

# SEAGO TRANSPORTATION ADVISORY COMMITTEE AGENDA FOR SEAGO TAC

| Date:       | May 17, 2018   |
|-------------|--|
| Time:       | 10 a.m.  |
| Location:   | Cochise College Benson Center, 1025 State Hwy. 90, Benson, Arizona                               |
| Call-in No. | Call Chris Vertrees (520-432-5301 ext. 209) (cdvertrees@seago.org) 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.

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

|      | Shaded items are action items.  |           |       |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|------|---|-----------|-------|--|--|--|--|--|--|
| ITEM | SUBJECT   | PRESENTER | PAGE  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1.   | Call to Order and Introductions   | Michael   | N/A   |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2.   | Call to the Public  | Michael   | N/A   |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 3.   | Approval of Minutes of March 15, 2018   | Michael   | 3-8   |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|      | STP/HSIP Ledger Reports   | Chris     | 9-10  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 4.   | <ul> <li>TIP Reports – FY18 and FY19</li> <li>Discussion and Possible Action on Current TIP</li> <li>Administrative Changes</li> <li>Proposed Amendments</li> </ul> | Chris     | 11-15 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 5.   | Traffic Count Program Update  | Chris     | 16    |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 6.   | Reminder: NOFA-Consolidated Appropriations Act (TIGER)  | Chris     | 17-27 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 6.   | ADOT-LPA Stakeholder Meeting Update   | Karen     | N/A   |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 7.   | District Engineers' Report  Status of State Highway Projects  Quarterly Project Report  | TBD       | N/A   |  |  |  |  |  |  |

SEAGO TAC: May 17, 2018



### SEAGO TRANSPORTATION ADVISORY COMMITTEE

### AGENDA FOR SEAGO TAC

| 8.  | Regional Local Program Reports  > Status of Local Projects  • STP Projects  • Update on Enhancement Projects  • Update on HSIP Projects  • Update on all Planning Studies | Towns, Cities,<br>Counties, &<br>ADOT | N/A |
|-----|---|---------------------------------------|-----|
| 9.  | Items for General Discussion  | All                                   | N/A |
| 10. | Next Meeting Date: July 19, 2018  | Michael                               | N/A |
| 11. | Adjourn   | Michael                               | N/A |

SHSP TAC Meeting will immediately follow our SEAGO TAC Meeting.

The purpose is to review and approve our SHSP.

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



| Date:      | March 15, 2018               |  |                                 |
|------------|------------------------------|--|---------------------------------|
| Time:      | 10 a.m.                      |  |                                 |
| Location:  | Cochise College Benson Cente | er, 1025 State Hwy. 90, Benson, Arizor | na                              |
|            |                              |  |                                 |
| Voting     | Karen Lamberton, Cochise     | Michelle Johnson, Benson               | Jennifer Fuller (Huachuca City) |
| TAC        | Mark Hoffman, ADOT           | John Basteen, Duncan                   | Donna Driskell, Tombstone       |
| Members    | Jesus Valdez, Santa Cruz     | Dwayne Wallace, Bisbee                 | lan McGaughey, Clifton          |
| Present    | Randy Petty, Safford         | Lynn Kartchner, Douglas                | Phil Ronnerud, Greenlee         |
|            | Juan Guerra , Nogales        | Michael Bryce, Graham (Chair)          | Terry Hinton, Thatcher          |
| Guests,    | Chris Vertrees, SEAGO        | Michael Blankenship, Greenlight        |                                 |
| Staff, and | Bradley Simmons, Cochise     | Sanjay Paul, Rick Engineering          |                                 |
| Other      | Brian Jevas, ADOT            | Leonard Fontes, Santa Cruz             |                                 |
| Attendees  | Jason Hart, ADOT             |  |                                 |
|            | Scott Kelly, Greenlight      |  |                                 |

#### 1. Call to Order and Introductions

Chair Michael Bryce called the meeting to order at 10:07 a.m. TAC members, guests and SEAGO staff introduced themselves.

#### 2. Call to the Public

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

#### 3. Approval of Minutes of January 18, 2018

Chair Michael Bryce asked for a motion to approve the January 18, 2018 Minutes.

**MOTION:** Karen Lamberton moved to approve the January 18, 2018 Minutes.

**SECOND:** Michelle Johnson

**ACTION: APPROVED UNANIMOUSLY** 

#### 4. Review, Discussion, Approval of FY19 HSIP Applications

Michael Blankenship (Greenlight Traffic Engineering) presented the TAC with a list of 20 potential HSIP projects based upon ADOT 2012-2016 crash data. The TAC reviewed each potential project. Cochise County had 8 potential projects. After discussion, Cochise County selected to combine Charleston Road (Tombstone to 4.8 miles S of Tombstone), Double Adobe Road (SR 80 to US 191) and Barataria Blvd (Moson Rd to Ranch Rd) into a single application. Greenlight will develop the project application and submit to SEAGO and Cochise County for review, approval and submission.

Graham County had 2 potential projects. After discussion, Graham County selected to combine Cottonwood Wash Road (1200 South to Saguaro Drive) and Golf Course Road (Hoopes Avenue to Elizabeth Ann Drive) into a single application. Greenlight will develop the project application and submit to SEAGO and Graham County for review, approval and submission.



Santa Cruz County had 3 potential projects. After discussion, Santa Cruz County declined to pursue the recommended projects. Santa Cruz County felt that Sonoita Creek Wash was a bigger safety concern. They crash data was reviewed and it appeared to be a potential project. Greenlight will develop the project application and submit to SEAGO and Santa Cruz County for review, approval and submission.

The TAC also reviewed two projects on ADOT facilities:

- SR 75 Duncan (Old Virden/Fairgrounds Rd to Family Dollar Store) Sidewalk both sides and high visibility crosswalk at Old Virden/Fairgrounds.
- US 191/20th St/Lone Star Intersection Pedestrian Hybrid Beacon (HAWK)

The TAC instructed Greenlight to develop those two applications and submit to ADOT Southeast District for review and consideration

Chair Michael Bryce asked for a motion to approve the development of the Cochise, Graham, and Santa Cruz HSIP applications.

**MOTION:** Randy Petty moved to approve the development and submission of the Cochise, Graham, and Santa Cruz HSIP applications.

**SECOND:** Juan Guerra

**ACTION: APPROVED UNANIMOUSLY** 

#### 5. STP/HSIP Ledger Reports

Chris Vertrees presented the STP/HSIP Ledger Reports that were included in the TAC packet on pages 11 and 12.

#### 6. TIP Report (2018-2022)

Chris Vertrees presented the TIP Report. Chris advised the TAC of the following TIP Requests:

SCC 12-12 – Santa Cruz County - (River Road and Pendleton Drive Safety Improvements): This is a HRRP project. The construction cost estimate has been recently revised. An additional \$181,340 is needed in Federal funding to ensure the project moves forward in a timely manner. Local HSIP will be used to fund the remainder of this project. If approved, the project was will be added to the TIP in the following manner:

Year: 2018

Phase: Construction Federal Share: \$181,340 Local Match: \$10,961

Total Project Cost: \$192,301



**CLF16-01 – Town of Clifton - (Zorilla Bridge Rehabilitation):** This is an off-system project. The construction cost estimate has been recently revised. An additional \$150,000 in Federal Funding is needed to ensure the project moves forward in a timely manner. STBG will be used to fund the remainder of this project. If approved, the project was will be added to the TIP in the following manner:

Year: 2018

Phase: Construction Federal Share: \$150,000 Local Match: \$9,067

Total Project Cost: \$159,067

**CCH 18-01 – Cochise County - (Davis Road DCR ROW)**: This is a STBG project programmed in FY18 for \$250,920. The ROW cost estimate is currently being revised. ROW costs are anticipated to be \$558,884. SEAGO is anticipating that \$153,518 in unused STBG funds will be returned to the Region from previous Davis Road ROW projects. Cochise County is requesting that the savings be re-programmed into the Davis Road DCR ROW Project. The County will be providing \$130,000 to address the expected ROW shortfall. STBG will be used to fund the remainder of this project. If approved, the project was will be added to the TIP in the following manner:

Year: 2018 Phase: ROW

Federal Share: \$153,518 Local Match: \$24,446 Other Funds: \$130,000

Total Project Cost: \$558,884

**CCH 19-01 – Cochise County - (Charleston Road Rumble Strips and Other Countermeasures):** This is an HSIP project. Cochise County was notified on January 26, 2018, that its HSIP application was approved (see attached ADOT Safety Project Eligibility Letter). In accordance with the eligibility letter, this project will be programmed as follows:

Year: 2019 Phase: Design

Federal Share: \$123,156

Local Match: \$0

Total Project Cost: \$123,156

Year: 2020

Phase: Construction Federal Share: \$501,000

Local Match: \$0

Total Project Cost: \$501,000

SEAGO TAC Minutes for March 15, 2018



Chair Michael Bryce asked for a motion to approve the 2018-2022 TIP amendments.

**MOTION:** Michelle Johnson moved to approve the 2018-2022 TIP amendments as requested.

**SECOND:** Phil Ronnerud

**ACTION: APPROVED UNANIMOUSLY** 

#### 7. SEAGO 2019-2023 Draft TIP

Chris advised the TAC that the SEAGO Region 2019-2023 TIP needs be submitted to ADOT by July 1, 2018. Due to the SEAGO TAC, Administrative Council, and Executive Board schedules, and the forty-five (45) day public participation process, the 2019-2023 Draft TIP needs to be approved at this meeting for submission to our Administrative and Executive Committees.

Chris advised the TAC that the following adjustments to the 2018-2022 TIP were made in the drafting of the 2019-2023 TIP:

- All projects listed as Obligated in 2017 section of the TIP have been removed.
- All FY 2018 projects that are expected to obligate by June 30, 2018, have been moved to the Obligated in 2018 section of the TIP.
- The 2018-2022 TIP Amendment #3 recommendations submitted to the TAC for approval at this meeting have been included in the 2019-2023 TIP.
- Any HSIP project applications selected to proceed at this meeting will be included in the Future Project Section of the 2019-2023 TIP.

Chris advised the TAC that additional programming decisions were needed to allow the TIP to be finalized for Public Comment. Chris noted that the TIP must be fiscally constrained over a 4-year period (2019 through 2022). Currently our TIP does not meet those requirements. Chris stated that there are two primary causes for this issue:

- 1. Chino Road Phase 2 seeing a significant increase (\$547,000) in its construction estimate. That was a very rough estimate.
- 2. On January 18, 2018, the Sierra Vista, MPO Board voted to expand its boundary. How this will impact on our STBG allocation is not directly known at this time. I am expecting a reduction of \$40,000 to \$80,000 in our annual apportionment. I have estimated a \$60,000 reduction in your attached programming option scenarios. This places extra pressure on us to program with the most accurate cost data possible.

Chris stated that he reviewed 3 options to fiscally constrain the TIP:

**Option 1:** Keep Douglas programmed in FY19 at \$3,000,000. This will set off a series of programming adjustments. Safford 20th Avenue will need to be pushed from FY20 to FY21. Thatcher Church Street (which is almost shovel ready) will need to be pushed to FY2023. However, even with these adjustments we will not be fiscally constrained. Chris referred the TAC to the Option 1 STBG Ledger included in their packet.

**Option 2:** Move Safford 20th Avenue up and reprogram Chino Road to FY2023, this would fiscally constrain the TIP. Chris did communicate with Safford City Engineer, Randy Petty. Randy indicated that the 20th Avenue project would not be ready to proceed in FY19.



**Option 3:** Move Thatcher Church Street up to FY19, this would fiscally constrain the TIP. There is a current construction cost estimate of \$2,325,079 (\$2,184,539: Federal). Chris did communicate with Thatcher Town Engineer, Heath Brown. Heath indicated that the Church Street project would be ready to proceed in FY19. This will require re-programming Chino Road to FY2023. Chris referred the TAC to the Option 3 STBG Ledger included in their packet.

Chris reviewed the Chino Road project estimate history with the TAC. He stated that during our September TAC meeting, the TAC programmed the estimated \$80,000 needed to complete design. This would allow for a detailed cost estimate to be developed. As of our November TAC meeting, no work had been completed involving the development the cost estimate. At that meeting the TAC voted to move the project to FY19 to provide Douglas additional time to provide the cost estimate. It was made clear that the estimate was needed by our March meeting due to the development of the 2019-2023 TIP. At our January meeting, Douglas reported no action had been taken. As of March 7, 2018, no action has been taken. Therefore, the only estimate we have is the rough estimate of \$3,000,000 provided by the ADOT project manager in August.

The TAC discussed the project status. Karen Lamberton indicated her frustration with the lack of progress. She stated that she hated to see the County loose a project. However, the lack of progress puts over \$2 million in regional funding at risk, Karen stated that she would make a motion to move Thatcher Church Street up to FY19 and reprogram Chino Road to FY2023.

