>\$2,914,440</b>		<b>\$175,560</b>	<b>\$0</b>	<b>\$3,090,000</b>
2026														
		LTAP							STP	\$10,000		\$0		\$10,000
		<b>TOTAL FOR 2025</b>								<b>\$10,000</b>		<b>\$0</b>		<b>\$10,000</b>
		<b>5-YEAR TOTALS</b>								<b>\$6,690,030</b>		<b>\$448,194</b>		<b>\$7,138,224</b>
		<b>FUNDING OBLIGATED IN 2021</b>												
SAF12-02	City of Safford	20th Ave, Phase II	Relation St to Golf Course Rd	.63 Miles	Construction	Urban Minor Arterial	3	5	STP	\$3,653,581		\$220,842		\$3,874,423
SCC 21-01	Santa Cruz County	Pendleton Drive - Roadway Dip Elimination	Pendleton Drive Dip at Sonoita Creek Wash	.25 miles	Design/PDA	Minor Arterial	2	2	HSIP	\$241,408		\$14,592		\$256,000
CLF21-01	Town of Clifton	Chase Creek Bridge #1 Replacement	Structure# 08536 Frisco Avenue - 0.1 mile north of Junction with Park Avenue	.01 mile	Design/PDA	Rural Local	2	2	Off System Bridge	\$273,179		\$16,512		\$289,691
GGH 21-01	Graham County	Golf Course Road, Cottonwood Wash Road - Shoulders and Rumble Strips	Golf Course Road from Hoopes Avenue to just west of 20th Avenue; Cottonwood Wash Road from Cottonwood Wash Loop to 1200 South.	5.1 miles	Design	Major Collector	2	2	HSIP STP	\$212,945 \$10,000		\$12,055		\$225,000 \$10,000
		<b>TOTAL FOR 2021</b>								<b>\$4,391,113</b>	<b>\$0</b>	<b>\$264,002</b>	<b>\$0</b>	<b>\$4,655,115</b>
		<b>Future Construction Projects</b>												
CCH12-10	Cochise County	Davis Rd. Improvements	Davis Road MP 13	1 mile	Construction of Safety & Drainage Improvements	Rural Major Collector	2	2	STP	\$924,560		\$55,885		\$980,445
CCH15-01	Cochise County	Davis Rd. Improvements	Davis Road MP 5	0.61 miles	Construction of Safety & Drainage Improvements	Rural Major Collector	2	2	STP	\$1,045,000		\$63,165		\$1,108,165



# TAC PACKET

---

**TO: SEAGO TAC**  
**FROM: CHRIS VERTREES, TRANSPORTATION PROGRAM ADMINISTRATOR**  
**DATE: MAY 26, 2021**  
**RE: SEAGO STBG PROJECT SCORING PRIORITIES**

---

At our March TAC meeting, we discussed an update to our STBG Project Scoring Criteria. After discussion, the TAC agreed that the criteria should be weighted. I was directed to create a survey for the TAC to prioritize the scoring criteria/weight to be used in our next STBG application cycle. 9 responses were received. The following are the results of the survey:

Priority 1: Project Development (Average Score 1.2)

Priority 2: Safety (Average Score 2.44)

Priority 3: Freight Movement/Economic Vitality (Average Score 3.11)

Priority 4: System Preservation & Improvement (Average Score 3.22)

I have updated the **Surface Transportation Block Grant (STBG) Project Application Scoring Form** to reflect the weighted scoring criteria for your review, discussion, and approval.

