

**MINUTES OF THE
ADMINISTRATIVE COUNCIL
COCHISE COLLEGE BENSON CENTER
1025 STATE ROUTE 90
BENSON, ARIZONA
FEBRUARY 11, 2016**

OFFICERS PRESENT: Soltis, Tedmond – City of Willcox (*Vice Chair*)

MEMBERS PRESENT: Basteen, John Jr. – Town of Duncan (by phone)
Driskell, Donna – City of Tombstone
Johnson, Jestin – City of Bisbee
McCormick, Jeff – Town of Pima
McGaughey, Ian – City of Clifton (*by phone*)
Mitchell, Tammy – Town of Huachuca City
Russell, Charles – San Carlos Apache Tribe
Potucek, Chuck – City of Sierra Vista
Skeete, Horatio - City of Safford
Stephens, William – City of Benson
Vlahovich, Jim – Cochise County (*by phone*)

STAFF PRESENT: Catten, Larry - Economic Development Planner
Heiss, Randy - Executive Director
Merideth, John - Office Assistant
Osborn, Cindy - Accounts Manager
Packer, Julie – Housing Program Manager
Vertrees, Chris - Transportation Planner
Villa, Laura – AAA Manager
Williams, Bonnie - CDBG Program Manager

GUESTS: Boyle, Kathy - ADOT

Mr. Randy Heiss informed the group that Vice Chair Terry Hinton would not be present due to illness and it was suggested that agenda item No. 7, Discussion and Possible Action to Elect Vice-Chair, be moved up to the first action item.

I. DISCUSSION AND POSSIBLE ACTION TO ELECT A NEW VICE CHAIR

Mr. Heiss reported that former Chair Shane Dille was no longer with the City of Nogales which created a vacancy in the Chair position of the Administrative Council. He reported the Bylaws state that the next highest-ranking officer will automatically move up into the Chair's position for the balance of the term. Due to Mr. Hinton's illness, it still left the need to fill the Vice-Chair position until the next election of officers. A motion was made by Mr. Chuck Potucek to appoint Mr. Ted Soltis to the position of Vice-Chair until the next election of officers.

MOTION: Chuck Potucek
SECOND: Bill Stephens
ACTION: **APPROVED UNANIMOUSLY**

II. CALL TO ORDER/PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE/INTRODUCTIONS

Interim Vice-Chair Ted Soltis called the meeting to order at 9:04 a.m. Mr. Randy Heiss requested that Agenda Item No. 4, Discussion and Possible Action Regarding the Revised Regional Grant Writing Services Project Proposal, be moved to Action Item No. 2, immediately following the Consent Agenda.

III. MEMBER ENTITIES' DISCUSSION

Vice-Chair Soltis made a call for items to discuss. Mr. Chuck Potucek commented on a recent meeting in Phoenix regarding real property rental tax and Senate Bill 1268. He also provided an update on the Public Safety Personnel Retirement System bill. Ms. Kathy Boyle reported that the State Transportation Board would be meeting in Nogales the following week. Ms. Tammy Mitchell discussed upcoming workshops at the Town of Huachuca City regarding changing their form of government from mayor/council to mayor/manager and that they would be hosting the SEAGO Executive Board meeting on February 26. Mr. Bill Stephens, City of Benson, provided an update on the Villages at Vigneto housing development project. No other common critical issues were discussed.

Mr. Heiss reported on House Bill 2157 dealing with political subdivision entities and that it would preclude new employees of organizations like SEAGO and the Arizona League of Cities and Towns from participating in the State Retirement plan.

IV. CALL TO THE PUBLIC

Vice-Chair Soltis made a call to the public and no one spoke.

V. ACTION ITEMS

1. Consent Agenda
 - a. Approval of the November 5, 2015 Minutes
 - b. Nominations to the Advisory Council on Aging

Mr. Chuck Potucek made a motion to approve Consent Agenda Items 1a. and 1b.

MOTION: Chuck Potucek
SECOND: Horatio Skeete
ACTION: **APPROVED UNANIMOUSLY**

2. Discussion and Possible Action Regarding the Revised Regional Grant Writing Services Project Proposal.

Mr. Randy Heiss initiated the video conference call with Ms. Mindy Muller with Community Development Professionals (CDP) out of Hamilton, OH. Mr. Heiss stated there had been negotiations with CDP and a revised scope of work and proposal for review and discussion. The revised CDP proposal would require \$45,000 and he proposed that for FY17 \$20,000 come in the form of assessments and the remaining \$25,000 come from fund balance. Mr. Potucek asked whether there was an opportunity to recoup the administrative fees as part of a grant proposal and Ms. Muller replied it is possible sometimes, but in general grant writing fees are not covered under a proposal. Mr. Horatio Skeete made a motion to approve funding the grant writing services with \$20,000 coming from member assessments and the remaining \$25,000 from fund balance.

MOTION: Horatio Skeete
SECOND: Chuck Potucek
ACTION: **APPROVED UNANIMOUSLY**

3. Discussion and Possible Approval of Resolution No. 2016-01 (HURF Resolution).

Mr. Heiss presented Resolution 2016-01 urging the Governor and Legislature eliminate the diversion of HURF and other dedicated transportation funding sources to the State General Fund.

MOTION: Bill Stephens
SECOND: Jestin Johnson
ACTION: **APPROVED UNANIMOUSLY**

4. Discussion and Possible Approval of the 2016-2017 Transportation Issues Position Statement.

Mr. Heiss reported that the Transportation Advisory Committee (TAC) had raised a number of concerns regarding the ability of local governments to plan and implement transportation projects, and they had prepared a position statement addressing the following issues:

- a. End the Diversion of Dedicated Transportation Funding;
- b. Restore the HURF Exchange Program;
- c. Explore all Possible Funding Options to Resolve the SR 189 Bottleneck;
- d. Expand Transportation Infrastructure Funding Mechanisms;
- e. Raise Title 34 Limitation on Use of Local Forces; and
- f. Support Efforts to Create a Unified Transportation Plan.

Mr. Jeff McCormick made a motion to approve the position statements on transportation issues as presented by Staff, with the understanding that Issue No. 5, Raise Title 34 Limitation on Use of Local Forces, could be reconsidered at a future date.

MOTION: Jeff McCormick
SECOND: Chuck Potucek
ACTION: **APPROVED UNANIMOUSLY**

5. Discussion and Possible Action to Re-appoint Cochise County Private Sector Representative Mark Schmitt to a Second Term of Office on the Executive Board.

Mr. Heiss explained that when term limits were imposed for Private Sector Representatives last November, the terms of existing Representatives were not considered. The only one of these that warranted action today was Mr. Schmitt who had been appointed in 2011 and had been serving ever since. All others were well inside their initial two-year term. Heiss stated he had been in contact with Mr. Schmitt and determined he was willing to continue serving, and suggested that he be reappointed to a final two-year term. A motion was made to recommend reappointment of Mr. Mark Schmitt as a Private Sector Representative for Cochise County to the Executive Board.

MOTION: Chuck Potucek
SECOND: Horatio Skeete
ACTION: **APPROVED UNANIMOUSLY**

6. Discussion and Possible Action Regarding FY17 Housing Program Funding.

Mr. Heiss lead a discussion regarding the Housing Program funding, reporting the situation is worse than before. Heiss stated there now remains one funding source for the program, the HUD Counseling grant from the National Community Reinvestment Coalition (NCRC), and that SEAGO is faced with either using fund balance and/or member assessments to fund the Housing Program in FY 2017. Heiss explained that the number of clients currently being served now stands at 44% of the clients served in FY 2014 and asked the Administrative Council to recommend a maximum level of fund balance use for the FY 2017 budget and he would set service levels accordingly. Vice-Chair Soltis made a motion to fund the Housing Program at 50% of the anticipated expenditures for FY 2017 budget.

MOTION: Vice-Chair Soltis
SECOND: Jestin Johnson
ACTION: **APPROVED UNANIMOUSLY**

7. Discussion and Possible Action Regarding FY16-18 CDBG Method of Distribution (MOD).

Ms. Bonnie Williams discussed the ADOH changes to our MOD and provided the current finalized MOD. She reported that CDBG applications from Cochise County, Duncan, Huachuca City, Patagonia, and Thatcher will be due to SEAGO by July 1, 2016. Mr. Potucek abstained from the vote.

MOTION: Tammy Mitchell
SECOND: Jim Vlahovich
ACTION: **APPROVED**

VI. INFORMATION ITEMS

A. Future Meeting Dates

Mr. Heiss discussed the future meeting dates, reporting the next meeting of the Administrative Council is scheduled for May 5, 2016. He also reported there would be a need for a Combined Administrative/Executive Committee conference call and it is scheduled for March 31, 2016.

B. Strategic Plan Implementation Progress Report

Mr. Heiss outlined progress on the strategic plan goals, stating everything has been accomplished on schedule, with the exception of the grant writing services which has been delayed due to the need for the increase in budget.

C. Graham County Private Sector Representative Vacancy

Mr. Heiss reported that there remains a vacancy on the Executive Board for a Graham County Private Sector Representative and reiterated the need to fill this vacancy.

D. Finance Report

Ms. Osborn reported that the audit had been completed and the auditors would be attending the February 26, 2015 Executive Board meeting to present the audit. She reported there were no findings this year. She also presented the finance report and responded to questions.

E. SEAGO Economic Development District Report

Mr. Larry Catten provided an update on the 2016-2020 Comprehensive Economic Development Strategy (CEDS) process, stating there was great progress being made and they were on track to submit the CEDS to EDA in June. He also presented the CEDS Mid-Year Report.

F. Transit Report

Mr. Chris Vertrees reported on the newly hired Assistant Regional Mobility Manager and the grant application to the Legacy Foundation, stating that a decision on the grant award should be made in April. He also provided updates on the 5310 Pilot Training Program and the 5311 Program.

G. SEAGO/SVMPO Joint Regional Strategic Highway Safety Plan

Mr. Vertrees provided an update on the progress of the SEAGO/SVMPO Joint Regional Strategic Highway Safety Plan stating there had been three responses to the request for proposals from Kimley-Horn, Amec Foster Wheeler, and Wilson & Co. He stated all three respondents presented at the January 21 TAC meeting and the TAC selected Amec Foster Wheeler. SEAGO is currently finalizing a timeline and scope of work with the consultant and hope to have a contract in place and for work to begin no later than Mar4ch 1, 2016.

H. Area Agency on Aging (AAA) Updates

Ms. Laura Villa reported on the programmatic monitoring being performed on all subawards in order to be in compliance with DES-DAAS policies and procedures. All congregate sites are being monitored by Shira Martin SEAGO's Health and Nutrition Program Coordinator and Long Term Care Ombudsman Program Coordinator. Ms. Villa also discussed the upcoming AZ4A Aging Conference scheduled for May 19-20, 2016 in Flagstaff. Ms. Villa also reported on Caregiver Workshops scheduled for Douglas on March 20 and Clifton on April 15.

Vice Chair Soltis asked whether the programmatic monitoring results are made available to the public and Ms. Villa explained the process. Mr. Heiss further explained that the documents are all public information but that SEAGO does not publicize the results.

I. Housing Program Statistics

Ms. Julie Packer provided the Housing Programs report and responded to questions.

VII. RURAL TRANSPORTATION ADVOCACY COUNCIL (RTAC) REPORT

In the absence of Mr. Kevin Adam, there was no RTAC report.

VIII. STAFF ANNOUNCEMENTS / CURRENT EVENTS

Mr. Heiss reminded everyone of the ADOT Long Range Transportation Plan meeting scheduled for the afternoon, stating that lunch would also be provided.

IX. FUTURE AGENDA ITEMS

Vice Chair Soltis asked for any future agenda items and there were none.

X. ADJOURNMENT

Mr. Skeete made a motion to adjourn.

MOTION: Horatio Skeete

SECOND: Bill Stephens

ACTION: **APPROVED**

Vice Chair Soltis adjourned the meeting at 10:30 AM.



ADMINISTRATIVE COUNCIL PACKET

MEMO TO: ADMINISTRATIVE COUNCIL
THROUGH: RANDY HEISS, EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR
FROM: LAURA VILLA, AREA AGENCY ON AGING PROGRAM MANAGER
DATE: APRIL 26, 2016
SUBJECT: NOMINATION TO VACANT CITY OF BENSON ACOA POSITION

As you know, the Advisory Council on Aging (ACOA) has had a vacancy in the position representing the City of Benson for some time now. At their April 21st meeting, the ACOA nominated Ms. Kathy Spangler to fill this position. Ms. Spangler moved to Cochise County as a child in 1978. Kathy was raised in Tombstone and graduated from Tombstone High School in 1986. Kathy attended Northern Arizona University for two years and transferred to the University of Arizona in Tucson. Kathy returned to Cochise County in 1991 to Benson, where she has resided for the last 24 years.

Kathy has worked in long term care for the last 16 years. She was the Business Office Manager at Life Care Center of Sierra Vista and then at Kindred – Hacienda in Sierra Vista, AZ. For the last year Kathy has been employed by Bridgeway Health Solutions, a long term AHCCCS insurance plan, as a non-clinical case manager. In her new role as case manager, Kathy visits members on the health plan in their homes all over Cochise County and provides services that allow the members to remain at home safely and successfully. Members can also be transferred to Assisted Living facilities or Skilled Nursing facilities when needed. Kathy is looking forward to learning more about SEAGO and creating relationships and networks to serve our elderly population in Cochise County.

If the nomination is accepted by the Executive Board, this will fill all of the vacant ACOA positions in Cochise County. However, vacancies remain for representation on the ACOA for Graham County unincorporated, Town of Pima and Town of Thatcher, as well as representation for Santa Cruz County unincorporated. Any suggestions on individuals who would be willing to serve in these positions would be appreciated.

I will attempt to answer any questions you may have at the meeting.

Attachments: None

Action

Requested:

Information Only

Action Requested Below:

A motion to recommend to the Executive Board approval of the nomination of Ms. Kathy Spangler to fill the vacant City of Benson position on the Advisory Council on Aging.



ADMINISTRATIVE COUNCIL PACKET

MEMO TO: ADMINISTRATIVE COUNCIL
FROM: RANDY HEISS, EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR
DATE: APRIL 26, 2016
SUBJECT: ELECTION OF OFFICERS

Article VII, Section C, of the SEAGO Bylaws provides as follows:

“C. The Administrative Council shall elect from among its members a (1) Chair, (2) Vice Chair, and (3) Secretary whose terms shall be co-terminus for one year each, at the conclusion of which any or all incumbents may be re-elected, but no officer of the Administrative Council may serve more than three consecutive one-year terms; and officers of the Administrative Council shall commence their terms on July 1 of each year.....”

The current slate of officers is as follows:

Chair: Terry Hinton, Town of Thatcher Manager
Vice-Chair: Tedmond Soltis, City of Willcox Manager
Secretary: Kay Gale, Greenlee County Administrator

I have communicated with the current slate of officers and Mr. Soltis indicated he would be willing to continue serving if the Council is agreeable. Ms. Gale has served three years in her current position, but remains eligible to be nominated as Chair or Vice-Chair. Ms. Gale stated she thinks it may be time for someone else step forward for nomination, but she would agree to Vice-Chair only if no one else is interested in serving as an officer. I have not heard back from Mr. Hinton. Per the Bylaws, the Administrative Council has the option of electing an entirely new slate of officers or a combination of new officers and existing officers.

Attachments: None.

Action Requested: Information Only Action Requested Below:

A motion to nominate and elect a slate of officers of the Administrative Council for Fiscal Year 2016 - 2017.



EXECUTIVE BOARD PACKET

MEMO TO: EXECUTIVE BOARD
FROM: RANDY HEISS, EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR
DATE: APRIL 26, 2016
SUBJECT: GRANT SERVICES CONTRACT AND ANNUAL ASSESSMENTS

GRANT SERVICES CONTRACT:

As you know, there were a number of unanticipated questions and concerns that arose at the February Executive Board meeting that caused this item to be tabled. Many of the questions raised were answered at the February meeting, but the Board felt the need to review the proposed program with their Administrative Council members and reconsider it again in May. One question most frequently asked related to a provision in the contract prohibiting member entities from using another firm to prepare their grant applications if Community Development Professionals identifies a funding opportunity meeting one of the community's priorities. This language has been removed from the contract.

I think it's important to remember that the concept of having regional grant services originated at the January 2015 Strategic Planning Retreat. This concept received significant support when strategies related to the concept are combined, and was among the strategies Retreat participants felt most passionate about. As a result, procuring professional grant services was included as a tactic to support Strategic Plan Goal 1 – *Expand SEAGO services to member entities and constituents*; and Goal 3 – *Advance economic competitiveness and sustainability*, in SEAGO's Five-Year Strategic Plan adopted by the Executive Board in May 2015.

The SEAGO Five-Year Strategic Plan is intended to be a guide for the agency over the next five years. The Plan serves many purposes including defining the purpose of the organization, establishing realistic goals and objectives, ensuring the most effective use is made of the organization's resources by focusing those resources on the key priorities, and bringing together everyone's best efforts and building consensus about where the organization is going. In bringing the regional grant services concept forward for consideration, staff is simply following through on implementing the goals of our Strategic Plan.

In our efforts to implement the Plan, staff is fully aware that it does not commit the Administrative Council and Executive Board to costs associated with each goal or tactic. This is done through the implementation plan and the budget process. At the February meeting, we had proposed that the \$45,000 needed to engage the services of Community Development Professionals in FY 2017 be split between a \$20,000 member assessment and use of fund balance (\$25,000), and if we are to move forward with the implementation of this tactic, consensus must now be found on how to pay for these services. Below are three Options and some Alternatives to these Options for your consideration on how we might do that:

OPTION 1:

In this Option, the proposed \$20,000 assessment is split evenly between SEAGO's member entities. There is no population formula. This is offered in consideration that each member entity will theoretically have the same potential to benefit from participating in the program, and therefore, each member entity should bear an equal share of the cost. Three Alternatives to this Option are offered for your consideration:

Alternate A:

Since this is not a population based assessment, it's possible Sierra Vista may reconsider participation. When the cost is split evenly between SEAGO's nineteen members, the cost would be \$1,053 each. Based on the City's response above, this may not be a viable Alternate.

Alternate B:

At the February Executive Board meeting, questions were raised about how much more the participating member entities would pay for this service if those remaining were to pick up the cost for Sierra Vista. If Sierra Vista does not participate, the cost could be split between the eighteen remaining member entities. With this Alternate, the cost for each member entity increases to \$1,111 each with no impact on fund balance.

Alternate C:

If additional member entities choose to opt out of participating in the program, the cost to the remaining participating jurisdictions would increase accordingly. It's possible the increased cost would cause additional member entities to withdraw from participating, and in turn, may drive up costs for those remaining in the program to the point the entire program will no longer be viable. This Alternate would provide the flexibility for any member entity to opt out of the program with fund balance picking up the cost of the non-participating members. The cost for the participating jurisdictions would remain fixed at \$1,053 in the first year of the contract. Depending on how many member entities opt out, the impact on fund balance could be considerable. See 'My Recommendations' below for additional information.

