



# SEAGO TRANSPORTATION ADVISORY COMMITTEE

## AMENDED AGENDA FOR SEAGO TAC

<b>Date:</b>	May 18, 2017
<b>Time:</b>	10 a.m.
<b>Location:</b>	Cochise College Benson Center, 1025 State Hwy. 90, Benson, Arizona
<b>Call-in No.</b>	Call Chris Vertrees (520-432-5301 ext. 209) ( <a href="mailto:cdvertrees@seago.org">cdvertrees@seago.org</a> ) 48 hrs. in advance of meeting date for call-in information.

Individuals wishing to participate in the meeting telephonically may do so by contacting Chris Vertrees at (520) 432-5301 extension 209. Contact must be made at least 48 hours before the meeting in order to obtain the call-in information. Please note that the option to participate telephonically may not be available unless requested as instructed above.

Si necesita acomodaciones especiales o un intérprete para esta conferencia, deben ponerse en contacto con Chris Vertrees al número (520) 432-5301, extensión 209, por lo menos setenta y dos (72) horas antes de la conferencia.

<b>Voting TAC Members</b>	Mark Hoffman – ADOT MPD Michelle Johnson –Benson Andy Haratyk – Bisbee Ian McGaughey – Clifton Karen Lamberton – Cochise County Lynn Kartchner – Douglas John Basteen – Duncan	Michael Bryce (Vice-Chair) – Graham County Phil Ronnerud –Greenlee Co. TBD - Huachuca City Juan Guerra – Nogales Dave Teel – Patagonia Jeff McCormick – Pima Randy Petty - Safford	Marvin Mull – San Carlos Apache Tribe (SCAT) Jesus Valdez (Chair) – Santa Cruz County Heath Brown – Thatcher Donna Driskell Tombstone Galo Galovale– Willcox
<b>Guests, Staff, and Other Expected Attendees</b>	Chris Vertrees – SEAGO		

**Shaded items are action items.**

ITEM	SUBJECT	PRESENTER	PAGE
1.	Call to Order and Introductions	Jesus	N/A
2.	Call to the Public	Jesus	N/A
3.	Approval of Minutes of March 18, 2017	Jesus	3-5
4.	STP/HSIP Ledger Reports	Chris	6-7
5.	TIP Report ➤ Discussion and Possible Action on Current TIP • Administrative Changes • Proposed Amendments	Chris	8-11
6.	SHSP Vision Statement Development	Chris	12
7.	SHSP Goal Statement Development	Chris	13-14
8.	SHSP Emphasis Area Development	Chris	15-20
9.	2020 Census Planning Discussion	Karen/Chris	21
10.	FY 18 PARA Call for Projects Reminder	Chris/Mark	22-27
11.	Transit Report	Chris	28
10.	District Engineers' Report ➤ Status of State Highway Projects Quarterly Project Report	TBD	N/A



SEAGO TRANSPORTATION ADVISORY COMMITTEE

AMENDED AGENDA FOR SEAGO TAC

11.	Regional Local Program Reports > Status of Local Projects <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• STP Projects</li> <li>• Update on Enhancement Projects</li> <li>• Update on HSIP Projects</li> <li>• Update on all Planning Studies</li> </ul>	Towns, Cities, Counties, & ADOT	N/A
12.	Items for General Discussion	All	N/A
13.	Items for Next Meeting	All	N/A
14.	Next Meeting Date: May 18, 2017	Jesus	N/A
15.	<b>Adjourn</b>		

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



# SEAGO TRANSPORTATION ADVISORY COMMITTEE

## MEETING MINUTES FOR MARCH 16, 2017

---

<b>Date:</b>	March 16, 2017		
<b>Time:</b>	10 a.m.		
<b>Location:</b>	Cochise College Benson Center, 1025 State Hwy. 90, Benson, Arizona		
<b>Voting TAC Members Present</b>	Randy Petty, Safford Karen Lamberton, Cochise Mark Hoffman, ADOT Jesus Valdez, Santa Cruz Juan Guerra, Nogales	Michael Bryce, Graham Donna Driskell, Tombstone Heath Brown, Thatcher Phil Ronnerud, Greenlee Ian McGaughey, Clifton	Lynn Kartchner, Douglas
<b>Guests, Staff, and Other Attendees</b>	Chris Vertrees, SEAGO Bradley Simmons, Cochise County Tom Engel, ADOT	Scott Kelley, AMEC Mike Blankenship, AMEC Dale Miller, AMEC	

### 1. Call to Order and Introductions

Chair Jesus Valdez called the meeting to order at 10:12 a.m. TAC members, guests and SEAGO staff introduced themselves.

### 2. Call to the Public

Chair Jesus Valdez made a Call to the Public and no one spoke.

### 3. Approval of Minutes of January 26, 2017

Chair Jesus Valdez asked for a motion to approve the January 26, 2017 Minutes.

**MOTION:** Juan Guerra moved to approve the January 26, 2017 Minutes.

**SECOND:** Ian McGaughey

**ACTION: APPROVED UNANIMOUSLY**

### 4. STP/HSIP Ledger Reports

Chris Vertrees presented the STP/HSIP Ledger Reports that were included in the TAC packet on pages 6 and 7.

### 5. TIP Report

Chris Vertrees presented the TIP Report. Chris advised the TAC of the following amendments were administrative in nature and provided for information:

**GGH 12-04 - Graham County - (Reay Lane Canal Ditch Relocation):** This is an HRRRP project. The ADOT Project Manager requested that construction funds be decreased to \$184,200 (a decrease of \$68,000) and that those funds be added to FY17 for ROW. Total



# SEAGO TRANSPORTATION ADVISORY COMMITTEE

## MEETING MINUTES FOR MARCH 16, 2017

---

project costs did not change. The project has been programmed in the following manner: Federal - \$68,000 and \$4,110 Local.

**GGH 13-04 - Graham County – (8th Avenue & Airport Road Intersection):** This project was identified in ADOT's repurposing plan of Earmark funding (Safford Bridge) as approved by Congress as part of the FY 2016 Appropriations Bill. This is an HRRRP project programmed for FY18. The ADOT Project Manager requested that \$700,000 of repurposed HPP funds (100% Federal funds) be added to FY17 for Design and that \$1,377,000 of repurposed HPP funds (100% Federal funds) to FY18 for Construction.

### 6. Approval of SEAGO 2018-2022 Draft TIP

Chris Vertrees presented the SEAGO 2018-2022 Draft TIP. Chris advised the TAC of the following:

The SEAGO Region 2018-2022 TIP needs be submitted to ADOT by July 1, 2017. Due to the SEAGO TAC, Administrative Council, and Executive Board schedules, and the forty-five (45) day public participation process, the 2018-2022 Draft TIP needs to be approved for submission to Administrative and Executive Committees at this meeting of the TAC. The following adjustments to the 2017-2021 TIP were made in the drafting of the 2018-2022 TIP:

- All projects listed as Obligated in 2016 section of the TIP have been removed from the TIP.
- All FY 2017 projects that are expected to obligate by June 30, 2017, have been moved to the Obligated in 2017 section of the TIP.
- THR12-13 – Town of Thatcher – (Church Street Widening): The project has been advanced from Future Construction Projects section of the TIP and tentatively programmed for FY 2022.
- FY 2017 Transit Projects have been removed from the Draft 2018-2022 TIP.

Chair Jesus Valdez asked for a motion to approve the SEAGO Region 2018-2022 TIP.

**MOTION:** Lynn Kartchner moved to approve the SEAGO Region 2018-2022 TIP.

**SECOND:** Phil Ronnerud

**ACTION: APPROVED UNANIMOUSLY**

### 7. HURF Exchange Update

Chris Vertrees advised the TAC that ADOT's HURF Exchange Program will restart on October 1, 2017. He advised the TAC that ADOT's HURF Exchange Policy and Procedures were located on pages 16-26 of their TAC Packet. The TAC reviewed and discussed the HURF Exchange process.

### 8. Arizona LPA Stakeholder Schedule

Chris Vertrees advised the TAC that the LPA Stakeholder meeting schedule is located on page 27 of their packet. The next meeting is on June 15, 2017, at the Maricopa Association of



## SEAGO TRANSPORTATION ADVISORY COMMITTEE

### MEETING MINUTES FOR MARCH 16, 2017

---

Governments office in Phoenix. Meetings are from 10:00 am to 2:00 pm. Karen Lamberton has volunteered to represent SEAGO. However, it was suggested that each agency try to make at least one meeting. Chris will have a sign-up sheet available at our May TAC meeting.