Chair Michael Bryce asked for a motion to approve the 2019-2023 Draft TIP.

**MOTION:** Karen Lamberton moved to approve the 2019-2023 TIP with Option 3.

**SECOND:** Ian McGaughey

**ACTION: APPROVED UNANIMOUSLY** 

#### 8. LTAP Training Update

Chris referred the TAC to his memo located on page 32 of the packet. He provided the TAC with an updated training schedule. Signing and Striping will be held on April 25<sup>th</sup> and Maintenance Math will be held on May 8<sup>th</sup>. Chris reviewed the Heavy Equipment Training Survey results with the TAC. Discussion was held involving holding the training at one Regional location or focusing on localized training. The TAC agreed to focus on localized training. Classes will be hosted by Bisbee, Safford, and Santa Cruz County during the fall/winter of this year and early 2019.

#### 9. ADOT-LPA Stakeholder Meeting Update

Karen Lamberton distributed to the TAC an Everyday Counts Report that summarized their March 8<sup>th</sup> meeting. Karen discussed IGA's, release of project funds, project schedules, HURF exchange, and future meeting topics.

#### 10. District Engineers' Report

Brian Jevas 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 Michael Bryce asked if anyone had items for general discussion. No one spoke.

#### 12. Items for Next Meeting

Chris Vertrees advised the TAC that the next meeting will include the SHSP TAC Meeting to approve to SHSP, the TAC will need to review and address any public comments received involving the Draft SEAGO 2019-2023 TIP, and Chris will ask ADOT to provide training involving TDMS.

13. Next Meeting Date: May 17, 2018, at the Cochise College Benson Center.

**MEETING ADJOURNED AT 12:15 PM** 

#### SEAGO STBG Ledger 2018-2022 Revised: May 2018

| New OA rate from ADOT effective FFY 2017              | 94.9% * | Projected Fed | I Funds *    | Cumulative I  | Balance     |
|---|---------|---------------|--------------|---------------|-------------|
| Action  | OA Rate | Apportionment | OA           | Apportionment | OA          |
| STP Carry Forward FY17 (Joe Carlson SRTS Bid Savings) | 94.9%   | \$18,195      | \$18,195     | \$18,195      | \$18,195    |
| FY 2018 Allocation                                    | 94.9%   | \$1,001,206   | \$950,144    | \$1,019,401   | \$968,339   |
| ADOT Loan Repayment In                                | 04.070  | \$525,430     | \$525,430    | \$1,544,831   | \$1,493,769 |
| Cochise County: Davis Road ROW                        |         | -\$404,438    | -\$404,438   | \$1,140,393   | \$1,089,331 |
| Clifton: Zorrilla Bridge Construction                 |         | -\$150,000    | -\$150,000   | \$990,393     | \$939,331   |
| Repay SVMPO for FY16 Loan #2                          |         | -\$69,870     | -\$69,870    | \$920,523     | \$869,461   |
| SEAGO Loan to ADOT (Pending)                          |         | -\$910,523    | -\$910,523   | \$10,000      | -\$41,062   |
| Tech Transfer (LTAP)                                  |         | -\$10,000     | -\$10,000    | \$0           | -\$51,062   |
| HSIP OA Usage   |         | \$0           | \$51,062     | \$0           | \$0         |
| FY 2018 Balance                                       |         |               |              | \$0           | \$0         |
|   |         |               |              |               |             |
| FY 2019 Allocation                                    | 94.9%   | \$940,000     | \$892,060    | \$940,000     | \$892,060   |
| ADOT Loan Repayment In                                |         | \$910,523     | \$910,523    | \$1,850,523   | \$1,802,583 |
| Cochise County Davis Road ROW Savings (Projected)     |         | \$153,518     | \$153,518    | \$2,004,041   | \$1,956,101 |
| Thatcher: Church Street                               |         | -\$2,189,950  | -\$2,189,950 | -\$185,909    | -\$233,849  |
| Tech Transfer (LTAP)                                  |         | -\$10,000     | -\$10,000    | -\$195,909    | -\$243,849  |
| FY 2019 Balance                                       |         |               |              | -\$195,909    | -\$243,849  |
| FY 2020 Allocation                                    | 94.9%   | \$940,000     | \$892,060    | \$744,091     | \$648,211   |
| Tech Transfer (LTAP)                                  |         | -\$10,000     | -\$10,000    | \$734,091     | \$638,211   |
| FY 2020 Balance                                       |         | Ţ : 0,000     | + ,          | \$734,091     | \$638,211   |
| FY2021 Allocation                                     | 94.9%   | \$940,000     | \$892,060    | \$1,674,091   | \$1,530,271 |
| Safford: 20th Avenue                                  | 04.070  | -\$2,000,000  | -\$2,000,000 | -\$325,909    | -\$469,729  |
| Tech Transfer (LTAP)                                  |         | -\$10,000     | -\$10,000    | -\$335,909    | -\$479,729  |
| FY 2021 Balance                                       |         | Ţ,000         | 713,000      | -\$345,909    | -\$489,729  |
| FY2022 Allocation                                     | 94.9%   | \$940,000     | \$892,060    | \$594,091     | \$402,331   |
| Tech Transfer (LTAP)                                  | 0 70    | -\$10,000     | -\$10,000    | \$584,091     | \$392,331   |
| FY 2022 Balance                                       |         | , ,,,,,,,     | ,            | \$584,091     | \$392,331   |

#### 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.

<sup>\*</sup> Notes: 1. Updated: May 2018

<sup>2.</sup> OA Rate is at 94.9% is subject to change

<sup>3.</sup> STP Apportionments are ADOT estimates and subject to change.

<sup>4.</sup> Estimated loss from SVMPO Expansion

<sup>5.</sup> Chino Road moved to FY2023 at \$3,000,000

#### SEAGO HSIP Ledger 2018-2019 Revised: May 2018

| New OA rate from ADOT effective FFY 2016     | 94.9% * | Projected Fed Funds * |            | Cumulative Balance |           |  |
|--|---------|-----------------------|------------|--------------------|-----------|--|
| Action                                       | OA Rate | Apportionment         | OA         | Apportionment      | OA        |  |
| HSIP Balance 10/1/16                         |         | \$0                   | \$0        | \$0                | \$0       |  |
| FY 2018 Allocation                           | 94.9%   | \$519,767             | \$493,259  | \$519,767          | \$493,259 |  |
| Repay SVMPO                                  |         | -\$200,000            | -\$200,000 | \$319,767          | \$293,259 |  |
| STP OA Useage                                |         | \$0                   | -\$51,062  | \$319,767          | \$242,197 |  |
| Santa Cruz County: Pendleton Drive           |         | -\$181,340            | -\$181,340 | \$138,427          | \$60,857  |  |
| FY 2018 Balance                              |         |                       |            | \$138,427          | \$60,857  |  |
| FY 2019 Allocation                           | 94.9%   | \$0                   | \$0        | \$0                | \$0       |  |
| (Local HSIP Funding Allocation Discontinued) |         |                       |            |                    |           |  |
|  |         |                       |            |                    |           |  |
|  |         |                       |            |                    |           |  |

<sup>\*</sup> Notes: 1. Updated: May 2018

#### 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.

<sup>2.</sup> Reflects ADOT assigned OA Rate of 94.9%

<sup>3.</sup> HSIP Apportionments are ADOT estimates and subject to change.



### TAC PACKET

TO: SEAGO TAC

FROM: CHRIS VERTREES, SEAGO TRANSPORTATION PLANNER

**DATE:** MAY 8, 2018

**RE:** SEAGO 2018-2022 & 2019-2023 TIP REPORT

The SEAGO 2019-2023 TIP is undergoing its 45-day Public Comment period (April 4, 2018 to March 18, 2018). **SEAGO has received no comments to date.** 

Administrative changes were made to the 2018-2022 TIP and the 2019-2023 TIP as follows:

#### **SEAGO FY18 Grant Application Parking Lot**

At our March 15, 2018 meeting, the TAC approved three HSIP applications. The following table reflects TAC approval of the applications:

| Project Name   | Road                    | Location                                     | Length (miles) | Estimated Cost | B/C<br>Ratio |
|--|-------------------------|--|----------------|----------------|--------------|
| Cochise County   | Charleston Road         | Tombstone to 4.8 miles<br>South of Tombstone | 4.8            |                |              |
| Road Safety<br>Improvement<br>Project                      | Double Adobe Road       | SR 80 to Frontier Road                       | 4.5            |                |              |
| 110,000  | Barataria Blvd          | Moson Road to Ranch<br>Road                  | 1.0            |                |              |
|  |                         | Total Project                                | 10.3           | \$551,000      | 29.7         |
| Graham County<br>Road Safety                               | Cottonwood Wash<br>Road | 1200 South to<br>Saguaro Drive               | 3.5            |                |              |
| Improvement<br>Project                                     | Golf Course<br>Road     | Hoopes Avenue to<br>Elizabeth Ann Drive      | 1.6            |                |              |
|  | ,                       |  | 5.1            | \$1,246,000    | 30.9         |
| Santa Cruz County<br>Sonoita Creek Wash<br>Safety Project* | Pendleton Drive         | Pendleton Drive Dip<br>at Sonoita Creek Wash | TBD            |                |              |
|  |                         | Total Project                                | TBD            | TBD            | TBD          |

<sup>\*</sup>The Santa Cruz County project was identified during the TAC meeting. No cost estimate B/C ratio tabulations had been completed. The TAC approved the project as long as it met ADOT application eligibility requirements.

The HSIP applications were developed and submitted to ADOT review. The Cochise County application required no revisions. The HSIP applications for Graham County and Santa Cruz County required cost estimate revisions and new B/C ratio tabulations based on the estimate revisions. The following table reflects the revisions to the TAC approved applications:

| Project Name   | Road                          | Location                                       | Length (miles) | Estimated Cost | B/C<br>Ratio |
|--|-------------------------------|--|----------------|----------------|--------------|
| Cochise County   | Charleston Road               | Tombstone to 4.8 miles South of Tombstone      | 4.8            |                |              |
| Road Safety<br>Improvement<br>Project                      | Double Adobe Road             | SR 80 to Frontier Road                         | 4.5            |                |              |
| ,  | Barataria Blvd                | Moson Road to Ranch<br>Road                    | 1.0            |                |              |
|  |                               | Total Project                                  | 10.3           | \$551,000      | 29.7         |
| Graham County<br>Road Safety                               | Cottonwood Wash<br>Road       | 1200 South to<br>Saguaro Drive                 | 3.5            |                |              |
| Improvement<br>Project                                     | Golf Course<br>Road           | Hoopes Avenue to<br>Elizabeth Ann Drive        | 1.6            |                |              |
|  | Total Project 5.1 \$2,330,205 |  | 4.9            |                |              |
| Santa Cruz County<br>Sonoita Creek Wash<br>Safety Project* | Pendleton Drive               | Pendleton Drive Dip<br>at Sonoita Creek Wash 1 |                |                |              |
|  |                               | Total Project                                  | 1              | \$1,536,000    | 3.0          |

**CCH 18-01 (Davis Road DCR – ROW):** An administrative change was made to the project length. The length was previously listed as being 1.7 miles long. Cochise County has advised that the correct project length is 2.39 miles.

SEAGO Draft TIP Amendment #4 is attached for your review.

