

SEAGO TRANSPORTATION ADVISORY COMMITTEE AGENDA FOR SEAGO TAC

| Date: | January 17, 2019 |
|-------------|--|
| Time: | 10 a.m. |
| Location: | Cochise College Benson Center - 1025 AZ-90, Benson, AZ 85602 |
| 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.

| Voting TAC Members | Mark Hoffman – ADOT MPD Michelle Johnson –Benson Dwayne Wallace – Bisbee Heather Ruder – Clifton Jackie Watkins – Cochise County Lynn Kartchner – Douglas John Basteen – Duncan | Michael Bryce– Graham County (Chair) Phil Ronnerud –Greenlee Co. Juan Guerra – Nogales Dave Teel – Patagonia Sean Lewis – Pima Randy Petty – Safford (Vice Chair) | Marvin Mull – San Carlos Apache Tribe (SCAT) Jesus Valdez – Santa Cruz County TBD - Tombstone Galo Galovale – Willcox |
|---|---|--|---|
| Guests, Staff, and Other Expected Attendees | Chris Vertrees – SEAGO Brian Jevas - ADOT | | |

| | 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 November 15, 2018 | Michael | 3-6 |
| 4. | STBG Ledger Report | Chris | 7 |
| 5. | TIP Report Discussion and Possible Action on Current TIP Administrative Changes Proposed Amendments | Chris | 8-10 |
| 6. | Election of Officers | Chris | 11 |
| 7. | Approval of 2019 TAC Meeting Schedule | Chris | 14 |
| 8. | SEAGO Region 2017 Crash Data Review and Discussion | Chris | 13-10 |
| 9. | Off System Bridge Program Call for Projects – Reminder | Chris | 17-28 |
| 10. | Rural Transportation Summit - Save the Date | Chris | 30 |
| 11. | District Engineers' Report Status of State Highway Projects Quarterly Project Report | TBD | N/A |

SEAGO TAC: January 17, 2019



SEAGO TRANSPORTATION ADVISORY COMMITTEE

AGENDA FOR SEAGO TAC

| 12. | 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, Counties, & ADOT | N/A |
|-----|---|---------------------------------------|-----|
| 13. | Items for General Discussion | All | N/A |
| 14. | Next Meeting Date: March 21, 2019 | Michael | N/A |
| 15. | Adjourn | Michael | N/A |

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



| Date: | November 15, 2018 | | | | | | | | | |
|------------|---|---------------------------------|--------------------------|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|
| Time: | 10 a.m. | | | | | | | | | |
| Location: | SEAGO – 1403 W. Hwy 92, Bisbee, Arizona 85603 | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | |
| Voting | Jackie Watkins, Cochise | Michelle Johnson, Benson | Jesus Valdez, Santa Cruz | | | | | | | |
| TAC | Mark Hoffman, ADOT | Heather Ruder, Clifton (Phone) | | | | | | | | |
| Members | Randy Petty, Safford (Vice Chair) | Lynn Kartchner, Douglas | | | | | | | | |
| Present | Michael Bryce, Graham (Chair) | Heath Brown, Thatcher | | | | | | | | |
| | Phil Ronnerud, Greenlee - Phone | Galo Galovale, Willcox, (Phone) | | | | | | | | |
| Guests, | Chris Vertrees, SEAGO | | | | | | | | | |
| Staff, and | Karen Lamberton, SVMPO | | | | | | | | | |
| Other | Jennifer Henderson, ADOT | | | | | | | | | |
| Attendees | (Phone) | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | |

1. Call to Order and Introductions

Chair Michael Bryce called the meeting to order at 10:10 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 September 20, 2018

Chair Michael Bryce asked for a motion to approve the September 20, 2018 Minutes.

MOTION: Michelle Johnson moved to approve the September 20, 2018 Minutes.

SECOND: Mark Hoffman

ACTION: APPROVED UNANIMOUSLY

4. STP Ledger Report

Chris Vertrees presented the STBG Ledger Report that was included in the TAC packet on pages 7.

5. TIP Report

Chris referred the TAC to the TIP report beginning on page 8 of their TAC packet. He advised that there are four TIP amendment requests. Chris asked the TAC to discuss and approve the Nogales and Santa Cruz TIP amendments first and consider the Thatcher and Safford amendments separately because he will be asking for tentative approval. Chris presented the



following amendments:

NOG 19-01 - Nogales (Valle Verde/Paseo Verde Paving Project): This is a CMAQ project.