#### **9. SHSP TAC Reminder**

Chris Vertrees reminded the TAC that the SHSP TAC meeting will immediately follow our meeting. He advised the TAC that the meeting agenda is located on page 28 of their packet.

#### **10. District Engineers' Report**

Tom Engel provided a District Engineer report for the Southeast District.

#### **11. Regional Local Program Reports**

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

#### **12. Items for General Discussion**

Chair Jesus Valdez asked if anyone had items for general discussion. No one spoke.

#### **13. Items for Next Meeting**

Karen requested a discussion involving the 2020 Census at the next meeting. We may have an amendment to the FY2018-2022 if any substantive comments are received during the TIP Public Comment Period. The next meeting will be focused SHSP vision and goal setting.

#### **14. Next Meeting Date July 20, 2017 at the Cochise College Benson Center.**

**MEETING ADJOURNED AT 11:45 AM**

SEAGO Draft STP Ledger 2017-2021  
Revised: May 2017

New OA rate from ADOT effective FFY 2017 Action	94.9% * OA Rate	Projected Fed Funds *		Cumulative Balance	
		Apportionment	OA	Apportionment	OA
STP Carry Forward FY16	94.9%	\$185,476	\$175,831	\$185,476	\$175,831
FY 2017 Allocation	94.9%	\$1,001,206	\$950,144	\$1,186,682	\$1,125,976
Davis Road MP 9.9 Bid Savings		\$482,675	\$482,675	\$1,669,357	\$1,608,651
Repay SVMPO for FY15/16 Loans		-\$905,637	-\$905,637	\$763,720	\$703,014
Greenlee County: Campbell Blue Bridge		-\$162,280	-\$162,280	\$601,440	\$540,734
Douglas - Joe Carlson SFTS		-\$66,010	-\$66,010	\$535,430	\$474,724
Loan Out to ADOT		-\$525,430	-\$525,430	\$10,000	-\$50,706
HSIP OA in for ADOT Loan		\$0	\$60,706	\$10,000	\$10,000
Tech Transfer (LTAP)		-\$10,000	-\$10,000	\$0	\$0
FY 2016 Balance				\$0	\$0
FY 2018 Allocation	94.9%	\$1,001,206	\$950,144	\$1,001,206	\$950,144
ADOT Loan Repayment In		\$525,430	\$525,430	\$1,526,636	\$1,475,574
Douglas: Chino Road Extension Phase 2 (Tenative)		-\$2,357,500	-\$2,357,500	-\$830,864	-\$881,926
Cochise County: Davis Road ROW		-\$250,920	-\$250,920	-\$1,081,784	-\$1,132,846
Repay SVMPO for FY16 Loan #2		-\$69,870	-\$69,870	-\$1,151,654	-\$1,202,716
Tech Transfer (LTAP)		-\$10,000	-\$10,000	-\$1,161,654	-\$1,272,586
FY 2018 Balance				-\$1,161,654	-\$1,272,586
FY 2019 Allocation	94.9%	\$1,001,206	\$950,144	-\$160,448	-\$322,441
Tech Transfer (LTAP)		-\$10,000	-\$10,000	-\$170,448	-\$332,441
FY 2019 Balance				-\$170,448	-\$332,441
FY 2020 Allocation	94.9%	\$1,001,206	\$950,144	\$830,758	\$617,703
20th Ave, Phase II (Construction) Safford		-\$2,000,000	-\$2,000,000	-\$1,169,242	-\$1,382,297
Tech Transfer (LTAP)		-\$10,000	-\$10,000	-\$1,179,242	-\$1,392,297
FY 2020 Balance				-\$1,179,242	-\$1,392,297
FY2021 Allocation	94.9%	\$1,001,206	\$950,144	-\$178,036	-\$442,152
Tech Transfer (LTAP)		-\$10,000	-\$10,000	-\$188,036	-\$452,152
FY 2021 Balance				-\$198,036	-\$462,152

- \* Notes: 1. Updated: May 2017  
2. OA Rate is at 94.9% is subject to change  
3. STP Apportionments are ADOT estimates and subject to change.

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

OA = Obligated Authority. This is the amount of money that can actually be obligated to SEAGO based upon the OA %.

STP = Surface Transportation Program funds. This amount is allocated to SEAGO based upon the 2010 population

Balance carry-over is no longer allowed. Excess funds must be utilized or loaned to another COG or to the State.

SEAGO HSIP Ledger 2017-2020  
Revised: May 2017

New OA rate from ADOT effective FFY 2016 Action	94.9% * OA Rate	Projected Fed Funds *		Cumulative Balance	
		Apportionment	OA	Apportionment	OA
HSIP Balance 10/1/16		\$118,850	\$112,670	<b>\$118,850</b>	<b>\$112,670</b>
FY 2017 Allocation	<b>94.9%</b>	\$519,767	\$493,259	\$638,617	\$605,929
Repay SVMPO Loan*		-\$496,377	-\$496,377	\$142,240	\$109,552
Repayment from YMPO		\$105,000	\$105,000	\$247,240	\$214,552
Loan In from SVMPO		\$200,000	\$200,000	\$447,240	\$414,552
SEAGO/SVMPO Strategic Highway Safety Plan		-\$50,000	-\$50,000	\$397,240	\$364,552
Santa Cruz County: River Road/ Pendleton Design		-\$56,580	-\$56,580	\$340,660	\$307,972
Santa Cruz County: Rio Rico/Pendleton Design		-\$70,725	-\$70,725	\$269,935	\$237,247
Graham County: Reay Lane/Safford Bryce Intersection		-\$66,010	-\$66,010	\$203,925	\$171,237
OA used for ADOT Loan		\$0	-\$96,442	\$203,925	\$74,795
FY 2017 Balance				<b>\$203,925</b>	<b>\$74,795</b>
FY 2018 Allocation	<b>94.9%</b>	\$519,767	\$493,259	\$723,692	\$568,054
Repay SVMPO		-\$200,000	-\$200,000	\$523,692	\$368,054
FY 2018 Balance				<b>\$523,692</b>	<b>\$368,054</b>
FY 2019 Allocation	<b>94.9%</b>	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
(Local HSIP Funding Allocation Discontinued)					

- \* Notes: 1. Updated: May 2107  
2. Reflects ADOT assigned OA Rate of 94.9%  
3. HSIP Apportionments are ADOT estimates and subject to change.

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

OA = Obligated Authority. This is the amount of money that can actually be obligated to SEAGO based upon the OA %.  
HSIP = Highway Safety Improvement Program funds. This amount is allocated to SEAGO based upon ADOT's distribution formula.  
Balance carry-over is no longer allowed. Excess funds must be utilized or loaned to another COG.



# TAC PACKET

---

**TO: SEAGO TAC**  
**FROM: CHRIS VERTREES, SEAGO TRANSPORTATION PLANNER**  
**DATE: MAY 10, 2017**  
**RE: TIP REPORT**

---

At the request of ADOT, the following two projects were administratively changed/added to our TIP following the TAC meeting:

**GGH 12-04 - Graham County - (Reay Lane Canal Ditch Relocation):** This is an HRRRP project. The ADOT Project Manager requested that the construction phase of the project be moved from from FY17 to FY18 because of a delay in getting the ROW clearance. The property from which the County is getting the additional ROW has been sold. A Partial Release from the mortgage company holding the lien needs to be obtained before the project can move to construction. This is expected to take approximately 3 months. Construction costs were not affected.

**CCH 14-04 - Cochise County – (SR191 to Central Highway DCR) –** In March 2016, the SEAGO TAC approved the use of STP funds for Cochise County to address \$60,000 in additional PMDR fees. Cochise County has advised ADOT that Cochise County had too many concerns and questions about what taking these STP funds might do to future requirements for project schedules to be comfortable moving forward to their Board with a JPA Amendment. This project was listed on our Obligated in 2016 section of our TIP. It has been moved the Future Project Section of our TIP as a placeholder.