**Attachments:** SEAGO Surface Transportation Block Grant (STBG) Project Application Scoring Form



**SEAGO TAC**  
**SURFACE TRANSPORTATION BLOCK GRANT (STBG)**  
**PROJECT APPLICATION SCORING FORM**

**Project Title:** \_\_\_\_\_

**Agency:** \_\_\_\_\_

**Scoring Agency:** \_\_\_\_\_

Scoring Criteria	Points (0-5)
<b>Project Development</b>	
Project Scope is clearly identified and feasible	0 1 2 3 4 5
Project Timeline is detailed and feasible	0 1 2 3 4 5
Project Budget is detailed and uses sound cost estimating principles	0 1 2 3 4 5
Project Budget is within SEAGO STBG funding cap or a funding Plan is in place if project exceeds funding cap	0 1 2 3 4 5
Matching Funds have been identified & secured	0 1 2 3 4 5
Project Development Risks (ROW, environmental, utilities, traffic) have been considered & addressed	0 1 2 3 4 5
<b>Project Development Score (Total Points x 5)</b>	
<b>Safety</b>	
Application includes 5 years of <b>crash data</b> for the project location	0 1 2 3 4 5
Project demonstrates the ability to reduce the frequency and/or severity of roadway crashes	0 1 2 3 4 5
<b>Safety Score (Total Points x 3)</b>	
<b>Freight Movement/Economic Vitality</b>	
Provides access to existing/new economic opportunities	0 1 2 3 4 5
Improves connection of employment and activity centers to population centers	0 1 2 3 4 5
Improves movement of goods efficiently through the regional transportation network	0 1 2 3 4 5
<b>Freight Movement/Economic Vitality (Total Points x 2)</b>	
<b>System Preservation &amp; Improvement</b>	
Improves multi-modal transportation	0 1 2 3 4 5
Preserves existing facilities and networks	0 1 2 3 4 5
Improves existing facilities and networks	0 1 2 3 4 5
<b>System Preservation &amp; Improvement (Total Points x 1)</b>	
<b>Total Score</b>	



# TAC PACKET

---

**TO:** SEAGO TAC  
**FROM:** CHRIS VERTREES, TRANSPORTATION PROGRAM ADMINISTRATOR  
**DATE:** MAY 26, 2021  
**RE:** DEVELOPMENT OF RTAC REGIONAL PROJECT LIST

---

This year, state legislative leadership set aside approximately \$200 million for transportation earmarks in the state budget. While virtually all of the transportation revenue bills have died this session, over \$200 million of the earmark bills have continued to advance (including Safford 20<sup>th</sup> Avenue). This process is expected to continue into the future as earmarking appears to be the most viable option for securing additional infrastructure funding. However, a significant concern with earmarking transportation projects is that it bypasses state, regional, and local planning and programming processes and priorities.

In response, RTAC will be recommending a compromise approach to state legislative leadership for next year's budget discussions. RTAC will be recommending that \$50 million of next year's earmark funding be designated towards regional transportation priorities. Each Greater COG/MPO would be allocated an amount proportional to their population. In preparation, RTAC has requested that COG and MPO in develop a list of regional priorities consisting of the top projects to be put forward by all of the COG/MPOs in Greater Arizona. Under this proposal, SEAGO will have approximately \$4.5 million in available funding.

The timeline for identifying projects will be very compact. RTAC would like the project list by September, so that it can present their recommendations to legislative leadership in October. Due to our TAC and Executive Board schedules we will need to identify and rank these projects at our July meeting so that they can be presented to our Executive Board for approval at our August meeting.

Projects will have a 3-year window to utilize the funding. This includes all project development phases including design, ROW, and construction. As this is state money, projects will need to be locally managed. Under the RTAC proposal, no COG/MPO or local jurisdiction would be precluded from pursuing separate earmarks for other projects. ***This would be the preferred path for the larger STBG projects currently on our TIP.***

At this meeting we will need to determine the process for project selection. We will need to answer the following questions:

1. Do we want to consider our current STBG TIP projects or do we want to open it up to all agencies?

2. Do we follow our recently approved STBG Project Selection Procedures including funding caps?
3. Do we use our current application and score form to apply for and rank these projects?

***For additional information, I have attached the RTAC Memorandums concerning their efforts. I have also attached our STBG Mini-DCR for review, discussion, and approval.***



Central Arizona Governments  
Central Yavapai Metro. Planning Org.  
Lake Havasu Metro. Planning Org.  
MetroPlan Greater Flagstaff  
Northern Arizona Council of Gov'ts.  
Sierra Vista Metro. Planning Org.  
Southeastern AZ Governments Org.  
Sun Corridor Metro. Planning Org.  
Western Arizona Council of Gov'ts.  
Yuma Metropolitan Planning Org.

March 17, 2021

## MEMORANDUM

**TO:** RTAC Board

**FROM:** Kevin Adam, RTAC Legislative Liaison  
Vinny Gallegos, CYMPO Director, RTAC Advisory Council Chair

**SUBJECT:** **Development of RTAC Regional Project List**

The State Legislature has demonstrated a growing interest in infrastructure investment. However, their increased focus on this issue has not yet risen to the point of supporting a fuel tax or fee increase to pay for it. Instead, they have prioritized earmarking surplus general fund revenues for specific infrastructure projects. This is popular as they get to support increased infrastructure investment without raising taxes. They also get to take credit for specific projects rather than directing funding to HURF or some other distribution process where the specific use of the funding has yet to be determined and will ultimately be decided by others outside of the Legislature.