#### SEAGO REGION

#### Draft 2018- 2022 TIP Amendment #4 (Administrative Changes)

Approved By: TAC - 3/15/18 Admistrative Council- 3/29/18 Executive Board - 3/29/18

| TIP YEAR<br>Project ID | PROJECT<br>SPONSOR        | PROJECT<br>NAME  | PROJECT<br>LOCATION  | LENGTH     | TYPE OF<br>IMP - WK - STRU | Functional<br>Classifications | LANES<br>BEFORE | LANES<br>AFTER | FED AID<br>TYPE      | FEDERAL<br>FUNDS               | LOCAL<br>MATCH | OTHER<br>FUNDS | TOTAL<br>COST                  |
|------------------------|---------------------------|--|--|------------|----------------------------|-------------------------------|-----------------|----------------|----------------------|--------------------------------|----------------|----------------|--------------------------------|
| 2018                   |                           |  |  |            |                            |                               |                 |                |                      |                                |                |                |                                |
| DGS17-01               | City of Douglas           | Chino Road Extension<br>Phase 2                                | Chino Road: 9th Street to SR90   | .85 miles  | Design                     | Urban Minor Arterial          | 2               | 2              | STP                  | \$75,440                       | \$4,560        |                | \$80,000                       |
| CCH18-01               | Cochise County            | Davis Road Project Assessment and DCR                          | Davis Road from Hwy 191 to N.<br>Central Highway<br>Valle Verde Dr. and Paseo Verde  | 2.39 miles | ROW                        | Rural Major Collector         | 2               | 2              | STP                  | \$404,438                      | \$24,446       | \$116,116      | \$545,000                      |
| NOG 19-01              | City of Nogales           | Valle Verde/Paseo Verde<br>Paving Project                      | 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<br>Paving Project                      | Valle Verde Dr. and Paseo Verde<br>Drive between Grand Ave. and W.<br>Mesa Verde Dr.   | 1150 Feet  | Design (PMDR Fee)          | Urban Local                   | 2               | 2              | CMAQ                 | \$28,290                       | \$1,710        |                | \$30,000                       |
|                        |                           | River Road and Pendleton<br>Drive Safety                       | Diver Dead and Deadlister Drive  | Mada       | O a material barr          | Dural Maior Callegator        |                 | 2              | LIDDDD               | #0.004.700                     | 0450.005       |                | 40.004.505                     |
| SCC12-12               | Santa Cruz County         | Improvements Drive Intersection                                | River Road and Pendleton Drive   | Varies     | Construction               | Rural Major Collector         | 2               |                | HRRRP                | \$2,664,700                    | \$159,865      |                | \$2,824,565                    |
| SCC12-03               | Santa Cruz County         | Improvements Rio Rico and Pendleton                            | Intersection   |            | Design                     | Rural Major Collector         |                 |                | HSIP                 | \$70,725                       | \$4,275        |                | \$75,000                       |
| SCC12-03               | Santa Cruz County         | Drive Intersection<br>Improvements<br>River Road and Pendleton | Intersection   |            | ROW                        | Rural Major Collector         |                 |                | HSIP                 | \$188,600                      | \$11,400       |                | \$200,000                      |
| SCC12-12               | Santa Cruz County         | Drive Safety<br>Improvements                                   | River Road and Pendleton Drive   | Varies     | Construction               | Rural Major Collector         | 2               | 2              | HSIP                 | \$181,340                      | \$10,961       |                | \$192,301                      |
| CLF16-01               | Town of Clifton           | Zorilla Street Bridge<br>Rehabilitation, Structure<br>#9633    | Zorilla Street between US 191 and Park, Avenue, Clifton, AZ  | 216 Feet   | Construction               | Rural Local                   | 2               | 2              | STP                  | \$150,000                      | \$9,067        |                | \$159,067                      |
| CLF16-01               | Town of Clifton           | Zorilla Street Bridge<br>Rehabilitation, Structure<br>#9633    | Zorilla Street between US 191 and<br>Park, Avenue, Clifton, AZ   | 216 Feet   | Construction               | Rural Local                   | 2               | 2              | Off-System<br>Bridge | \$729,896                      | \$44,118       |                | \$774,014                      |
| 02. 10 0 1             | LTAP TOTAL FOR 2018       |  | Tuni, rivolido, Olitori, riz   | 2101000    | Concuracion                | Trainal Eddai                 | _               |                | STP                  | \$10,000<br><b>\$4,584,022</b> | \$275,274      | \$116,116      | \$10,000<br><b>\$4,859,296</b> |
|                        | TOTAL TOR 2010            |  |  |            |                            |                               |                 |                |                      | <b>\$4,004,022</b>             | ΨΕΙΟ,ΕΙΨ       | ψ110,110       | ψ4,000,200                     |
| 2019                   |                           | Chino Road Extension   |  |            |                            |                               |                 |                |                      |                                |                |                |                                |
| DGS17-01               | City of Douglas           | Phase 2  | Chino Road: 9th Street to SR90   | .85 miles  | Construction               | Urban Minor Arterial          | 2               | 2              | STP                  | \$2,282,060                    | \$137,940      |                | \$2,420,000                    |
| GGH12-04               | Graham County             | 8th Ave & Airport Rd<br>Intersection                           | Intersection   |            | Construction               | Rural Major Collector         | 2               | 2              | HPP                  | \$996,375                      | \$60,226       |                | \$1,056,601                    |
| GGH12-04               | Graham County             | 8th Ave & Airport Rd<br>Intersection                           | Intersection   |            | Construction               | Rural Major Collector         | 2               | 2              | HRRRP                | \$2,300,000                    |                |                | \$2,300,000                    |
| NOG 19-01              | City of Nogales           | Valle Verde/Paseo Verde<br>Paving Project                      | Valle Verde Dr. and Paseo Verde<br>Drive between Grand Ave. and W.<br>Mesa Verde Dr.   | 1150 Feet  | Construction               | Urban Local                   | 2               | 2              | CMAQ                 | \$409,942                      | \$24,779       |                | \$434,721                      |
| CCH 19-01              | Cochise County            | Cochise County Rumble<br>Strips and Other<br>Countermeasures   | Charleston Road from County Line to 4 miles north of Brunckow Road   | 4 miles    | Design                     | Major Collector               | 2               | 2              | HSIP                 | \$123,156                      | \$0            |                | \$123,156                      |
|                        | -                         | Bankerd Ave. Paving  | Bankerd Avenue from East Doe   |            | -                          |                               | _               |                |                      |                                |                |                |                                |
| NOG 19-02              | City of Nogales           | Project<br>I-19/Ruby Road TI-                                  | Street Intersection  | 510 Feet   | Design                     | Urban Local                   | 2               | 2              | CMAQ                 | \$69,103                       | \$4,178        |                | \$73,281                       |
| SCC 18-01              | Santa Cruz County LTAP    | Improvements   | I-19/Ruby Road TI  |            | Design                     | Rural Major Collector         | 2               | 2              | CMAQ<br>STP          | \$984,256<br>\$10,000          | \$59,494       |                | \$1,043,750<br>\$10,000        |
|                        | TOTAL FOR 2019            |  |  |            |                            |                               |                 |                |                      | \$15,754,175                   | \$801,577      |                | \$16,555,752                   |
| 2020                   |                           |  |  |            |                            |                               |                 |                |                      |                                |                |                |                                |
|                        | City of Safford           | 20th Ave, Phase II   | Relation St to Golf Course Rd East side of Grand Avenue from Baffert Drive to Country Club Drive. Intersects with Grand Avenue path on south side of | .63 Miles  | Construction               | Urban Minor Arterial          | 3               | 5              | STP                  | \$2,000,000                    | \$120,891      |                | \$2,120,891                    |
| NOG 20-02              | City of Nogales           | Pathway Project, Baffert Dr<br>to Nogales High School          | Frank Reed Road to Nogales High School   | 3 miles    | Design                     | N/A                           | N/A             | N/A            | CMAQ                 | \$121,162                      | \$7,324        |                | \$128,486                      |
| NOG 19-02              | City of Nogales           | Bankerd Ave. Paving<br>Project                                 | Bankerd Avenue from East Doe<br>Street Intersection  | 510 Feet   | Construction               | Urban Local                   | 2               | 2              | CMAQ                 | \$214,462                      | \$12,964       |                | \$227,426                      |
| 001140.04              | Ocabica Ocumbu            | Cochise County Rumble<br>Strips and Other<br>Countermeasures   | Charleston Road from County Line   | 4 !!       | Opportunities              | Maias Callantas               | 2               | 2              | HSIP                 | #F04.000                       |                |                | <b>#</b> 504.000               |
| CCH 19-01              | Cochise County            | Rio Rico and Pendleton<br>Drive Intersection                   | to 4 miles north of Brunckow Road  | 4 miles    | Construction               | Major Collector               | 2               |                | HOIP                 | \$501,000                      | \$0            |                | \$501,000                      |
| SCC12-03               | Santa Cruz County<br>LTAP | Improvements   | Intersection   |            | Construction               | Rural Major Collector         |                 |                | HRRRP<br>STP         | \$984,555<br>\$10,000          | \$50,445       |                | \$1,035,000<br>\$10,000        |
|                        | TOTAL FOR 2020            |  |  |            |                            |                               |                 |                |                      | \$3,831,179                    | \$191,624      | \$0            | \$4,022,803                    |
| 2021                   |                           |  |  |            |                            |                               |                 |                |                      |                                |                |                |                                |
| NOG 20-02              | City of Nogales           | Pathway Project, Baffert Dr<br>to Nogales High School          | Baffert Drive to Country Club<br>Drive. Intersects with Grand  | 3 miles    | Construction               | N/A                           | N/A             | N/A            | CMAQ                 | \$637,780                      | \$38,551       |                | \$676,331                      |

## SEAGO REGION Draft 2018- 2022 TIP Amendment #4 (Administrative Changes) Approved By: TAC - 3/15/18 Admistrative Council- 3/29/18 Executive Board - 3/29/18