**NOG 19-01 – City of Nogales (Valle Verde/Paseo Verde Paving Project) -** This is a CMAQ project. Original design estimates did not include \$30,000 in PMDR fees. In addition, design estimates indicated a need for an additional \$20,000. ADOT approved an additional \$50,000 to be added to the project. The updated design costs were added to the TIP in the following manner:

**Design: Federal - \$80,593 Local Match - \$4,871 Total - \$85,464**

**Design (PMDR Fee): Federal - \$28,290 Local Match - \$1,710 Total - \$30,000**

**Design Phase Total - Federal - \$108,883 Local Match - \$6,581 Total - \$115,464**

SEAGO TIP Amendment #5 is attached for your records.

**SEAGO REGION**  
**2017- 2021 TIP Amendment #5**  
**Approved By: TAC - Administrative Council- Executive Board -**

TIP YEAR Project ID	PROJECT SPONSOR	PROJECT NAME	PROJECT LOCATION	LENGTH	TYPE OF IMP - WK - STRU	Functional Classifications	LANES BEFORE	LANES AFTER	FED AID TYPE	FEDERAL FUNDS	LOCAL MATCH	OTHER FUNDS	TOTAL COST
<b>2017</b>													
DGS13-05	City of Douglas	Joe Carlson Safe Routes to School	Douglas		Construction Sidewalks, Crosswalks, Striping & ADA Ramps				SRTS	\$250,000			\$250,000
DGS13-05	City of Douglas	Joe Carlson Safe Routes to School	Douglas		Construction Sidewalks, Crosswalks, Striping & ADA Ramps				STP	\$66,010	\$3,990		\$70,000
ST-TE-15	State	Sidewalks: Hwy 92: MP353-353.4, Naco Hwy: Naco Hwy-Collins Rd, Bisbee	Hwy 92:MP353-353.4, Naco Hwy: Naco Hwy-Collins Rd, Bisbee		Construction/Sidewalks				TE18	\$706,987	\$42,734		\$749,721
GEH-BR-08	Greenlee County	Campbell Blue Bridge Replacement	Blue River Road (FR 281), 8.8 South of E Jct US 180	61 feet	Design	Rural Local	2	2	STP	\$200,000	\$12,089		\$212,089
GGH12-03	Graham County	Reay Lane/Safford Bryce Road	Intersection		Construction	Rural Major Collector	2	2	HRRRP	\$424,350	\$25,650		\$450,000
GGH12-03	Graham County	Reay Lane/Safford Bryce Road	Intersection		Construction	Rural Major Collector	2	2	HSIP	\$66,010	\$3,990		\$70,000
SEA15-02	SEAGO/SVMPO Region	Regional Strategic Highway Safety Plan	Various Locations	N/A	Planning Study	Varies	N/A	N/A	HSIP	\$50,000	\$3,022		\$53,022
SCC12-12	Santa Cruz County	River Road and Pendleton Drive Safety Improvements	River Road and Pendleton Drive	Varies	Design	Rural Major Collector	2	2	HSIP	\$56,580	\$3,420		\$60,000
SCC12-03	Santa Cruz County	Rio Rico and Pendleton Drive Intersection Improvements	Intersection		Design	Rural Major Collector			HSIP	\$70,725	\$4,275		\$75,000
ST-TE-21	State	Town of Pima US 70 Pedestrian Bridge Extension	US 70, Town of Pima		Construction: Pedestrian Bridge				TE17	\$561,792	\$33,958		\$595,750
GGH12-04	Graham County	8th Ave & Airport Rd Intersection	Intersection		Design	Rural Major Collector	2	2	HPP	\$518,650	\$31,350		\$550,000
GGH-13-04	Graham County	Reay Lane Irrigation Canal Ditch Relocation	Reay Lane Between US70 & Safford Bryce Road in Safford	.2 miles	ROW	Rural Minor Collector	2	2	HRRRP	\$68,000	\$4,110		\$72,110
	LTAP								STP	\$10,000			\$10,000
		<b>TOTAL FOR 2017</b>								<b>\$3,049,104</b>	<b>\$168,588</b>		<b>\$3,217,692</b>
<b>2018</b>													
GGH12-04	Graham County	8th Ave & Airport Rd Intersection	Intersection		Construction	Rural Major Collector	2	2	HPP	\$831,350	\$50,251		\$881,601
GGH12-04	Graham County	8th Ave & Airport Rd Intersection	Intersection		Construction	Rural Major Collector	2	2	HRRRP	\$2,300,000			\$2,300,000
DGS17-01	City of Douglas	Chino Road Extension Phase 2	Chino Road: 9th Street to SR90	.85 miles	Construction	Urban Minor Arterial	2	2	STP	\$2,357,500	\$142,500		\$2,500,000
CCH18-01	Cochise County	Davis Road Project Assessment and DCR	Davis Road from Hwy 191 to N. Central Highway	1.6 miles	ROW	Rural Major Collector	2	2	STP	\$250,920	\$16,143		\$267,063
NOG 19-01	City of Nogales	Valle Verde/Paseo Verde Paving Project	Valle Verde Dr. and Paseo Verde Drive between Grand Ave. and W. Mesa Verde Dr.	1150 Feet	Design	Urban Local	2	2	CMAQ	\$80,593	\$4,871		\$85,464
NOG 19-01	City of Nogales	Valle Verde/Paseo Verde Paving Project	Valle Verde Dr. and Paseo Verde Drive between Grand Ave. and W. Mesa Verde Dr.	1150 Feet	Design (PMDR Fee)	Urban Local	2	2	CMAQ	\$28,290	\$1,710		\$30,000
GGH-13-04	Graham County	Reay Lane Irrigation Canal Ditch Relocation	Reay Lane Between US70 & Safford Bryce Road in Safford	.2 miles	Construction	Rural Minor Collector	2	2	HRRRP	\$184,200	\$11,134		\$195,334
CLF16-01	Town of Clifton	Zorilla Street Bridge Rehabilitation, Structure #9633	Zorilla Street between US 191 and Park, Avenue, Clifton, AZ	216 Feet	Construction	Rural Local	2	2	Off-System Bridge	\$729,896	\$44,118		\$774,014
	LTAP								STP	\$10,000			\$10,000
		<b>TOTAL FOR 2018</b>								<b>\$6,772,749</b>	<b>\$103,612</b>		<b>\$6,876,361</b>
<b>2019</b>													
SCC12-12	Santa Cruz County	River Road and Pendleton Drive Safety Improvements	River Road and Pendleton Drive	Varies	Construction	Rural Major Collector	2	2	HRRRP	\$534,354	\$30,486		\$564,840
SCC 18-01	Santa Cruz County	I-19/Ruby Road TI-Improvements	I-19/Ruby Road TI		Design	Rural Major Collector	2	2	CMAQ	\$984,256	\$59,494		\$1,043,750
NOG 19-01	City of Nogales	Valle Verde/Paseo Verde Paving Project	Valle Verde Dr. and Paseo Verde Drive between Grand Ave. and W. Mesa Verde Dr.	1150 Feet	Construction	Urban Local	2	2	CMAQ	\$409,942	\$24,779		\$434,721
SCC12-03	Santa Cruz County	Rio Rico and Pendleton Drive Intersection Improvements	Intersection		Construction	Rural Major Collector			HRRRP	\$754,400	\$45,600		\$800,000
	LTAP								STP	\$10,000			\$10,000
		<b>TOTAL FOR 2019</b>								<b>\$2,692,952</b>	<b>\$160,359</b>	<b>\$0</b>	<b>\$2,853,311</b>