Chris advised that the ADOT project manager recently received an updated cost estimate for this project. The estimate reflects additional costs of \$135,000 due to an increase in paving costs. If approved, the project was will be added to the TIP in the following manner:

Year: 2019

Phase: Construction Federal Share: \$537,510 Local Match: \$32,490

Total Project Cost: \$570,000

SCC12-12 – Santa Cruz County (River Road and Pendleton Drive): Chris advised ADOT has advised that the shoulder paving and the safety project were combined and was originally funded as a CMAQ/HRRRP project. The CMAQ funding was dropped because the safety funding was thought to be adequate to fund the project. Bids came in much higher than the engineer's estimate and now it is necessary to pull the CMAQ funding back in. If approved, the project was will be added to the TIP in the following manner:

Year: FY18

Phase: Construction Federal - \$672,213 Local Match - \$40,632

Total - \$712,845

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

MOTION: Heath Brown moved to approve the 2018-2022 TIP amendments as requested.

SECOND: Michelle Johnson

ACTION: APPROVED UNANIMOUSLY

Chris then presented the following tentative amendments:

THR 12-13 – Thatcher (Church Street Widening): Chris advised that the project was discussed at our last TAC meeting. At the November meeting the TAC was advised that the estimate submitted with the Stage V plans had an error in the sidewalk quantity. This resulted in a decrease in total project cost to \$2.35M. This estimate was used to program the project. ADOT C&S reviewed this estimate and updated unit prices. The new estimate is \$2.841M. I advised the TAC that to support the additional costs, SEAGO will need to borrow approximately \$375,000 from another COG/MPO. This would result in other STBG projects on the TIP being pushed back a year. After discussion, I was directed by the TAC to pursue a loan. Chris advised that he has secured a loan in the amount of \$118,377 from WACOG. He indicated that we need approximately \$250,000 to fund the project. To ensure the project can bid when ready. Chris asked the TAC for tentative approval of this amendment. Chris stated that this will allow him to



continue to pursue loan opportunities and secure Executive Board approval. The TIP will be formally amended once funding is secured. Chris asked the TAC to tentatively approve the project in the following manner:

Year: 2019

Phase: Construction Federal Share: \$2,669,475 Local Match: \$171,350

Total Project Cost: \$2,840,825

Chris stated that Safford's 20th Avenue Project (SAF12-02) will need to be moved from FY20 to FY21 to accommodate the additional Church Street Funding and allow an additional save year for the 20th Avenue project.

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

MOTION: Heath Brown moved to approve the 2018-2022 TIP amendments as requested.

SECOND: Randy Petty

ACTION: APPROVED UNANIMOUSLY

6. Safford East Relation Bridge Future Project Review

Chris advised the TAC that The SEAGO Region Future Project Programming Procedures were reviewed and approved by the SEAGO TAC on November 20, 2014, and by the SEAGO Executive Board on February 27, 2015. The procedures allow for member agencies to submit an "Out of Cycle" HSIP, STP, or an Off-System Bridge Project application.

Safford has submitted an "Out of Cycle" STP project for consideration. In 2017, Safford was awarded a PARA Pre-Scoping Project for East Relation Street. For your review, I have attached Preliminary Scoping Report, Project Vicinity Map, Scope of Work, Itemized Cost Estimate, and the Conceptual Design Plans.

Randy Petty presented the project and answered TAC member questions.

Chris advised the TAC that placement in the SEAGO Future Project Section does not guarantee any future funding commitment. However, it does open opportunities to pursue other funding sources not current identified. If approved, it will be placed in the Future Project section of the TIP in the amount of \$11,771,300.

Chair Michael Bryce asked for a motion to approve the placement of the East Relation Street project to the Future Project Section of the TIP.

MOTION: Phil Ronnerud moved to approve placing the project to the Future Project section of

the TIP.

SECOND: Dwayne Wallace

ACTION: APPROVED UNANIMOUSLY



7. SEAGO Region 2017 Crash Data Review and Discussion

Chris advised the TAC that the 2017 crash data for the SEAGO region has been collected. Chris referred the TAC to the table located on page 30 of their TAC packet. Chris advised that the table reflects the crashes within the region by severity. There are two tables for each jurisdiction. The first line reflects the total crashes that occurred within a specific jurisdiction regardless of road ownership. Because we cannot apply for projects on ADOT facilities, the second line identifies the crashes that occurred on locally owned roads within a specific jurisdiction. We are currently merging this data with the 2013-2016 crash data collected during the development of our safety plan.