|           | LTAP                     |  |   |            |                                     |                         |     |     | STP        | \$10,000                                |                 |           | \$10,000     |
|-----------|--------------------------|--|---|------------|-------------------------------------|-------------------------|-----|-----|------------|---|-----------------|-----------|--------------|
|           | TOTAL FOR 2021           |  |   |            |                                     |                         |     |     |            | \$10,000                                | \$0             |           | \$10,000     |
|           |                          |  |   |            |                                     |                         |     |     |            |   |                 |           |              |
| 2022      |                          |  |   |            |                                     |                         |     |     |            |   |                 |           |              |
| 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  |
|           | LTAP                     |  |   |            |                                     |                         |     |     | STP        | \$10,000                                |                 |           | \$10,000     |
|           | TOTAL FOR 2022           |  |   |            |                                     |                         |     |     |            | \$3,027,600                             | \$182,400       | \$0       | \$3,210,000  |
|           | DDIDGE DDG IEGEG         |  |   |            |                                     |                         |     |     |            |   |                 |           |              |
|           | BRIDGE PROJECTS          |  |   |            | Scoping, Design,                    |                         |     |     |            |   |                 |           |              |
|           |                          | Ft. Thomas River Structure                     |   |            | Environmental ROW, and              |                         |     |     | Off System |   |                 |           |              |
| GGH-BR-02 | Graham County            | No. 8131                                       | Ft. Thomas River  | 1000 feet  | Construction                        | Rural Local             | 2   | 2   | Bridge     | \$1,000,000                             | \$60,445        |           | \$1,060,445  |
|           | -                        | Soap Box Canyon Bridge                         |   |            |                                     |                         |     |     |            |   |                 |           |              |
|           |                          | Replacement Structure                          | Wards Canyon Road, 3.39 miles E                           |            |                                     |                         |     |     | Off System |   |                 |           |              |
| GEH-BR-07 | Greenlee County          | 8149: Phase 2                                  | Jct US 191  | 31 feet    | Replacement                         | Rural Local             | 2   | 2   | Bridge     | \$424,350                               | \$25,650        |           | \$450,000    |
|           | TOTAL BRIDGE PROJECTS    |  |   |            |                                     |                         |     |     |            | 64 404 250                              | £00 00E         |           | 64 540 445   |
|           | TOTAL BRIDGE PROJECTS    |  |   |            |                                     |                         |     |     |            | \$1,424,350                             | \$86,095        |           | \$1,510,445  |
|           | TOTAL FOR FIVE YEAR      |  |   |            |                                     |                         |     |     |            |   |                 |           |              |
|           | PROGRAM                  |  |   |            |                                     |                         |     |     |            | \$28,631,326                            | \$1,536,969     | \$116,116 | \$30,284,411 |
|           | FUNDING OBLIGATED IN 201 | 17   |   |            |                                     |                         |     |     |            | , ,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,, | , , , , , , , , | , , ,     | ,,,,,,       |
|           |                          |  |   |            | Construction Sidewalks,             |                         |     |     |            |   |                 |           |              |
|           |                          | Joe Carlson Safe Routes                        |   |            | Crosswalks, Striping & ADA          |                         |     |     |            |   |                 |           |              |
| DGS13-05  | City of Douglas          | to School                                      | Douglas   |            | Ramps                               |                         |     |     | SRTS       | \$250,000                               |                 |           | \$250,000    |
|           |                          | In Contract Onto Double                        |   |            | Construction Sidewalks,             |                         |     |     |            |   |                 |           |              |
| DGS13-05  | City of Douglas          | Joe Carlson Safe Routes to School              | Davidas   |            | Crosswalks, Striping & ADA<br>Ramps |                         |     |     | STP        | \$66.010                                | \$3,990         |           | \$70,000     |
| DGS 13-05 | City of Douglas          | 10 SC11001                                     | Douglas   |            | Ramps                               |                         |     |     | SIP        | \$00,010                                | \$3,990         |           | \$70,000     |
|           |                          | Sidewalks: Hwy 92: MP353                       | 3   |            |                                     |                         |     |     |            |   |                 |           |              |
|           |                          | 353.4, Naco Hwy: Naco                          | Hwy 92:MP353-353.4, Naco Hwy:                             |            |                                     |                         |     |     |            |   |                 |           |              |
| ST-TE-15  | State                    | Hwy-Collins Rd, Bisbee                         | Naco Hwy-Collins Rd, Bisbee                               |            | Construction/Sidewalks              |                         |     |     | TE18       | \$706,987                               | \$42,734        |           | \$749,721    |
|           |                          | Campbell Blue Bridge                           | Blue River Road (FR 281), 8.8                             |            |                                     |                         |     |     |            |   |                 |           |              |
| GEH-BR-08 | Greenlee County          | Replacement                                    | South of E Jct US 180                                     | 61 feet    | Design                              | Rural Local             | 2   | 2   | STP        | \$200,000                               | \$12,089        |           | \$212,089    |
| 001140.00 | Orah ara Orana           | Reay Lane/Safford Bryce                        | 1-4   |            | 0                                   | Describing Collector    | 0   |     | HRRRP      | 0404.050                                | 605.050         |           | 0.450.000    |
| GGH12-03  | Graham County            | Road<br>Reay Lane/Safford Bryce                | Intersection  |            | Construction                        | Rural Major Collector   | 2   | 2   | HKKKP      | \$424,350                               | \$25,650        |           | \$450,000    |
| GGH12-03  | Graham County            | Road   | Intersection  |            | Construction                        | Rural Major Collector   | 2   | 2   | HSIP       | \$66,010                                | \$3,990         |           | \$70,000     |
| 001112 00 | Statiant Sounty          | Regional Strategic                             | Intersection  |            | Construction                        | Traini Major Concolor   | -   |     | TIOII      | ψου,υ το                                | ψ0,000          |           | ψ10,000      |
| SEA15-02  | SEAGO/SVMPO Region       | Highway Safety Plan                            | Various Locations   | N/A        | Planning Study                      | Varies                  | N/A | N/A | HSIP       | \$50,000                                | \$3,022         |           | \$53,022     |
|           |                          | River Road and Pendleton                       |   |            |                                     |                         |     |     |            | , , , , , ,                             |                 |           | , , .        |
|           |                          | Drive Safety                                   |   |            |                                     |                         |     |     |            |   |                 |           |              |
| SCC12-12  | Santa Cruz County        | Improvements                                   | River Road and Pendleton Drive                            | Varies     | Design                              | Rural Major Collector   | 2   | 2   | HSIP       | \$56,580                                | \$3,420         |           | \$60,000     |
|           |                          | Town of Pima US 70<br>Pedestrian Bridge        |   |            | Construction: Pedestrian            |                         |     |     |            |   |                 |           |              |
| ST-TE-21  | State                    | Extension                                      | US 70, Town of Pima                                       |            | Bridge                              |                         |     |     | TE17       | \$561,792                               | \$33,958        |           | \$595,750    |
| 31-1L-21  | State                    | 8th Ave & Airport Rd                           | US 70, TOWITOTT IIIIa                                     |            | Bridge                              |                         |     |     | 1217       | \$301,73Z                               | ψ55,950         |           | ψ333,730     |
| GGH12-04  | Graham County            | Intersection                                   | Intersection  |            | Design                              | Rural Major Collector   | 2   | 2   | HPP        | \$700,000                               |                 |           | \$700,000    |
|           | 7                        |  |   |            | 1                                   | .,                      |     |     |            | ,,,,,,,                                 |                 |           | ,,           |
|           |                          | Reay Lane Irrigation Canal                     |   |            |                                     |                         |     |     |            |   |                 |           |              |
| GGH-13-04 | Graham County            | Ditch Relocation                               | Safford Bryce Road in Safford                             | .2 miles   | ROW                                 | Rural Minor Collector   | 2   | 2   | HRRRP      | \$68,000                                | \$4,110         |           | \$72,110     |
| CCU 12 04 | Craham County            | Reay Lane Irrigation Canal<br>Ditch Relocation | Reay Lane Between US70 &<br>Safford Bryce Road in Safford | 2 miles    | Construction                        | Rural Minor Collector   | 2   | 2   | HRRRP      | \$194.200                               | 611 124         |           | \$195,334    |
| GGH-13-04 | Graham County LTAP       | DITCH REIOCATION                               | Sanoru Bryce Road III Sarford                             | .2 miles   | Construction                        | Ruidi Willioi Collector | 2   | ۷   | STP        | \$184,200<br>\$10,000                   | \$11,134        |           | \$195,334    |
|           | TOTAL FOR 2016           |  |   |            |                                     |                         |     |     | SIF        | \$3,343,929                             | \$144,098       |           | \$3,488,027  |
|           | TOTAL FOR 2010           |  |   |            |                                     |                         |     |     |            | ψυ,υ+υ,929                              | φ144,030        |           | φ3,400,027   |
|           |                          |  |   |            |                                     |                         |     |     |            |   |                 |           |              |
|           | Future Construction Proj | iects  |   |            |                                     |                         |     |     |            |   |                 |           |              |
|           |                          |  |   |            | Construction of Safety &            |                         |     |     |            |   |                 |           |              |
| CCH12-10  | Cochise County           | Davis Rd. Improvements                         | Davis Road MP 13  | 1 mile     | Drainage Improvements               | Rural Major Collector   | 2   | 2   | STP        | \$924,560                               | \$55,885        |           | \$980,445    |
|           |                          |  |   |            | Construction of Safety &            |                         |     |     |            |   |                 |           |              |
| CCH15-01  | Cochise County           | Davis Rd. Improvements                         | Davis Road MP 5   | 0.61 miles | Drainage Improvements               | Rural Major Collector   | 2   | 2   | STP        | \$1,045,000                             | \$63,165        |           | \$1,108,165  |
| 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  |

#### SEAGO REGION

#### Draft 2018- 2022 TIP Amendment #4 (Administrative Changes)

Approved By: TAC - 3/15/18 Admistrative Council- 3/29/18 Executive Board - 3/29/18

|  | SEAGO                | FY18 HSIP Application Parking Lot            |                   |                   |           |
|--|----------------------|--|-------------------|-------------------|-----------|
| Project<br>Name  | Road                 | Location                                     | Length<br>(miles) | Estimated<br>Cost | B/C Ratio |
| Cochise County<br>Road Safety<br>Improvement<br>Project      | Charleston Road      | Tombstone to 4.8 miles South of Tombstone    | 4.8               |                   |           |
|  | Double Adobe Road    | SR 80 to Frontier Road                       | 4.5               |                   |           |
|  | Barataria Blvd       | Moson Road to Ranch Road                     | 1                 |                   |           |
|  |                      | Total Project                                | 10.3              | \$551,000         | 29.7      |
| Graham County Road Safety Improvement Project                | Cottonwood Wash Road | 1200 South to Saguaro Drive                  | 3.5               |                   |           |
| 110,000  | Golf Course Road     | Hoopes Avenue to Elizabeth Ann Drive         | 1.6               |                   |           |
|  |                      | Total Project                                | 5.1               | \$2,330,205       | 4.9       |
| Santa Cruz<br>County Sonoita<br>Creek Wash<br>Safety Project | Pendleton Drive      | Pendleton Drive Dip at Sonoita Creek<br>Wash |                   |                   |           |
|  |                      | Total Project                                |                   | \$1,536,000       | 3.1       |



## TAC PACKET

TO: SEAGO TAC

FROM: CHRIS VERTREES, SEAGO TRANSPORTATION PLANNER

**DATE:** MAY 10, 2018

RE: TRAFFIC COUNT PROGRAM UPDATE

Traffic Counting is scheduled to begin on Monday, May 14, 2018, in Santa Cruz County. Works consulting has identified 635 count locations in the Region. Selected count locations will focus on three primary goals:

- Complete our FY17 Regional Traffic Count Plan (120 locations selected by our TAC).
- Bring roads functionally classified as a collector or above current.
- Develop week-long count locations that will be repeated the same week of every year going forward. These sites will serve for growth factoring in years that we don't do counts.

All count locations are tentative. You will have an opportunity to make some adjustments to meet your needs. Works Consulting (Joe Breyer or Jothan Samuelson) will be reaching out to each participating agency prior to counting to discuss and confirm traffic count locations. I will be bringing more information involving count locations to our meeting.

We will be closing the Works Consulting contract prior to the end of the fiscal year (6/30/18). Please respond quickly to information/confirmation requests from Joe or Jothan so we take full advantage of the funds we have remaining.

Works will ensure all count data collected will be uploaded into TDMS for your use. Local traffic count maps will be available through a Dropbox link for you to print.

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



- 10. What actions can be taken to improve public awareness of traumatic injury as a public health issue?
- 11. What actions could be taken to improve the rapid extrication of motor vehicle crash patients?
- 12. What actions could be taken to improve the rapid transport of trauma patients?
- 13. What actions could be taken to improve prehospital care for pediatric trauma patients?
- 14. What actions could be taken to improve tribal prehospital trauma care?
- 15. What research is needed to improve prehospital trauma care during a mass casualty incident?
- 16. What is the potential role of 9–1–1 in improving prehospital trauma care outcomes?
- 17. What is the potential role of bystander care, such as Stop the Bleed, in improving prehospital trauma care outcomes?
- 18. What is the potential role of vehicle telematics in improving prehospital trauma care outcomes?
- 19. What is the potential role of telemedicine in improving prehospital trauma care outcomes?
- 20. What is the potential role of community paramedicine, mobile integrated healthcare, and other emerging EMS subspecialties in improving prehospital trauma care outcomes?
- 21. How could data-driven and evidence-based improvements in EMS systems improve prehospital trauma care?
- 22. How could enhanced collaboration among EMS systems, health care providers, hospitals, public safety answering points, public health, insurers, and others improve prehospital trauma care?
- 23. What are some opportunities to improve exchange of evidence based prehospital trauma care practices between military and civilian medicine?
- 24. Do you have any additional comments regarding prehospital trauma care?

Authority: 44 U.S.C. Section 3506(c)(2)(A). Issued in Washington, DC, on April 19,

2018.

#### Jeff Michael,

Associate Administrator, Research and Program Development.

[FR Doc. 2018-08504 Filed 4-26-18; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4910-59-P

#### **DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION**

### Office of the Secretary of Transportation

Notice of Funding Opportunity for the Department of Transportation's National Infrastructure Investments Under the Consolidated Appropriations Act, 2018

**AGENCY:** Office of the Secretary of Transportation, DOT.

ACTION: Notice of funding opportunity.

SUMMARY: The Consolidated Appropriations Act, 2018 (Pub. L. 115-141, March 23, 2018) ("FY 2018 Appropriations Act" or the "Act") appropriated \$1.5 billion to be awarded by the Department of Transportation ("DOT" or the "Department") for National Infrastructure Investments. This appropriation stems from the program funded and implemented pursuant to the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act of 2009 (the "Recovery Act"). This program was previously known as the Transportation Investment Generating Economic Recovery, or "TIGER Discretionary Grants," program and is now known as the Better Utilizing Investments to Leverage Development, or "BUILD Transportation Discretionary Grants," program. Funds for the FY 2018 BUILD Transportation program are to be awarded on a competitive basis for projects that will have a significant local or regional impact. The purpose of this Final Notice is to solicit applications for **BUILD Transportation Discretionary** 

**DATES:** Applications must be submitted by 8:00 p.m. E.D.T. on July 18, 2018. **ADDRESSES:** Applications must be submitted through *Grants.gov*.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: For further information concerning this notice, please contact the BUILD Transportation program staff via email at BUILDgrants@dot.gov, or call Howard Hill at 202–366–0301. A TDD is available for individuals who are deaf or hard of hearing at 202–366–3993. In addition, DOT will regularly post answers to questions and requests for clarifications as well as information about webinars for further guidance on DOT's website at

www.transportation.gov/BUILD grants.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: Many of the selection criteria of BUILD Transportation grants overlap with previous rounds of National Infrastructure Investments discretionary grants, though the program is refocused on infrastructure investment that will make a positive impact throughout the country. The FY 2018 BUILD Transportation program will continue to give special consideration to projects located in rural areas. For this round of **BUILD Transportation Discretionary** Grants, the maximum grant award is \$25 million, and no more than \$150 million can be awarded to a single State, as specified in the FY 2018 Appropriations Act. Each section of this notice contains information and instructions relevant to the application process for these BUILD Transportation Discretionary Grants, and all applicants should read this notice in its entirety so that they have the information they need to submit eligible and competitive applications.

#### **Table of Contents**

A. Program Description

B. Federal Award Information

C. Eligibility Information

D. Application and Submission Information

E. Application Review Information

F. Federal Award Administration Information

G. Federal Awarding Agency Contacts

H. Other Information

#### A. Program Description

The Consolidated Appropriations Act, 2018 (Pub. L. 115-141, March 23, 2018) ("FY 2018 Appropriations Act" or the "Act") appropriated \$1.5 billion to be awarded by the Department of Transportation ("DOT" or the "Department") for National Infrastructure Investments. Since this program was first created, \$5.6 billion has been awarded for capital investments in surface transportation infrastructure over nine rounds of competitive grants. Throughout the program, these discretionary grant awards have supported projects that have a significant local or regional

The Department is committed to addressing the unmet transportation infrastructure needs of rural areas. Rural America is home to many of the nation's most critical transportation infrastructure assets, including 444,000 bridges, 2.98 million miles of roadways, and 30,500 miles of Interstate highways. More than 55 percent of all public road miles are locally-owned rural roads. While only 19 percent of the nation's population lives in rural areas, 49 percent of all traffic fatalities occur on rural roads (2015). In addition, Americans living in rural areas and on Tribal lands continue to disproportionately lack access to basic broadband service. The Department believes that underinvestment in rural transportation systems has allowed a slow and steady decline in the transportation routes that connect rural

American communities to each other and to the rest of the county. New investment is necessary to grow rural economies, facilitate freight movement, improve access to reliable and affordable transportation options and enhance health access and safety for residents. To address these rural transportation infrastructure needs, DOT intends to award a greater share of BUILD Transportation Discretionary Grant funding to projects located in rural areas that align well with the selection criteria than to such projects in urban areas.