**SEAGO REGION**  
**2017 - 2021 TIP Amendment #4**  
**Approved By: TAC - Administrative Council - Executive Board-**

<b>2020</b>												
SAF12-02	City of Safford	20th Ave, Phase II	Relation St to Golf Course Rd	.63 Miles	Construction	Urban Minor Arterial	3	5	STP	\$2,000,000	\$120,891	\$2,120,891
		LTAP							STP	\$10,000		\$10,000
		<b>TOTAL FOR 2019</b>								<b>\$2,010,000</b>	<b>\$120,891</b>	<b>\$2,130,891</b>
<b>2021</b>												
		LTAP							STP	\$10,000		\$10,000
		<b>TOTAL FOR 2020</b>								<b>\$10,000</b>	<b>\$0</b>	<b>\$0</b>
<b>BRIDGE PROJECTS</b>												
GGH-BR-02	Graham County	Ft. Thomas River Structure No. 8131	Ft. Thomas River	1000 feet	Scoping, Design, Environmental ROW, and Construction	Rural Local	2	2	Off System Bridge	\$1,000,000	\$60,445	\$1,060,445
GEH-BR-07	Greenlee County	Soap Box Canyon Bridge Replacement Structure 8149: Phase 2	Wards Canyon Road, 3.39 miles E Jct US 191	31 feet	Replacement	Rural Local	2	2	Off System Bridge	\$424,350	\$25,650	\$450,000
		<b>TOTAL BRIDGE PROJECTS</b>								<b>\$1,424,350</b>	<b>\$86,095</b>	<b>\$1,510,445</b>
		<b>TOTAL FOR FIVE YEAR PROGRAM</b>								<b>\$15,959,155</b>	<b>\$639,545</b>	<b>\$16,598,700</b>
<b>FUNDING OBLIGATED IN 2016</b>												
ST-TE-16	State	US 70 MP 291 SUP and East Entry Monument (San Carlos Apache Tribe)	US 70 MP 291		Construction/SUP, landscaping, lighting entry monument				TE17	\$956,055	\$57,789	\$1,013,844
GGH-TE-13	Graham County	Golf Course Road SUP	Golf Course Rd from Reay Ln to 20th Ave	7,150 ft	Construction	TE Shared Use Path			TE 18	\$454,752	\$27,488	\$482,240
ST-TE-20	State	SR 191, Sidewalk Project	SR 191, Sidewalk project		Construction: Sidewalks				TE18	\$312,543		\$312,543
GGH13-04	Graham County	Reay Lane Irrigation Canal Ditch Relocation	Reay Lane Between US70 & Safford Bryce Road in Safford	.2 miles	ROW	Rural Minor Collector	2	2	HRRRP	\$20,746	\$1,254	\$22,000
SCC15-02	Santa Cruz County	Santa Cruz County: Nogales Non-Attainment Area Surfacing	Multiple unpaved roads in the unincorporated Rio Rico area of Santa Cruz County.	9.7 miles	Construction (Chipsealing)		2	2	CMAQ	\$457,355	\$27,645	\$485,000
SCC15-02	Santa Cruz County	Santa Cruz County: Nogales Non-Attainment Area Surfacing	Multiple unpaved roads in the unincorporated Rio Rico area of Santa Cruz County.	9.7 miles	Construction (Chipsealing)		2	2	CMAQ	\$150,000	\$9,067	\$159,067
CCH-19-01	Cochise County	Davis Rd. Improvements	Davis Road MP 9	1 mile	Construction of Safety & Drainage Improvements	Rural Major Collector	2	2	STP	\$1,830,468	\$104,337	\$1,934,805
CCH12-09	Cochise County	Davis Rd. Realignment	SR80 to SR191	24miles	Construction of Safety & Drainage Improvements	Rural Major Collector	2	2	HPP	\$1,993,821	\$110,643	\$2,114,338
DGS12-05	City of Douglas	Chino Road Extension Phase 1	Chino Road: 3rd Street to 9th Street	.9 miles	Construction	Urban Minor Arterial	2	2	STP	\$46,978	\$3,022	\$50,000
ADOT16-01	ADOT	Bankard Avenue and UPRR railroad crossing 742-038V	Bankard Avenue, east of 19B in Nogales, Santa Cruz County, AZ	0.1	Railroad Signal Improvements		2	2	HSIP-RGC	\$305,000		\$305,000
ADOT16-02	ADOT	Baffert Place and UPRR railroad crossing 742-036G	Baffert Place, east of 19B in Nogales, Santa Cruz County, AZ	0.1	Railroad Signal Improvements		2	2	HSIP-RGC	\$313,000		\$313,000
ADOT16-03	ADOT	Banks Bridge-UPRR RR crossing 742-040W	Banks Bridge east of 19B in Nogales, Santa Cruz County, AZ	0.1	Railroad Signal Improvements		2	2	HSIP-RGC	\$484,500		\$484,500
ADOT16-04	ADOT	Calle Sonora-UPRR RR crossing 742-037N	Calle Sonora, east of 19B in Nogales, Santa Cruz County, AZ	0.1	Railroad Signal Improvements		2	2	HSIP-RGC	\$484,500		\$484,500
ADOT16-05	ADOT	Court Street and UPRR railroad crossing 742-041D	Court Street, east of 19B in Nogales, Santa Cruz County, AZ	0.1	Railroad Signal Improvements		2	2	HSIP-RGC	\$143,000		\$143,000
ADOT 15-01	ADOT	Mt. Turnbull Rd and AZER railroad crossing safety improvements DOT#742-307K	Mt. Turnbull Road (AKA Home Alone Rd), south of US70 @ MP 295.8 in Bylas, Graham County, AZ	0.1	Railroad-Highway Grade Crossing improvements		2	2	HSIP-RGC	\$360,000		\$360,000
GEH-BR-08	Greenlee County	Campbell Blue Bridge Replacement	Blue River Road (FR 281), 8.8 South of E Jct US 180	61 feet	Design	Rural Local	2	2	STP	\$200,000	\$11,400	\$211,400
CLF16-01	Town of Clifton	Zorilla Street Bridge Rehabilitation, Structure #9633	Zorilla Street between US 191 and Park, Avenue, Clifton, AZ	216 Feet	Design	Rural Local	2	2	Off-System Bridge	\$235,750	\$14,250	\$250,000
NOG 14-01	City of Nogales	Citywide Traffic Sign Replacement	City Wide	N/A	Construction				HSIP	\$119,517		\$119,517
NOG12-06	City of Nogales	Crawford Street Pavement Project	Sonoita Ave to McNab Drive	0.37	Construction	Urban Collector	2	5	STP	\$485,000	\$29,316	\$514,316
		LTAP							STP	\$10,000		\$10,000
		<b>TOTAL FOR 2016</b>								<b>\$9,362,985</b>	<b>\$401,425</b>	<b>\$9,764,410</b>

**SEAGO REGION**  
**2017- 2021 TIP Amendment #5**  
**Approved By: TAC - Administrative Council- Executive Board -**

<b>Future Construction Projects</b>													
THR12-13	Town of Thatcher	Church Street Widening	US 70 to Stadium Avenue	5,400 feet	Construction	Urban Major Collector	2	3	STP	\$3,017,600	\$182,400		\$3,200,000
CCH12-10	Cochise County	Davis Rd. Improvements	Davis Road MP 13	1 mile	Construction of Safety & Drainage Improvements	Rural Major Collector	2	2	STP	\$924,560	\$55,885		\$980,445
CCH15-01	Cochise County	Davis Rd. Improvements	Davis Road MP 5	0.61 miles	Construction of Safety & Drainage Improvements	Rural Major Collector	2	2	STP	\$1,045,000	\$63,165		\$1,108,165
CCH14-04	Cochise County	Davis Road Improvements	SR191 to Central Highway	1.6 miles	PE (Design Review)	Rural Major Collector	2	2	STP	\$56,373	\$ 3,627		\$60,000
SAF12-02	City of Safford	20th Ave, Phase 3	Relation St to Golf Course Rd	.63 Miles	Construction	Urban Minor Arterial	3	5	STP	\$1,337,000	\$80,815		\$1,417,815