Chris stated that the next step will be to locate the crashes by jurisdiction using GIS to ensure accuracy. Once GIS mapping is finalized, we will review the region for high priority locations for potential HSIP projects that the region might want to pursue when ADOT announces its next call for HSIP applications. That call is expected to occur in late January. Chris advised that he expects to have that data in place by our January TAC meeting.

8. Off-System Bridge Update

Jennifer Henderson of the ADOT LPA Section was on the phone. Jennifer provided the TAC an update on the newly developed Off-system Bridge Guidelines and the upcoming call for projects. She indicated that she expects the call to be made in December.

9. SEAGO Region Transit Update

Chris referred the TAC to the Transit report located on pages 41-42 of the TAC packet. Chris briefly highlighted some of the key progress/issues identified in the report.

10. District Engineers' Report

No district engineers report was available for this meeting

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.

13. Items for Next Meeting

Chris Vertrees identified a review of 2017 crash data, possible review on the Off System Bridge project applications, selection of new officers and approval of the 2019 TAC meeting schedule.

13. Next Meeting Date: January 17, 2019, in Benson.

MEETING ADJOURNED AT 12:20PM

SEAGO STBG Ledger 2019-2023 Revised: January 2019

| New OA rate from ADOT effective FFY 2017 | 94.9% * | Projected Fed | d Funds * | Cumulative | Balance |
|---|---------|---------------|--------------|---------------|--------------|
| Action | OA Rate | Apportionment | OA | Apportionment | OA |
| STP Carry Forward FY18 | 94.9% | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| | | | | | |
| FY 2019 Allocation* | 94.9% | \$909,856 | \$863,453 | \$909,856 | \$863,453 |
| ADOT Loan Repayment In | | \$910,523 | \$910,523 | \$1,820,379 | \$1,773,976 |
| Cochise County Davis Road ROW Savings (Projected) | | \$153,518 | \$153,518 | \$1,973,897 | \$1,927,494 |
| Loan from NACOG | | \$375,000 | \$375,000 | \$2,348,897 | \$2,302,494 |
| Thatcher: Church Street | | -\$2,669,475 | -\$2,669,475 | -\$320,578 | -\$366,981 |
| Clifton: Zorilla Bridge | | -\$188,600 | -\$188,600 | -\$509,178 | -\$555,581 |
| Loan from WACOG (Pending) | | \$118,377 | \$118,377 | -\$390,801 | -\$437,204 |
| Loan from SVMPO (Repay 2021) | | \$425,000 | \$425,000 | \$34,199 | -\$12,204 |
| Loan from SVMPO (Repay 2020) | | \$200,000 | \$200,000 | \$234,199 | \$187,796 |
| Tech Transfer (LTAP) | | -\$10,000 | -\$10,000 | \$224,199 | \$177,796 |
| FY19 Balance | | | | \$224,199 | \$177,796 |
| | | | | | |
| FY 2020 Allocation | 94.9% | \$909,856 | \$863,453 | \$1,134,055 | \$1,041,250 |
| Repay NACOG Loan | | -\$375,000 | -\$375,000 | \$759,055 | \$666,250 |
| Repay WACOG Loan | | -\$118,377 | -\$118,377 | \$640,678 | \$547,873 |
| Repay SVMPO Loan | | -\$200,000 | -\$200,000 | \$440,678 | \$347,873 |
| Tech Transfer (LTAP) | | -\$10,000 | -\$10,000 | \$430,678 | \$337,873 |
| FY 2020 Balance | | | | \$430,678 | \$337,873 |
| | | | | | |
| FY 2021 Allocation | 94.9% | \$909,856 | \$863,453 | \$1,340,534 | \$1,201,326 |
| Safford: 20th Avenue | | -\$2,000,000 | -\$2,000,000 | -\$659,466 | -\$798,674 |
| Repay SVMPO Loan | | -\$425,000 | -\$425,000 | -\$1,084,466 | -\$1,223,674 |
| Tech Transfer (LTAP) | | -\$10,000 | -\$10,000 | -\$1,094,466 | -\$1,233,674 |
| FY 2021 Balance | | | | -\$1,094,466 | -\$1,233,674 |
| | | | | | |
| FY2022 Allocation | 94.9% | \$909,856 | \$863,453 | -\$184,610 | -\$370,221 |
| Tech Transfer (LTAP) | | -\$10,000 | -\$10,000 | -\$194,610 | -\$380,221 |
| FY 2022 Balance | | | | -\$204,610 | -\$390,221 |
| | | | | | |
| FY2023 Allocation | 94.9% | \$909,856 | \$863,453 | \$705,246 | \$473,233 |
| Tech Transfer (LTAP) | | -\$10,000 | -\$10,000 | \$695,246 | \$463,233 |
| FY 2023 Balance | | | | \$695,246 | \$463,233 |

^{*} Notes: 1. Updated: January 2019

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.