#### **B. Federal Award Information**

#### 1. Amount Available

The FY 2018 Appropriations Act appropriated \$1.5 billion to be awarded by DOT for the BUILD Transportation program. The FY 2018 BUILD Transportation Discretionary Grants are for capital investments in surface transportation infrastructure and are to be awarded on a competitive basis for projects that will have a significant local or regional impact. Additionally, the Act allows for up to \$15 million (of the \$1.5 billion) to be awarded as grants for the planning, preparation or design of eligible projects. DOT is referring to any such awarded projects as BUILD Transportation Planning Grants. The FY 2018 Appropriations Act also allows DOT to retain up to \$25 million of the \$1.5 billion for award, oversight and administration of grants and credit assistance made under the BUILD Transportation program. If this solicitation does not result in the award and obligation of all available funds, DOT may publish additional solicitations.

The FY 2018 Appropriations Act allows up to 20 percent of available funds (or \$300 million) to be used by the Department to pay the subsidy and administrative costs for a project receiving credit assistance under the Transportation Infrastructure Finance and Innovation Act of 1998 ("TIFIA") program, if that use of the FY 2018 BUILD funds would further the purposes of the BUILD Transportation program.

#### 2. Award Size

The FY 2018 Appropriations Act specifies that BUILD Transportation Discretionary Grants may not be less than \$5 million and not greater than \$25 million, except that for projects located in rural areas (as defined in Section C.3.ii.) the minimum BUILD Transportation Discretionary Grant size is \$1 million. There is no statutory minimum grant size, regardless of

location, for BUILD Transportation Planning grants.

#### 3. Restrictions on Funding

Pursuant to the FY 2018 Appropriations Act, no more than 10 percent of the funds made available for **BUILD Transportation Discretionary** Grants (or \$150 million) may be awarded to projects in a single State. The Act also directs that not less than 30 percent of the funds provided for BUILD Transportation Discretionary Grants (or \$450 million) shall be used for projects located in rural areas. Further, DOT must take measures to ensure an equitable geographic distribution of grant funds, an appropriate balance in addressing the needs of urban and rural areas, and investment in a variety of transportation modes.

#### 4. Availability of Funds

The FY 2018 Appropriations Act requires that FY 2018 BUILD Transportation Discretionary Grants funds are only available for obligation through September 30, 2020. Obligation occurs when a selected applicant and DOT enter into a written grant agreement after the applicant has satisfied applicable administrative requirements, including transportation planning and environmental review requirements. All FY 2018 BUILD funds must be expended (the grant obligation must be liquidated or actually paid out to the grantee) by September 30, 2025. After this date, unliquidated funds are no longer available to the project. As part of the review and selection process described in Section E.2., DOT will consider whether a project is ready to proceed with an obligation of grant funds from DOT within the statutory time provided. No waiver is possible for these deadlines.

#### 5. Previous TIGER Awards

Recipients of TIGER Discretionary Grants may apply for funding to support additional phases of a project awarded funds in the TIGER program. However, to be competitive, the applicant should demonstrate the extent to which the previously funded project phase has been able to meet estimated project schedules and budget, as well as the ability to realize the benefits expected for the project.

#### C. Eligibility Information

To be selected for a BUILD Transportation Discretionary Grant, an applicant must be an Eligible Applicant and the project must be an Eligible Project.

#### 1. Eligible Applicants

Eligible Applicants for BUILD Transportation Discretionary Grants are State, local, and tribal governments, including U.S. territories, transit agencies, port authorities, metropolitan planning organizations (MPOs), and other political subdivisions of State or local governments.

Multiple States or jurisdictions may submit a joint application and must identify a lead applicant as the primary point of contact, and also identify the primary recipient of the award. Each applicant in a joint application must be an Eligible Applicant. Joint applications must include a description of the roles and responsibilities of each applicant and must be signed by each applicant.

#### 2. Cost Sharing or Matching

Per the FY 2018 Appropriations Act, BUILD Transportation Discretionary Grants may be used for up to 80 percent of a project located in an urban area <sup>1</sup> and the Secretary may increase the Federal share of costs above 80 percent for a project located in a rural area. Urban area and rural area are defined in Section C.3.ii of this notice.

For a project located in an urban area, the Federal share of the costs for which an expenditure is made under a BUILD Transportation grant may not exceed 80 percent. Non-Federal sources include State funds originating from programs funded by State revenue, local funds originating from State or local revenuefunded programs, or private funds. Toll credits under 23 U.S.C. 120(i) are considered a non-Federal source. Unless otherwise authorized by statute, State or local cost-share may not be counted as the non-Federal share for both the BUILD Transportation grant and another Federal grant program. The Department will not consider previously-incurred costs or previously-expended or encumbered funds towards the matching requirement for any project. Matching funds are subject to the same Federal requirements described in Section F.2. as awarded funds.

#### 3. Other

#### i. Eligible Projects

Eligible projects for BUILD Transportation Discretionary Grants are capital projects that include, but are not limited to: (1) Highway, bridge, or other road projects eligible under title 23, United States Code; (2) public transportation projects eligible under chapter 53 of title 49, United States

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> To meet match requirements, the minimum total project cost for a project located in an urban area must be \$6.25 million.

Code; (3) passenger and freight rail transportation projects; (4) port infrastructure investments (including inland port infrastructure and land ports of entry); and (5) intermodal projects.2 The FY 2018 Appropriations Act allows up to \$15 million for the planning, preparation or design of projects eligible for BUILD Transportation funding. Activities eligible for funding under **BUILD Transportation Planning Grants** are related to the planning, preparation, or design-including environmental analysis, feasibility studies, and other pre-construction activities—of surface transportation projects. Research, demonstration, or pilot projects are eligible only if they will result in longterm, permanent surface transportation infrastructure that has independent utility as defined in Section C.3.iii. Applicants are strongly encouraged to submit applications only for eligible award amounts.

#### ii. Rural/Urban Definition

For purposes of this notice, DOT defines "rural area" as an area outside an Urbanized Area (UA) as designated by the U.S. Census Bureau. In this notice, an "urban area" is defined as an area inside a UA as designated by the U.S. Census Bureau.

The Department will consider a project to be in a rural area if the majority of the project (determined by geographic location(s) where the majority of the money is to be spent) is located in a rural area. Costs incurred on an Urbanized Area border, including an intersection with an Urbanized Area, will be considered urban for the purposes of the FY 2018 BUILD Transportation Program, Rural and urban definitions differ in some other DOT programs, including TIFIA and the Nationally Significant Freight and Highway Projects Program (FAST Act § 1105; 23 U.S.C. 117).

This definition affects three aspects of the program. The FY 2018 Appropriations Act directs that (1) not less than \$450 million of the funds provided for BUILD Transportation Discretionary grants are to be used for projects in rural areas; (2) for a project in a rural area the minimum award is \$1 million; and (3) the Secretary may increase the Federal share above 80 percent to pay for the costs of a project in a rural area.

#### iii. Project Components

An application may describe a project that contains more than one component, and may describe components that may be carried out by parties other than the applicant. DOT may award funds for a component, instead of the larger project, if that component (1) independently meets minimum award amounts described in Section B and all eligibility requirements described in Section C; (2) independently aligns well with the selection criteria specified in Section E; and (3) meets National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) requirements with respect to independent utility. Independent utility means that the component will represent a transportation improvement that is usable and represents a reasonable expenditure of DOT funds even if no other improvements are made in the area, and will be ready for intended use upon completion of that component's construction. All project components that are presented together in a single application must demonstrate a relationship or connection between them. (See Section D.2.iv. for Required Approvals).

Applicants should be aware that, depending upon the relationship between project components and applicable Federal law, DOT funding of only some project components may make other project components subject to Federal requirements as described in Scoting F 2

DOT strongly encourages applicants to identify in their applications the project components that have independent utility and separately detail costs and requested BUILD Transportation funding for those components. If the application identifies one or more independent project components, the application should clearly identify how each independent component addresses selection criteria and produces benefits on its own, in addition to describing how the full proposal of which the independent component is a part addresses selection criteria.

#### iv. Application Limit

Each lead applicant may submit no more than three applications. Unrelated project components should not be bundled in a single application for the purpose of adhering to the limit. If a lead applicant submits more than three applications as the lead applicant, only

the first three received will be considered.

#### v. Program of Projects

Applicants that demonstrate the ability to generate additional non-Federal revenue for transportation infrastructure investment as described in Section E.1.i.h. of this notice may apply for multiple projects, exceeding the three application limit, that collectively constitute a "program of projects". A program of projects consists of independent projects that address the same transportation challenge and whose combined benefits, including funding efficiency, are greater than if the projects are completed individually. For a program of projects, applicants must submit an application for each project within the program and describe how each project constitutes a program. Each project application within a program of projects must meet eligibility criteria described in Section C of this notice, demonstrate independent utility, and individually address the merit criteria within this notice. DOT will evaluate each application within a program of projects in the same manner in which it evaluates individual project applications. Each project within a program of projects is subject to the \$25 million award maximum and total awards cannot exceed \$150 million per State. Only applicants that generate additional non-Federal revenue as described in Section E.1.i.h. may submit applications exceeding the three application limit for consideration as a program of projects, and only one program of projects may be submitted by each eligible applicant.

### D. Application and Submission Information

#### 1. Address

Applications must be submitted to Grants.gov. Instructions for submitting applications can be found at www.transportation.gov/BUILDgrants along with specific instructions for the forms and attachments required for submission.

### 2. Content and Form of Application Submission

The application must include the Standard Form 424 (Application for Federal Assistance), Standard Form 424C (Budget Information for Construction Programs), cover page, and the Project Narrative. More detailed information about the Project Narrative follows. Applicants should also complete and attach to their application the "BUILD 2018 Project Information"

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>2</sup> Please note that the Department may use a BUILD Transportation Discretionary Grant to pay for the surface transportation components of a broader project that has non-surface transportation components, and applicants are encouraged to apply for BUILD Transportation Discretionary Grants to pay for the surface transportation components of these projects.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>3</sup> Updated lists of UAs as defined by the Census Bureau are available on the Census Bureau website at http://www2.census.gov/geo/maps/dc10map/ UAUC RefMap/ua/.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>4</sup> See www.transportation.gov/BUILDgrants for a list of UAs.

form available at www.transportation. gov/BUILDgrants.

The Department recommends that the requirements and assist evaluators in project narrative follow the basic outline locating relevant information. below to address the program

| I. Project Description                                    | See D.2.i.                 |
|---|----------------------------|
| II. Project Location                                      | See D.2.ii.                |
| III. Grant Funds, Sources and Uses of all Project Funding | See D.2.iii.               |
| IV. Merit Criteria  | See D.2.iv.(1).            |
| V. Project Readiness                                      | See D.2.iv.(2) and E.1.ii. |

The project narrative should include the information necessary for the Department to determine that the project satisfies project requirements described in Sections B and C and to assess the selection criteria specified in Section E.1. To the extent practicable, applicants should provide supporting data and documentation in a form that is directly verifiable by the Department. The Department may ask any applicant to supplement data in its application, but expects applications to be complete upon submission.

In addition to a detailed statement of work, detailed project schedule, and detailed project budget, the project narrative should include a table of contents, maps and graphics, as appropriate, to make the information easier to review. The Department recommends that the project narrative be prepared with standard formatting preferences (a single-spaced document, using a standard 12-point font such as Times New Roman, with 1-inch margins). The project narrative may not exceed 30 pages in length, excluding cover pages and table of contents. The only substantive portions that may exceed the 30-page limit are documents supporting assertions or conclusions made in the 30-page project narrative. If possible, website links to supporting documentation should be provided rather than copies of these supporting materials. If supporting documents are submitted, applicants should clearly identify within the project narrative the relevant portion of the project narrative that each supporting document supports. At the applicant's discretion, relevant materials provided previously to an operating administration in support of a different DOT financial assistance program may be referenced and described as unchanged. The Department recommends using appropriately descriptive file names (e.g., "Project Narrative," "Maps," "Memoranda of Understanding and Letters of Support," etc.) for all attachments. DOT recommends applications include the following sections:

#### i. Project Description

The first section of the application should provide a concise description of the project, the transportation challenges that it is intended to address, and how it will address those challenges. This section should discuss the project's history, including a description of any previously completed components. The applicant may use this section to place the project into a broader context of other transportation infrastructure investments being pursued by the project sponsor, and, if applicable, how it will benefit communities in rural areas.