OPTION 2:

No Alternatives to this Option are offered. This Option assesses the \$20,000 cost on a modified population based formula, but also allows the flexibility for any member entity to opt out of the program with fund balance picking up the cost of the non-participating members. Depending on how many member entities opt out, the impact on fund balance could be considerable. See 'My Recommendations' below for additional information.

OPTION 3:

In this Option, no assessment for the program is proposed. Two Alternatives to this Option are offered for your consideration:

Alternate A:

In this Alternate, no direct services to member entities would be available, and SEAGO would contract with CDP to search for funding opportunities to expand or enhance regional services and fulfill the goals of our Strategic Plan. The best example of this is Goal 1, Tactic C - Prepare and Submit a Regional Technical Services Center Grant Application. At the January 2015 Strategic

Planning Retreat, the tactic that gained by far the most support was to establish a technical services center that could be utilized by member entities in developing projects in their communities. SEAGO would work with CDP to identify several priorities that would become the focal points of grant opportunities. The cost of the contract would be no more than \$10,000 in the first year and would be paid from fund balance. When success has been established, member entities may wish to reconsider the original scope of the project in the second contract year.

Alternate B:

In this Alternate, the project would go forward as proposed at the February meeting with the entire cost of \$45,000 for the first contract year coming from the fund balance. If the program meets performance measures, there would be an expectation that a member entity assessment would cover most, if not all of the program costs in the second contract year. Considering the substantial impact to fund balance and other factors, staff does not recommend this Alternate.

My Recommendations

My first preference would be for all member entities to participate in the program. This would provide the maximum opportunity for the regional partnerships and collaboration originally envisioned in the Request for Proposals. Option 1, Alternate A appears to be the fairest method of sharing the program costs. If only Sierra Vista and a few other member entities request to opt out, I would recommend Option 1, Alternate C. If less than 70% of member entities choose to participate in the program, much of the potential for regional partnerships and collaboration will be lost and the impact to fund balance will be considerable. In this case, I would recommend Option 3, Alternate A.

ANNUAL ASSESSMENTS:

SEAGO Member Dues

With the exception of using the OEPS estimate as the population base for each community, the column for SEAGO Member Dues remains unchanged from the Option adopted for Fiscal Year 2016.

EDA Planning Assessment

Prior to Fiscal Year 2016, approximately 53% of the annual dues were used as matching funds for the EDA grant and to fund economic development program work. In all of the Options presented, the economic development assessment is now shown in a separate column from the annual dues.

RTAC Assessment

In all of the Options presented, the RTAC assessment remains in a stand-alone column and is based on the 2010 population of each non-metropolitan member entity multiplied by 8.2 cents per capita. The resulting cost is then split 70/30, with transportation planning funds paying 70% and a member assessment paying the remaining 30% of the RTAC dues.

Attachments: Fiscal Year 2017 Assessment Schedules, Options 1 – 3; Draft Regional Grant Consulting Contract.

Action Requested: Information Only Action Requested Below:

A motion to recommend approval of one of the Options presented by staff to the Executive Board.

FY 2017 ASSESSMENT SCHEDULE OPTION 1

SouthEastern Arizona Governments Organization Draft Dues and Assessment Schedule Fiscal Year 2017

SEAGO Member	2015 OPES Est. (a)	SEAGO Member Dues (b)	ED Planning Assessment (c)	RTAC Assessment (d)	Grant Services Contractor Assessment (f)	Total FY2017 Estimated Assessment (g)	Member Percent of Total FY2017 Assessment (h)	Total FY2015 SEAGO Assessment (i)	Total FY2010 SEAGO Assessment (j)
Benson	4,999	\$1,750	\$1,054	\$123	\$1,053	\$3,980	4.08%	\$1,655	\$2,055
Bisbee	5,297	\$1,442	\$1,117	\$130	\$1,053	\$3,742	3.84%	\$1,803	\$2,305
Douglas	16,956	\$3,815	\$3,577	\$420	\$1,053	\$8,864	9.09%	\$5,635	\$7,078
Huachuca City	1,794	\$897	\$378	\$44	\$1,053	\$2,372	2.43%	\$601	\$747
Sierra Vista	44,183	\$3,314	\$1,977	\$0	\$0	\$5,291	5.43%	\$13,153	\$17,798
Tombstone	1,333	\$1,066	\$281	\$33	\$1,053	\$2,433	2.50%	\$447	\$579
Willcox	3,636	\$1,273	\$767	\$91	\$1,053	\$3,183	3.27%	\$1,218	\$1,529
Cochise County*	50,914	\$2,037	\$8,299	\$977	\$1,053	\$12,365	12.69%	\$16,701	\$21,406
Pima	2,553	\$894	\$539	\$58	\$1,053	\$2,543	2.61%	\$775	\$954
Safford	9,659	\$2,630	\$2,037	\$231	\$1,053	\$5,951	6.11%	\$3,102	\$3,859
Thatcher	5,125	\$1,396	\$1,081	\$112	\$1,053	\$3,641	3.74%	\$1,572	\$1,992
San Carlos Apache Tribe	5,029	\$1,369	\$1,061	\$116	\$1,053	\$3,598	3.69%	\$1,550	\$2,365
Graham County*	16,109	\$3,625	\$3,398	\$383	\$1,053	\$8,458	8.68%	\$5,072	\$5,882
Clifton	4,510	\$1,579	\$951	\$80	\$1,053	\$3,662	3.76%	\$1,074	\$1,281
Duncan	802	\$642	\$169	\$17	\$1,053	\$1,880	1.93%	\$226	\$290
Greenlee County*	5,243	\$1,428	\$519	\$107	\$1,053	\$3,107	3.19%	\$1,437	\$1,836
Nogales	21,910	\$4,382	\$2,169	\$504	\$1,053	\$8,107	8.32%	\$6,757	\$8,486
Patagonia	963	\$770	\$203	\$22	\$1,053	\$2,048	2.10%	\$296	\$370
Santa Cruz County*	27,397	\$4,794	\$5,779	\$620	\$1,053	\$12,246	12.56%	\$8,324	\$10,275
SEAGO Region Totals	228,412	\$39,101	\$35,357	\$4,069	\$18,947	\$97,474	100.00%	\$71,397	\$91,089

*Unincorporated area only

Fund Balance Use = -\$1,053

Notes to Assessments:

- (a) Most calculations are based on the 2015 OEPS Population Estimates for each member community. We intend to use the mid-decade population estimates in FY 2017 and future years until the 2020 Census figures are available.
- (b) In this column, SEAGO Member Dues are based on population blocks with the larger entities paying less per capita, and the smaller entities who generally need more services paying more per capita.
- (c) The assessment provides matching funds for the EDA planning grant and related economic development activities. Calculations are based on a per capita rate, with entities who have economic development staff paying less per capita and the remaining entities paying more.
- (d) RTAC assessment is based on the non-urbanized population of the region and 8.2 cents per capita. The SVMPO pays its dues directly to the RTAC and its population is not included in the calculation.
- (f) The grant services assessment in this column is split evenly between SEAGO's 19 member entities. If Sierra Vista or other jurisdictions opt out, the cost could be picked up by fund balance.
- (g) The total for this column will depend on any final adjustments to the calculations of individual program assessment columns and decisions to use fund balance rather than assessments to cover anticipated expenses.
- (h) This column displays the percent each member's assessment represents of the total FY 2017 assessment.
- (i) Information is provided so comparisons can be drawn between total FY2017 assessment and total FY2015 assessment.
- (j) Information is provided so comparisons can be drawn between total FY2017 assessment and total FY2010 assessment.

FY 2017 ASSESSMENT SCHEDULE OPTION 2

SouthEastern Arizona Governments Organization Draft Dues and Assessment Schedule Fiscal Year 2017

SEAGO Member	2015 OPES Est. (a)	SEAGO Member Dues (b)	ED Planning Assessment (c)	RTAC Assessment (d)	Grant Services Contractor Assessment (f)	Total FY2017 Estimated Assessment (g)	Member Percent of Total FY2017 Assessment (h)	Total FY2015 SEAGO Assessment (i)	Total FY2010 SEAGO Assessment (j)
Benson	4,999	\$1,750	\$1,054	\$123	\$753	\$3,680	3.86%	\$1,655	\$2,055
Bisbee	5,297	\$1,442	\$1,117	\$130	\$696	\$3,385	3.55%	\$1,803	\$2,305
Douglas	16,956	\$3,815	\$3,577	\$420	\$1,262	\$9,074	9.51%	\$5,635	\$7,078
Huachuca City	1,794	\$897	\$378	\$44	\$314	\$1,634	1.71%	\$601	\$747
Sierra Vista	44,183	\$3,314	\$1,977	\$0	\$0	\$5,291	5.54%	\$13,153	\$17,798
Tombstone	1,333	\$1,066	\$281	\$33	\$233	\$1,614	1.69%	\$447	\$579
Willcox	3,636	\$1,273	\$767	\$91	\$548	\$2,678	2.81%	\$1,218	\$1,529
Cochise County*	50,914	\$2,037	\$8,299	\$977	\$3,566	\$14,879	15.59%	\$16,701	\$21,406
Pima	2,553	\$894	\$539	\$58	\$385	\$1,875	1.96%	\$775	\$954
Safford	9,659	\$2,630	\$2,037	\$231	\$1,269	\$6,167	6.46%	\$3,102	\$3,859
Thatcher	5,125	\$1,396	\$1,081	\$112	\$673	\$3,261	3.42%	\$1,572	\$1,992
San Carlos Apache Tribe	5,029	\$1,369	\$1,061	\$116	\$661	\$3,206	3.36%	\$1,550	\$2,365
Graham County*	16,109	\$3,625	\$3,398	\$383	\$1,199	\$8,605	9.02%	\$5,072	\$5,882
Clifton	4,510	\$1,579	\$951	\$80	\$679	\$3,289	3.45%	\$1,074	\$1,281
Duncan	802	\$642	\$169	\$17	\$140	\$968	1.01%	\$226	\$290
Greenlee County*	5,243	\$1,428	\$519	\$107	\$689	\$2,743	2.87%	\$1,437	\$1,836
Nogales	21,910	\$4,382	\$2,169	\$504	\$1,631	\$8,685	9.10%	\$6,757	\$8,486
Patagonia	963	\$770	\$203	\$22	\$169	\$1,164	1.22%	\$296	\$370
Santa Cruz County*	27,397	\$4,794	\$5,779	\$620	\$2,039	\$13,233	13.87%	\$8,324	\$10,275
SEAGO Region Totals	228,412	\$39,101	\$35,357	\$4,069	\$16,905	\$95,432	100.00%	\$71,397	\$91,089

*Unincorporated area only

Fund Balance Use = **-\$3,095**

Notes to Assessments:

- (a) Most calculations are based on the 2015 OEPS Population Estimates for each member community. We intend to use the mid-decade population estimates in FY 2017 and future years until the 2020 Census figures are available.
- (b) In this column, SEAGO Member Dues are based on population blocks with the larger entities paying less per capita, and the smaller entities who generally need more services paying more per capita.
- (c) The assessment provides matching funds for the EDA planning grant and related economic development activities. Calculations are based on a per capita rate, with entities who have economic development staff paying less per capita and the remaining entities paying more.
- (d) RTAC assessment is based on the non-urbanized population of the region and 8.2 cents per capita. The SVMPO pays its dues directly to the RTAC and its population is not included in the calculation.
- (f) The assessments in this column are a blend of per capita rates and population blocks. The amount for each entity is first calculated on the percent the population of the entity represents of the total population for the region, then adjusted by population blocks, with the larger entities paying less per capita and the smaller entities paying more per capita. The cost for Sierra Vista is picked up by fund balance.
- (g) The total for this column will depend on any final adjustments to the calculations of individual program assessment columns and decisions to use fund balance rather than assessments to cover anticipated expenses.
- (h) This column displays the percent each member's assessment represents of the total FY 2017 assessment.
- (i) Information is provided so comparisons can be drawn between total FY2017 assessment and total FY2015 assessment.
- (j) Information is provided so comparisons can be drawn between total FY2017 assessment and total FY2010 assessment.

FY 2017 ASSESSMENT SCHEDULE OPTION 3

SouthEastern Arizona Governments Organization Draft Dues and Assessment Schedule Fiscal Year 2017

SEAGO Member	2015 OPES Est. (a)	SEAGO Member Dues (b)	ED Planning Assessment (c)	RTAC Assessment (d)	Grant Services Contractor Assessment (f)	Total FY2017 Estimated Assessment (g)	Member Percent of Total FY2017 Assessment (h)	Total FY2015 SEAGO Assessment (i)	Total FY2010 SEAGO Assessment (j)
Benson	4,999	\$1,750	\$1,054	\$123	\$0	\$2,927	3.73%	\$1,655	\$2,055
Bisbee	5,297	\$1,442	\$1,117	\$130	\$0	\$2,690	3.43%	\$1,803	\$2,305
Douglas	16,956	\$3,815	\$3,577	\$420	\$0	\$7,812	9.95%	\$5,635	\$7,078
Huachuca City	1,794	\$897	\$378	\$44	\$0	\$1,320	1.68%	\$601	\$747
Sierra Vista	44,183	\$3,314	\$1,977	\$0	\$0	\$5,291	6.74%	\$13,153	\$17,798
Tombstone	1,333	\$1,066	\$281	\$33	\$0	\$1,381	1.76%	\$447	\$579
Willcox	3,636	\$1,273	\$767	\$91	\$0	\$2,130	2.71%	\$1,218	\$1,529
Cochise County*	50,914	\$2,037	\$8,299	\$977	\$0	\$11,313	14.41%	\$16,701	\$21,406
Pima	2,553	\$894	\$539	\$58	\$0	\$1,490	1.90%	\$775	\$954
Safford	9,659	\$2,630	\$2,037	\$231	\$0	\$4,898	6.24%	\$3,102	\$3,859
Thatcher	5,125	\$1,396	\$1,081	\$112	\$0	\$2,588	3.30%	\$1,572	\$1,992
San Carlos Apache Tribe	5,029	\$1,369	\$1,061	\$116	\$0	\$2,546	3.24%	\$1,550	\$2,365
Graham County*	16,109	\$3,625	\$3,398	\$383	\$0	\$7,406	9.43%	\$5,072	\$5,882
Clifton	4,510	\$1,579	\$951	\$80	\$0	\$2,610	3.32%	\$1,074	\$1,281
Duncan	802	\$642	\$169	\$17	\$0	\$827	1.05%	\$226	\$290
Greenlee County*	5,243	\$1,428	\$519	\$107	\$0	\$2,054	2.62%	\$1,437	\$1,836
Nogales	21,910	\$4,382	\$2,169	\$504	\$0	\$7,055	8.98%	\$6,757	\$8,486
Patagonia	963	\$770	\$203	\$22	\$0	\$996	1.27%	\$296	\$370
Santa Cruz County*	27,397	\$4,794	\$5,779	\$620	\$0	\$11,194	14.25%	\$8,324	\$10,275
SEAGO Region Totals	228,412	\$39,101	\$35,357	\$4,069	\$0	\$78,527	100.00%	\$71,397	\$91,089

*Unincorporated area only

Notes to Assessments:

- (a) Most calculations are based on the 2015 OEPS Population Estimates for each member community. We intend to use the mid-decade population estimates in FY 2017 and future years until the 2020 Census figures are available.
- (b) In this column, SEAGO Member Dues are based on population blocks with the larger entities paying less per capita, and the smaller entities who generally need more services paying more per capita.
- (c) The assessment provides matching funds for the EDA planning grant and related economic development activities. Calculations are based on a per capita rate, with entities who have economic development staff paying less per capita and the remaining entities paying more.
- (d) RTAC assessment is based on the non-urbanized population of the region and 8.2 cents per capita. The SVMPO pays its dues directly to the RTAC and its population is not included in the calculation.
- (f) No assessment. Assumes SEAGO will contract with CDP to identify funding opportunities aligning with the strategic plan, or fund the full project from fund balance.
- (g) The total for this column will depend on any final adjustments to the calculations of individual program assessment columns and decisions to use fund balance rather than assessments to cover anticipated expenses.
- (h) This column displays the percent each member's assessment represents of the total FY 2017 assessment.
- (i) Information is provided so comparisons can be drawn between total FY2017 assessment and total FY2015 assessment.
- (j) Information is provided so comparisons can be drawn between total FY2017 assessment and total FY2010 assessment.



SEAGO
FY 2016- FY 2018 CONTRACT
FOR REGIONAL GRANT SERVICES

This contract (the "Contract") is made and entered into as of **June 1, 2016**, between the SouthEastern Arizona Governments Organization (SEAGO) and Community Development Professionals, LLC, (the "Consultant"), and is the first year of a two (2) year contract award. This Contract may be renewed for an additional three (3) years upon mutual consent of SEAGO and the Consultant.

Recitals:

- A. SEAGO is in need of a consultant to perform regional grant writing services, as generally described in the Scope of Services in the Request for Proposals (RFP), the original proposal submitted by the Consultant on November 18, 2015; and as reflected in the revised proposal submitted by the Consultant dated December 21, 2015.
- B. The Consultant has offered to provide the necessary consulting and technical assistance services for the project in accordance with this Contract.

NOW, THEREFORE, the parties mutually agree as follows:

1. Performance of Services - The Consultant promises and agrees to perform the services, as described in this Contract and the RFP in a good, competent and professional manner, and as specifically indicated in the Consultant's Proposal and revised Proposal (the "Proposals") opened on November 18, 2015, to the complete satisfaction of the SEAGO, and its Member Entities. The RFP and the Consultant's Proposals are incorporated herein by this reference, and the documents are made a part of this Contract as if the same were fully set forth herein. In the event that any incorporated term or provision conflicts with this Contract, this Contract controls.

2. Scope of Services -The Consultant shall provide all of the materials, equipment and services required by this Contract in accordance with recognized professional standards, and in a competent and acceptable form and manner, including, all of the services described in the RFP, the Scope of Services in the RFP, and the Consultant's Proposals.

3. Compensation - SEAGO will compensate the Consultant for his/her performance, and the Consultant agrees to accept as complete payment for such full performance, **the sum of Forty Thousand Sixty Dollars and No Cents (\$ 40,060.00)** for the first year of the contract, and **the sum of Thirty-Eight Thousand Eight Hundred and Fifteen Dollars and No Cents (\$ 38,815.00)** for the second year of the contract. Additional contract years and scopes of services shall be negotiated at the sole discretion of SEAGO.

Charges for additional services that constitute a requested increase in scope of services may be negotiated. Such additional services shall be requested in writing by the Consultant and must be approved by SEAGO's Executive Board.

4. Invoicing and Payments - The Consultant shall invoice the percent completed on a monthly basis. The invoice shall show the total percent previously completed and an itemization of all services completed. The invoice shall show the consultant's name, address, phone number, fax number, and any other necessary information. All invoices are subject to review and certification of SEAGO's authorized representative and/or SEAGO prior to payment.