To date, virtually all of the transportation revenue bills are already dead this session while many of the earmark bills continue to advance. Legislative leadership has indicated that they are setting aside \$200 million in the state budget for these types of projects.

One of the big concerns with earmarking transportation projects is that it bypasses state, regional and local planning and programming priorities. When advancing an earmark, the merits of the project are usually articulated but why the project should jump to the front of the funding line typically is not. That is why programming is so important as it is the best way to prioritize needs and make the best investment choices based on technical analysis, local input and the funding that is available.

As earmarking appears to be the most viable option for securing additional infrastructure funding, the RTAC Advisory Committee, consisting of the Greater AZ COG/MPO directors, is recommending a compromise approach. We propose to develop a list of regional priorities consisting of the top projects put forward by all of the COG/MPOs in Greater AZ.

Legislators would still be advocating for specific projects but they would reflect the state’s rural regional priorities as determined by Greater AZ’s transportation planning organizations. The Directors have had several discussions regarding the most equitable and viable approach to compiling such a consensus driven project list and recommend these initial guidelines:

1. The total project list value will be \$40 million.
2. Each Greater AZ COG/MPO would be allocated an amount proportional to their population.
3. No COG/MPO or local jurisdiction would be precluded from pursuing separate earmarks for other projects.

RTAC, in coordination with the Greater AZ COG/MPOs, will not likely have time to develop this list and pursue funding this legislative session but will have it prepared well in advance of next session. We do need direction from the RTAC Board on if, and how, to proceed. If we can agree to the general parameters, such as funding levels & distribution, the COG/MPOs would start the process of identifying projects from their regions.

Under this proposed scenario, each COG/MPO would have the following funding totals for the inclusion of projects on the list:

<b>COG/MPO</b>	<b>POPULATION %</b>	<b>FUNDING SHARE</b>
CAG	5.43%	\$2,173,038
CYMPO	9.32%	\$3,726,190
LHMPO	4.08%	\$1,633,292
METROPLAN	6.29%	\$2,517,567
NACOG	22.47%	\$8,986,801
SCMPO	8.65%	\$3,459,274
SEAGO	10.95%	\$4,379,776
SVMPO	4.82%	\$1,926,277
WACOG	12.18%	\$4,873,673
YMPO	15.81%	\$6,324,112
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>\$40,000,000</b>





Central Arizona Governments  
 Central Yavapai Metro. Planning Org.  
 Lake Havasu Metro. Planning Org.  
 MetroPlan Greater Flagstaff  
 Northern Arizona Council of Gov'ts.  
 Sierra Vista Metro. Planning Org.  
 Southeastern AZ Governments Org.  
 Sun Corridor Metro. Planning Org.  
 Western Arizona Council of Gov'ts.  
 Yuma Metropolitan Planning Org.

May 25, 2021

## MEMORANDUM

TO: Greater AZ COG/MPO Transportation Planners  
 RTAC Board & Advisory Committee

FROM: Kevin Adam, RTAC Legislative Liaison

**SUBJECT: REVISED ALLOCATIONS FOR RTAC REGIONAL PRIORITY PROJECT LIST**

At yesterday's RTAC Board meeting, the Board provided direction regarding an adjustment to the regional priority project list and the funding that is allocated to each region. The list was developed with the intent of identifying the priorities from all of Greater Arizona's COG/MPOs. From that perspective, we overlooked a very substantial portion of Pinal County that is no longer included in CAG or Sun Corridor MPO but is still a part of RTAC. We will add funding for this region on top of the \$40 million already allocated and round the new net total to \$50 million. This rounding has caused a slight increase to the totals for all regions. Please take notice of the new funding levels allocated to your region:

<b>GREATER AZ COG/MPO</b>	<b>POPULATION</b>	<b>PERCENTAGE</b>	<b>OLD FUNDING SHARE</b>	<b>NEW FUNDING SHARE</b>
CAG	80,859	4.49%	\$2,173,038	\$2,245,526
CYMPO	138,652	7.7%	\$3,726,190	\$3,850,488
LHMPO	60,775	3.38%	\$1,633,292	\$1,687,775
METROPLAN	93,679	5.2%	\$2,517,567	\$2,601,548
NACOG	334,400	18.57%	\$8,986,801	\$9,286,583
PINAL (OTHER)	312,042	17.33%	\$0	\$8,665,681
SCMPO	128,720	7.15%	\$3,459,274	\$3,574,668
SEAGO	162,972	9.05%	\$4,379,776	\$4,525,876
SVMPO	71,677	3.98%	\$1,926,277	\$1,990,533
WACOG	181,350	10.07%	\$4,873,673	\$5,036,249
YMPO	235,321	13.07%	\$6,324,112	\$6,535,072
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>1,800,447</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>\$40,000,000</b>	<b>\$50,000,000</b>



# SURFACE TRANSPORTATION BLOCK GRANT PROGRAM

## PROJECT NOMINATION SHEET AND MINI DESIGN CONCEPT REPORT

---

Provide a Mini-DCR with the following information. Some information may not be pertinent to your project; however, provide as much information about your proposed project as you are able.