#### ii. Project Location

This section of the application should describe the project location, including a detailed geographical description of the proposed project, a map of the project's location and connections to existing transportation infrastructure, and geospatial data describing the project location. If the project is located within the boundary of a Ćensusdesignated UA, the application should identify the UA.

iii. Grant Funds, Sources and Uses of **Project Funds** 

This section of the application should describe the project's budget. This budget should not include any previously incurred expenses. At a minimum, it should include:

(A) Project costs;

(B) For all funds to be used for eligible project costs, the source and amount of those funds:

(C) For non-Federal funds to be used for eligible project costs, documentation of funding commitments should be referenced here and included as an appendix to the application;

(D) For Federal funds to be used for eligible project costs, the amount, nature, and source of any required non-Federal match for those funds;

(E) A budget showing how each source of funds will be spent. The budget should show how each funding source will share in each major construction activity, and present that data in dollars and percentages. Funding sources should be grouped into three categories: non-Federal; BUILD;

and other Federal. If the project contains individual components, the budget should separate the costs of each project component. If the project will be completed in phases, the budget should separate the costs of each phase. The budget detail should sufficiently demonstrate that the project satisfies the statutory cost-sharing requirements described in Section C.2;

In addition to the information enumerated above, this section should provide complete information on how all project funds may be used. For example, if a particular source of funds is available only after a condition is satisfied, the application should identify that condition and describe the applicant's control over whether it is satisfied. Similarly, if a particular source of funds is available for expenditure only during a fixed time period, the application should describe that restriction. Complete information about project funds will ensure that the Department's expectations for award execution align with any funding restrictions unrelated to the Department, even if an award differs from the applicant's request.

#### iv. Criteria

This section of the application should demonstrate how the project aligns with the Criteria described in Section E.1 of this notice. The Department encourages applicants to either address each criterion or expressly state that the project does not address the criterion. Applicants are not required to follow a specific format, but the outline suggested below, which addresses each criterion separately, promotes a clear discussion that assists project evaluators. To minimize redundant information in the application, the Department encourages applicants to cross-reference from this section of their application to relevant substantive information in other sections of the application. The guidance in this section is about how the applicant should organize their application. Guidance describing how the Department will evaluate projects against the Merit Criteria is in Section E.1 of this notice. Applicants also should review that section before

considering how to organize their application.

#### (1) Merit Criteria

#### (a) Safety

This section of the application should describe the anticipated outcomes of the project that support the Safety criterion (described in Section E.1.i.(a) of this notice). The applicant should include information on, and to the extent possible, quantify, how the project would improve safety outcomes within the project area or wider transportation network, to include how the project will reduce the number, rate, and consequences of transportation-related accidents, serious injuries, and fatalities among transportation users, or how the project will eliminate unsafe grade crossings or contribute to preventing unintended releases of hazardous materials.

#### (b) State of Good Repair

This section of the application should describe how the project will contribute to a state of good repair by improving the condition or resilience of existing transportation facilities and systems (described in Section E.1.i.(b) of this notice), including the project's current condition and how the proposed project will improve it, and any estimation of impacts on long-term cost structures or impacts on overall life-cycle costs. If the project will contribute to a state of good repair of transportation infrastructure that supports border security, the applicant should describe how.

#### (c) Economic Competitiveness

This section of the application should describe how the project will support the Economic Competitiveness criterion (described in Section E.1.i.(c) of this notice). The applicant should include information about expected impacts of the project on the movement of goods and people, including how the project increases the efficiency of movement and thereby reduces costs of doing business, improves local and regional freight connectivity to the national and global economy, reduces burdens of commuting, and improves overall wellbeing. The applicant should describe the extent to which the project contributes to the functioning and growth of the economy, including the extent to which the project addresses congestion or freight connectivity, bridges service gaps in rural areas, or promotes the expansion of private economic development.

#### (d) Environmental Protection

This section of the application should describe how the project addresses the

environmental protection criterion (described in Section E.1.i.(d) of this notice). Applicants are encouraged to provide quantitative information, including baseline information that demonstrates how the project will reduce energy consumption, stormwater runoff, or achieve other benefits for the environment such as brownfield redevelopment.

#### (e) Quality of Life

This section should describe how the project increases transportation choices for individuals, expands access to essential services for people in communities across the Ûnited States, improves connectivity for citizens to jobs, health care, and other critical destinations, particularly for rural communities, or otherwise addresses the quality of life criterion (described in Section E.1.i.(e) of this notice). If construction of the transportation project will allow concurrent installation of fiber or other broadband deployment as an essential service, the applicant should describe those activities and how they support quality of life. Unless the concurrent activities support transportation, they will not be eligible for reimbursement.

#### (f) Innovation

This section of the application should describe innovative strategies used and the anticipated benefits of using those strategies, including those corresponding to three categories (described in Section E.1.i.(f) of this notice): (i) Innovative Technologies, (ii) Innovative Project Delivery, or (iii) Innovative Financing.

#### (i) Innovative Technologies

If an applicant is proposing to adopt innovative safety approaches or technology, the application should demonstrate the applicant's capacity to implement those innovations, the applicant's understanding of whether the innovations will require extraordinary permitting, approvals, or other procedural actions, and the effects of those innovations on the project delivery timeline.

#### (ii) Innovative Project Delivery

If an applicant plans to use innovative approaches to project delivery, applicants should describe those project delivery methods and how they are expected to improve the efficiency of the project development or expedite project delivery.

If an applicant is proposing to use SEP-14 or SEP-15 (as described in section E.1.i.(f) of this notice) the applicant should describe that proposal.

The applicant should also provide sufficient information for evaluators to confirm that the applicant's proposal would meet the requirements of the specific experimental authority program.<sup>5</sup>

#### (iii) Innovative Financing

If an applicant plans to incorporate innovative funding or financing, the applicant should describe the funding or financing approach, including a description of all activities undertaken to pursue private funding or financing for the project and the outcomes of those activities.

#### (g) Partnership

This section of the application should include information to assess the partnership criterion (described in Section E.1.i.(g) of this notice) including a list of all project parties and details about the proposed grant recipient and other public and private parties who are involved in delivering the project. This section should also describe efforts to collaborate among stakeholders, including with the private sector.

#### (h) Non-Federal Revenue for Transportation Infrastructure Investment

If an applicant generates additional non-Federal revenue (as described in Section E.1.i.(h) of this notice), this section should provide evidence of newly secured and committed revenue for transportation infrastructure investments and identify the source of the revenue. If new revenue for transportation infrastructure investments has not already been secured, the applicant should explain necessary steps to securing revenue and provide a timeline of key milestones leading to its commitment. To ensure new revenue does not supplant existing sources, applications should provide estimates of future revenue levels absent and, separately, with the new revenue. If applicable, this section should describe any fiscal or legal constraints that affect the applicant's ability to generate non-Federal revenue.

#### (2) Project Readiness

This section of the application should include information that, when considered with the project budget information presented elsewhere in the application, is sufficient for the Department to evaluate whether the project is reasonably expected to begin

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>5</sup> SEP-14 information is available at https:// www.fhwa.dot.gov/programadmin/contracts/sepa.cfm. SEP-15 information is available at https:// www.fhwa.dot.gov/ipd/p3/tools\_programs/sep15\_ procedures.aspx.

construction in a timely manner. To assist the Department's project readiness assessment, the applicant should provide the information requested on technical feasibility, project schedule, project approvals, and project risks, each of which is described in greater detail in the following sections. Applicants are not required to follow the specific format described here, but this organization, which addresses each relevant aspect of project readiness, promotes a clear discussion that assists project evaluators. To minimize redundant information in the application, the Department encourages applicants to cross-reference from this section of their application to relevant substantive information in other sections of the application.

The guidance here is about what information applicants should provide and how the applicant should organize their application. Guidance describing how the Department will evaluate a project's readiness is described in Section E.1.ii of this notice. Applicants also should review that section when considering how to organize their

application.

#### (a) Technical Feasibility

The applicant should demonstrate the technical feasibility of the project with engineering and design studies and activities; the development of design criteria and/or a basis of design; the basis for the cost estimate presented in the BUILD application, including the identification of contingency levels appropriate to its level of design; and any scope, schedule, and budget riskmitigation measures. Applicants should include a detailed statement of work that focuses on the technical and engineering aspects of the project and describes in detail the project to be constructed.

#### (b) Project Schedule

The applicant should include a detailed project schedule that identifies all major project milestones. Examples of such milestones include State and local planning approvals (programming on the Statewide Transportation Improvement Program); start and completion of NEPA and other Federal environmental reviews and approvals including permitting; design completion; right of way acquisition; approval of plans, specifications and estimates; procurement; State and local approvals; project partnership and implementation agreements, including agreements with railroads; and construction. The project schedule should be sufficiently detailed to demonstrate that:

(1) All necessary activities will be complete to allow BUILD
Transportation funds to be obligated sufficiently in advance of the statutory deadline (September 30, 2020 for FY 2018 funds), and that any unexpected delays will not put the funds at risk of expiring before they are obligated;

(2) the project can begin construction quickly upon obligation of BUILD Transportation funds, and that the grant funds will be spent expeditiously once construction starts, with all BUILD Transportation funds expended by

September 30, 2025; and

(3) all real property and right-of-way acquisition will be completed in a timely manner in accordance with 49 CFR part 24, 23 CFR part 710, and other applicable legal requirements or a statement that no acquisition is necessary.

#### (c) Required Approvals

(1) Environmental Permits and Reviews. The application should demonstrate receipt (or reasonably anticipated receipt) of all environmental approvals and permits necessary for the project to proceed to construction on the timeline specified in the project schedule and necessary to meet the statutory obligation deadline, including satisfaction of all Federal, State and local requirements and completion of the NEPA process. Specifically, the application should include:

(a) Information about the NEPA status of the project. If the NEPA process is complete, an applicant should indicate the date of completion, and provide a website link or other reference to the final Categorical Exclusion, Finding of No Significant Impact, Record of Decision, and any other NEPA documents prepared. If the NEPA process is underway, but not complete, the application should detail the type of NEPA review underway, where the project is in the process, and indicate the anticipated date of completion of all milestones and of the final NEPA determination. If the last agency action with respect to NEPA documents occurred more than three years before the application date, the applicant should describe why the project has been delayed and include a proposed approach for verifying and, if necessary, updating this material in accordance with applicable NEPA requirements.

(b) Information on reviews, approvals, and permits by other agencies. An application should indicate whether the proposed project requires reviews or approval actions by other agencies, 6

indicate the status of such actions, and provide detailed information about the status of those reviews or approvals and should demonstrate compliance with any other applicable Federal, State or local requirements, and when such approvals are expected. Applicants should provide a website link or other reference to copies of any reviews, approvals, and permits prepared.

(c) Environmental studies or other documents, preferably through a website link, that describe in detail known project impacts, and possible mitigation for those impacts.

mitigation for those impacts.
(d) A description of discussions with the appropriate DOT operating administration field or headquarters office regarding the project's compliance with NEPA and other applicable Federal environmental reviews and approvals.

(e) A description of public engagement about the project that has occurred, including details on the degree to which public comments and commitments have been integrated into project development and design.

(2) State and Local Approvals. The applicant should demonstrate receipt of State and local approvals on which the project depends, such as State and local environmental and planning approvals and Statewide Transportation
Improvement Program (STIP) or (Transportation Improvement Program) TIP funding. Additional support from relevant State and local officials is not required; however, an applicant should demonstrate that the project has broad public support.

(3) Federal Transportation Requirements Affecting State and Local Planning. The planning requirements applicable to the relevant operating administration apply to all BUILD Transportation projects, 7 including

historic resources require review and approval by Federal and State agencies with jurisdiction over those resources.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>6</sup> Projects that may impact protected resources such as wetlands, species habitat, cultural or

<sup>7</sup> Under 23 U.S.C. 134 and § 135, all projects requiring an action by FHWA must be in the applicable plan and programming documents (e.g., metropolitan transportation plan, transportation improvement program (TIP) and statewide transportation improvement program (STIP)). Further, in air quality non-attainment and maintenance areas, all regionally significant projects, regardless of the funding source, must be included in the conforming metropolitan transportation plan and TIP. Inclusion in the STIP is required under certain circumstances. To the extent a project is required to be on a metropolitan transportation plan, TIP, and/or STIP, it will not receive a BUILD Transportation grant until it is included in such plans. Projects not currently included in these plans can be amended by the State and MPO. Projects that are not required to be in long range transportation plans, STIPs, and TIPs will not need to be included in such plans in order to receive a BUILD Transportation grant. Port freight rail, and intermodal projects are not required to be on the State Rail Plans called for in the Passenger Rail Investment and Improvement Act of

intermodal projects located at airport facilities. Applicants should demonstrate that a project that is required to be included in the relevant State, metropolitan, and local planning documents has been or will be included in such documents. If the project is not included in a relevant planning document at the time the application is submitted, the applicant should submit a statement from the appropriate planning agency that actions are underway to include the project in the relevant planning document.