Every payment obligation of SEAGO under this Contract is conditioned upon the availability of funds, appropriated or allocated for the payment of such obligation. If funds are not allocated and available for the continuance of this Contract, this Contract may be terminated by SEAGO at the end of the period for which the funds are available. No liability shall accrue to SEAGO in the event this provision is exercised, and SEAGO shall not be obligated or liable for any future payments or for any damages as a result of termination under this paragraph.

5. Rejection/Correction of Services - SEAGO shall have the right to reject all or any service or product submitted under this Contract which does not meet the required specifications. In the event of any such rejection, the Consultant agrees to promptly remedy any and all deficiencies. No compensation shall be due for any rejected services until such deficiencies have been corrected, and corrected at the Consultant's sole cost.

6. Notices - All notices, invoices, and payments shall be made in writing and may be given by personal delivery or by mail or e-mail with signature. The designated recipients for such notices, invoices, and payments are as follows:

To SEAGO: Cindy Osborn, Accounts Manager
SEAGO
1403 W. Highway 92
Bisbee, Arizona 85603
Phone: (520) 432-5301

To Consultant: Community Development Professionals, LLC
332 Dayton Street
Hamilton, Ohio 45011
Attention: Mindy Muller

7. Entire Contract - This Contract shall be effective upon its approval by the parties, as indicated by the signatures of their representatives hereto. This Contract and its attachments and

those documents incorporated by reference represent the entire Contract and understanding between the parties. There are no verbal terms, conditions, or provisions. No amendment shall be effective unless properly authorized and executed by the parties in writing and in the same manner as this Contract was executed.

8. Duration of Contract – This Contract shall become effective **June 1, 2016** and shall remain in effect until **May 31, 2018**.

9. Additional Contract Terms - This Contract includes the following terms, conditions, and provisions:

- a. All of the terms, conditions and provisions in the document entitled Standard Contract Terms and Conditions attached hereto as Exhibit A. In the event the Standard Contract Terms and Conditions conflict with this Contract, this Contract controls.
- b. During the duration of this Contract, SEAGO shall not engage the services of any other consultant to prepare funding applications in response to grant opportunities identified by the Consultant in its performance of the Scope of Services of this Contract. Doing so shall be considered a material breach of contract. This Contract Provision does not apply to SEAGO's member entities.
- c. During the first year of this Contract, SEAGO and its Member Entities commit to engaging the services of the Consultant to prepare a minimum of five (5) funding applications in response to grant opportunities identified by the Consultant in its performance of the Scope of Services of this Contract. During the second year of this Contract, SEAGO and its Member Entities commit to engaging the services of the Consultant to prepare a minimum of three (3) funding applications in response to grant opportunities identified by the Consultant in its performance of the Scope of Services of this Contract.

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, the duly authorized representatives of the parties have executed this Contract as indicated below:

SEAGO – Randy Heiss, Executive Director

Date

Community Development Professionals, LLC – Mindy Muller

Date

EXHIBIT A

SEAGO STANDARD CONTRACT TERMS AND CONDITIONS Regional Grant Writing Services

THE FOLLOWING TERMS AND CONDITIONS ARE AN EXPLICIT PART OF THE CONTRACT FOR REGIONAL GRANT WRITING SERVICES BETWEEN SEAGO AND COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT PROFESSIONALS, LLC, EFFECTIVE JUNE 1, 2016

1. **CERTIFICATION:** By execution of the Contract, the Consultant certifies that all laws, rules and regulations pertaining to civil rights, equal employment opportunity, affirmative action for disabled workers, access to records and records retention, conflict of interest, lobbying, and drug free workplace shall be followed by the Consultant. By execution of the Contract, the Consultant also certifies that neither it nor its principals are presently debarred, suspended, proposed for debarment, declared ineligible, or voluntarily excluded from participation in this federal contracts any federal department or agency. Furthermore, the Consultant will cause these provisions to be inserted in all subcontracts for any services covered by under the Contract, so that such provisions will be binding upon each sub-firm.
2. **GRATUITIES:** SEAGO may, by written notice to the Consultant, cancel the Contract if SEAGO determines that gratuities, in the form of entertainment, gifts, or otherwise, were offered or given by the Consultant or any agent or representative of the Consultant, to any officer, agent, or employee of SEAGO with a view toward securing any contract, securing favorable treatment with respect to the awarding, amending, or the making of any determinations with respect to the performing of such contact. In the event the Contract is canceled by SEAGO pursuant to this provision, SEAGO shall be entitled, in addition to any other rights and remedies, to recover or withhold payment from the Consultant in the amount of the gratuity.
3. **APPLICABLE LAW:** The Contract shall be governed by the laws of the State of Arizona.
4. **LEGAL REMEDIES:** The parties hereby agree to make a good faith effort to resolve any controversy or claim through informal negotiations. Any claim or controversy must first be presented in writing, with supporting documentation, to the other party or its authorized agent. The recipient shall have seven (7) days to prepare and deliver a response. Thereafter, if the parties fail to resolve the claim or controversy following a reasonable period for such resolution, but not less than ten (10) days, the aggrieved party may request the presiding judge of the Superior Court of Cochise County, Arizona to assign a mediator.
5. **CONTRACT:** The Contract Documents between SEAGO and the Consultant shall consist of:
 - (a) The RFP, including instructions, and all terms and conditions, service plans, scope of services, and attachments or addenda thereto;
 - (b) The Proposals submitted by the Consultant in response to the RFP and subsequent negotiations with SEAGO;

- (c) These Standard Contract Terms and Conditions;
- (d) General and Special Provisions, if any; and
- (e) The executed Contract.

The RFP shall govern in all matters not otherwise addressed by this Contract or the Consultant's proposals. All of these documents shall cumulatively constitute "the Contract," as used herein.

6. **CONTRACT AMENDMENTS:** The Contract may be modified only by a written amendment authorized by the SEAGO Executive Director after approval by the Executive Board.
7. **CONTRACT APPLICABILITY:** The Consultant shall substantially conform to the terms, conditions, specifications, and other requirements found within the text of the contract documents. All previous Contracts, contracts, understandings or other documents between the Consultant and SEAGO, which are not expressly part of the Contract, are not applicable and are not part of this Contract.
8. **PROVISIONS REQUIRED BY LAW:** Each and every provision of law and any clause required by law to be in the Contract will be read and enforced as though it were included herein, and if through mistake or otherwise any such provision is not inserted or is not correctly inserted, then upon the application of either party the Contract will forthwith be expressly amended to make such insertion or correction.
9. **SEVERABILITY:** The provisions of this Contract are severable to the extent that any provision or application held to be invalid shall not affect any other provision or applications of the Contract which may remain in effect without the invalid provision or application.
10. **RELATIONSHIP OF PARTIES:** It is clearly understood that each party will act in its individual capacity and not as an agent, employee, partner, joint venturer, or associate of the other. The Consultant is an independent contractor in the performance of this Contract. An employee or agent of one party shall not be deemed or construed to be the employee or agent of the other party for any purpose whatsoever. The Consultant is advised that taxes or Social Security payments will not be withheld from a payment issued hereunder, and that the Consultant should make arrangements to directly pay such expenses, if any.
11. **INTERPRETATION-PAROL EVIDENCE:** This Contract is intended by the parties as a final expression of their Contract, and is intended also as a complete and exclusive statement of the terms of the Contract. No course of prior dealings between the parties and no usage of the trade shall be relevant to supplement or explain any term used in the Contract. Acceptance or acquiescence in a course of performance rendered under the Contract shall not be relevant to determine the meaning of the Contract, even though the accepting or acquiescing party had knowledge of the nature of the performance and opportunity to object.
12. **ASSIGNMENT-DELEGATION:** No right or interest in this Contract shall be assigned by the Consultant without prior written permission of SEAGO, and no delegation of any duty of the Consultant shall be made without prior written permission of SEAGO.

13. **RIGHTS AND REMEDIES:** No provision in this document or in the Consultant's offer shall be construed, expressly or by implication, as a waiver by SEAGO, of any existing or future right and/or remedy available by law in the event of any claim or default or breach of contract. The failure of SEAGO to insist upon the strict performance of any term or condition of the Contract, or to exercise or delay the exercise of any right or remedy provided in the Contract, or by law, or the acceptance of materials or services, or the payment for materials or services, shall not release the Consultant from any responsibilities or obligations imposed by the Contract or by law, and shall not be deemed a waiver of any right of SEAGO to insist upon the strict performance of the Contract.
14. **PROHIBITED INTERESTS:** Neither SEAGO, the Consultant nor any of its contractors or their subcontractors shall enter into any contract, subcontract, or arrangement in connection with this Contract or any property included or planned to be included in the services relating to this Contract, in which a member, officer, or employee of SEAGO or the Consultant either during his tenure or for one year thereafter has any interest, direct or indirect.
15. **INDEMNIFICATION:** Each party (as "Indemnitor") agrees to indemnify, defend, and hold harmless the other party (as "Indemnitee") from and against any and all claims, losses, liability, costs, or expenses (including reasonable attorney's fees) (hereinafter collectively referred to as "Claims") arising out of bodily injury of any person (including death) or property damage, but only to the extent that such Claims which result in vicarious/derivative liability to the Indemnitee are caused by the negligent act, omission, misconduct, or other fault of the Indemnitor, its officers, officials, agents, employees, or volunteers. In addition, the Consultant shall cause its contractor(s), subcontractors, and subrecipients, if any, to indemnify, defend, save and hold harmless SEAGO, the state of Arizona, any jurisdiction or agency issuing any permits for any services arising out of this Contract, and their respective directors, officers, officials, agents, and employees (hereinafter referred to as "Indemnitee") from and against any and all claims, actions, liabilities, damages, losses, or expenses (including court costs, attorneys' fees, and costs of claim processing, investigation and litigation) (hereinafter referred to as "Claims") for bodily injury or personal injury (including death), or loss or damages to tangible or intangible property to the extent caused, or alleged to be caused by the negligent or willful acts or omissions of the Consultant's contractor or subrecipient or any of the directors, officers, agents, or employees or subcontractors of such contractor or subrecipient. This indemnity includes any claim or amount arising out of or recovered under the Workers' Compensation Law or arising out of the failure of such contractor or subrecipient to conform to any federal, state or local law, statute, ordinance, rule, regulation or court decree. It is the specific intention of the parties that the Indemnitee shall, in all instances, except for claims arising from the negligent or willful acts or omissions of the Indemnitee, be indemnified by such contractor or subrecipient from and against any and all claims.
16. **FORCE MAJEURE:**
- (a) Except for payment of sums due, neither party shall be liable to the other, nor deemed in default under this Contract, if, and to the extent that, such party's performance of the Contract is prevented by reason of Force Majeure. The term "Force Majeure" means an occurrence that is beyond the control of the party affected and occurs without its fault or negligence. Without limiting the foregoing, Force Majeure includes acts of God; acts of the public enemy; war; riots; strikes; mobilization; labor disputes; civil disorders; fire; floods;

lockouts; injunctions, intervention, acts, or failures or refusal to act by government authority; and other similar occurrences beyond the control of the party declaring Force Majeure, which such party is unable to prevent by exercising reasonable diligence. The Force Majeure shall be deemed to commence when the party declaring Force Majeure notifies the other party in writing of the existence of the Force Majeure and shall be deemed to continue as long as the results or effects of the Force Majeure prevent the party from resuming performance in accordance with this Contract.

- (b) Force Majeure shall not include late performance by a sub-firm, unless the delay arises out of a Force Majeure occurrence in accordance with this Force Majeure term and condition.
- (c) Any delay or failure in performance by either party hereto shall not constitute default hereunder or give rise to any claim for damages or loss of anticipated profits if, and to the extent that, such delay or failure is caused by Force Majeure.
- (d) If either party is delayed at any time in the progress of the services by Force Majeure, then the delayed party shall notify the other party in writing of such delay within forty-eight (48) hours of commencement thereof, and shall make a specific reference to this article, thereby invoking its provisions. The delayed party shall cause such delay to cease as soon as practicable and shall notify the other party in writing when it has done so. The time of completion may be extended by contract modification for a period of time equal to the time that the results or effects of such delay prevent the delayed party from performing in accordance with this Contract.

17. **RIGHT TO ASSURANCE:** Whenever one party to this Contract in good faith has reason to question the other party's intent to perform, he may demand that the other party give a written assurance of this intent to perform. In the event that a demand is made and no written assurance is given within five (5) days, the demanding party may treat this failure as an anticipatory repudiation of the Contract.
18. **RECORDS:** The Consultant shall retain, and shall contractually require each sub-firm to retain, reports, files, project activities, and other records relating to the acquisition and performance of the Contract for a period of three (3) years after the completion of the Contract. All such documents shall be subject to inspection and audit at reasonable times during normal business hours. Upon request, a legible copy of any or all such documents shall be produced at the request of SEAGO, and any other person or agency authorized by SEAGO.
19. **WARRANTIES:** The Consultant warrants that all services performed under this Contract will be performed in a manner consistent with that degree of care and skill ordinarily exercised by members of the same profession currently practicing under similar circumstances. Mere acceptance of the service specified, and any inspection incidental thereto by SEAGO, shall not alter or affect the obligations of the Consultant or the rights of SEAGO under the foregoing warranties.
20. **ADVERTISING:** Consultant shall not advertise or publish information concerning this Contract without prior written consent of the SEAGO.
21. **TERMINATION BY SEAGO:** SEAGO may cancel this Contract without penalty or further obligation pursuant to A.R.S. §38-511, if any person significantly involved in initiating,

negotiating, securing, drafting, or creating the Contract on behalf of SEAGO is or becomes, at any time while the Contract or any extension of the Contract is in effect, an employee or agent of any other party to the Contract in any capacity, or a consultant to any other party to this Contract with respect to the subject matter of the Contract. Such cancellation shall be effective when written notice from SEAGO is received by the Consultant, unless the notice specifies a later time.

22. TERMINATION BY THE SEAGO FOR CAUSE:

- (a) SEAGO, in its sole discretion, may terminate the Contract if the Consultant:
 - i. Does not fulfill contract elements by due date;
 - ii. Disregards laws, ordinances, rules, regulations, or orders of a public authority having jurisdiction;
 - iii. Otherwise is guilty of a breach of a provision of the Contract or other contract documents; or
 - iv. Fails or refuses to provide detailed billing invoices verifying tasks accomplished.
- (b) When any of the above reasons exist, SEAGO may without prejudice to the other rights or remedies of SEAGO, and after giving the Consultant thirty (30) days written notice, terminate the Contract with the Consultant, and may finish the services by whatever reasonable method SEAGO may deem expedient. If the unpaid balance of the Contract exceeds costs of finishing the Contract, including all expenses made necessary thereby, the Consultant shall be entitled to receive payment for its performance and for reasonable overhead, profit, and damages associated with such, up to the amount of such excess. If such completion costs exceed the unpaid balance, the Consultant shall pay the difference to SEAGO within thirty (30) days of invoice from SEAGO.
- (c) In the event of any termination, all finished or unfinished documents, data, studies, models, photographs, applications, and reports prepared by the Consultant under this Contract shall, at the option of SEAGO, become SEAGO's property, and the Consultant shall be entitled to receive just and equitable compensation for any services satisfactorily completed.
- (d) Notwithstanding the above, the Consultant shall not be relieved of liability to SEAGO for damages sustained by SEAGO by virtue of any breach of the Contract by the Consultant, and SEAGO may withhold any payments to the Consultant for the purpose of set-off, until such time as the exact amount of damages due SEAGO from the Consultant is determined.

- 23. SUSPENSION BY SEAGO FOR CONVENIENCE:** SEAGO may, without cause, order the Consultant, in writing, to suspend, delay, or interrupt its performance, in whole or in part, for such a period of time as SEAGO may determine. An adjustment shall be made for increases in the cost of performance of the Contract, including profit on the increased cost of performance, caused by suspension, delay, or interruption. No adjustment shall be made to the extent:

- (a) That performance is, was, or would have been so suspended, delayed, or interrupted by another cause for which the contractor is responsible; or
- (b) That an equitable adjustment is made or denied under another provision of the Contract.

24. **TERMINATION BY SEAGO FOR CONVENIENCE:** SEAGO, by written notice to the Consultant, may terminate this Contract, in whole or in part, when, in the sole discretion of SEAGO, it is in SEAGO's best interest to do so. In such case, the Consultant shall be paid for all services provided, and reasonable termination expenses and a reasonable allowance for profit and overhead on its performance; provided, however, that such payments, exclusive of termination expenses, shall not exceed the total contract price(s) reduced by other contract payments previously made to the Consultant, and as further reduced by the value of the performance as yet not completed. The Consultant shall not be entitled to profit and overhead on services that were not provided. The parties expressly agree that this termination right is not a mutual right.

25. **TERMINATION NOTICE:** Upon receipt of a termination notice, the Consultant shall: a) promptly discontinue all services affected (unless the notice directs otherwise); and, b) deliver or otherwise make available to SEAGO, copies of data, reports, applications, and such other information as may have been accumulated by the Consultant in performing this Contract.

26. **TERMINATION BY THE CONSULTANT:**

- (a) The Consultant may terminate the Contract if the performance is stopped for a period of ninety (90) days through no act or fault of the Consultant, its agents or employees, or any other persons performing portions of the project, for any of the following reasons:
 - i. Issuance of an order of a court or other public authority having competent jurisdiction;
 - ii. An act of government, such as a declaration of national emergency;
 - iii. SEAGO has not made payment within sixty (60) days.

If one of the above reasons exists, the Consultant may, upon seven (7) additional days written notice to SEAGO, terminate the Contract and recover from SEAGO payment for its performance, including reasonable overhead, profit, and damages attributable to the performance rendered.

- (b) The Consultant may, upon thirty (30) days written notice, terminate the Contract if the Consultant has evidence that SEAGO or any of its Member Entities is guilty of a breach of any provision of the Contract or any other contract documents.

27. **ACCESS TO INFORMATION:** It is agreed that all reasonable information, data reports, records, applications, spreadsheets, and other documents, as are existing, available, and necessary for the carrying out of the services outlined above shall be furnished to the Consultant by SEAGO, provided Consultant safeguard the same and not otherwise disclose the same to a third party without SEAGO's written permission.

No charge will be made to the Consultant for such information, and SEAGO will cooperate with the Consultant in every way possible to facilitate that performance of the services described in the Contract.