<b>SEAGO Region FY 2016 5310 Awards</b>							
<b>Project ID</b>	<b>Project Sponsor</b>	<b>Project Name</b>	<b>Project Location</b>	<b>Award Type</b>	<b>Federal Share</b>	<b>Local Share</b>	<b>Total Award</b>
SEA-17-01	Easter Seals Blake Foundation - Greenlee Community	Minivan with Ramp to replace VIN 1323	Clifton	Capital	\$39,237	\$4,360	\$43,597
SEA-17-02	Easter Seals Blake Foundation - Graham City Work	Minivan with Ramp to replace VIN 2620	Safford	Capital	\$39,237	\$4,360	\$43,597
SEA-17-03	SEACRS, Inc	Minivan with Ramp to replace VIN 5556	Sierra Vista	Capital	\$39,237	\$4,360	\$43,597
SEA-17-04	SEACRS, Inc	Cutaway with Lift - 14 Passenger to replace VIN 2427	Sierra Vista	Capital	\$56,677	\$6,297	\$62,974
SEA-17-05	Senior Citizens of Patagonia, Inc	Minivan with Ramp Expansion for Sonoita/Elgin	Patagonia	Capital	\$39,237	\$4,360	\$43,597
SEA-17-06	Horizon Health and Wellness	Minivan with No Lift to replace VIN 9862	Sierra Vista	Capital	\$25,290	\$2,810	\$28,100
SEA-17-07	SEAGO	Regional Mobility Manager	Region-wide	Mobility Management	\$135,000	\$33,750	\$168,750
SEA-17-08	SEAGO	Regional Training Program	Region-wide	Mobility Management	\$100,000	\$25,000	\$125,000
SEA-17-09	Easter Seals Blake Foundation - Graham City Work	Minivan with Ramp to replace VIN 1325	Graham County	Capital	\$39,237	\$4,360	\$43,597
SEA-17-10	Easter Seals Blake Foundation - Greenlee Work	Minivan with Ramp to replace VIN 1324	Greenlee County	Capital	\$39,237	\$4,360	\$43,597
SEA-17-11	Easter Seals Blake Foundation - SAGE Graham County	Transit Program Operating Funds	Graham County	Operating	\$40,000	\$40,000	\$80,000
SEA-17-12	Easter Seals Blake Foundation - SAGE Greenlee County	Transit Program Operating Funds	Greenlee County	Operating	\$5,000	\$5,000	\$10,000
SEA-17-13	Santa Cruz Training Program, Inc.	Transit Program Operating Funds	Nogales	Operating	\$10,000	\$10,000	\$20,000
SEA-17-14	Senior Citizens of Patagonia, Inc	Transit Program Operating Funds	Patagonia	Operating	\$8,000	\$8,000	\$16,000
SEA-17-15	Volunteer Interfaith Caregiver Program	Transit Program Operating Funds	Sierra Vista	Operating	\$40,000	\$40,000	\$80,000
<b>Total FY16 Awards</b>					<b>\$655,389</b>	<b>\$197,017</b>	<b>\$852,406</b>



# TAC PACKET

---

**TO: SEAGO TAC**  
**FROM: CHRIS VERTREES, SEAGO TRANSPORTATION PLANNER**  
**DATE: MAY 9, 2017**  
**RE: SHSP VISION STATEMENT DEVELOPMENT**

---

As discussed at our March 16<sup>th</sup> TAC Meeting, a majority of this meeting will be dedicated to finalizing a vision statement, developing a fatality/serious injury goal statement, and identification of our plan's emphasis areas. In general, a vision statement is an aspirational description of what we would like our plan to achieve or accomplish in the mid-term or long-term future. It is intended to serve as a guide for choosing current and future courses of action. The following are examples of some SHSP vision statements:

**“Toward Zero Deaths by Reducing Crashes for a Safer Arizona”**

-- Arizona 2014 Strategic Highway Safety Plan

**“Zero Deaths-Zero Injuries”**

--MAG 2015 Strategic Transportation Safety Plan

**“No More Deaths, No More Injuries – Know More”**

--Yuma 2016 Strategic Transportation Safety Plan

**“Working Together Towards Zero Deaths, Everyone Gets Home Alive”**

-- PAG 2016 Strategic Transportation Safety Plan

**“Moving Towards Zero Deaths”**

-- Colorado 2015 Strategic Highway Safety Plan

**“California Will Have a Safe Transportation System for All Users”**

-- California 2015 Strategic Highway Safety Plan

**“Louisiana Travelers Arrive Safely at Their Destinations”**

--Louisiana 2015 Strategic Highway Safety Plan

**“To Provide a Safer Surface Transportation System for Residents, Businesses, and Visitors”**

-- Florida 2015 Strategic Highway Safety Plan



# TAC PACKET

---

**TO: SEAGO TAC**  
**FROM: CHRIS VERTREES, SEAGO TRANSPORTATION PLANNER**  
**DATE: MAY 9, 2017**  
**RE: SHSP GOAL STATEMENT DEVELOPMENT**

---

As discussed at our March 16<sup>th</sup> TAC Meeting, a majority of this meeting will be dedicated to finalizing a vision statement, developing a fatality/serious injury goal statement, and identification of our plan's emphasis areas. In general, a goal statement is clearly articulated, strategic statement that provides direction, purpose or intent of what our plan intends to accomplish. A well-developed goal statement should be:

**Specific:** Goals should be simplistically written and clearly define what we are going to do.

**Measurable:** Goals should be measurable so that we have tangible evidence that we have accomplished the goal.

**Attainable:** The goal must be relatively within our grasp, yet provides an opportunity for improvement.

**Results-focused:** Goals should measure outcomes, not activities.

**Time-bound:** Goals should be linked to a timeframe that creates a practical sense of urgency. Timelines should be stated clearly and specific.

The following are examples of SHSP goal statements:

**“Reduce the number of fatalities and serious injuries in Arizona by 3 to 7 percent during the next 5 years.”**

-- Arizona 2014 Strategic Highway Safety Plan

**“Reduce the number of serious injuries in the region by 3 percent annually.”**

--Yuma 2016 Strategic Transportation Safety Plan

**“Reduce the number of fatalities and serious injuries in the PAG region by 7 to 10 percent during the next 5 years.”**

--PAG 2016 Strategic Transportation Safety Plan

**“To achieve a reduction of at least 3 fatalities and 15 serious injuries annually and continue to reduce the total number of fatalities and serious injuries to achieve at least a 50 percent reduction by 2035.”**

-- Delaware 2015 Strategic Highway Safety Plan

**“To save an average of one life per month or reducing fatalities from 548 in 2008 to 416 by 2019.”**

-- Colorado 2014 Strategic Highway Safety Plan

**“Reduce annual fatalities from the baseline five-year (2004-2008) average of 390 to 195 by 2030 and reduce annual serious injuries from the baseline five-year (2004 to 2008) average of 1,757 to 878 by 2030.”**

-- Nevada 2016 Strategic Highway Safety Plan

**“To achieve a 3 percent annual reduction in the number and rate of fatalities; and a 1.5 percent annual reduction in the number and rate of severe injuries.”**

-- California 2015 Strategic Highway Safety Plan



# TAC PACKET

---

**TO: SEAGO TAC**  
**FROM: CHRIS VERTREES, SEAGO TRANSPORTATION PLANNER**  
**DATE: MAY 9, 2017**  
**RE: SHSP EMPHASIS AREA IDENTIFICATION & PRIORITIZATION**

---

As discussed at our March 16<sup>th</sup> TAC Meeting, a majority of this meeting will be dedicated to finalizing a vision statement, developing a fatality/serious injury goal statement, and identification of our plan's emphasis areas. The purpose of identifying and prioritizing emphasis areas is to identify the specific set of areas that offers the greatest potential for reducing major crashes in the SEAGO and SVMPO regions. The state has identified 12 primary emphasis areas. Emphasis areas with sufficiently different crash types are divided into additional subcategories. Our safety plan does not need to adopt all of ADOT's emphasis areas. We can also choose to focus on an emphasis area subcategory such as Older Drivers. However, our SHSP needs to mirror the state's plan. We cannot develop our own emphasis areas. Below are the emphasis areas and subcategories identified in the Arizona SHSP.

1. Speeding and Aggressive Driving
2. Impaired Driving
3. Occupant Protection
4. Motorcycles
5. Distracted Driving
6. Roadway Infrastructure and Operations
  - a. Lane/Roadway Departure
  - b. Intersections/Railroad Crossings
7. Age Related
  - a. Younger Drivers (Under 25)
  - b. Older Drivers (Over 64)
8. Non-motorized Users
  - a. Pedestrians
  - b. Bicyclists
9. Heavy Vehicles/Buses/Transit
10. Natural Risks
  - a. Weather
  - b. Animals
11. Traffic Incident Management
12. Interjurisdictional

Attached is the most recent data provided by our consultant. The chart on the next page shows the total percent share of all fatalities or serious injuries included in the five year period (2012-2016) associated with each of the Emphasis Area categories or subcategories.