^{2.} OA Rate is at 94.9% is subject to change

^{3.} STP Apportionments are SEAGO estimates and subject to change.

^{4.} Loss of \$86,326 from SVMPO Expansion



TO: SEAGO TAC

FROM: CHRIS VERTREES, SEAGO TRANSPORTATION PROGRAM MANAGER

DATE: January 7, 2019

RE: SEAGO 2019-2023 TIP REPORT

The following TIP Amendment is being requested:

CLF 16-01 – (Zorilla Street Bridge Rehabilitation, Structure #9633): This is an Off-System Bridge project. This project was bid in FY18. There was one bidder for the project. The bid was \$548K over the estimated budget developed by ADOT. A project status meeting was conducted on December 18, 2018. It was determined that refining the scope of work and rebidding the project was the best option. A strategy was developed to combine remaining Off-system Bridge funds (OSB funds are capped at \$1M), SEAGO STP funds, additional Town match, and the anticipated economy of multiple bids to address the funding gap. With TAC approval, SEAGO is in position to provide \$188,600 in STP funding to support the project. If approved, the project was will be added to the TIP in the following manner:

Year: 2019

Phase: Construction Federal Share: \$188,600 Local Match: \$11,400

Total Project Cost: \$200,000

The Draft SEAGO 2019-2023 TIP Amendment #2 is attached for your review.