28. **SEAGO'S PROPERTY:** All of the reports, information, data, etc., prepared or assembled by the Consultant under this Contract (unless described by the Consultant in writing and agreed to by SEAGO) are the property of SEAGO and the Consultant agrees that it shall not make available any such materials to any individual or organization without the prior written approval of SEAGO.
29. **REPORTS AND INFORMATION:** The Consultant, at such times and in such forms as SEAGO may require, shall furnish SEAGO such reports as it may request pertaining to the services undertaken pursuant to this Contract, the costs and obligations incurred, or to be incurred in connection therewith, and any other matter covered by this Contract.
30. **CHANGES:** SEAGO may, from time-to-time, request changes in the scope of the services of the Consultant to be performed under this Contract. Such changes, including any increase or decrease in the amount of the Consultant's compensation, which are mutually agreed upon by and between SEAGO and the Consultant, shall be incorporated in written amendments to the Contract.
31. **PERSONNEL:**
 - (a) The Consultant represents that it has, or will secure at his/her own expense, all personnel required in performing the services under this Contract. Such personnel shall not be employees of, or have any contractual relationship with, SEAGO.
 - (b) All of the services required hereunder will be performed by the Consultant, or under its supervision, and all personnel engaged in the services shall be fully qualified and shall be authorized or permitted under state and local law to perform such services.
32. **SUBCONTRACT:** No subcontract shall be entered into by the Consultant with any other party to furnish any of the services specified herein without the advance written approval of SEAGO. All subcontracts shall comply with federal and state laws and regulations, which are applicable to the services covered by the subcontract, as if the sub-firm were the Consultant referred to herein. The Consultant is responsible for contract performance whether or not sub-firms are used.
33. **INSURANCE REQUIREMENTS:** The successful consultant, at its own expense, shall purchase and maintain the herein stipulated minimum insurance. All insurance required herein shall be maintained in full force and effect until all services required to be performed under the terms of the contract is satisfactorily completed and formally accepted. Failure to fully maintain all insurance may, at the sole discretion of SEAGO, constitute a material breach of contract.

The Applicant's insurance shall be primary insurance as respects SEAGO, and any insurance or self-insurance maintained by SEAGO shall not contribute to it.

REQUIRED COVERAGE:

Automobile Liability:

The consultant shall maintain automobile liability insurance with respect to the consultant's owned, hired, and non-owned vehicles assigned to or used in performance of the services. The consultant's insurance will provide primary coverage in the event of an accident or any other claim. Consultants may choose the level of insurance coverage that he or she believes is appropriate, notwithstanding that such insurance must meet the mandatory minimum insurance coverage required by applicable State laws and regulations. However, SEAGO accepts no responsibility for damage to the consultant's personal vehicle. In the event of an accident, the consultant and the consultant's insurance company are responsible for all damage and repair to the consultant's vehicle and are primary for all other claims.

In case any service is subcontracted, the consultant will require the sub-firm(s) to maintain automobile liability insurance with respect to their owned, hired, and non-owned vehicles assigned to or used in performance of the service to at least the same extent as required of the consultant.

Workers Compensation:

The consultant shall carry worker's compensation insurance to cover obligations imposed by federal and state statutes having jurisdiction of the consultant's employees engaged in the performance of the services under the contract, with employer's liability insurance of not less than \$100,000 for each accident, \$100,000 for each employee, and \$500,000 deceased policy limit.

In case any service is subcontracted, the consultant will require the sub-firm(s) to provide worker's compensation and employer's liability to at least the same extent as required of the consultant.

Proof of Insurance:

Prior to commencing services under the contract, the consultant shall furnish SEAGO with evidence of insurance issued by the consultant's insurer(s), as evidence that policies providing the required coverage, conditions and limits required by the contract are in full force and effect.

In case any service is subcontracted, the consultant will require the sub-firm(s) to provide evidence of insurance to at least the same extent as required of the consultant.

Cancellation and Expiration Notice:

If a policy expires during the life of the contract, evidence of renewal must be received by SEAGO fifteen (15) days prior to the expiration date. Insurance required under the contract shall not expire, be canceled, or materially changed without thirty (30) days prior written notice to SEAGO.

SEAGO maintains the right to impose insurance requirements as it feels is appropriate.

34. MISCELLANEOUS PROVISIONS:

- (a) This Contract shall be binding upon and ensure to the benefit of the parties hereto and their respective heirs, executors, administrators, legal representatives, successors, and assigns where permitted by this Contract.
- (b) In any case one or more of the provisions contained in this Contract shall for any reason be held to be invalid, illegal, or unenforceable, it shall not affect any other provision thereof, and this Contract shall be construed as if such invalid, illegal, or unenforceable provision had never been contained herein.
- (c) Subject to the provisions of paragraph 4 of these Standard Contract Terms and Conditions, any action at law or in equity is necessary to enforce or interpret the terms of the Contract; the prevailing party shall be entitled to reasonable attorney's fees, costs, and necessary disbursements in addition to any other relief to which such party may be entitled.
- (d) To the extent applicable under Arizona Revised Statutes Section 41-4401, each Party and its subcontractors warrants their compliance with all federal immigration laws and regulations that relate to their employees and their compliance with the E-verify requirements under Arizona Revised Statutes Section 23-214(A). A breach of the above-mentioned warranty by any Party or its subcontractors shall be deemed a material breach of the Contract and may result in the termination of the Contract by the non-breaching Parties. Each Party retains the legal right to randomly inspect the papers and records of the other Parties' or its subcontractors' employees who work on the Contract to ensure that the Parties or its subcontractors are complying with the above-mentioned warranty.
- (e) Pursuant to Arizona Revised Statutes Sections 35-391.06 and 35-393.06, each Party certifies that it does not have a scrutinized business operation in Sudan or Iran. For the purpose of this Section the term "scrutinized business operations" shall have the meanings set forth in Arizona Revised Statutes Section 35-391 or 35-393, as applicable. If any Party determines that another Party submitted a false certification, that Party may impose remedies as provided by law including terminating this Contract.
- (f) No member, officer, or employee of SEAGO either during his or her tenure or for one year thereafter shall have any interests, direct or indirect, in this contract or the proceeds thereof.



ADMINISTRATIVE COUNCIL PACKET

MEMO TO: ADMINISTRATIVE COUNCIL
THROUGH: RANDY HEISS, EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR
FROM: LARRY CATTEN, ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT PLANNER
DATE: APRIL 25, 2016
SUBJECT: RESOLUTION NO. 2016-02

Attached for your consideration is SEAGO Resolution No. 2016-02. This resolution is for an Economic Development Administration (EDA) partnership planning assistance grant for funds in the amount of \$75,000 to continue the stability and ability of SEAGO to administer the Economic Development District (EDD) program.

The SEAGO EDD utilizes these funds not only for existing planning work but also possible expanded activities which will further the cause of economic development. The SEAGO EDD will utilize the grant proceeds, and requisite matching funds to implement and sustain regional solutions to promote healthy, economic development throughout the four counties of the SEAGO region.

The Resolution pledges \$35,357 to provide matching funds for the EDA partnership planning grant and related economic development activities. The match is funded through an Economic Development Assessment paid by SEAGO member entities.

Attachment: Resolution No. 2016-02

Action Requested: Information Only Action Requested Below:

A motion to recommend to the Executive Board approval of Resolution 2016-02 for an EDA Partnership Planning Assistance Grant in the amount of \$75,000 and matching funds of \$35,357 funded through assessments paid by SEAGO member entities.



SouthEastern Arizona Governments Organization

Serving our member governments and their constituents since 1972

RESOLUTION NO. 2016-02

A RESOLUTION OF THE SOUTHEASTERN ARIZONA GOVERNMENTS ORGANIZATION AUTHORIZING SUBMISSION OF AN APPLICATION FOR FY 2017 PARTNERSHIP PLANNING ASSISTANCE GRANT FUNDS FROM THE ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT ADMINISTRATION

WHEREAS, the SouthEastern Arizona Governments Organization (SEAGO) has been designated by the Economic Development Administration (EDA) as an Economic Development District (EDD) for the four-county region of Cochise, Graham, Greenlee, and Santa Cruz Counties; and

WHEREAS, the SouthEastern Arizona Governments Organization is desirous of expanding activities which continue to advance the economic development of these four counties; and

WHEREAS, the Economic Development Administration of the U.S. Department of Commerce has partnership planning assistance grants which will cultivate long-range and regional planning among the SEAGO member entities to alleviate economic distress; and

WHEREAS, the current economic stress in these four counties is demonstrated by the continued depletion of full time high-wage jobs, continuing foreclosure stress on commercial and residential properties, unresolved international border issues, unacceptable unemployment levels, and persistent low/median family incomes in the majority of the SEAGO Region.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that the SEAGO Executive Board hereby authorizes an application be made to the U.S. Department of Commerce, EDA for a 2016-2017 planning grant in the amount of \$75,000; and

THAT, up to \$35,357 is hereby committed to assure that SEAGO meets the matching funds requirement for the EDA grant, funded through annual assessment (membership) dues paid by its members; and

THAT, SEAGO's Executive Director is authorized to sign and execute all application forms, contracts, or documents for the receipt and use of these funds.

Passed and adopted by the SEAGO Executive Board on this 20th day of May 2016.

SEAGO Member Entities

Cochise County

Benson

Bisbee

Douglas

Huachuca City

Sierra Vista

Tombstone

Willcox

Graham County

Pima

Safford

San Carlos

Apache Tribe

Thatcher

Greenlee County

Clifton

Duncan

Santa Cruz County

Nogales

Patagonia

SEAGO Main Office

Administration

CDBG

Economic Dev.

Housing

Transportation

1403 W. Hwy 92

Bisbee, AZ 85603

520-432-5301

520-432-5858 Fax

Area Agency on Aging Office

300 Collins Road

Bisbee, AZ 85603

520-432-5301

520-432-9168 Fax

www.seago.org

Randy Heiss, Executive Director
SouthEastern Arizona
Governments Organization

Gerald (Sam) Lindsey, Chair
Executive Board



ADMINISTRATIVE COUNCIL PACKET

MEMO TO: ADMINISTRATIVE COUNCIL
THROUGH: RANDY HEISS, EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR
FROM: CINDY OSBORN, ACCOUNTS MANAGER
DATE: APRIL 26, 2016
SUBJECT: FY17 BUDGET

The assumptions in the FY17 budget are as follows:

- The Transportation program has been awarded an additional \$420,000 by ADOT for two additional services. The majority of the work will be contracted.
- Estimated Housing funding of only \$15,000 will require a 50% reduction in Housing program services.
- There is fund balance use of \$24,000 in the proposed budget. This amount is required to continue Housing program services at 50% of the current level.
- A salary increase for all employees is not sustainable at this time.
- Any fund balance use required for the regional grant services program will be added to the budget upon approval by the Executive Board.

The proposed FY17 budget worksheet included in this packet provides a detailed overview of each program's budget. Program Managers participated in the development of their program(s) budget and successful budget implementation will depend on diligent monitoring of revenue and expenditures by each Program Manager.

Attachments: Proposed FY17 Budget

Action Requested: Information Only Action Requested Below:

A motion to recommend approval of the FY17 Budget to the Executive Board.

SEAGO
FY17 Proposed Budget

	ADEQ	CDBG	ED	Housing Admin	Housing HUD Counsel	Elderly Transit	Public Transit	SPR	RMM	RMM Trng	Safety Plan	Traffic	Route Study	AAA Admin	AAA AM5	AAA SHIP	AAA SMP	AAA HPR	AAA LTC	Agency Response	Central Admin	Total
Revenues																						
Federal/State	5,400	20,000	75,000	-	15,000	20,000	20,000	125,000	125,000	150,000	320,620	30,000	64,000	221,111	16,456	25,929	14,155	17,362	52,198	-	-	1,317,231
Local	-	99,857	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	99,857
Assessment	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	78,527	78,527
Assessment Transfer	-	-	35,357	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	(35,357)	-
Use of Fund Balance	-	-	-	24,000	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	24,000
In-Kind	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	31,250	31,250	37,500	19,380	1,710	16,000	-	-	2,300	2,200	-	4,500	-	-	146,090
TOTAL REVENUE	5,400	119,857	110,357	24,000	15,000	20,000	20,000	156,250	156,250	187,500	340,000	31,710	80,000	221,111	16,456	28,229	16,355	17,362	56,698	43,170	-	1,665,705
Expenditures																						
Salary/Wages	1,999	61,670	55,583	6,772	11,273	9,667	9,667	55,043	69,346	13,251	2,156	1,083	5,977	89,946	9,973	24,356	7,275	8,320	23,296	16,656	76,202	559,512
ERE	686	27,295	23,666	3,724	7,356	2,869	2,869	19,049	18,437	4,389	755	378	1,721	30,248	3,158	11,172	3,337	3,396	9,518	5,717	27,076	206,815
Audit	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	21,950	21,950
Purchased Services	-	190	1,138	546	900	1,200	962	3,525	1,400	119,500	315,000	28,000	51,284	4,500	-	100	-	-	-	1,831	4,300	534,376
Supplies	-	125	200	400	-	150	25	1,750	1,200	1,000	472	-	750	1,500	-	350	-	200	400	600	2,714	11,836
Postage	-	700	25	75	-	-	100	50	25	-	-	-	25	250	-	100	-	140	150	100	500	2,240
Copy	-	800	200	70	-	50	2,000	250	250	1,000	500	-	500	2,000	-	200	-	200	50	100	525	8,695
Travel	2,253	8,400	7,000	500	-	1,637	-	10,736	5,272	4,331	1,120	231	1,395	17,614	-	4,500	-	1,000	5,800	5,000	3,200	79,989
Meals	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1,000	-	1,000
Phone	-	400	600	250	-	-	-	540	1,680	-	-	-	-	2,500	-	550	-	230	400	300	4,500	11,950
Internet Charges	-	150	200	200	-	-	-	700	400	-	-	-	-	2,000	-	600	-	-	-	-	1,500	5,750
Utilities	-	212	200	200	-	-	-	200	300	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	3,000	4,112
Equip Maintenance	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	850	-	-	-	-	-	-	1,000	1,850
Equipment Purchase	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1,898	900	400	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	3,198
Advertising	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	325	-	-	-	500	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	825
Dues/Subscriptions	-	-	2,500	-	-	-	450	12,000	250	-	-	-	-	5,100	-	-	-	-	-	6,000	-	26,300
Miscellaneous	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	14	-	14
Insurance	-	175	150	165	-	-	-	152	291	-	-	-	-	800	-	-	-	-	-	-	6,000	7,733
Conferences/Training	-	500	1,500	-	-	1,500	1,000	3,550	1,300	1,200	-	-	-	500	-	100	-	25	1,800	2,000	2,000	16,975
Allocated Indirect	462	18,640	16,946	1,717	4,291	2,927	2,927	15,097	22,800	4,930	616	308	1,849	35,341	3,325	11,862	3,543	3,851	10,784	3,851	(166,067)	-
Depreciation	-	600	450	561	-	-	-	460	825	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	11,600	14,496
In-Kind	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	31,250	31,250	37,500	19,380	1,710	16,000	-	-	2,300	2,200	-	4,500	-	-	146,090
TOTAL EXPENDITURES	5,400	119,857	110,357	15,180	23,820	20,000	20,000	156,250	156,250	187,500	340,000	31,710	80,000	193,150	16,456	56,190	16,355	17,362	56,698	43,170	(0)	1,665,705
Surplus/(Deficit)	(0)	(0)	(0)	8,820	(8,820)	0	0	(0)	0	(0)	0	(0)	(0)	27,961	(0)	(27,961)	0	0	(0)	(0)	0	(0)



ADMINISTRATIVE COUNCIL PACKET

MEMO TO: ADMINISTRATIVE COUNCIL
FROM: RANDY HEISS, EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR
DATE: APRIL 26, 2016
SUBJECT: SUSTAINABILITY OF THE SEAGO FUND BALANCE

The purpose of this memorandum is to enable the Administrative Council and Executive Board to better understand the use of fund balance in prior years, the amount of fund balance currently available, and to provide a projection of how long uses of fund balance may be sustained. This information is intended to guide decisions as to how much of the fund balance should be used in balancing the annual budget. The table below provides an overview of the use of fund balance over the last seven fiscal years:

Fund Balance Use ¹			
Fiscal Year Ending	Beginning Balance	Ending Balance	Use of Fund Balance
6/30/09	\$ 1,681,043	\$ 1,921,455	\$ 240,412
6/30/10	\$ 1,921,455	\$ 1,877,819	(\$ 43,636)
6/30/11 (Restated ²)	\$ 1,451,014	\$ 1,297,124	(\$ 153,890 ³)
6/30/12	\$ 1,297,124	\$ 1,298,000	\$ 876
6/30/13	\$ 1,298,000	\$ 1,136,413	(\$ 161,587 ⁴)
6/30/14	\$ 1,136,413	\$ 1,319,039	\$ 182,626
6/30/15	\$ 1,319,039	\$ 1,382,732	\$ 63,693

The fund balance policy established by the Executive Board on February 27, 2015 sets the minimum unrestricted fund balance in its General Fund at 50 percent of the prior fiscal year's total actual operating expenditures. In FY 2015, the most recent year for which final figures are available, actual operating expenditures were **\$1,038,881**. Fifty percent of the FY 2015 actual operating expenditures is **\$519,440**. The amount of fund balance available at the end of FY 2015 (\$1,382,732) amounts to **133%** of that year's actual operating expenditures. Under this scenario, there would conceptually be **\$863,292** available for use in future budget years before the minimum level of fund balance is reached. The table on the following page provides an overview of how long it would take to reduce the existing fund balance of \$1,382,732 to \$519,440 under a number of different scenarios:

¹ With the exception of FY 15, all figures are from audited financial statements for said years.

² In FY 11, the Arizona Department of Housing eliminated SEAGO from the Save My Home Program and recovered \$426,804 on deposit with SEAGO so that this funding could be used for foreclosure prevention assistance in the urban counties.

³ Approximately \$152,000 of this amount was from the purchase of the SEAGO office building and associated land.

⁴ Building improvements plus amounts approved for program use in the FY 13 budget process.

Impact of Fund Balance Use	
Annual Use of Fund Balance	Number of Years
\$ 5,000 per year	173
\$ 10,000 per year	86
\$ 15,000 per year	58
\$ 20,000 per year	43
\$ 25,000 per year	35
\$ 30,000 per year	29
\$ 35,000 per year	25
\$ 40,000 per year	22
\$ 45,000 per year	19
\$ 50,000 per year	17

As shown in the table above, SEAGO will be able to operate for a considerable period of time with moderate use of fund balance and still maintain an operating reserve of \$519,440. However, because almost all of SEAGO's programs operate on a cost reimbursement basis, there is very limited excess revenue generated that can be used to cover any expenses in excess of program revenues. As a Council of Governments, SEAGO has no taxation authority, and other than the annual assessment to our member entities, SEAGO has no significant or sustainable source of unrestricted revenue. Therefore, at this time, there is no use of fund balance that is 'sustainable' in the purest sense of the term.

As a result, SEAGO intends to adhere to the following guidelines to sustain the existing fund balance for as long as possible:

- 1) Track the use of fund balance annually in order to monitor the level of fund balance available for future years.
- 2) Present annual budgets that minimize the use of fund balance to the extent practicable.
- 3) Clearly identify any proposed use of fund balance in the annual budget approval process so that the Administrative Council and Executive Board have the option to control the amount of fund balance used.
- 4) Operate programs within their approved budgets and evaluate accordingly.
- 5) Continue seeking new grants and funding sources, and/or developing new programs and services that generate excess revenue to replenish any fund balance used.
- 6) Expense depreciation of buildings and improvements to the benefiting programs and use those funds to replenish the fund balance that was used for the buildings and improvements.