## SEAGO/Sierra Vista MPO Strategic Highway Safety Plan Draft Emphasis Areas and Safety Strategies

**Comparison of Region and State Fatalities by State Emphasis Area**

State Emphasis Areas	SEAGO/SVMPO Fatal Crashes	State Fatal Crashes
Lane Departure	61%	45%
Occupant Protection	53%	45%
Speeding	39%	38%
Impaired Driving	36%	34%
Young Driver Under 25	25%	28%
Older Driver Over 64	21%	18%
Intersection	13%	26%
Heavy Vehicle	13%	10%
Pedestrian	11%	18%
Motorcycles	11%	19%
Distracted Driving	5%	15%
Weather-related	4%	3%
Bicyclist	2%	3%
Animal-involved	2%	<1%

### Safety Strategies:

Focus on 4 E's: Engineering (Planning/Policy, Design/Implementation), Education, Enforcement, EMS

#### ***Lane Departure***

- Engineering (Design/Implementation)
  - Use traffic control devices to better delineate the edge of the roadway (i.e. signs, RPMs, edgelines, rumble strips)
  - Construct roadway infrastructure improvements (e.g. paved/graded shoulders, gradual side slopes, Safety Edge, etc.)
- Education
  - Increase public education on corrective roadway departure driving techniques

#### ***Occupant Protection:***

- Enforcement
  - Conduct high-visibility, saturated seat belt enforcement campaigns
- Education
  - Conduct seat belt education events for children
  - Provide child protection seat distribution programs coupled with high-profile inspection events/clinics utilizing certified child protection seat technicians



- Train law-enforcement personnel to check for proper child restraint use during all motorist encounters

### ***Speeding:***

- Enforcement
  - Targeted enforcement in school zones and locations with speeding related crashes
- Engineering
  - Install speed feedback signs
  - Install traffic calming to reduce speeds
- Education
  - Launch NHTSA's "5 To Drive" campaign in area schools

### ***Impaired Driving:***

- Engineering (Design/Implementation)
  - Implement wrong-way detection systems to reduce wrong-way crashes on freeways
- Education
  - Improve public awareness of and access to alternate forms of transportation
  - Partner with employers to suggest policies and procedures aimed at reducing impaired driving by their employees
  - Develop materials for educating target groups for impaired driving including mass-media campaigns on DUI dangers and penalties
  - Utilize Dynamic Message Signs for impaired driving educational messages
- Enforcement
  - Conduct high visibility DUI saturation patrols
  - Promote policies and practices that result in the imposition of meaningful penalties for impaired-driving convictions

### ***Young Drivers***

- Engineering (Planning)
  - Promote technology which monitors young driver behavior
- Education
  - Identify best practices for promoting and/or implementing Safe Driving pledge campaigns
  - Strengthen driver education
  - Promote stronger parental/guardian education and engagement in the licensure process for young drivers
  - Enhance outreach campaigns to young drivers and their families about safe driving behavior and programs, e.g. the Tucson Police Department's START (Safe Teen Accident Reduction Training) Program
  - Develop public relations campaigns highlighting the risks of distracted driving
  - Promote insurance and other incentives for safe driving
  - Conduct mock crash demonstrations for high school students



### **Older Drivers:**

- Engineering (Design/Implementation)
  - improve visibility of traffic control devices
- Education
  - increase awareness about and availability of alternative transportation options
  - promote insurance and other incentives for safe driving
  - initiate a safe driving campaign for elderly drivers (including snow birds)
- Enforcement
  - support efforts to require more frequent testing (vision, medical) of older drivers for license renewals
  - Implement local ordinances banning texting while driving

### **Intersections:**

- Engineering (Planning/Policy)
  - Identify practices or standards that integrate safety into planning and design
  - Conduct Road Safety Assessments (RSAs) at high risk locations
  - Implement systemic improvements based on identifying characteristics of high risk intersections
- Engineering (Design/Implementation)
  - Improve intersection geometry
  - Install roundabouts where feasible
  - Evaluate and improve sight distance
  - Evaluate signal phasing for improvements
  - Provide/improve intersection lighting
- Enforcement
  - Conduct targeted enforcement of high crash risk intersections
  - Implement speeding and red light running enforcement efforts
- EMS
  - Implement emergency vehicle preemption at signalized intersections

### **Pedestrians:**

- Engineering (Planning/Policy):
  - encourage submittal of TIP projects that include safety elements for all modes by including safety as an explicit project evaluation criteria
  - promote the use of “best practices” that integrate safety analysis and design throughout the planning process
  - identify high risk locations for potential implementation of enhanced pedestrian crossings
  - develop and implement a Complete Streets program
  - develop a system to evaluate whether certain midblock and/or multi-lane uncontrolled crosswalks should remain, be improved, or be removed
  - Develop an ADA Transition Plan
- Engineering (Design/Implementation)



- Evaluate and install controlled pedestrian crossings
- Install medians and pedestrian crossing islands
- Provide sidewalks, multi-use paths, and/or marked crosswalks
- Improve sight distance and/or visibility between motor vehicles and pedestrians
- Utilize the Safe Routes to School program
- Provide street lighting at uncontrolled arterial crosswalks
- Education
  - Develop/maintain training and public information pedestrian safety campaigns
  - Increase pedestrian safety education for all roadway users
  - Promote the use of pedestrian safety lights

#### ***Motorcyclists:***

- Engineering (Design/Implementation)
  - Improve infrastructure features to help reduce the number and severity of motorcycle crashes
- Education
  - Improve public awareness, education and training for motorcyclists, motorists, and all safety stakeholders to promote safer driving behaviors
  - Enhance rider training programs to improve motorcycle safety
  - Promote use of helmets
  - Utilize Dynamic Message Signs for safety messages

#### ***Distracted Driving:***

- Education
  - Initiate/strengthen distracted driving school campaigns
- Enforcement
  - Implement local ordinances banning texting while driving

#### ***Weather-related:***

- Education
  - Education campaigns, public service announcements, etc. on driving techniques during weather events such as dust storms
- Engineering
  - Signage about weather conditions

#### ***Bicyclists:***

- Engineering (Planning/Policy)
  - Encourage submittal of TIP projects that include safety elements for all modes by including safety as an explicit project evaluation criteria
  - Promote the use of “best practices” that integrate safety analysis and design throughout the planning process
  - Identify high risk locations for potential implementation of enhanced pedestrian or bike crossings



- Develop and implement a Complete Streets program
- Develop a Bicyclist Safety Assessment (BSA) program
- Seek funding to support safety programs for improving bicycle safety
- Engineering (Design/Implementation)
  - Evaluate and install controlled pedestrian or bike crossings
  - Provide bicycle detection at signalized intersections
  - Provide bike lanes, separated bike lanes, bike boulevards, and off-road multi-use paths
  - Utilize the Safe Routes to School program
  - Provide street lighting at uncontrolled arterial crosswalks
  - Commit to recognizing dedicated lateral space for bicycle traffic under a (modified) standard cross section for one or more road functional classes
  - Bicycle striping plan through streets with adequate cross section
  - Bicycle service facilities (racks – where to target; other service amenities for bicycle “pit stops”)
  - Special programs and events – Sunday street closures for bicyclists/pedestrians
  - Utilize the federal Surface Transportation Block Grant Program for bicycle facilities
- Education
  - Develop/maintain training and public information bicycle safety campaigns
  - Increase bicycle safety education for all roadway users
  - Improve public awareness to promote safer behavior by all roadway users relative to bicycle traffic
  - Promote use of helmets by adult bicyclists
  - Promote the use of bike safety lights
  - Dedicated website clearinghouse on area biking opportunities, routes, safety, reminders, planning, etc.
  - Utilize Dynamic Message Signs for safety messages
- Enforcement
  - Increase enforcement of existing laws designed to promote bicycle safety, such as wrong-way riding and vehicles encroaching on bicycle facilities

## Chris Vertrees

---

**Subject:** FW: Census 2020 Early Planning

---

**From:** Lambertson, Karen L [<mailto:KLamberton@cochise.az.gov>]  
**Sent:** Wednesday, May 03, 2017 4:40 PM  
**To:** 'Chris Vertrees'  
**Cc:** 'Dan Coxworth'  
**Subject:** Census 2020 Early Planning

Chris: The main items of discussion for the Census 2020 item for SEAGO's meeting on the 18<sup>th</sup> are 1) has SEAGO heard anything at all about it. State POPTAC should be discussing it already. 2) Preliminary thoughts on the role of SEAGO – if desired that SEAGO take on any coordination role then a proposal, with a request for funding, to the member jurisdictions ought to be proposed. There could be justification and economies of scale of having SEAGO hire on someone for about a year and half – Summer 2018 to Fall of 2019. 3) Interest specifically from the Cochise County jurisdictions to partner early on a Complete Count Committee.