### A. COVER LETTER AND TITLE PAGE

### B. INTRODUCTION

The introduction must contain the following project information, if applicable;

- The project route name including termini and functional classification;
- Length of project (if in segments, length of each segment);
- Location – mile posts, or physical address;
- Expected project development timeline to include Design, ROW, and Construction;
- Purpose and need for the project;
- Proposed project future benefit – 20 to 30 years out.

### C. BACKGROUND DATA

This section addresses, if applicable:

- The year the road or element was constructed, previous up-grade to the project, if any, existing typical section.
- General features such as structures, major drainage, major traffic control items, rail road crossings, major utilities, and crash data history.
- Provide current and future traffic data – Average Daily Traffic Counts

### D. PROJECT SCOPE

Describe the project limits and the recommended project scope.

### E. ENVIRONMENTAL PROJECT DEVELOPMENT CONSIDERATIONS

*Environmental requirements as determined by the project scope.*

- Potential Hazardous Waste sites
- 404 Permit requirements
- Section 4(f) lands
- Flood plain encroachment
- Wetlands
- Scenic or Historic Route
- Archaeological clearance
- Social or Economic impacts

### F. ESTIMATED COST

You may use an Excel spreadsheet (recommended), but it must have all the following information in the same format. If you need more rows or columns to add additional information, please do so.



# SURFACE TRANSPORTATION BLOCK GRANT PROGRAM

## PROJECT NOMINATION SHEET AND MINI DESIGN CONCEPT REPORT

Project Phase/Type of Work	Estimated Cost
Preliminary Engineering-Design (Include ADOT Review Fees)	\$
Right-of-Way	\$\$
Utility Relocation	\$\$
Other (Please Identify)	\$\$
Construction	\$\$
Total Project Cost*	\$

*\*The project sponsors will be responsible for any project costs in excess of the approved project cost.*

### G. ITEMIZED ESTIMATE

Utilize the Project Cost Estimate Sheet (above), or you can create an Excel spreadsheet exactly like the cost estimate Word document, and provide it with your application. It MUST be in the same format with the same information.

### H. LOCAL MATCH

Identify the amount and source of local match.

### I. VICINITY MAP

Provide a clear project vicinity map. More than one map is allowed.

### J. TYPICAL SECTION SKETCH

Provide a typical section sketch for the project including R/W limits and the proposed pavement structural section, slopes, and lane and shoulder dimensions. As a safety project, provide before and after scenarios, if appropriate.

### K. SAFETY

Provide up to 5 years of crash data for the project location. Discuss the ability of the project to reduce the frequency and/or severity of roadway crashes.

### L. FREIGHT MOVEMENT/ECONOMIC VITALITY

Discuss how the project addresses the following:

- Provides access to existing/new economic opportunities;
- Improves connection of employment and activity centers to population centers;
- Improves movement of goods efficiently through the regional transportation network.

### M. SYSTEM PRESERVATION AND IMPROVEMENT

Discuss how the project addresses the following:

- Improves multi-modal transportation;
- Preserves existing facilities and networks;
- Improves existing facilities and networks.

***Provide the STP Mini-DCR in electronic form to SEAGO for distribution to the TAC no later than July 8, 2021.***



# TAC PACKET

---

**TO: SEAGO TAC**  
**FROM: CHRIS VERTREES, SEAGO TRANSPORTATION PLANNER**  
**DATE: MAY 26, 2021**  
**RE: SEAGO TAC IN-PERSON MEETING DISCUSSION**

---

The Cochise College Benson Center has re-opened its facility for public meetings/trainings. They currently have a cap of 6 persons per classroom. We normally book a double classroom. This would allow us to have 12 persons per meeting.

At this meeting, I will be asking the TAC if they are ready to resume in-person meetings. We will continue with a hybrid model via zoom for those who are not yet ready to travel.