Attachments: None

Action
Requested:

Information Only

Action Requested Below:



ADMINISTRATIVE COUNCIL PACKET

MEMO TO: ADMINISTRATIVE COUNCIL
THROUGH: RANDY HEISS, EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR
FROM: BONNIE WILLIAMS, CDBG PROGRAM MANAGER
DATE: APRIL 21, 2016
SUBJECT: FISCAL YEAR 2016 CDBG APPLICATIONS

For those of you who are unfamiliar with the CDBG application process, it began months ago with the two required hearings for public participation. From the start of the public participation process to the conclusion of a project is usually three years.

The deadline for submitting this year's applications to SEAGO is now July 1. I will continue to be in frequent contact with the designated CDBG contact person from all applicant communities to assist them with the planning, budgeting and preparation of their applications. After they are submitted to SEAGO, I will review and revise each application as needed, in preparation for submittal to the Arizona Department of Housing (ADOH).

With the Executive Board's approval, I will submit all applications to the ADOH CDBG Program by the deadline of August 1. ADOH staff will review each application and be in contact with your CDBG contact person when that process is complete. Receiving a contract from ADOH may take until the end of the year or longer, as now ADOH is requiring that the Environmental Review be completed before they will fund the project.

Based on the Letters of Intent submitted April 1, following is a list of the FY 2016 applications which will be submitted to SEAGO, for which I seek your recommendation for approval to submit to our Executive Board and ADOH:

Cochise County: \$231,778 for building improvements to the Southern AZ Children's Haven building in Huachuca City and building improvements to the Rural Accent Bowie Community Center and Food Pantry.

Huachuca City: \$231,778 for water system storage tank upgrades

Thatcher: \$195,450 for ADA improvements to several parks

Patagonia: \$314,946 for water system upgrades

Duncan: \$100,000 for sewer system upgrades

Please be aware that ADOH has the final authority to award these projects. Communities must submit eligible, affordable and compliant project applications, and demonstrate the capacity to administer and complete them within the projected budget. Failure to do so may result in non-award, with the funds rolled into the State Special Projects (SSP) account. Please contact me if you have any questions.

Attachment: None

Action Requested: Information Only Action Requested Below

A motion to recommend approval of these projects to the Executive Board and to forward these applications to ADOH by August 1.



ADMINISTRATIVE COUNCIL PACKET

MEMO TO: ADMINISTRATIVE COUNCIL
THROUGH: RANDY HEISS, EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR
FROM: LAURA VILLA, AAA PROGRAM MANAGER
DATE: APRIL 26, 2016
SUBJECT: FY 2017 AAA SUBAWARD RENEWAL RECOMMENDATIONS

Prior to the start FY 2015, the AAA solicited proposals for Congregate Meals, Home Delivered Meals, Housekeeping, Personal Care, Home Nursing, Community Nursing, In-Home Respite, Legal Assistance, Transportation, Case Management, Caregiver Outreach/Training, Caregiver Adaptive Aids, and Caregiver Home Repair. Subaward agreements developed pursuant to the Request for Proposals were issued for FY 2015, with an option to renew subawards for up to an additional 4 years as was expressed in the RFP. Subaward renewals were issued in FY 2016 based on the recommendations developed by staff and approved by the Administrative Council and Executive Board.

The Executive Board must consider our tentative subaward renewal recommendations at their meeting on May 20th so that subaward agreements can be in place and services begun by July 1st. Based on the initial funding available from the Arizona Department of Economic Security (ADES) for the AAA services listed above, we have developed recommendations for subaward renewal funding for Fiscal Year 2017. These initial funding levels may be increased or decreased based on subaward negotiations, alerts from ADES, or to reallocate units to areas of greater need in order to better manage the carryover of funds.

Staff requests your support of the attached recommendations for Fiscal Year 2017 subaward renewals. I will attempt to answer any questions you may have at the meeting.

Attachment: Fiscal Year 2017 Subaward Renewal Recommendations

Action Requested: Information Only Action Requested Below

A motion to recommend approval of the proposed Fiscal Year 2017 AAA subaward renewal recommendations to the Executive Board.

AAA FY 2017 Contract Award Recommendations

Case Management			
Provider	Service	Service Area	Contract Amount
Cochise Health and Social Services	Case Management	Cochise County - All	\$ 186,944
	Caregiver Case Management	Cochise County - All	\$ 38,000
Greenlee County Health Department	Case Management	Greenlee County - All	\$ 23,773
Santa Cruz County Public Fiduciary	Case Management	Santa Cruz County - All	\$ 45,383
Southeastern Arizona Community Unique Services	Case Management	Graham County - All	\$ 45,000

Home Care Cluster			
Provider	Service	Service Area	Contract Amount
Accent Care	Housekeeping	Cochise County - All	\$ 137,853
	Personal Care		\$ 55,000
	In-home Respite		\$ 16,000
Accent Care	Housekeeping	Graham County - All	\$ 11,000
	Personal Care		\$ 5,000
	In-home Respite		\$ 2,000
Accent Care	Housekeeping	Greenlee County - All	\$ 10,000
	Personal Care		\$ 4,000
	In-home Respite		\$ -
Accent Care	Housekeeping	Santa Cruz County - All	\$ 19,000
	Personal Care		\$ 7,000
	In-home Respite		\$ 1,000
Consumer Direct	Housekeeping	Santa Cruz County - All	\$ 19,000
	Personal Care		\$ 8,000
	In-home Respite		\$ 500
Greenlee County Health Department	Housekeeping	Greenlee County - All	\$ 30,000
	Personal Care		\$ 30,000
	In-home Respite		\$ 2,000
	Home Nursing		\$ 9,000
Lutheran Social Services	Housekeeping	Cochise County - All	\$ 47,721
	Personal Care		\$ 25,000
	In-home Respite		\$ 6,000

Home Care Cluster (continued)			
Provider	Service	Service Area	Contract Amount
Lutheran Social Services	Housekeeping	Santa Cruz County - All	\$ 20,000
	Personal Care		\$ 8,000
	In-home Respite		\$ 2,124
Southeastern Arizona Community Unique Services	Housekeeping	Graham County - All	\$ 85,426
	Personal Care		\$ 38,000
	In-home Respite		\$ 11,000
	Home Nursing		\$ -

Meals Programs			
Provider	Service	Service Area	Contract Amount
Catholic Community Services	Congregate Meals	Benson, Sierra Vista	\$ 45,000
	Home Delivered Meals	Rural Cochise County	\$ 130,554
City of Tombstone	Congregate Meals	Tombstone	\$ 31,756
Douglas ARC	Congregate Meals	Douglas	\$ 15,000
	Home Delivered Meals	Southeastern Cochise County	\$ 205,152
Mom's Meals	Home Delivered Meals	Cochise, Graham, Greenlee and Santa Cruz Counties	\$ 80,853
Santa Cruz Council on Aging	Congregate Meals	Nogales, Rio Rico	\$ 60,000
Southeastern Arizona Community Unique Services	Congregate Meals	Safford, Clifton and Duncan	\$ 45,000
	Home Delivered Meals	Graham and Greenlee Counties	\$ 142,353
Senior Citizens of Patagonia	Congregate Meals	Patagonia	\$ 36,722

Transportation			
Provider	Service	Service Area	Contract Amount
City of Benson	Transportation	Benson Area	\$ 20,184
City of Bisbee	Transportation	Bisbee Area	\$ 25,000

Transportation (continued)			
Provider	Service	Service Area	Contract Amount
City of Douglas	Transportation	Douglas	\$ 38,000
Southeastern Arizona Community Action Program	Transportation	Safford, Clifton, and Duncan areas	\$ 35,000

Other Services			
Provider	Service	Service Area	Contract Amount
Cochise Health and Social Services	Caregiver Training	Cochise County - All	\$ 2,971
	Caregiver Outreach		\$ 4,113
Greenlee County Health Department	Caregiver Training	Greenlee County-All	\$ 743.0
	Caregiver Outreach		\$ 1,029
Santa Cruz County Public Fiduciary	Caregiver Training	SantaCruz County-All	\$ 743
	Caregiver Outreach		\$ 1,029
Southeastern Arizona Community Unique Services	Caregiver Training	Graham County-All	\$ 743
	Caregiver Outreach		\$ 1,029
Southeastern Arizona Community Unique Services	Adaptive Aids	Graham County - All	\$ 6,500
	Caregiver Home Repair		\$ 3,000
		Cochise, Graham, Greenlee and Santa Cruz Counties	
Southern Arizona Legal Aid			\$ 13,200
Unobligated Funds	Congregate	Cochise, Graham, Greenlee and Santa Cruz Willcox	\$ 75,000
	Transportation		\$ 10,000
			\$ 1,979,398



ADMINISTRATIVE COUNCIL PACKET

MEMO TO: ADMINISTRATIVE COUNCIL
FROM: RANDY HEISS, EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR
DATE: APRIL 25, 2015
SUBJECT: CONSIDERATION OF RESOLUTION NO. 2016-03

In April of 2012, SEAGO passed Resolution No. 2012-02 supporting and advocating for resources to improve Arizona's ports of entry with Mexico, including improvements to the Douglas Port of Entry, Chino Road and associated infrastructure. In February of 2015, SEAGO passed Resolution No. 2015-02 supporting the City of Douglas' plans to move forward in partnership with the City of Agua Prieta, Sonora to build a new commercial Land Port of Entry (LPOE), and supporting its Section 559 Donation Acceptance Authority Proposal to U.S. Customs and Border Protection (CBP).

After much effort by the City of Douglas in preparing and submitting the Section 559 Donation Acceptance Authority Proposal, and lengthy discussions between Douglas officials and representatives of CBP and the General Services Administration, the federal government did not accept the proposal. As a consequence of that non-acceptance, and the reality that the pressure and demand is increasing and will continue to increase on the current Douglas-Raul H. Castro Land Port of Entry, Douglas is continuing to pursue all available alternatives to move the existing port improvements and new commercial port construction projects forward.

The attached Resolution speaks to the need for the new commercial LPOE and improvements to the existing POE facility, and to SEAGO's support for the City of Douglas as it pursues its project initiatives with the State of Arizona, State of Sonora, Mexico, and the U.S. Government. Staff requests the Administrative Council recommend approval of Resolution No. 2016-03 in expressing support for the City of Douglas in its effort improve and expand its capacity to develop an important commercial corridor that will economically benefit all of the SEAGO Region.

Attachments: Resolution No. 2016-03

Action Requested: Information Only Action Requested Below:

A motion to recommend approval of Resolution No. 2016-03 to the Executive Board.



SouthEastern Arizona Governments Organization

Serving our member governments and their constituents since 1972

RESOLUTION NO. 2016-03

A RESOLUTION OF THE SOUTHEASTERN ARIZONA GOVERNMENTS ORGANIZATION SUPPORTING THE CITY OF DOUGLAS EFFORTS TO MODERNIZE AND EXPAND THE CURRENT RAUL H. CASTRO PORT OF ENTRY, AND TO CONSTRUCT A NEW PORT OF ENTRY FACILITY TO ACCOMMODATE COMMERCIAL CARGO

WHEREAS, the size, historic significance, and location of the existing Douglas- Raul H. Castro Land Port of Entry (LPOE) render it unsuitable for significant expansion, cause frequent delays in cross border commerce, and hinder the ability of Customs and Border Protection (CBP) officers to safely and effectively fulfill their operational mandate; and

WHEREAS, inbound commercial traffic at the Douglas LPOE has increased over 25 percent over the past five years, exports, including oversized/overweight mining equipment, have increased 26 percent over the same period, and a recent ADOT analysis suggests truck volumes could continue to increase by more than 6% per year over the next 10 years which will further exacerbate the operational constraints at the existing site; and

WHEREAS, facilitating oversized cargo crossings at the Douglas LPOE requires a complete port shut down of several hours and the current LPOE configuration requires such shipments queue and travel through heavily urbanized areas on both sides of the border, thereby suppressing legitimate trade and travel; and

WHEREAS, the current Douglas LPOE location requires the frequent flow of hazardous chemicals through the urbanized areas of Douglas and Agua Prieta, and the current facility does not have the necessary facilities for spill containment or mitigation; and

WHEREAS, based upon General Services Administration studies, traffic growth is anticipated to continue to grow especially as relates to solar, thermoelectric power, and mining expansions in northeastern Sonora, Mexico, and the existing Douglas LPOE will not allow CBP to adequately meet its mission within the next five years; and

WHEREAS, the City of Douglas is desirous of a solution that will promote and enhance legitimate trade and travel between southeastern Arizona and Northeastern Sonora, and stimulate the economies on both sides of the U.S. /Mexico border; and

SEAGO Member Entities

Cochise County

Benson

Bisbee

Douglas

Huachuca City

Sierra Vista

Tombstone

Willcox

Graham County

Pima

Safford

San Carlos

Apache Tribe

Thatcher

Greenlee County

Clifton

Duncan

Santa Cruz County

Nogales

Patagonia

SEAGO Main Office

**Administration
CDBG
Economic Dev.
Housing
Transportation**

*1403 W. Hwy 92
Bisbee, AZ 85603
520-432-5301
520-432-5858 Fax*

Area Agency on Aging Office

*300 Collins Road
Bisbee, AZ 85603
520-432-2528
520-432-9168 Fax*

www.seago.org

WHEREAS, in order to enhance border security, allow CBP officers to safely and effectively fulfill their operational mandate, and expand economic opportunities for the City and the region, the City of Douglas continues to work with U.S. Customs and Border Protection in continued advocacy, positioning, and pursuit of alternatives for mutually viable methods of LPOE construction and financing, that will provide for the construction of a new commercial LPOE outside the urbanized area, and the repurposing of the existing LPOE.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED:

That in order to foster more efficient cross-border flows, promote the development of retail, manufacturing and tourism opportunities, and create an environment for regional and bi-national sustained job creation and increased tax-base, the Executive Board of SouthEastern Arizona Government Organization:

- 1) Recognizes the value that legitimate cross-border travel and trade brings to the SEAGO region,
- 2) Supports the bi-national collaboration and efforts of the City of Douglas and the City of Agua Prieta to reduce traffic congestion in the urbanized international corridor connecting Douglas and Agua Prieta, and
- 3) Urges the State of Arizona and the State of Sonora to select the modernization and expansion of the Douglas-Agua Prieta Ports of Entry as a priority project for both state governments

BE IT FURTHER RESLOVED:

That the Executive Board of SouthEastern Arizona Government Organization urges the U.S. Customs and Border Protection to include the Douglas LPOE as part of the agency's 5-year capital improvements program and request that the Arizona Federal Congressional delegation continue their advocacy and positioning efforts required for the advancement of this project.

Passed and adopted by the SEAGO Executive Board on this 20th day of May 2016.

Gerald "Sam" Lindsey, Chair
Executive Board

Randy Heiss, Executive Director
SouthEastern Arizona
Governments Organization



ADMINISTRATIVE COUNCIL PACKET

MEMO TO: ADMINISTRATIVE COUNCIL
FROM: RANDY HEISS, EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR
DATE: APRIL 26, 2016
SUBJECT: FUTURE MEETING DATES

The Administrative Council normally meets at 9:00 a.m. on the first Thursday of February, May, August and November at the Cochise College Benson Center, located at 1025 Highway 90 in Benson, Arizona. The Executive Board normally meets at 10:00 a.m. on the Fridays two weeks following the Administrative Council meetings unless there is a holiday, or unless the Board sets an alternative date. The location of each Executive Board meeting is determined by the jurisdiction hosting the meeting, and therefore varies.

Administrative Council	Executive Board
August 4, 2016	August 19, 2016 Greenlee County
November 3, 2016	November 18, 2016 Santa Cruz County
February 9, 2017*	February 24, 2017* Cochise County
May 4, 2017	May 19, 2017 Graham County

*** The February 2017 meeting dates will be moved one week as shown to avoid a conflict with the ACMA Winter Conference.**

Also, below please find the schedule for the combined telephonic Administrative and Executive Committee meetings in the coming 12 months:

Combined Administrative and Executive Committee Meetings (telephonic)
June 2, 2016
September 29, 2016
December 1, 2016
March 30, 2017

Attachments: None.

Action Requested: Information Only Action Requested Below:



ADMINISTRATIVE COUNCIL PACKET

MEMO TO: ADMINISTRATIVE COUNCIL

FROM: RANDY HEISS, EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR

DATE: APRIL 26, 2016

SUBJECT: IMPLEMENTATION OF STRATEGIC PLAN GOALS

Below is a brief report on the implementation of the goals set forth in our FY 2016 – FY 2020 Strategic Plan:

Goal 1, Tactic A - Increase Central Administration Resources: 100% Complete

Goal 1, Tactic B - Procure Professional Grant Writing Services: Tasks 1, 2 and 3 are now 100% complete. I estimate that Task 4, Evaluate proposals, select consultant, enter into contract has slipped from 90% complete to 70% complete.

Goal 1, Tactic C - Prepare and submit a Regional Technical Services Center Grant Application: This Tactic will not begin until Goal 1, Tactic B is substantially complete. Delays encountered in implementing Goal 1, Tactic B may negatively impact the timely completion and possibly the implementation of this goal. Once a funding source is identified, steps may need to be taken to strengthen our position and increase chances of funding being awarded, which could further delay the application timeline.

Goal 1, Tactic D - Assist Member Entities in Developing Local Economic Development Strategies: It's estimated that Task 1, Re-engage / Update list of Strategy Committee members, is now 100% complete. Task 2, Create local Strategy Committees, is concurrent with Task 1 and is at a similar state of completion. Task 3, Convene meetings with local Strategy Committees, is estimated to be 60% complete. Task 4, Develop local economic development strategies and update project lists is approximately 80% complete.

Goal 1, Tactic E - Conduct Feasibility Analysis of Consolidated Regional Human Services: We now anticipate that this Tactic will be initiated late in fiscal year 2017. Delays encountered in implementing Goal 1, Tactic B may negatively impact the timely completion and possibly the implementation of this goal.

Goal 2, Tactic A - Expand Current Public Information and Outreach Activities in Regional Newspapers: 100% complete, and outreach is ongoing.

Goal 2, Tactic B - Same as Goal 1, Tactic A; See above.

Goal 2, Tactic C - Begin Using Member Entities as a Resource to Increase public Awareness: Task 1 under this Tactic is to identify key member entity staff to coordinate efforts with, and Task 2 is to determine most appropriate, cost effective and efficient media / format. After sending letters to each member agency to identify the local staff contacts,

making follow-up contacts to non-responding jurisdictions, we have moved forward with the final task under this Tactic – Implement public awareness campaign. I estimate tasks 1, 2 and 3 are 100% complete.

Goal 3, Tactic A - Same as Goal 1, Tactic B; See above.

Goal 3, Tactic B - Same as Goal 1, Tactic C; See above.

Goal 3, Tactic C - Same as Goal 1, Tactic D; See above.