Last time around we were behind on the resolutions, putting us at the back of the line for grants. If any joint ventures planned we need those resolutions in place mid 2018 to qualify for grants. If there are going to be any which is not at all certain at this point.

Abstract version of the Census 2020 effort: Politicians following the Census are alarmed at limited budgets increases (half of what was requested); delays in testing electronic formats (last time around failed in the field); leaked potential questions regarding immigrant status (which were declared by the Bureau as not on the their table but nevertheless the perception is that it is on the White House table). The latest monthly report on the planning process for the Census was a litany of stalled programs pending the new administration's direction. The usual pre-Census angst leading up to the usual inadequately funded and staffed Census effort generating all kinds of heated media rhetoric.

The largest concern is that the 2020 Census expected massive costs and labor savings by going electronic but, if the delays in testing continue, the chances of failure are increased, combined with the inability to then rapidly back retrofit to the old style in the field approach (and if any of the economic staff are paying attention they will argue for the old style as it would create a third year in office boost to employment nation-wide).

Not critical at all yet but this next year will disappear on us and all of sudden this will be upon us all. Unless Congress gets rid of it and comes up with a different way to redistrict and allocate funds. Every decade an attempt at it.

**Karen L. Lambertson, AICP**  
County Transportation Planner  
Community Development Department  
1415 Melody Lane, Building F  
Bisbee, AZ 85603  
520-432-9240 phone  
520-432-9278 fax

**Public Programs... Personal Service**  
[www.cochise.az.gov](http://www.cochise.az.gov)

## Chris Vertrees

---

**From:** Jason Bottjen <JBottjen@azdot.gov>  
**Sent:** Wednesday, April 19, 2017 1:11 PM  
**To:** Jason Hafner (jhafner@scmpo.org); Irene Higgs; Christopher Bridges; David Wessel; Jean Knight; Daniel Coxworth; Charles A. Gutierrez (cgutierrez@ympo.org); Travis Ashbaugh; Jason Kelly; Jason James; Chris Vertrees (cvertrees@seago.org); Chris Vertrees; Justin Hembree (justinh@wacog.com)  
**Cc:** Charla Glendening; Daniel Gabiou; Mark Hoffman; Donald Sneed; Tom Engel; Clemenc Ligocki  
**Subject:** FY18 PARA Program Call for Projects  
**Attachments:** Para-Program-Frequently-Asked-Questions.pdf

Hello,

**Please help me disseminate this message by sharing this with your member agencies and anyone else you deem appropriate.**

The Arizona Department of Transportation (ADOT) Multimodal Planning Division (MPD) is issuing a call for the Planning Assistance for Rural Areas (PARA) program for FY18.

The PARA Program provides federal funds to assist tribal governments, counties, cities and towns located outside Transportation Management Area (TMA) planning boundaries with multimodal transportation planning needs.

During this call, both PARA Pre-Scoping and PARA Study applications will be accepted for FY18.

**Please submit your completed application(s) to me via email by Wednesday, May 31, 2017 (JBottjen@azdot.gov).**

Notification of selected PARA Pre-Scoping Projects and PARA Planning Studies for FY 2018 will be distributed sometime in July 2017.

I have attached a PARA Program FAQ document and both PARA Pre-Scoping and PARA Planning Study applications along with guidance can be found at: [PARA Program Overview](#)

Please review the guidance provided on the first two pages of each application.

Items to consider:

- There is no Local Match for PARA projects. The PARA Program is 100% funded by ADOT using Federal Statewide Planning and Research (SPR) funds.
- Planning Studies range from \$100k-\$250k and Pre-Scoping ranges from \$25k - \$60k depending on scope, distance from Phoenix, and complexity.
- Eligible applicants include counties, cities, towns and tribal governments (including chapters, districts and villages) located outside Maricopa Association of Governments and Pima Association of Governments planning area boundaries.
- All applications must be prepared by LPA staff. Any private sector consultant that provides application assistance will be ineligible to bid on project solicitations associated with a funded study request for proposals.
- While there is no limit to the number of Pre-Scoping applications that can be submitted, no county, city, town or tribal government will be awarded more than one PARA Pre-Scoping project. If submitting more than one PARA Pre-Scoping application, please provide the priority level of each application.

- Projects with a design phase listed in the Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) for the related Planning Organization for Fiscal Year 2018 are ineligible.

Please contact me with any questions.

**Jason Bottjen**

Planning Program Manager

ADOT Multimodal Planning Division

206 S. 17<sup>th</sup> Avenue, MD310B

Phoenix, AZ 85007

602-712-6166

azdot.gov



---

Confidentiality and Nondisclosure Notice: This email transmission and any attachments are intended for use by the person(s)/entity(ies) named above and may contain confidential/privileged information. Any unauthorized use, disclosure or distribution is strictly prohibited. If you are not the intended recipient, please contact the sender by email, and delete or destroy all copies plus attachments.

**ADOT Multimodal Planning Division  
Planning Assistance for Rural Areas (PARA) Program  
Frequently Asked Questions**

**PLANNING STUDY APPLICATIONS**

**Q. Who is eligible to receive PARA program funds?**

A. Funding is available to local communities, cities, towns, and counties located outside Transportation Management Areas (Phoenix and Tucson urbanized boundaries); and Tribal governments and their sub-units are eligible including: chapters, districts and villages.

**Q. Is local match required to receive PARA funding?**

A. The PARA program is funded 100% by ADOT using Federal Statewide Planning and Research (SPR) funds; therefore no local match is required.

**Q. Will ADOT provide additional planning assistance beyond the PARA scope after the study is initiated?**

A. Additional funds may be provided in special circumstances. This is dependent upon the specific circumstance, funding availability, and ADOT approval.

**Q. If my local jurisdiction has received Small Area Transportation Study (SATS) or PARA funding in the past may we submit an application for funding?**

A. Local jurisdictions awarded projects in the past are eligible to submit applications; however, it is important to note the selection process is competitive.

**Q. May my community partner with other communities when applying for the PARA program?**

A. Partnerships between communities are encouraged. A lead agency and associated contact must be identified for project management purposes.

**Q. May consultants assist with preparation of PARA project applications?**

A. Private consultants should not assist with the development and completion of PARA program project applications. Firms assisting with applications will be ineligible to propose on projects due to potential conflicts of interest. Also, local jurisdictions receiving assistance from consultants will be ineligible for PARA program funding.

**Q. May PARA funds be used for staff salaries?**

A. PARA funds may not be used for staff salaries.

**Q. What transportation issues may be addressed by PARA program funding?**

A. Addresses issues related to roadway, transit, and non-motorized transportation modes including the following activities:

- Roadway operations and facilities planning;
- Transit operations and facilities planning;
- Feasibility review of public transit with intent of seeking FTA or other funding assistance;
- General Plan Circulation Element development / update;
- Bike / Ped Planning including General Plan Bicycle elements; and
- Trails Planning as part of a multimodal roadway, pedestrian and transit system.

**Q. What activities are not eligible for PARA funding?**

A. The following activities are not eligible for funding;

- Design documents
- Environmental clearances (NEPA documents);
- Engineering documents including pre-design and DCRs; and
- Construction of facilities or capital expenses including: staff salaries, and purchasing computer hardware.

**Q. What types of Planning Studies are considered under PARA?**

A. At least one of the below FAST Act National Performance Goals must be identified for the study to be considered eligible:

- Safety;
- Infrastructure condition;
- Congestion reduction;
- System reliability;
- Freight movement and economic vitality;
- Environmental sustainability; and/or
- Reduced project delivery delays.

**Q. May the PARA program be used to conduct a recreational trails study?**

A. The PARA program is intended for the study of rural transportation systems. This type of study would be eligible if the trail network provides linkages to other transportation systems, e.g. local roadway network, transit services, bicycle routes, etc.

**Q. May the PARA program be used for flood and waterway planning?**

A. This is not an eligible activity within the PARA program. A suggested source for assistance may be the County, Flood Control District, or Arizona Department of Water Resources.