To the extent possible, freight projects should be included in a State Freight Plan and supported by a State Freight Advisory Committee (49 U.S.C. 70201, 70202), if these exist. Applicants should provide links or other documentation supporting this consideration.

Because projects have different schedules, the construction start date for each BUILD Transportation grant must be specified in the project-specific agreements signed by relevant operating administration and the grant recipients, based on critical path items that applicants identify in the application and will be consistent with relevant State and local plans.

#### (d) Assessment of Project Risks and Mitigation Strategies

Project risks, such as procurement delays, environmental uncertainties, increases in real estate acquisition costs, uncommitted local match, or lack of legislative approval, affect the likelihood of successful project start and completion. The applicant should identify all material risks to the project and the strategies that the lead applicant and any project partners have undertaken or will undertake in order to mitigate those risks. The applicant should assess the greatest risks to the

2008, or in a State Freight Plan as described in the FAST Act. However, applicants seeking funding for freight projects are encouraged to demonstrate that they have done sufficient planning to ensure that projects fit into a prioritized list of capital needs and are consistent with long-range goals. Means of demonstrating this consistency would include whether the project is in a TIP or a State Freight Plan that conforms to the requirements Section 70202 of Title 49 prior to the start of construction. Port planning guidelines are available at StrongPorts.gov.

project and identify how the project parties will mitigate those risks.

To the extent it is unfamiliar with the Federal program, the applicant should contact the appropriate DOT operating administration field or headquarters offices, as found in contact information at www.transportation.gov/BUILDgrants, for information on the pre-requisite steps to obligate Federal funds in order to ensure that their project schedule is reasonable and that there are no risks of delays in satisfying Federal requirements.

BUILD Transportation Planning Grant applicants should describe their capacity to successfully implement the proposed activities in a timely manner.

#### (3) Benefit Cost Analysis

This section describes the recommended approach for the completion and submission of a benefit-cost analysis (BCA) as an appendix to the Project Narrative. The results of the analysis should be summarized in the Project Narrative directly, as described in Section D.2.

Applicants should delineate each of their project's expected outcomes in the form of a complete BCA to enable the Department to evaluate the project's cost-effectiveness by estimating a benefit-cost ratio and calculating the magnitude of net benefits and costs for the project. In support of each project for which an applicant seeks funding that applicant should submit a BCA that quantifies the expected benefits of the project against a no-build baseline, provides monetary estimates of the benefits' economic value, and compares the properly-discounted present values of these benefits to the project's estimated costs.

The primary economic benefits from projects eligible for BUILD Transportation Grants are likely to include savings in travel time costs, vehicle operating costs, and safety costs for both existing users of the improved facility and new users who may be attracted to it as a result of the project. Reduced damages from vehicle emissions and savings in maintenance costs to public agencies may also be quantified. Applicants may describe other categories of benefits in the BCA that are more difficult to quantify and value in economic terms, such as improving the reliability of travel times or improvements to the existing human and natural environments (such as increased connectivity, improved public health, storm water runoff mitigation, and noise reduction), while also providing numerical estimates of the magnitude and timing of each of these additional impacts wherever possible.

Any benefits claimed for the project, both quantified and unquantified, should be clearly tied to the expected outcomes of the project.

The BCA should include the full costs of developing, constructing, operating, and maintaining the proposed project, as well as the expected timing or schedule for costs in each of these categories. The BCA may also consider the present discounted value of any remaining service life of the asset at the end of the analysis period. The costs and benefits that are compared in the BCA should also cover the same project scope.

The BCA should carefully document the assumptions and methodology used to produce the analysis, including a description of the baseline, the sources of data used to project the outcomes of the project, and the values of key input parameters. Applicants should provide all relevant files used for their BCA, including any spreadsheet files and technical memos describing the analysis (whether created in-house or by a contractor). The spreadsheets and technical memos should present the calculations in sufficient detail and transparency to allow the analysis to be reproduced by DOT evaluators. Detailed guidance for estimating some types of quantitative benefits and costs, together with recommended economic values for converting them to dollar terms and discounting to their present values, are available in the Department's guidance for conducting BCAs for projects seeking funding under the BUILD Transportation program (see www.transportation.gov/BUILDgrants/ additional-guidance).

## 3. Unique Entity Identifier and System for Award Management (SAM)

Each applicant must: (1) Be registered in SAM before submitting its application; (2) provide a valid unique entity identifier in its application; and (3) continue to maintain an active SAM registration with current information at all times during which it has an active Federal award or an application or plan under consideration by a Federal awarding agency. The Department may not make a BUILD Transportation grant to an applicant until the applicant has complied with all applicable unique entity identifier and SAM requirements and, if an applicant has not fully complied with the requirements by the time the Department is ready to make a BUILD Transportation grant, the Department may determine that the applicant is not qualified to receive a BUILD Transportation grant and use that determination as a basis for making

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>6</sup> Projects at grant obligated airports must be compatible with the FAA-approved Airport Layout Plan, as well as aeronautical surfaces associated with the landing and takeoff of aircraft at the airport. Additionally, projects at an airport: Must comply with established Sponsor Grant Assurances, including (but not limited to) requirements for non-exclusive use facilities, consultation with users, consistency with local plans including development of the area surrounding the airport, and consideration of the interest of nearby communities, among others; and must not adversely affect the continued and unhindered access of passengers to the terminal.

a BUILD Transportation grant to another applicant.

#### 4. Submission Dates and Times

#### i. Deadline

Applications must be submitted by 8:00 p.m. E.D.T. on July 18, 2018. The *Grants.gov* "Apply" function will open by June 3, 2018.

To submit an application through Grants.gov, applicants must:

(1) Obtain a Data Universal Numbering System (DUNS) number;

(2) Register with the System for Award Management (SAM) at www.SAM.gov;

(3) Create a Grants.gov username and

password; and

(4) The E-Business Point of Contact (POC) at the applicant's organization must respond to the registration email from *Grants.gov* and login at *Grants.gov* to authorize the applicant as the Authorized Organization Representative (AOR). Please note that there can be more than one AOR for an organization.

Please note that the Grants.gov registration process usually takes 2-4 weeks to complete and that the Department will not consider late applications that are the result of failure to register or comply with Grants.gov applicant requirements in a timely manner. For information and instruction on each of these processes, please see instructions at http://www.grants.gov/ web/grants/applicants/applicantfaqs.html. If applicants experience difficulties at any point during the registration or application process, please call the Grants.gov Customer Service Support Hotline at 1(800) 518-4726, Monday-Friday from 7:00 a.m. to 9:00 p.m. EST.

#### ii. Consideration of Applications

Only applicants who comply with all submission deadlines described in this notice and electronically submit valid applications through *Grants.gov* will be eligible for award. Applicants are strongly encouraged to make submissions in advance of the deadline.

#### iii. Late Applications

Applicants experiencing technical issues with *Grants.gov* that are beyond the applicant's control must contact *BUILDgrants@dot.gov* prior to the application deadline with the user name of the registrant and details of the technical issue experienced. The applicant must provide:

(1) Details of the technical issue

experienced;

(2) Screen capture(s) of the technical issues experienced along with corresponding *Grants.gov* "Grant tracking number";

- (3) The "Legal Business Name" for the applicant that was provided in the SF–424:
- (4) The AOR name submitted in the SF-424;
- (5) The DUNS number associated with the application; and
- (6) The *Grants.gov* Help Desk Tracking Number.

To ensure a fair competition of limited discretionary funds, the following conditions are not valid reasons to permit late submissions: (1) Failure to complete the registration process before the deadline; (2) failure to follow Grants.gov instructions on how to register and apply as posted on its website; (3) failure to follow all instructions in this notice of funding opportunity; and (4) technical issues experienced with the applicant's computer or information technology environment. After the Department reviews all information submitted and contact the Grants.gov Help Desk to validate reported technical issues, DOT staff will contact late applicants to approve or deny a request to submit a late application through Grants.gov. If the reported technical issues cannot be validated, late applications will be rejected as untimely.

#### E. Application Review Information

#### 1. Criteria

This section specifies the criteria that DOT will use to evaluate and award applications for BUILD Transportation Discretionary Grants. The criteria incorporate the statutory eligibility requirements for this program, which are specified in this notice as relevant. Projects will also be evaluated for demonstrated project readiness and benefits and costs.

#### i. Merit Criteria

Applications that do not demonstrate a likelihood of significant long-term benefits based on these criteria will not proceed in the evaluation process. DOT does not consider any merit criterion more important than the others. BUILD Transportation Planning Grant applications will be evaluated against the same criteria as capital grant applications. While the FY 2018 Appropriations Act allows funding solely for pre-construction activities, the Department will prioritize FY 2018 **BUILD Transportation funding for** projects which demonstrate the ability to move into the construction phase within the period of obligation. The selection criteria, which will receive equal consideration, are:

#### (a) Safety

The Department will assess the project's ability to foster a safe transportation system for the movement of goods and people. The Department will consider the projected impacts on the number, rate, and consequences of crashes, fatalities and injuries among transportation users; the project's contribution to the elimination of highway/rail grade crossings, or the project's contribution to preventing unintended releases of hazardous materials.

#### (b) State of Good Repair

The Department will assess whether and to what extent: (1) The project is consistent with relevant plans to maintain transportation facilities or systems in a state of good repair and address current and projected vulnerabilities; (2) if left unimproved, the poor condition of the asset will threaten future transportation network efficiency, mobility of goods or accessibility and mobility of people, or economic growth; (3) the project is appropriately capitalized up front and uses asset management approaches that optimize its long-term cost structure; (4) a sustainable source of revenue is available for operations and maintenance of the project and the project will reduce overall life-cycle costs; (5) maintain or improve transportation infrastructure that supports border security functions; and (6) the project includes a plan to maintain the transportation infrastructure in a state of good repair. The Department will prioritize projects that ensure the good condition of transportation infrastructure, including rural transportation infrastructure, that support commerce and economic growth.

#### (c) Economic Competitiveness

The Department will assess whether the project will (1) decrease transportation costs and improve access, especially for rural communities, through reliable and timely access to employment centers and job opportunities; (2) improve long-term efficiency, reliability or costs in the movement of workers or goods; (3) increase the economic productivity of land, capital, or labor; (4) result in longterm job creation and other economic opportunities; or (5) help the United States compete in a global economy by facilitating efficient and reliable freight movement.

Projects that address congestion in major urban areas, particularly those that do so through the use of congestion pricing or the deployment of advanced technology, projects that bridge gaps in service in rural areas, and projects that attract private economic development, all support local or regional economic competitiveness.

#### (d) Environmental Protection

The Department will consider the extent to which the project improves energy efficiency, reduces dependence on oil, reduces congestion-related emissions, improves water quality, avoids and mitigates environmental impacts and otherwise benefits the environment, including through alternative right of way uses demonstrating innovative ways to improve or streamline environmental reviews while maintaining the same outcomes. The Department will assess the project's ability to: (i) Reduce energy use and air or water pollution through congestion mitigation strategies; (ii) avoid adverse environmental impacts to air or water quality, wetlands, and endangered species; or (iii) provide environmental benefits, such as brownfield redevelopment, ground water recharge in areas of water scarcity, wetlands creation or improved habitat connectivity, and stormwater mitigation.

#### (e) Quality of Life

The Department will consider the extent to which the project: (i) Increases transportation choices for individuals to provide more freedom on transportation decisions; (ii) expands access to essential services for communities across the United States, particularly for rural communities; and (iii) improves connectivity for citizens to jobs, health care, and other critical destinations, particularly for rural communities. Americans living in rural areas and on Tribal lands continue to disproportionately lack access and connectivity, and the Department will consider whether and the extent to which the construction of the transportation project will allow concurrent installation of fiber or other broadband deployment as an essential service.

#### (f) Innovation

The Department will assess the extent to which the applicant uses innovative strategies, including: (i) Innovative technologies, (ii) innovative project delivery, or (iii) innovative financing.

#### (i) Innovative Technologies

DOT will assess innovative approaches to transportation safety, particularly in relation to automated vehicles and the detection, mitigation, and documentation of safety risks. When making BUILD Transportation award decisions, the Department will consider any innovative safety approaches proposed by the applicant, particularly projects which incorporate innovative design solutions, enhance the environment for automated vehicles, or use technology to improve the detection, mitigation, and documentation of safety risks. Innovative safety approaches may include, but are not limited to:

 Conflict detection and mitigation technologies (e.g., intersection alerts and signal prioritization);

 Dynamic signaling or pricing systems to reduce congestion;

• Signage and design features that facilitate autonomous or semi-autonomous vehicle technologies;

 Applications to automatically capture and report safety-related issues (e.g., identifying and documenting nearmiss incidents); and

Cybersecurity elements to protect

safety-critical systems.