Goal 3, Tactic D - Same as Goal 1, Tactic E; See above.

Goal 3, Tactic E - Expand and Market Program Services to Advance Sustainability and Reduce or Eliminate Use of Fund Balance: We now anticipate that this Tactic will be initiated late in fiscal year 2017. Delays encountered in implementing Goal 1, Tactic B may negatively impact the timely completion and possibly the implementation of this goal.

Attachments: None

Action Requested: Information Only Action Requested Below:



ADMINISTRATIVE COUNCIL PACKET

MEMO TO: ADMINISTRATIVE COUNCIL
FROM: RANDY HEISS, EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR
DATE: APRIL 26, 2016
SUBJECT: GRAHAM COUNTY EXECUTIVE BOARD PRIVATE SECTOR REPRESENTATIVE

As you are aware, our Executive Board must include private sector representation as a requirement of the Economic Development Administration. Per SEAGO's Bylaws, Private Sector Representatives are appointed from the nominations submitted by the Member Entity Representatives from each county area, and must represent a low income or minority group, or representative organization, or represent the principal economic interests in the region, such as, but not limited to business, industry, finance, utilities, education, the professions, agriculture, or labor.

The Graham County private sector representative position on the Executive Board has been vacant since April of 2015, and it would be greatly appreciated if the Graham County member entities would discuss the situation and bring another nomination forward in time to be placed on the agenda for your August 2016 meeting. Please remember, the private sector representative is only required to meet the criteria in the first paragraph of this memorandum – the nominee does not need be someone associated with the Graham County Chamber of Commerce.

Attachments: None.

Action Requested: Information Only Action Requested Below:



ADMINISTRATIVE COUNCIL PACKET

MEMO TO: ADMINISTRATIVE COUNCIL
THROUGH: RANDY HEISS, EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR
FROM: CINDY OSBORN, ACCOUNTS MANAGER
DATE: APRIL 26, 2016
SUBJECT: FINANCE REPORT

The SEAGO Statement of Revenues & Expenditures for the period March 2016 and FY16 year-to-date is attached. I will attempt to answer any questions you may have regarding the finance report at the meeting.

Attachment: Statement of Revenues and Expenditures March 31, 2016

Action Requested: Information Only Action Requested Below

SEAGO
Statement of Revenues and Expenditures - Unposted Transactions Included In Report
From 3/1/2016 Through 3/31/2016
(In Whole Numbers)

		Current Period Actual	YTD Actual	Total Budget	Percentage of Budget Used
Revenue					
General Fund	101	1,618	(14,524)	(45,500)	31.92%
Agency Response	301	(1,856)	62,583	53,242	117.54%
Community Development Block Grant	302	2,000	68,052	128,282	53.04%
Economic Development	303	9,278	80,079	110,357	72.56%
Housing	305	4,088	59,830	88,665	67.47%
Environmental Quality	306	16	2,237	5,700	39.24%
Elderly Transit	307	1,314	13,958	20,000	69.79%
Public Transit	308	1,009	9,440	20,000	47.20%
State Planning & Research	309	11,792	112,961	156,250	72.29%
Area Agency on Aging	310	29,485	246,986	375,189	65.82%
Regional Mobility Management	311	19,337	119,641	182,247	65.64%
Traffic Count	312	0	11,626	51,042	22.77%
RMM Training	314	14,778	91,901	231,783	39.64%
Regional Strategic Highway Safety Plan	315	0	0	350,000	0.00%
Total Revenue		<u>92,859</u>	<u>864,770</u>	<u>1,727,258</u>	<u>50.07%</u>
Expenses					
Central Administration	201	0	0	0	0.00%
Agency Response	301	2,635	26,043	53,242	48.91%
Community Development Block Grant	302	11,551	79,104	118,282	66.87%
Economic Development	303	9,278	80,079	110,357	72.56%
Housing	305	4,788	59,830	83,620	71.54%
Environmental Quality	306	16	2,237	5,700	39.24%
Elderly Transit	307	1,314	13,958	20,000	69.79%
Public Transit	308	1,009	9,440	20,000	47.20%
State Planning & Research	309	11,792	112,961	156,250	72.29%
Area Agency on Aging	310	29,163	240,946	367,089	65.63%
Regional Mobility Management	311	19,337	119,641	182,247	65.64%
Traffic Count	312	0	11,626	51,042	22.77%
RMM Training	314	14,778	91,901	231,783	39.64%
Regional Strategic Highway Safety Plan	315	0	0	350,000	0.00%
Total Expenses		<u>105,661</u>	<u>847,766</u>	<u>1,749,613</u>	<u>48.45%</u>
Balance		<u>(12,802)</u>	<u>17,003</u>	<u>(22,355)</u>	<u>(76.05)%</u>



ADMINISTRATIVE COUNCIL PACKET

MEMO TO: ADMINISTRATIVE COUNCIL

THROUGH: RANDY HEISS, EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR

FROM: LARRY CATTEN

DATE: APRIL 26, 2016

SUBJECT: RECENT EDD ACTIVITY AND CEDS UPDATE

Recent Activity

While a significant portion of the SEAGO EDD Economic Development Planner's time and effort has been devoted to preparing the 2016 – 2020 CEDS, there have been continuing initiatives to provide meaningful outreach to the SEAGO member communities. Of particular significance are the training workshops that SEAGO has sponsored and organized. The most recent training sessions include:

January 22 – SEAGO sponsored and organized a training workshop for real estate professionals in Cochise County. The workshop acquainted local realtors with the possibility of marketing and selling residential properties to the thousands of Canadian tourists who visit Southeastern Arizona every year, and the best ways to engage those marketing opportunities. The workshop was taught by Mr. R. Glenn Williamson, Canadian Honorary Consul to Arizona and CEO of the Canada Arizona Business Council, and was attended by 25 participants.

February 10 – SEAGO co-sponsored a USDA Grant Opportunities Workshop for businesses in Graham and Greenlee Counties. The workshop was held at Eastern Arizona College (EAC), and the purpose of the workshop was to acquaint local business with two USDA Grant opportunities: 1) Rural Grant for America Program, and 2) Value Added Producer Grant. The workshop was attended by 18 participants.

March 2 – SEAGO sponsored and organized a Grant Writing Workshop for businesses and non-profit organizations in Graham County. The workshop was held at EAC and was co-hosted by the EAC and the Graham County Chamber of Commerce. SEAGO, as the primary sponsor, developed the curriculum for the training session and retained an experienced grant writing instructor for the workshop. The workshop had 30 participants and on focused finding grant opportunities and writing successful grant proposals.

- March 15 – SEAGO partnered with Local First Arizona and the Arizona Rural Development Council to provide a training workshop for the Cochise County Chambers of Commerce (including the Sierra Vista Chamber, Douglas Chamber, Bisbee Chamber, Benson Chamber, and Willcox Chamber). The training included a presentation of ways and means for local chambers to organize and sustain campaigns to support local businesses with “shop local” programs and projects.
- March 23 - SEAGO sponsored and organized a Grant Writing Workshop for businesses and non-profit organizations in Greenlee County. The workshop was held at the Greenlee County Library and was co-hosted by EAC, the Greenlee County Chamber of Commerce, and the Greenlee County Tourism Council. SEAGO, as the primary sponsor, worked with the grant writing instructor to develop and deliver a curriculum specifically focused on local grants available from the United Way, the Arizona Community Foundation, Cenpatico, and Freeport-McMoRan. The workshop was attended by 19 participants.
- May 10 – SEAGO is sponsoring a workshop to acquaint local winery owners in Santa Cruz and Cochise County with the potential for exporting wines to other countries. The workshop will be taught by an export expert from the Arizona Commerce Authority (ACA), and will provide a thorough overview of all aspects of the export business. If participants are interested in pursuing export opportunities, subsequent training and mentoring will be provided by SEAGO and ACA. Invitations to attend the workshop have been delivered to owners of the 25 wineries in Santa Cruz and Cochise Counties.

SEAGO is currently working with EAC and the Graham County Chamber of Commerce to conduct a BIEN workshop. BIEN is a program developed by MAG and co-sponsored by SEAGO, and is an internet based network intended to create a business-to-business e-platform to connect individual businesses across international boundaries. The training will acquaint local business with the opportunity to connect with and engage businesses in Arizona, Mexico and Canada and provide a platform for them to directly contact each other in order to partner and grow their businesses. The workshop will be held in an EAC computer lab so participants can sign up on BIEN during the workshop. It is anticipated that the workshop will be scheduled in late May or early June.

CEDS Update

On February 9, 2016, the CEDS Committee met to begin the process of analyzing the results of the sub-regional SWOT sessions, and developing recommendations for strategies, objectives and tasks for the 2016 - 2020 CEDS. That meeting was very productive in providing SEAGO staff with the foundation for writing the first draft of the CEDS Strategic Goals. On March 14 the first draft of the Strategic Goals was drafted and sent to all members of the CEDS committee for their review and comment. On March 23, CEDS Committee responses were received, and SEAGO staff incorporated

the comments into a second draft of the Strategic Goals. The second draft was sent for CEDS Committee review on April 5 and responses were received and incorporated on April 15. It is anticipated that the April 15 draft of the CEDS 2016 – 2020 Strategic Goals is the final draft of the document.

Attachments: CEDS 2016 – 2020 SWOT Analysis and Strategic Goals.

Action Requested: Information Only Action Requested Below:

SEAGO Staff Request – Attached, please find the second draft of the CEDS 2016 – 2020 SWOT Analysis and Strategic Goals. While it is not required by the EDA as part of the CEDS process, please take the opportunity to review the Strategic Goals, and submit any comments to Larry Catten, lcatten@seago.org. Your comments will be, to the extent possible, incorporated into the document. The entire CEDS document must be published for public comment by May 30, 2016, so please submit comments on or before May 25 so they can be included in the Strategic Goals section of the CEDS document.

Regional SWOT Analysis and Categorical Areas of Strategic Planning Need

Regional SWOT Analysis

Given the geographical and socio-economic diversity of the SEAGO region, the SWOT analysis sessions of the strategic planning process was conducted at a sub-regional level. Members of the CEDS Committee from Santa Cruz County convened in a SWOT analysis session on November 3, 2015; the Cochise County SWOT session was held on November 24, 2015; the Graham and Greenlee Counties joined in a SWOT session on December 3, 2015. Following are the SWOT conclusions that resulted from each of the sub-regional meetings.

Sub-Regional SWOT Analysis

Santa Cruz County SWOT

Category	Issue
Strengths	Weather
	Logistics expertise
	Border trade
	Mexican consumers
	Produce distribution industry cluster
	Airport
	Cultural heritage
	Bilingual community
	Strong local organizations
	Utilities capacity
	Transportation network
	Available labor pool
	Family friendly
	NAFTA Trade corridor
	International trade experience
	Natural beauty
	Proximity to Tucson; I-19 corridor
	Solar energy potential
	Low crime rate
	Wine industry
	Mining
Weaknesses	Lack of and disrepair of roads
	Lack of financial resources to make community improvements
	Lack of political will to raise taxes to address community needs and infrastructure
	Political infighting within and between government jurisdictions
	Business Regulations
	Topography – hills and floodplain
	Untrained/unskilled workforce
	Lack of warehouse space
	Lack of business diversity
	Volatile Mexican Peso
	Wage competitiveness
	Stagnant growth
	Tourist fear of border

	Bad publicity re: perception of high crime
	Poor customer service
	Lack of community beautification
	Spanish as first language – deterrent to tourism
	Inefficiency (delays) at ports of entry
	Insufficient gas line capacity
Opportunities	Improve public relations and marketing
	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Business 2. Tourism 3. Living
	Expand local education opportunities
	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Full scale community college and curriculum 2. More U of A class and degree offerings
	Utilize the Foreign Trade Zone designation of Santa Cruz County
	Improved and expanded road system
	Full staffing of Port of Entry
	Encourage and support environmentally responsible mining
	Encourage and support wine industry
	Encourage and support solar energy projects
	Encourage and support flood plain mitigation to provide more developable land
	Encourage and support city/county as retail destination
	Encourage and support retail diversification
	Diversify industry base
	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Invest in Sonora manufacturing – Santa Cruz County to meet supply chain needs
	Connect Nogales to import/export opportunities with the expanding sea port at Guaymas, Mexico
	Capitalism on medical tourism occurring in Nogales, Sonora
Threats	Negative publicity
	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Human/drug trafficking
	Port of Entry understaffing
	International Banking issues for Mexicans doing business in Santa Cruz
	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Bank closures 2. U.S. Banks not accepting Mexican customers
	Competition from other Mexico/U.S Border Communities (e.g. McAllen, Laredo, El Paso)
	State focus on Metro areas and indifference to border and rural communities

Cochise County SWOT

Category	Issue
Strengths	
	Collaboration of agencies in the County
	Outdoor space
	Cochise College and University of Arizona Sierra Vista
	Regional hospital
	International border with Mexico
	Community events
	Tourism opportunities
	Winter visitors
	Services for the disadvantaged
	Weather
	Birding
	Retirees
	Ft. Huachuca/DOD contractors
	Shoppers from Mexico
	Safe communities
	Family activities
	International business opportunities
	Heritage and History
	Multinational citizens
	Cultural diversity
	Available land for development
	Cost of living
	Two Ports of Entry
	Quality of life
	No traffic
	Strong sense of community
	Dark skies – Star gazing/observatories
	Sister City affiliations
	Public transit is some communities
	Environmental awareness
	Affordable housing
	Clean communities
	Medical services
	Commercial corridor to Mexico/supply chain opportunities
	Significant agri-business – crops and cattle
	Innovative agricultural practices
	Natural resources
	Mining and mining reclamation opportunities
	Competitive wages
	Recreation opportunities
	New bike trail designation
	Ft. Huachuca mission as attraction to existing cyber security companies and start-ups
	Cyber security training and education opportunities
	Some community's proximity to Interstate I-10 interchanges
	Some communities access to rail service
Weaknesses	
	Lack of training of elected officials
	Lack of coordination of elected officials
	Over regulation in some communities
	Bad publicity from border proximity
	Inter-community public transportation
	JTED funding decline
	Funds for tourism advertising
	Lack of county-wide economic development strategic planning and cooperation

	Inadequate economic development investment by communities
	Too much focus on past rather than future opportunities
	In adequate labor pool of people qualified for potential employer's job opportunities (technology, cyber security)
	Some community's distance from Interstate I-10
	Lack of I-10 signage to give reason for travelers to leave the interchange and travel into the County
	Lack of rail service to some communities; particularly serving the Ports of Entry
	Bank closures in border communities
	Dependence on employment by the public sector
	Dependence of Ft. Huachuca as employment base and lack of focus of economic diversity
	Declining local government budgets
	Declining population
	Lack of incentives for business growth and attraction
	Availability of land with infrastructure in place
	Sequestration hurting Ft. Huachuca and local economy
	Lack of customer friendliness and customer service
	Lack of airport development
	Lack of employment opportunities
	Unstable defense market
	BRAC shadow over Ft. Huachuca
	Perception of County as unsafe border community
	Slow reaction to economic development trends and opportunities
	Lack of event coordination between communities
	Fear by local business of new competing business moving into the region
	Border Patrol employees living outside of the area in which they work
Opportunities	
	Growing and attracting Cyber security business
	Business incubator for tech start-ups
	UAS business attraction
	Attracting investment "Angels"
	Gaming
	Seven airports in County available for development and business attraction
	Aggressive grant writing
	International trade with Mexico
	Supply trade business between Mexico and U.S.
	Agriculture innovation
	Agriculture technology
	Foreign Trade Zone
	Wine Industry – growth/ exporting/supply chain opportunities
	Authentic tourism based on region history, and authentic locations
	Localism – farm to table agriculture
	Grow winter visitors opportunity (Villages at Vigneto development)
	Mining and mine reclamation technology development (collaboration with U of A tech Park)
	Workforce development and customization to meet the needs of existing and new business
	Tourism and even collaboration by and between the communities
	Mexico business supply chain – mining, auto manufacturing, aerospace manufacturing

Development tactical training opportunities (paramilitary training)
 Customs and Border Patrol training academy
 Expand community events beyond the community
 Develop destination events
 Develop facilities for conferences
 Grow green energy potential

Threats

Perception of safety along the border
 Perception of lack of water for business, commercial and residential growth
 National economy
 Manpower insufficient for companies to grow and for attracting new companies
 Sequestration
 Lack of positive intergovernmental communication
 Negative publicity regarding border safety
 Too much emphasis on history of area and insufficient attention to future economic growth opportunities
 Poor citizen attitude about community economic development potential (pessimism v. optimism)
 Concern about available water for economic and residential growth

Graham/Greenlee County SWOT

Category Issue

Strengths

Beautiful rural setting
 Weather
 Community college
 - Education opportunities
 - Large employer
 Freeport McMoran (FMI)
 Strong sense of community
 - Small town feel
 - Family oriented
 Strong work ethic
 Mount Graham amenities
 Outdoor recreation
 - Hunting,
 - camping,
 - fishing
 - birding
 Community history and culture
 Historic downtowns
 Prisons
 - employment
 - Gives back to community
 - Improves population numbers
 Agriculture
 Safe communities
 Lack of traffic congestion/good access to community and business
 Safe schools
 Quality schools and teachers
 Family Friendly community events
 Non-burdensome government regulations
 - Quick and easy permitting process
 - Low development costs
 Community college workforce training

Strong and reliable community hospital
 - Quality care
 - Convenient
 - Major employer

Golf course
 Airports
 Diverse cultural community
 Faith based community
 Willingness of community leaders to work together
 Stable employment rates
 Multiple water sources
 Low tax rate and cost of living
 Low crime rates
 Resident's interest in improving community
 Downtown events and activities
 Small business base of both small and large businesses
 Road system
 Desire for revitalization
 Non-profit organizations
 Grant funding organizations

Weaknesses

Small Population
 Difficulty attracting people to live in area
 Lack of business diversity
 Lack of skilled workforce
 Limited affordable housing
 Lack of infrastructure and roads to developable land
 Water quality and water distribution system
 Small tax base
 Lack of community identity/branding
 Limited private property ownership
 Flooding
 Land in flood plain
 Lack of "shop local" support
 People leaving community to live elsewhere
 Lack of will by elected officials to take risk
 Lack of community will to take risks
 Limited art and cultural opportunities
 Lack of assistance to entrepreneurs
 Lack of Foreign Trade Zone
 Constituent reluctance to raise taxes for community needs
 Low per Capita income
 Lack of effective elected official inter and intra government communication
 Dependence on Mine
 Limited private developable land
 Lack of hospitality space (Greenlee)
 Disorganized Chamber of commerce
 Lack of technical education opportunities
 Loss of talent to larger communities
 Lack of higher wage jobs
 Ageing infrastructure
 Limited dining and shopping options
 Remote location
 Inability to attract large companies
 Blight
 Highway 191 as primary road to Graham and Greenlee County from Interstate I-10 is not a 4 line road the entire way
 Limited access to investment capital
 Community resistance to growth and change
 Limited public transportation

Real estate market that has not recovered from the recession
Lack of broadband service
Looking back at how things were rather than forward
Opportunities
Mining supply chain
Rail distribution
Golf course improvements and development around the course
Airport development opportunities
Regional recreation opportunities
- Sports events
River improvements and river recreation
Chase Creek redevelopment and commercial rehabilitation
Clifton Historic Train Depot
Attracting new industry
Expand current business
- Identify
- Provide assistance
More 4 year graduation programs offered by EAC and ASU
Solar Energy
Vitalize the Gila Valley Economic Development corp.
Utilize available industrial development funds
Birding Tourism
Sports Tourism
Recreation Tourism
Develop business incubator
Identify and develop available private land
Threats
Mine Closing
Flooding
Growth of online retail
Lack of inter-governmental communication
Limited private land for development
Leadership/champion burnout
Small population
Limited housing stock
Limited available commercial space
Blight
Small skilled workforce
Lack of government funding/declining local government budgets
Government and citizen resistance to change
Lack of broadband
- Limited distance learning opportunity
- Limited commodity trading
- Limited business development
Lack of community volunteers
Water quantity and quality
Inadequate first responder capability

Categories of Regional Economic Development Potential

To maximize the effectiveness of the SEAGO EDD as a viable and relevant resource in regional economic development, the CEDS Committee developed a list of categories in which SEAGO could put its resources to the highest and best use. The following comprises the CEDS

Committee's identification of economic development category based upon the SWOT analysis.