**Q. Are homeowners associations eligible to apply for PARA funding?**

A. Homeowners associations are not eligible for PARA funding. The association is a corporation formed by a home developer with the charge of managing and marketing of homes and land. Views of homeowners associations may not reflect the views of the community as a whole.

**Q. What are my responsibilities as a local public agency project contact?**

A. The lead local public agency project contact will be responsible for the following:

- Assisting ADOT PM as part of the Study team;
- Assisting with development of public involvement materials used in related activities (e.g. public meetings, forums and stakeholder meetings);
- Providing guidance and local perspective, including timely review and final approval of all deliverables; and
- Assist with securing meeting rooms for project meetings (e.g. public meetings, TAC meetings, PMT meetings).

**Q. What is ADOT’s role related to management of a PARA study?**

A. ADOT Project Manager responsibilities include:

- Overall project management
- Consultant selection oversight
- Scheduling TAC meetings
- Deliverables review and acceptance; and
- Payment for consultant services.

**Q. What areas should be emphasized in a PARA program application?**

A. The most important section of the PARA application carrying the most scoring process weight is the Background, Purpose, Need and Goals Statement which should include a strong discussion of the following:

- Overall project considerations
- Demonstration of need for the Study;
- Demonstration of planning element incorporation.

**Q. What are the application submittal requirements?**

A. Submittal requirements:

- Submitted to ADOT no later than Wednesday, May 31, 2017;
- Late or incomplete applications will not be considered; and
- Send all required items (less than 12MB) via Email to: [JBottjen@azdot.gov](mailto:JBottjen@azdot.gov)

**Q. When is funding available?**

A. Fy18 PARA cycle funding will be available sometime in the late summer to early fall of 2017.

**Q. Who is on the PARA application selection committee and will local agencies be involved with the process?**

A. The selection committee will be made up of ADOT MPD project managers. Within a few weeks after expiration of the application submittal period, a meeting will be held to select projects, and local jurisdiction contacts will be notified shortly after conclusion of the meeting.

**Q. What parameters will PARA program applications be scored against and what is the weight of each?**

A. Applications will be scored against the following criteria:

- Overall Project Considerations: 0-20 Points
- Demonstration of Need for Study: 0-25 Points
- Incorporation of FAST Act National Performance Goals: 0-15 Points
- Demonstration of Community Support: 0-15 Points
- Benefits the State, Region, and / or Community: 0-25 Points

**Q. Who is on the project consultant selection committee and what level of involvement will my local jurisdiction have with selecting a project consultant?**

A. The project consultant will be selected by a committee composed of ADOT MPD PARA program project managers.

## PRE-SCOPING PROJECTS

### **Q. What types of projects qualify for the Pre-Scoping process?**

A. If a transportation need is identified, but you are unsure how much the project would cost, how long the design would take, or what the full scope of work should be, the Pre-Scoping process would help your project. Examples of applicable projects could include (but are not limited to):

- Pavement and bridge preservation (less than 2 miles in length)
  - Roadway maintenance
  - Bridge rehabilitation
  - Bridge scour retrofit
- Minor safety and mobility improvements (less than 2 miles in length)
  - ADA, bicycle, and pedestrian improvements
  - Adding roadway shoulder / safety edge
  - Adding sidewalk / shared-use path
  - Adding bus stops or bus pull-outs
  - Adding striping / delineators / rumble strips / guard rail
  - Adding or replacing signs or lighting
  - Road diets
  - Roundabouts
  - Minor drainage improvements

### **Q. How does the Pre-Scoping process work?**

A. The Pre-Scoping process essentially allows you to complete the 1<sup>st</sup> one-to-two months of project design effort upfront. Refer to the PARA Pre-Scoping Process form link on the PARA Pre-Scoping tab of the PARA Program Home Page for a detailed breakdown of the Pre-Scoping process.

### **Q. How would the Pre-Scoping process help my project?**

A. By taking advantage of the Pre-Scoping process, your project would have a better chance of being designed within budget and on schedule. The deliverables of the Pre-Scoping process include producing a realistic project budget, schedule, and scoping document.

### **Q. How much does the Pre-Scoping process cost me?**

A. The PARA program is funded 100% by ADOT using Federal Statewide Planning and Research (SPR) funds; therefore no local match is required.

### **Q. How long does the Pre-Scoping process take?**

A. Once a project is "kicked off", it is anticipated that the Pre-Scoping process will take 3-4 months to complete. If your project is selected, the ADOT Regional Planner will set up a Kick-Off Meeting sometime after July 1, 2017.

### **Q. How much staff time will I need to commit?**

A. It is anticipated that your agency's representative would commit 5-15 hours of time over the course of 3-4 months, per project. ADOT would expect your representative to attend the Kick-Off Meeting / Field Review and review the Pre-Scoping deliverables: Field Review Report and Pre-Scoping Report.

**For other questions not listed above, please contact the PARA Program Manager, Jason Bottjen, at [JBottjen@azdot.gov](mailto:JBottjen@azdot.gov) or 602-712-6166.**



# TAC PACKET

---

**TO: SEAGO TAC**  
**FROM: CHRIS VERTREES, SEAGO TRANSPORTATION PLANNER**  
**DATE: MAY 9, 2017**  
**RE: 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 updated SEAGO Transportation Services Coordination Plan has been updated and is available at: <https://www.keepandshare.com/doc12/242802/seago-fy17-transportation-coordination-plan-update-03-31-17-pdf-3-0-meg?da=y>

## **WILLCOX TRANSPORTATION PROJECT**

SEAGO has partnered with the Volunteer Interfaith Caregiver Program (VICaP) to provide transportation services to the Willcox area. SEAGO assisted VICaP in obtaining a van for use in Willcox. The Willcox transportation program continues to grow. VICaP has recruited five volunteer drivers in the area. In addition to the van program, this program uses volunteer drivers with their own vehicles to transport clients to needed services. The program is now providing rides to Tucson and Safford. Once the intercity connection is completed to Benson, VICaP will provide rides to join the service.

SEAGO has kicked-off a Willcox Transit Needs Survey. It is expected to be completed in early May. The survey results will be used to support further transit grant opportunities for the area.

## **COCHISE COUNTY INTERCITY ROUTE STUDY**

On March 31, 2016, the Administrative and Executive Committees approved accepting a 5304 Planning Grant and approved SEAGO to develop an RFP and select a consultant to perform a feasibility study for an intercity route from Douglas, to Bisbee, Sierra Vista, and Benson. SEAGO selected Moore and Associates as the consultant to lead the study. A project website has been developed. The project website is <https://cochisetransitplan.com> and is available in English and Spanish. All working papers and survey results can be accessed through the website.

The intercity route is in its final planning stages. The study's transit advisory committee selected the name ***Cochise Connection***. Service will begin in Douglas and follow a SR 80/90 route with stops at the Lowell Plaza in Bisbee, Vista Canyon Medical Center, Cochise College Main Campus, and the Vista Transit Center in Sierra Vista, the Huachuca City Public Library, and the Benson Visitor Center. The SR 80/90 route was chosen over the SR 80/92 route due to time and cost restraints. The SR 80/90 route will allow 3 trips a day as opposed to 2 trips daily for the SR 80/92 route. Service is expected to begin on August 7, 2017. A website for the service is in final development. The site will be [www.cochiseconnection.com](http://www.cochiseconnection.com).

## **GRAHAM/GREENLEE COUNTY FTA 5310 PROGRAM TRANSITION PROJECT**

SEACAP has provided notice that they will be ending their transportation program on June 30<sup>th</sup>. Easter Seals Blake Foundation (ESBF) has volunteered to step in and continue services in Graham and Greenlee Counties. SEAGO is working with SEACAP and ESBF to make this a seamless transition.

ESBF has been providing transportation services in Graham and Greenlee Counties for almost 30 years. SEACAP has three vans located in Graham and Greenlee County. They will be transferred to ESBF for use in Clifton, Duncan, and Safford. ESBF will also be hiring SEACAP's Clifton, Duncan, and Safford drivers to ensure consistency of service. The integration of the ESBF and SEACAP's resources should result in enhanced and more dependable service in Graham and Greenlee Counties. ESBF will be submitting a FTA Section 5310 Grant in May. ESBF may be reaching out to the Counties, Cities, and Towns for Letters of Support for their application. Services could be contingent upon a successful application.

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