For innovative safety proposals, the Department will evaluate safety benefits that those approaches could produce and the broader applicability of the potential results. DOT will also assess the extent to which the project uses innovative technology that supports surface transportation to significantly enhance the operational performance of the transportation system.

Innovative technologies include: broadband deployment and the installation of high-speed networks concurrent with the project construction; connecting Intelligent Transportation System (ITS) infrastructure; and providing direct fiber connections that support surface transportation to public and private entities, which can provide a platform and catalyst for growth of rural communities. The Department will consider whether and the extent to which the construction of the transportation project will allow concurrent broadband deployment and the installation of high-speed networks.

#### (ii) Innovative Project Delivery

DOT will consider the extent to which the project utilizes innovative practices in contracting, congestion management, asset management, or long-term operations and maintenance.

The Department also seeks projects that employ innovative approaches to improve the efficiency and effectiveness of the environmental permitting and review to accelerate project delivery and achieve improved outcomes for communities and the environment. The Department's objective is to achieve

timely and consistent environmental review and permit decisions. Participation in innovative project delivery approaches will not remove any statutory requirements affecting project delivery. While BUILD Transportation award recipients are not required to employ innovative approaches, the Department encourages BUILD Transportation applicants to describe innovative project delivery methods for proposed projects.

Additionally, DOT is interested in

projects that apply innovative strategies to improve the efficiency of project development or expedite project delivery by using FHWA's Special Experimental Project No. 14 (SEP-14) and Special Experimental Project No. 15 (SEP-15). Under SEP-14 and SEP-15, FHWA may waive statutory and regulatory requirements under title 23 on a project-by-project basis to explore innovative processes that could be adopted through legislation. This experimental authority is available to test changes that would improve the efficiency of project delivery in a manner that is consistent with the purposes underlying existing requirements; it is not available to frustrate the purposes of existing requirements.

When making BUILD Transportation award decisions, the Department will consider the applicant's proposals to use SEP-14 or SEP-15, whether the proposals are consistent with the objectives and requirements of those programs, the potential benefits that experimental authorities or waivers might provide to the project, and the broader applicability of potential results. The Department is not replacing the application processes for SEP-14 or SEP-15 with this notice or the BUILD Transportation program application. Instead, it seeks detailed expressions of interest in those programs. If selected for an BUILD Transportation award, the applicant would need to satisfy the relevant programs' requirements and complete the appropriate application processes. Selection for a BUILD Transportation award does not mean a project's SEP-14 or SEP-15 proposal has been approved. The Department will make a separate determination in accordance with those programs' processes on the appropriateness of a waiver.

#### (iii) Innovative Financing

DOT will assess the extent to which the project incorporates innovations in transportation funding and finance through both traditional and innovative means, including by using private sector funding or financing and recycled revenue from the competitive sale or lease of publicly owned or operated assets.

#### (g) Partnership

The Department will consider the extent to which projects demonstrate strong collaboration among a broad range of stakeholders. Projects with strong partnership typically involve multiple partners in project development and funding, such as State and local governments, other public entities, and private or nonprofit entities. DOT will consider rural applicants that partner with State, local, or private entities for the completion and operation of transportation infrastructure to have strong partnership. DOT will also assess the extent to which the project application demonstrates collaboration among neighboring or regional jurisdictions, including neighboring rural areas, to achieve local or regional benefits. In the context of public-private partnerships, DOT will assess the extent to which partners are encouraged to ensure longterm asset performance, such as through pay-for-success approaches.

DOT will also consider the extent to which projects include partnerships that bring together diverse transportation agencies or are supported, financially or otherwise, by other stakeholders that are pursuing similar objectives. For example, DOT will consider the extent to which transportation projects are coordinated with economic development, housing, water and waste infrastructure, power and electric infrastructure, broadband and land use plans and policies or other public service efforts.

#### (h) Non-Federal Revenue for Transportation Infrastructure Investment

The Administration believes that attracting significant new, non-Federal revenue streams dedicated to transportation infrastructure investment is desirable to maximize investment in transportation infrastructure. The Department will assess the extent that applications provide evidence that the applicant will secure and commit new, non-Federal revenue to transportation infrastructure investment.

New revenue means revenue that is not included in current and projected funding levels and results from specific actions taken to increase transportation infrastructure investment. For example, an applicant may generate new revenue through asset recycling, tolling, taxincrement financing, or sales or gas tax increases. New revenue does not include the proceeds of a new bond

issuance unless an applicant raises or commits to raising new revenue to repay the bonds. The Department will consider actions to create new revenue only if those actions occurred after January 1, 2015 or will occur in the future: it will not consider actions that occurred before January 1, 2015. For applications that propose to generate revenue over multiple years, the maximum time period that should be used is 10 years, beginning on January 1, 2018. Among otherwise similar applications, applicants that generate more new non-Federal revenue for future transportation infrastructure investment will be more competitive. The Department recognizes that applicants have varying abilities and resources to generate non-Federal revenue. If an applicant describes broader legal or fiscal constraints that affect its ability to generate non-Federal revenue, the Department will consider those constraints. As mandated by the FY 2018 Appropriations Act, the Department will not use the Federal share as a selection criterion in awarding projects.

#### ii. Demonstrated Project Readiness

During application evaluation, the Department may consider project readiness to assess the likelihood of a successful project. In that analysis, the Department will consider significant risks to successful completion of a project, including risks associated with environmental review, permitting, technical feasibility, funding, and the applicant's capacity to manage project delivery. Risks do not disqualify projects from award, but competitive applications clearly and directly describe achievable risk mitigation strategies. A project with mitigated risks or with a risk mitigation plan is more competitive than a comparable project with unaddressed risks.

#### iii. Project Costs and Benefits

The Department may consider the costs and benefits of projects seeking BUILD Transportation funding. To the extent possible, the Department will rely on quantitative, data-supported analysis to assess how well a project addresses this criterion, including an assessment of the project's estimated benefit-cost ratio and net quantifiable benefits based on the applicant-supplied BCA described in Section D.2.vi.

#### iv. Additional Considerations

The FY 2018 Appropriations Act requires the Department to consider contributions to geographic diversity among recipients, including the need for a balance between the needs of rural and urban communities when selecting BUILD Transportation projects.

#### 2. Review and Selection Process

DOT reviews all eligible applications received by the deadline. The BUILD Transportation grants review and selection process consists of at least Technical Review and Senior Review. In the Technical Review, teams comprising staff from the Office of the Secretary (OST) and operating administrations review all eligible applications and rate projects based on how well the projects align with the selection criteria. The Senior Review Team, which includes senior leadership from OST and the operating administrations determines which projects to advance to the Secretary as Highly Rated. The FY 2018 Appropriations Act mandated BUILD Transportation grant awards by December 18, 2018. To ensure the Department meets the statutory deadline specified in the FY 2018 Appropriations Act, the Department may revise the evaluation process based on the number of applications received. The Secretary selects from the Highly Rated projects for final awards.

#### 3. Additional Information

Prior to award, each selected applicant will be subject to a risk assessment as required by 2 CFR 200.205. The Department must review and consider any information about the applicant that is in the designated integrity and performance system accessible through SAM (currently the Federal Awardee Performance and Integrity Information System (FAPIIS)). An applicant may review information in FAPIIS and comment on any information about itself. The Department will consider comments by the applicant, in addition to the other information in FAPIIS, in making a judgment about the applicant's integrity, business ethics, and record of performance under Federal awards when completing the review of risk posed by applicants.

### F. Federal Award Administration Information

#### 1. Federal Award Notice

Following the evaluation outlined in Section E, the Secretary will announce awarded projects by posting a list of selected projects at www.transportation. gov/BUILDgrants. Notice of selection is not authorization to begin performance. Following that announcement, the relevant operating administration will contact the point of contact listed in the SF 424 to initiate negotiation of the grant agreement for authorization.

#### 2. Administrative and National Policy Requirements

All awards will be administered pursuant to the Uniform Administrative Requirements, Cost Principles and Audit Requirements for Federal Awards found in 2 CFR part 200, as adopted by DOT at 2 CFR part 1201. Additionally, applicable Federal laws, rules and regulations of the relevant operating administration administering the project will apply to the projects that receive **BUILD** Transportation Discretionary Grants awards, including planning requirements, Service Outcome Agreements, Stakeholder Agreements, Buy America compliance, and other requirements under DOT's other highway, transit, rail, and port grant programs.

For projects administered by FHWA, applicable Federal laws, rules, and regulations set forth in Title 23 U.S.C. and Title 23 CFR apply. For an illustrative list of the applicable laws, rules, regulations, executive orders, polices, guidelines, and requirements as they relate to a BUILD Transportation project administered by the FHWA, please see https://ops.fhwa.dot.gov/ Freight/infrastructure/tiger/fy2016\_gr\_ exhbt/index.htm. For BUILD Transportation projects administered by the Federal Transit Administration and partially funded with Federal transit assistance, all relevant requirements under chapter 53 of title 49 U.S.C. apply. For transit projects funded exclusively with BUILD Transportation

Discretionary Grants funds, some

requirements of chapter 53 of title 49

U.S.C. and chapter VI of title 49 CFR

apply. For projects administered by the

Federal Railroad Administration, FRA

requirements described in 49 U.S.C.

Subtitle V, Part C apply.
Federal wage rate requirements
included in subchapter IV of chapter 31
of title 40, U.S.C., apply to all projects
receiving funds under this program, and
apply to all parts of the project, whether
funded with BUILD Transportation
Discretionary Grant funds, other Federal
funds, or non-Federal funds.

#### 3. Reporting

#### i. Progress Reporting on Grant Activities

Each applicant selected for BUILD Transportation Discretionary Grants funding must submit quarterly progress reports and Federal Financial Reports (SF–425) to monitor project progress and ensure accountability and financial transparency in the BUILD Transportation program.

#### ii. System Performance Reporting

Each applicant selected for BUILD Transportation Discretionary Grant funding must collect information and report on the project's observed performance with respect to the relevant long-term outcomes that are expected to be achieved through construction of the project. Performance indicators will not include formal goals or targets, but will include observed measures under baseline (pre-project) as well as postimplementation outcomes for an agreedupon timeline, and will be used to evaluate and compare projects and monitor the results that grant funds achieve to the intended long-term outcomes of the BUILD Transportation program are achieved. To the extent. possible, performance indicators used in the reporting should align with the measures included in the application and should relate to at least one of the selection criteria defined in Section E. Performance reporting continues for several years after project construction is completed, and DOT does not provide **BUILD Transportation Discretionary** Grant funding specifically for performance reporting.

#### iii. Reporting of Matters Related to Recipient Integrity and Performance

If the total value of a selected applicant's currently active grants, cooperative agreements, and procurement contracts from all Federal awarding agencies exceeds \$10,000,000 for any period of time during the period of performance of this Federal award, then the applicant during that period of time must maintain the currency of information reported to the SAM that is made available in the designated integrity and performance system (currently FAPIIS) about civil, criminal, or administrative proceedings described in paragraph 2 of this award term and condition. This is a statutory requirement under section 872 of Public Law 110-417, as amended (41 U.S.C. 2313). As required by section 3010 of Public Law 111-212, all information posted in the designated integrity and performance system on or after April 15, 2011, except past performance reviews required for Federal procurement contracts, will be publicly available.

#### G. Federal Awarding Agency Contacts

For further information concerning this notice please contact the BUILD Transportation program staff via email at BUILDgrants@dot.gov, or call Howard Hill at 202-366-0301. A TDD is available for individuals who are deaf or hard of hearing at 202-366-3993. In addition, DOT will post answers to questions and requests for clarifications on DOT's website at www.transportation.gov/BUILDgrants. To ensure applicants receive accurate information about eligibility or the program, the applicant is encouraged to contact DOT directly, rather than through intermediaries or third parties, with questions. DOT staff may also conduct briefings on the BUILD Transportation Discretionary Grants selection and award process upon request.

#### H. Other information

#### 1. Protection of Confidential Business Information

All information submitted as part of or in support of any application shall use publicly available data or data that can be made public and methodologies that are accepted by industry practice and standards, to the extent possible. If the application includes information the applicant considers to be a trade secret or confidential commercial or financial information, the applicant should do the following: (1) Note on the front cover that the submission "Contains Confidential Business Information (CBI)"; (2) mark each affected page "CBI"; and (3) highlight or otherwise denote the CBI portions. DOT protects such information from disclosure to the extent allowed under applicable law. In the event DOT receives a Freedom of Information Act (FOIA) request for the information, DOT will follow the procedures described in its FOIA regulations at 49 CFR 7.17. Only information that is ultimately determined to be confidential under that procedure will be exempt from disclosure under FOIA.

Issued on: April 20, 2018.

Elaine L. Chao,

Secretary.

[FR Doc. 2018–08906 Filed 4–26–18; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4910–9X–P