Strategic Plan Economic Development Categories

Border Trade
1. Supply chain
2. Mexican consumer
3. Logistics expertise in U.S. border communities
4. Key location in Sun Corridor
5. More efficient POE (Nogales)
6. New POE (Douglas)
7. FTZ opportunity
8. Port of Guaymas connection
9. Understand model for successful border communities (e.g. McAllen, TX)
Business Clusters
1. Produce distribution
2. Wineries
3. Agribusiness
a. Technology
b. Innovation
4. Defense contractors
a. Cyber security
5. Mining (Mexico and U.S.)
6. Prisons
7. Passive Energy
Tourism
1. Weather
a. Winter visitors
2. Heritage/cultural diversity
3. History
4. Recreation
a. Hunting
b. Camping
c. Water activity
d. Birding
e. wildlife
5. Sports
6. Natural beauty
7. Tourist fear of border communities
8. Customer service
9. Medical tourism
10. Star gazing
Infrastructure - Utility capacity in member entities jurisdiction (including broadband)
Workforce development
Green Energy industry
Wine Industry
1. Grow industry
2. Supply chain opportunities
Agri-business
1. Grow industry
2. Supply chain opportunities
3. Agricultural innovation R&D
Mining
1. Supply chain opportunities
UAS
Infrastructure
Elected official understanding and support for community economic development opportunities
1. Inter community initiatives
2. Intra government communication, and cooperation
3. Economic Development investment - Costs to facilitate economic development (e.g. infrastructure, quality of life amenities, incentives)
4. Community risk taking
5. Community resistance of growth and change

Port of Entry business opportunities
1. Delays at ports of entry
2. Development of Douglas port of entry
Foreign Trade Zone
Economic development nexus of community and community colleges, and universities with presence in the community
Community events
Standing SEAGO Econ. Dev. Committee to enhance communication, understanding, and cooperation between communities
Business Incubator
Business Diversity
Local First Campaign
1. Buy local
2. Farm to table agriculture
Blight
1. Mitigation
2. Elimination
Rail
Housing stock and availability as an economic development issue
Airport development opportunities
Border patrol training and housing opportunities
Tactical training opportunities

Strategic Goals, Objectives and Tasks

The following Strategic Goals, and accompanying objectives and tasks, are derived from the data and strategic planning process that has been identified in this document. It is important to recognize that many of the following objectives and tasks, as they are incorporated into SEAGO’s annual “Scope of Work”, will require financial resources not currently available to the SEAGO EDD. While not specifically indicating that obtaining additional funding for the SEAGO EDD is a critical and essential goal, the CEDS Committee recognized that implementing the Strategic Goals will require SEAGO staff to aggressively pursue additional and extensive funding sources and assistance to accomplish those goals. It is anticipated that SEAGO will actively and aggressively work to:

1. Identify partnerships with other agencies, organizations, and individuals that can assist in the implementation of the Strategic Goals,
2. Identify agencies, organizations, and individuals that are willing to provide “pro bono” services in Strategic Goal implementation,
3. Identify and pursue additional funding sources, particularly grants, to fully or partially fund Strategic Goal initiatives.

Strategic Goal 1: Improve the Economic Development Climate and Economic Development Capability of the SEAGO Region

The intent of this strategic position is for SEAGO to provide relevant and high quality regional support to economic development practitioners in the Region by improving the Region’s economic base, and increasing opportunities for Regional economic development communication and collaboration.

Objectives

1. Create a SEAGO Economic Development District (EDD) Economic Development Advisory Council that is a functional committee resource to the SEAGO Executive Board.

With regard to community and regional economic development initiatives and opportunities, SEAGO EDD’s activities have not been fully and consistently responsive to the regional resource and support needs of the member entities, and economic development practitioners.

Historically, EDD activities have been under the oversight and direction of the SEAGO Executive Board, and assisted by the Administrative Council. The CEDS Committee has primarily functioned to develop the CEDS document and provide input for annual CEDS updates, but has not functioned as a committee directly involved in consistent and continuous regional economic development activity or initiatives, and has not functioned to enable region-wide economic development communication and collaboration. As a result, it has been difficult for SEAGO economic development staff to gain real and perceived relevance in economic development progress both at the local community and regional level.

It is proposed that a SEAGO Economic Development District Advisory Council be established and structured as an advisory group that can provide direct economic development operational direction to SEAGO staff, and policy recommendations to the Executive Board.

Tasks

- Engage the process of creating an SEAGO Economic Development Advisory Council.
- Develop a comprehensive list of public and private economic development practitioners in the Region.
- Provide a regular and consistent forum for sharing economic development related information, techniques, conditions and concerns in the SEAGO Region among economic development professionals, practitioners and volunteers.

Strategic Goal 2: Enhance Educational and Workforce Training opportunities and Integrate with Regional Economic Development

The CEDS Committee identified three issues that should be addressed to educational and workforce training needs in the region. The identified issues are:

1. The need for workforce development on a regional level
2. The need to address education/workforce development in a unified way amongst and between the educational and workforce development institutions in the Region
3. The need to align workforce development with economic development needs and opportunities

The City of Sierra Vista has begun addressing the workforce development and training needs in the greater Sierra Vista metropolitan area, and has the potential to be collaboratively expanded by SEAGO throughout the Region

Objectives

1. Gather and make available current workforce data within the Region.
2. Work with educational institutions, workforce development providers, and business leaders in the Region to integrate economic development with relevant workforce training.

The CEDS Committee determined that it is imperative that the Region has a workforce that has the educational background and workforce training to meet the needs of existing employers in the Region, and to create a workforce base that is attractive to new business. This is particularly important in conjunction with the CEDS strategy focused on identifying and growing business clusters in the Region (*see Goal 3*). To identify workforce development needs in the Region, and develop a forum for workforce developers, educational leaders, and business leaders is a critical element of sustainable economic growth in the Region.

Tasks

- From available resources, gather and make available current workforce data within the Region.
- Conduct surveys to identify trained workforce needs and availability.
- Identify existing cluster businesses and potential business clusters in the Region and establish forums for leaders in those clusters to address current and future workforce training needs and opportunities.
- Integrate and utilize the knowledge base of workforce forum participants to address current education and training needs, ways, and means to create functional education/workforce development programs and delivery systems that align education and workforce development with economic development.

Strategic Goal 3: Maximize Opportunities to Grow Existing Cluster Group Businesses and Attract Direct and Indirect Cluster Related Business to the Region

An industry cluster is a geographic concentration of related industries and supportive institutions (such as universities and trade associations) that utilize the same extended value chain; share common needs for talent, and use a shared labor pool; require similar technologies and physical infrastructure; and exchange key information/knowledge that can lead to innovation and technological advancements. Consideration of existing businesses in the Region was a consistent topic throughout the CEDS Committee strategic planning process. There was a consensus amongst CEDS Committee members that the Region has assets that have proven attractive to certain types of business endeavors. As a result, there are existing and emerging business clusters that should be identified and assisted in their growth potential. The CEDS Committee discussions concluded that there are possible cluster groupings in the areas of cyber-security, defense contractors, tourism, wineries, agri-business, mining, produce distribution, passive energy, and unmanned aircraft systems (UAS). However, analysis must be engaged to identify the “critical mass” of these potential business groupings, as well as other potential existing and future business clusters in the Region. SEAGO can play a significant role in:

1. Identifying existing business cluster groups in the region,
2. Understanding the Regional attributes that attracts certain business groupings,
3. Developing networking opportunities for businesses within a business cluster,
4. Facilitating ways to enhance the growth of existing businesses within the cluster groups,
5. Analyzing market indicators to identify possible future growth industries and assessing the Region’s ability to position itself to take advantage of potential opportunities

Objectives

1. Identify business clusters in the Region (cluster mapping), along with cluster groupings in Mexico near the border between the SEAGO Region and Sonora, Mexico.
2. Maximize the business growth and business attraction potential of the business clusters.

Tasks

- Identify business groupings with sufficient numbers to be considered business clusters.

- Develop a network of principles /stakeholders/associations in each business cluster grouping to identify and capitalize on individual and collective business growth opportunities, and to attract new directly and indirectly related business that could benefit from proximity to the business cluster.
- Identify ways that the cluster group businesses can collaborate for their mutual benefit.
- Identify education and workforce training needs for the cluster groupings that can be addressed by Regional educational and workforce development entities.

Strategic Goal 4: Maximize the Potential of the Tourism Rich SEAGO Region

Visitors to the SEAGO Region have traditionally been an important source of new consumer dollars circulating in each community. The SEAGO Region is rich with tourist destination locations, as well as historically and culturally significant sites, activities, and events. The CEDS Committee identified tourism and the business opportunities related to tourism as a significant and important economic engine in the Region.

Objectives

1. Maximize Regional tourism destination opportunities and the potential of the Region’s natural assets.
2. Maximize visitation to respective community events and activities by enhancing intra-regional support and attendance, national interest and attendance, and international interest and attendance.

Tasks

- Attract winter visitors to visit and spend additional time in the Region.
- Identify and maximize unique aspects of each community to draw diverse visitors.
- Develop and promote tourism attractions for younger generations and families, such as outdoor, action oriented and extreme adventure venues.
- Assist communities to become more attractive to retirees because of location, retirement amenities, climate, and culture.
- Identify ways and means to promote the Region’s border communities for medical tourism.
- Attract visitors from Mexico and increase the length of stay of day visitors from Mexico into overnight visitors to the Region.
- Attract Northern U.S. and Canadian visitors to visit and extend length of stay in the Region.

- Attract overnight stay visitors from metropolitan areas within a one day travel range of the Region.
- Assist in promotion, cross pollination, and regional coordination of community events and activities.
- Provide customer service and tourist friendly training for local businesses and employees involved with, or benefiting from, tourism.

Strategic Goal 5: Strengthen, Expand and Diversify the Existing Economic Base within the SEAGO Region

The SEAGO Region has experienced a decline in residential population largely because the economy is disproportionately small in size compared to the resident population base, and there are a comparatively small number of export base industries in the Region. The expansion and diversification of the Region’s economic base is a major challenge and top priority for the future sustainability of its sub-regions, counties and communities. An important and significant role for SEAGO is to provide support for the Region’s economic development practitioners and to identify and address economic development needs that are appropriately accomplished at a regional level, or can be assisted by SEAGO at a local level. It is anticipated that sub-regional, county and community economic needs will be continually changing, new and unanticipated opportunities will arise, and new theories and approaches to economic development will require regular consideration. Strategic Goal 1 (above) is a regional approach that is intended to keep SEAGO abreast of the economic needs of the region as a whole, and local community needs.

Objectives

Based on the need for economic development diversification and the need for SEAGO and its member entities to be on the cutting edge of economic development opportunities and advances, viable economic development objectives are:

1. Actively support community business attraction programs.
2. Actively recommend and support economic gardening activities to grow existing business in the region, and identify and assist potential “start-up” businesses.
3. Identify, and work to meet training needs to assist local business in sustaining, stabilizing and expanding their business.
4. Foster the expansion of existing and growth of new business clusters in the region (see Strategic Goal 3).
5. Collaborate with SBA Small Business Development Centers to maximize business start-up services in the Region.

6. Investigate the potential of, and assist communities in development of business incubators that will help serve the economic gardening potential of the community.
7. Develop a strategy to maximize the economic potential of the existing Foreign Trade Zones (FTZ) within the SEAGO Region administered by grantees based in Nogales/Santa Cruz County (FTZ 60) and Sierra Vista/Cochise County (FTZ 139) with particular emphasis on the advantages offered by the adoption of the U.S. Department of Commerce FTZ Alternative Site Framework (ASF) for FTZ 139.
8. Assist in the development of a commercial port of entry in Douglas, and the potential expansion of trade and business resulting from the new commercial port of entry.
9. Identify and apply for federal and private grants that will assist with the Region's economic diversification.

Tasks

- Train local community economic development practitioners, elected officials and community leaders of the need, function, and utility of economic gardening.
- Research the potential for functional and sustainable business incubators in member agencies interested in pursuing an incubator facility and program.
- Train local community economic development practitioners, elected officials and community leaders of the need, function, utility, and successful models of business incubators.
- Identify and promote funding sources for start-up businesses in the Region.

Strategic Goal 6: Leverage Regional Transportation Planning for Economic Base Improvement

Much of the SEAGO Region is at an economic development disadvantage due to inadequate transportation infrastructure connections to the interstate network. Considerable congestion exists on roads serving Arizona's land ports of entry, industrial areas, military bases, and mining operations during peak traffic hours. The lack of public transportation accessibility compared to the metropolitan areas of Phoenix, Tucson and El Paso, Texas, is a significant impediment for developing employment centers in many jurisdictions within the SEAGO Region.

Because of the severe funding constraints, Arizona has been unable to keep pace with transportation infrastructure investments necessary for our State to compete with states with much large resource bases, such as California and Texas. Due to these States' strategic investments in transportation infrastructure, aggressive international trade policies and access to financing mechanisms currently unavailable to Arizona, from 2004 through 2014, California

and Texas have successfully increased imports from Mexico while Arizona's share has remained virtually flat.

Transportation funding sources at both the State and Federal levels have been, and continue to be, inadequate to meet system needs. While Arizona has not adjusted the gas tax for inflation in over 21 years, many other states have been far more proactive by increasing their gas tax, implementing automatic adjustments based on gas prices and inflation, or considering alternative funding measures such as dedicated sales taxes or moving to vehicle miles travelled fee structures. Similarly, the Federal gasoline tax has not been increased since 1993, and the Highway Trust Fund (HTF), into which the revenue flows, has suffered because the tax has not kept pace with inflation. Additionally, improvements in vehicle fuel economy and increased use of alternative fuel vehicles have reduced consumption, thereby reducing gasoline tax collections. The Federal gasoline tax currently generates approximately 2/3 of the funds going into the HTF, and with the recent passage of the Fixing America's Surface Transportation Act (FAST Act); the balance of funds will come from using the Federal Reserve's "surplus" funds, selling oil from the Strategic Petroleum Reserve, and a number of other sources. However, the decision to avoid raising the gas tax or implement an alternative mechanism for transportation funding will mean that the HTF funding gap will only continue to increase over the next five years until the FAST Act expires.

Unlike other States (e.g. the neighboring State of Utah), Arizona's transportation investments have not consistently been driven by a project's linkage to the State's economic development goals; some transportation investment decisions have not effectively been driven by their potential to bring return on investment.

Objectives

SEAGO alone cannot effectively or significantly influence the State of Arizona's policies and practices with regard to transportation planning and project funding. However, SEAGO can be an important collaborative participant with other agencies, organizations, and entities to pursue the following objectives.

1. Develop an Arizona Unified Transportation Plan.
2. Expand existing dedicated transportation funding sources.
3. Enable local option transportation funding sources.
4. Increase access to public transportation systems.

Tasks:

- Convene regional transportation planning experts and identify surface transportation projects throughout the SEAGO Region with strong potential for return on investment.

- Convene public transportation planning experts to identify public transportation investments that will improve mobility to employment centers in the SEAGO Region.
 - Participate at the State level to integrate surface and public transportation projects into a statewide list for prioritization in an Arizona Unified Transportation Plan.
 - Educate State and Local government leadership, business and industry leaders and the general public on the connection between safe, efficient, and properly maintained surface and public transportation systems, and economic development, job creation, and public safety.
 - Develop public information campaigns advocating for the expansion of existing dedicated State and Federal transportation funding sources.
 - Encourage State and Local government leadership, business and industry leaders and the general public to advocate the need to expand existing dedicated Federal transportation funding sources and the benefits to the State and National economy to Federal policy makers.
 - Identify and advocate for local options to raise additional transportation revenues to build and maintain local transportation systems.
 - Seek traditional and alternative funding sources for intercity public transportation connections.
3. Foster border industry entrepreneurship and innovation.
 4. Strengthen retail development and tourism attractions.
 5. Develop and communicate a consistent border region brand and message.
 6. Build border infrastructure and integrated transportation systems that enhance the border region's economic connectivity.

Tasks

- Support and facilitate the U.S. / Mexico Border Mayor's Coalition meetings, activities and initiatives.
- Provide expertise and identify funding opportunities to develop border business attraction planning and action strategies.
- Advocate for Port of Entry related infrastructure for Ports of Entry in the SEAGO Region.
- Advocate for State funded incentives to attract business investment into the border region of the SEAGO Region.
- Analyze current maquiladora and produce industry relationships to develop an asset list that can be used to help attract additional companies that would benefit from similar border business relationships and opportunities.
- Identify infrastructure deficits impeding business selection of border communities for relocation or expansion.
- Identify and pursue possible cross border training opportunities to connect Mexico businesses with businesses in the SEAGO Region.

Strategic Goal 7: Expand SEAGO's Border Region Economic Vitality and Impact by Pursuing Border Related Economic Development opportunities

Much of the SEAGO Region's economy is closely linked to, and benefits from, a strong economic and cultural relationship with Mexico. The SEAGO CEDS Committee recognizes that a strong and vibrant economic and cultural connection to Mexico is essential to the entire region's economic vitality. Business assets along the Arizona/Mexico border, if recognized, promoted and maximized, can produce considerable economic value for border communities, the region, the State of Arizona, and the entire nation. It is critical that the SEAGO Region work to enhance border business and trade opportunities by attracting new investment, promoting economic development, and creating an environment conducive to sustainable economic growth and job creation.

Objectives

1. Develop partnerships by and between border communities in the Region and Mexico for border-targeted business attraction and industry development.
2. Create an environment to enhance business retention and expansion of existing cross-border industry sectors.

Strategic Goal 8: Develop Quality Infrastructure for Greater Economic Development

While most jurisdictions within the SEAGO Region have adequate infrastructure development to meet the needs of their respective residential and commercial segments, it is important to identify and develop the full range of quality infrastructure and facilities to stimulate future economic development capacity and opportunity.

There is a potential for funding from a number of sources that SEAGO has not fully utilized in the past. Creating a short-list of the best locations to grow local and regional industries combined with aggressively seeking funds by SEAGO and its member entities could provide a stimulus for faster development of land and building assets, and enhanced opportunity for economic development. There are a number of potential infrastructure revenue streams that can be linked with economic development initiatives in the SEAGO Region:

1. Community Development Block Grants and annual TIP funds are utilized for transportation, water, wastewater, community improvements, public facilities and housing projects throughout the SEAGO Region.
2. SEAGO member agencies annually make capital investments for a variety of community projects within their respective jurisdictions.
3. Infrastructure funding is available through grant applications to US Department of Commerce Economic Development Administration, US Department of Agriculture- Rural Development, US Department of Housing and Urban Development, US Environmental Protection Agency, US Department of Energy, Arizona Commerce Authority, Arizona Department of Housing, Arizona Department of Transportation, and Indian Communities under Proposition 202.
4. In 2009, the State authorized the use of public-private sector participation in transportation and other public facility investments.
5. Home builders and land developers were active in many areas of the SEAGO Region prior to the 2008 recession. The residential and commercial development community was actively planning and entitling development projects for commercial and residential subdivisions. It is anticipated that both the commercial and residential development communities are regaining a footing in many areas of the SEAGO Region that could result private sector infrastructure development for the benefit of the private projects.

Objectives

1. Support the development of the market-ready and high development potential areas of the Region.
2. Plan and program regional transportation, water, wastewater, public facilities, and telecommunications infrastructure investments to best stimulate the highest and best economic development locations throughout the Region.
3. Support the development of fully improved industrial parks and industrial buildings within the Region, with particular focus on high-potential locations.
4. Support the development of free wireless internet zones in commercial and highly trafficked tourist areas.
5. Support and assist with the development of infrastructure that will spur economic growth in the Region within identified and targeted business clusters.

Tasks

- Develop a list of highest priority and secondary priority locations for infrastructure and facility

investments and for which feasibility studies and development projects can be considered.

- Consider a joint agreement by and between SEAGO member entities on the highest priority and secondary locations to focus upon near-term and mid-term development because of their greatest economic growth impact within the Region.
- Pursue cooperative partnering of SEAGO and its member agencies in assertively seeking funding opportunities from the state, federal agencies, and private funding sources.
- Pursue CDBG funding for certified Colonia communities in the SEAGO Region under the Cranston-Gonzalez National Affordable Housing Act of 1990 for upgrading the housing and infrastructure of Colonia communities.

Strategic Goal 9: Provide Economic Development Assistance and Support for San Carlos Apache Indian Reservation within the SEAGO Region

The CEDS Committee recognized that San Carlos Apache Indian Reservation within the SEAGO Region is disadvantaged, and a long distance from the stronger economic development centers of the Region. It was further recognized that there are instances that the Reservation does not have sufficient resources to devote significant staff time to proactively pursue economic development. While economic development practitioners in the Region are, rightfully and understandably, fully engaged in their respective jurisdictions, there is some potential that SEAGO and its member entities could provide some economic development assistance to the Indian communities.

Objectives

Explore alternative ways of engaging Indian communities and providing economic development support and mutually beneficial initiatives.

Tasks

- Identify ways to engage representatives of San Carlos Apache Indian Reservation in SEAGO's economic development program, including participation on the Economic Development Advisory Council.
- Explore ways for the SEAGO member entities to assist and support economic development initiatives on the San Carlos Apache Indian Reservation.
- Explore ways for the San Carlos Apache Indian Reservation to assist and support economic development initiatives in the SEAGO Region.

Strategic Goal 10: Develop Strong Working Relationships with Public and Private Development Partners at the Regional, State and Federal Levels

The CEDS Committee concluded that the SEAGO EDD has been underutilized in addressing the economic development needs of the member entities and the Region generally. The 2016- 2020 CEDS is an effort to aggressively utilize the staff and tools of the SEAGO EDD to facilitate economic growth in the region. As previously indicated, SEAGO's economic development funding is extremely limited, and constrains SEAGO's ability to adequately and responsibly pursue the requisite economic development strategies. It is essential that SEAGO work closely with public and private partners at the Local, State and Federal levels. To be effective, SEAGO must develop strong partnerships and funding opportunities to address immediate needs and sustain long-term progress, program development, and regional economic growth.

Objectives

1. Stay in frequent and close contact with Federal and State agencies, and keep them current on the SEAGO Region economic development needs and achievements, as well as the needs of its member entities and other regional economic development partners.
2. Continually and systematically stay abreast of funding opportunities provided by State and Federal agencies.
3. Develop strong working relationships with private sources of economic development funding such as utility providers and private foundations.

Tasks

- Explore the potential of retaining the services of a grant writer to identify grant funding opportunities and assist in development of grant proposals as needed.
- Work closely with the EDA's Economic Development Representative in the development of potential planning and development projects and programs.
- Work closely with Arizona USDA – Rural Development in development of potential future projects and programs.
- Continue to grow the partnering relationship with the US Small Business Administration and the local Small Business Development Centers.
- Develop a partnering and collaborative relationship with the Arizona Commerce Authority.
- Identify and work closely with, and establish partnerships with representatives of private entities such as utilities and foundations that can assist in the Region's economic development initiatives.

- Enhance regional relationships with other in-state and out of state Associations of Governments, and regional economic development groups such as Sun Corridor and the Tucson Hispanic Chamber of Commerce.
- Develop a pool for matching funds for grants to fund studies and infrastructure needs for economic development projects.

Strategic Goal 11: Encourage, support and advocate for housing development that has demonstrable economic development benefits in a community

Housing development is not typically considered an economic development engine. Most often, housing development follows and is a consequence of an area's economic growth and prosperity. However, in certain instances housing development can and should be considered an important and viable economic development initiative. This is particularly true in rural areas such as the SEAGO Region. The CEDS Committee considered three circumstances where housing development can be considered an economic development imperative, and should be considered in SEAGO's economic development strategic goals. Those three circumstances are:

1. A community in which insufficient and/or inadequate housing stock is a significant deterrent to attracting business to locate in the community.
2. A community in which there are available jobs, but the housing stock has not kept pace with the job growth; requiring potential workers to either not seek or not accept the available jobs, or preventing employees from residing in the community and becoming part of the community fabric.
3. A community that is appropriately located and can accommodate housing development projects that are of a substantial size, scope, and nature that will attract new investors, residents, businesses, and consumers.

Southern Arizona, with its enviable climate, geography, and environment is a draw for planned developments that include significant amenities and commercial development within the planned community, and have a synergistic effect of attracting businesses desiring close proximity to the housing development. There are communities in the SEAGO region that are favorably located and postured for such housing development.

Objectives

Assist member agencies to identify and support the development of housing projects that are of sufficient size, scope, and nature to significantly add to the economic health and vitality of the community.



ADMINISTRATIVE COUNCIL PACKET

MEMO TO: ADMINISTRATIVE COUNCIL
THROUGH: RANDY HEISS, EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR
FROM: CHRIS VERTREES, SEAGO TRANSPORTATION PLANNER
DATE: APRIL 27, 2016
SUBJECT: TRANSIT REPORT

The following is a brief update involving our transit and Mobility Management Programs:

REGIONAL MOBILITY MANAGEMENT

SEAGO has developed a website specifically dedicated to linking the public and human services providers to transportation resources within the region. The website is <http://www.azmobility.org>.

The Arizona Transit Association and Arizona Department of Transportation held their Annual Conference the week of April 11th, which included their 2016 Excellence Awards ceremony. One of the most prestigious awards presented this year was Outstanding Mobility Manager. The award recognizes an individual, organization, or group that has demonstrated outstanding mobility management planning and efficient administration of federal and state transit programs. This year's winner of the award was SEAGO's Regional Mobility Manager, Connie Gastelum.

On January 27, 2016, SEAGO submitted a Letter of Interest involving a Strategic Grant opportunity with the Legacy Foundation of Sierra Vista. The grant request is for \$600,000 (\$200,000 annually for three years). SEAGO proposed using the Legacy Foundation grant to act as the coordinating agency to promote, expand and enhance transportation access to health services in Cochise and Southeastern Santa Cruz County over the next three years. On February 2, 2016, SEAGO was advised that our Letter of Interest made the final cut and we were asked to submit a full grant proposal for our program. SEAGO submitted a full grant application on February 29, 2016. We should be hearing of a decision by the end of April.

REGIONAL 5310 PILOT TRAINING PROGRAM

SEAGO was awarded a Coordinated Mobility Grant of \$150,000 to continue our training program for FY16. SEAGO has partnered with Sun Corridor MPO, CAG, and NACOG to deliver the program statewide. WACOG has reached out to SEAGO and wishes to partner in 2017.

SEAGO and our consultant, M. Greene Planning & Resource Development has developed workshops involving Developing a Budget, Grant Writing, Grant Management, Data Collection, and Asset Management. Our Coordinated Mobility Training Plan that details the workshop curriculum can be found at: <http://seago.org/?q=regional-mobility-management-0>.

Attendance and feedback has outstanding. SEAGO has averaged 31 attendees per class offered and approximately 93% of the attendees have indicated that following the workshop: "they had the



ADMINISTRATIVE COUNCIL PACKET

MEMO TO: ADMINISTRATIVE COUNCIL
THROUGH: RANDY HEISS, EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR
FROM: CHRIS VERTREES, SEAGO TRANSPORTATION PLANNER
DATE: APRIL 27, 2016
SUBJECT: SEAGO/SVMPO JOINT REGIONAL STRATEGIC HIGHWAY SAFETY PLAN

The following is an update on the progress of our SEAGO/SVMPO Joint Regional Strategic Highway Safety Plan project:

On March 16, 2016, SEAGO entered into a contract with Amec Foster Wheeler to develop our Strategic Highway Safety Plan (SHSP). On March 17, 2016, a project kick-off meeting was conducted with our TAC. The purpose of the meeting was to identify agency needs, refine the scope of work, and finalize the project schedule. A project meeting schedule has been developed in coordination with our TAC. The following is the meeting schedule:

Public/Stakeholder Meetings:

- Initial: June 22, 2016
- Final: April 20, 2017

Local Agency Study Sessions:

- May 24, 2016, 8:30 – 10:30, Graham/Greenlee Counties
- May 24, 2016, 1:00–3:00, SVMPO & Safety Committee, 3:00–4:00 Bike/Pedestrian Advocates
- May 25, 2016, 8:30 – 10:30, Santa Cruz County
- May 25, 2016, 2:00 – 4:00, Cochise County

Executive Board Presentations:

- Final Report: SEAGO - May 19, 2017 in Graham County

SEAGO/SVMPO TAC Meetings

- September 15, 2016
- January 19, 2017
- May 25, 2017

I will be glad to answer any questions you may have at our meeting.

Action Requested:

Information Only

Action Requested Below

capacity to implement strategies outlined in the workshop". Full post-workshop reports can be found at: <http://www.azmobility.org/#!/resources/cd4v>.

COORDINATION GROUP MEETINGS

The **Cochise County** Coordination Group meets at the Public Works Building in Sierra Vista. The meeting is from 10am to 12pm. Cochise County Transit Coordination meetings are held the second Thursday of the month on a bi-monthly basis. On average, 15 organizations are represented including city and county governments, non-profit organizations, and businesses. SEAGO is the Local Mobility Manager for Cochise County and Connie Gastelum is the meeting facilitator. She can be reached at cgastelum@seago.org. A schedule of the Cochise Coordination Meetings and Agenda Packets can be accessed at our Regional Mobility Management website at <http://seago.org/?q=regional-mobility-management-0>.

Santa Cruz County Transit Coordination meetings are held on a bi-monthly basis and normally scheduled the second Tuesday of month at the City of Nogales Public Works Building from 10am to 12pm. There are six organizations that operate transit/transportation services in the county and they are regular attendees at coordination meetings. Connie Gastelum is the LMM. She can be reached at the email address noted above. Meetings and Agenda Packets can also be accessed at the website noted above. A schedule of the Santa Cruz Coordination Meetings and Agenda Packets can be accessed at our Regional Mobility Management website at <http://seago.org/?q=regional-mobility-management-0>.

Graham and Greenlee Counties Transit Coordination meetings are the third Tuesday of each month at the Blake Foundation Café on Main Street in Safford from 10am to 12pm. There are nine organizations that operate transit/transportation services in the two county area and they are regular attendees at coordination meetings. Cheryl Wilson, with Blake Foundation, assists SEAGO in coordinating these meetings. Cheryl can be reached at cwilson@blakefoundation.org

5311 PROGRAMS

SEAGO is a member of the Benson, Bisbee, Douglas and Sierra Vista Transit Advisory Committees. SEAGO has participated in all meetings scheduled by these agencies.

SEAGO has been a very active participant in the Graham County Transit Feasibility Study. SEAGO has participated in the development of a Dial-A-Ride plan that utilizes existing regional resources and enables a lower-cost alternative to a fixed route system. The final report was completed on April 18, 2016. The feasibility report can be accessed at:

<https://www.dropbox.com/s/vkcj08licr6v9h5/Graham%20County%20Transit%20Feasibility%20Study%20Final%20Report%204-16.pdf?dl=0>

In December, SEAGO submitted a FTA Section 5304 planning grant application to conduct a transit study that will assist the cities of Douglas, Bisbee and Sierra Vista in determining the feasibility of an intercity bus route from Douglas to Sierra Vista. In February the grant was awarded. On March 31, 2016, the Admin and Executive Committees approved accepting the grant and approved SEAGO to develop an RFP and select a consultant to assist with plan development. The goal is to have a consultant in place and begin the study on July 1, 2016.

I will be glad to answer any questions you may have at the meeting.

Action Requested:

Information Only

Action Requested Below



ADMINISTRATIVE COUNCIL PACKET

MEMO TO: ADMINISTRATIVE COUNCIL
THROUGH: RANDY HEISS, EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR
FROM: LAURA VILLA, AAA PROGRAM MANAGER
DATE: APRIL 26, 2016
SUBJECT: AREA AGENCY ON AGING REGION VI UPDATES

The SEAGO Area Agency on Aging has completed SFY 2016 Programmatic Monitoring of all its subawards on the service provider side as well as on the case management side in order to be in compliance with DES-DAAS policies and procedures. Area Agency on Aging has sent out the FY17 Subaward Renewal packets to all of its subawards and these are due back by May 23, 2016.

Shi Martin received her certification for Matter of Balance and initiated her coach training in Bisbee on March 30 and completed her first participant training in April with approximately 15 participants. Shi will continue to make partnerships with different fire districts who may be interested in becoming coaches and help their communities raise awareness and take advantage of this free course.

The AZ4A Aging Summit, scheduled for May 19 and 20, 2016 in Flagstaff, has been sold out it is. I thank those of you who helped spread the word in your respective communities. I will keep you posted of where the next Aging Summit 2018 will be held as it is intended to be shifted throughout Arizona regions every other year.

SEAGO/Area Agency on Aging in collaboration from the Alzheimer's Association, Cochise Health and Social Services, Greenlee County Health Department, SEAHEC and EAHEC held their first Caregiver Education Workshops in Douglas and in Clifton. Case Managers Yolanda Thomas and Diane Leaman did a fabulous job hosting this event. Feedback received from those who attended was positive and we are hoping for this to continue in the coming years as the disease is progressing rapidly and more family members and caregivers are in desperate need of support.

SEAGO/Area Agency on Aging has started registrations for its 2nd Annual Aging Conference in Bisbee which will be held at St. Patrick's Roman Catholic Church on Friday June 10, 2016 from 8:30 to 4:30 P.M. This one day event will provide information on: Caring for someone with Dementia through the stages; Meaningful moments-Engaging the person with Alzheimer's; Caring for the Caregiver; SEAGO programs and services; and Long Term Care / Advanced Directives. Again, I ask you if you would distribute this information in your respective communities.

Attachment: Conference on Aging flyer <http://region6-conference-on-aging-2016.eventbrite.com>

Action Requested: Information Only Action Requested



SEAGO – Area Agency on Aging is pleased to invite you to participate in the Region 6 Conference on Aging

“Living Longer; Living Better”

Friday, June 10, 2016


8:30 A.M - 4:30 P.M

Region 6
Conference on Aging
Brought to you by:
The Desert Southwest Chapter
of the Alzheimer’s Association
&
SEAGO—Area Agency on Aging

Friday, June 10, 2016
St. Patrick’s Roman Catholic Church
100 Quality Hill
Bisbee, AZ

The focus groups for our conference will be caseworkers, caregivers, their families, and the general public. There will be plenty of opportunities for networking and outreach.



alzheimer's  association® *Assistance. Advocacy. Assurers on Aging.*
Desert Southwest Chapter



This invitation has been extended to groups and organizations in all 4 counties of our region so space will be limited.

Prospective vendors are asked to provide a door prize in lieu of a registration fee.

Lunch will be provided at the conference.
We are all looking forward to your participation.

Register at:

<http://region6-conference-on-aging-2016.eventbrite.com>

For more information contact us at: 520-432-2528



ADMINISTRATIVE COUNCIL PACKET

MEMO TO: ADMINISTRATIVE COUNCIL
THROUGH: RANDY HEISS, EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR
FROM: JULIE PACKER, HOUSING PROGRAMS MANAGER
DATE: APRIL 25, 2016
SUBJECT: FY 16 HOUSING PROGRAM INFORMATION

The attached table shows the housing statistics up through the third quarter of FY16 broken out by each entity. The table includes both new clients and clients still being assisted from FY15 that carried over to this fiscal year. I continue to work mostly with people who are still having mortgage issues.

Two presentations were conducted for Head Start families in Douglas who are wanting to purchase a home eventually, but do not know what they need to do to get started. The presentations focused on money management and credit.

Board Action Requested: Information Only Action Requested Below

ENTITY OR COMMUNITY	INFO CALLS*	PRE-PURCHASE, DELINQUENCY (non -SOHAZ) POST-PURCHASE, RENTAL, FINANCIAL	SAVE OUR HOME AZ
Benson	29	3	5
Bisbee	26	3	0
Douglas	17	6	2
Huachuca City	12	3	5
Sierra Vista	51	10	14
Tombstone	5	0	0
Willcox	12	1	0
Cochise County	29	6	8
Pima	8	1	2
Safford	23	3	8
Thatcher	6	3	2
Graham County	7	2	4
Clifton	1	0	1
Duncan	0	0	0
Greenlee County	0	0	0
Nogales	22	8	5
Patagonia	5	1	0
Santa Cruz County	22	5	8
San Carlos Apache Tribe	0	0	0

TOTAL CLIENTS COUNSELED:

268

55

64

FY 16 NEW CLIENTS:

22

37