SEAGO REGION

Draft 2019- 2023 TIP Amendment #2

Approved By: TAC - Admistrative Council- Executive Board -

| TIP YEAR Project ID | PROJECT SPONSOR | PROJECT NAME | PROJECT LOCATION | LENGTH | TYPE OF IMP - WK - STRU | Functional Classifications | LANES BEFORE | LANES AFTER | FED AID TYPE | FEDERAL FUNDS | LOCAL MATCH | OTHER FUNDS | TOTAL COST |
|------------------------|---------------------------|---|--|-------------|----------------------------|----------------------------------|-----------------|----------------|-----------------|--|----------------|----------------|-------------------------|
| 2019 | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| THR12-13 | Town of Thatcher | Church Street Widening | US 70 to Stadium Avenue | 5,400 feet | Construction | Urban Major Collector | 2 | 3 | STP | \$2,669,475 | \$171,350 | | \$2,840,825 |
| 001110.01 | | 8th Ave & Airport Rd | | | | | | _ | | **** | *** | | ********* |
| GGH12-04 | Graham County | Intersection 8th Ave & Airport Rd | Intersection | | Construction | Rural Major Collector | 2 | 2 | HPP | \$996,375 | \$60,226 | | \$1,056,601 |
| GGH12-04 | Graham County | Intersection | Intersection | | Construction | Rural Major Collector | 2 | 2 | HRRRP | \$2,300,000 | | | \$2,300,000 |
| | | Valle Verde/Paseo Verde | Valle Verde Dr. and Paseo Verde | | | | | | | | | | |
| NOG 19-01 | City of Nogales | Paving Project | Drive between Grand Ave. and W. Mesa Verde Dr. | 1150 Feet | Construction | Urban Local | 2 | 2 | CMAQ | \$537,510 | \$32,490 | | \$570,000 |
| 1100 10 01 | Oity of Noguico | | Pendleton Drive, Via Caliente to | 11001 001 | Construction | Orban Eocai | - | | CIVILITIES | ψουτ,στο | ψ02,430 | | ψο το, σοσ |
| | | River Road and Pendleton | | | | | | | | | | | |
| SCC12-12 | Santa Cruz County | Drive Safety Improvements | Drive/Ruby Road Intersection | Varies | Construction | Rural Major Collector | 2 | 2 | CMAQ | \$672,213 | \$40,632 | | \$712,845 |
| 00012 12 | ounta oraz odanty | | | Varies | Construction | Train major concetor | - | | CIVILITIES | ψ07 Z,Z 10 | ψ-10,002 | | ψ1 12,040 |
| | | Cochise County Rumble Strips and Other | | | | | | | | | | | |
| CCH 19-01 | Cochise County | 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 |
| | - | I-19/Ruby Road TI- | | 4 1111103 | _ | | - | | | | | | |
| SCC 18-01 | Santa Cruz County | Improvements | I-19/Ruby Road TI | | Design | Rural Major Collector | 2 | 2 | CMAQ | \$984,256 | \$59,494 | | \$1,043,750 |
| CLF16-01 | Town of Clifton | | Zorilla Street between US 191 and Park, Avenue, Clifton, AZ | 216 Feet | Construction | Rural Local | 2 | 2 | STP | \$188,600 | \$11,400 | | \$200,000 |
| 02. 10 01 | Town or outon | Bankerd Ave. Paving | Bankerd Avenue from East Doe | 2101.000 | Construction | Transi 200ai | _ | | 0 | \$100,000 | | | \$200,000 |
| NOG 19-02 | City of Nogales | Project | Street Intersection | 510 Feet | Design | Urban Local | 2 | 2 | CMAQ | \$69,103 | \$4,178 | | \$73,281 |
| | TOTAL FOR 2019 | | | | | | | | STP | \$10,000 \$8,550,688 | \$379,770 | | \$10,000 \$8,930,458 |
| | TOTAL FOR 2019 | | | | | | | | | \$6,550,666 | \$379,770 | | \$6,930,456 |
| 2020 | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | East side of Grand Avenue from | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | Pathway Project Raffert D | Baffert Drive to Country Club r Drive. Intersects with Grand | | | | | | | | | | |
| NOG 20-02 | City of Nogales | to Nogales High School | Avenue path on south side of | 3 miles | Design | N/A | N/A | N/A | CMAQ | \$121,162 | \$7,324 | | \$128,486 |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | Bankerd Ave. Paving Project | Bankerd Avenue from East Doe | | | | | | | | | | |
| NOG 19-02 | City of Nogales | Project | Street Intersection | 510 Feet | Construction | Urban Local | 2 | 2 | CMAQ | \$214,462 | \$12,964 | | \$227,426 |
| | ony or regards | Cochise County Rumble | | | | | _ | | | 42,.42 | ¥ :=,000 | | |
| | | Strips and Other | Objective Dead from County Line | | | | | | | | | | |
| CCH 19-01 | Cochise County | Countermeasures | Charleston Road from County Line to 4 miles north of Brunckow Road | 4 miles | Construction | Major Collector | 2 | 2 | HSIP | \$501,000 | \$0 | | \$501,000 |
| 00111001 | occinise county | Rio Rico and Pendleton | to 4 miles floral of Branckow Road | 4 1111103 | Construction | Wajor Concetor | | | 11011 | ψου 1,000 | ΨΟ | | ψοσ1,σσσ |
| | | Drive Intersection | | | | | | | | | | | |
| SCC12-03 | Santa Cruz County LTAP | Improvements | Intersection | | Construction | Rural Major Collector | | | HRRRP STP | \$984,555 \$10,000 | \$50,445 | | \$1,035,000 \$10,000 |
| | TOTAL FOR 2020 | | | | | | | | 311 | \$1,831,179 | \$70,733 | \$0 | |
| | | | | | | | | | | , ,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,, | 4.0,.00 | | |
| 2021 | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| SAF12-02 | City of Safford | 20th Ave, Phase II | Relation St to Golf Course Rd Charleston Road from Tombstone | .63 Miles | Construction | Urban Minor Arterial | 3 | 5 | STP | \$2,000,000 | \$120,891 | | \$2,120,891 |
| | | | to 4.8 miles south of Tombstone; | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | Double Adobe Road from SR 80 to | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | Charleston, Double Adobe Barataria Rds - E & C | , Frontier Road; Barataria Boulevard from Moson Road to | | | | | | | | | | |
| CCH 21-01 | Cochise County | Rumble Strips | Ranch Road. | 10.7 miles | Design | Major Collector | 2 | 2 | HSIP | \$264,000 | \$0 | \$0 | \$264,000 |
| | , | · | | | | ,, | | | | , , , , , , | | | |
| SCC 21-01 | Santa Cruz County | Pendleton Drive - Roadway Dip Elimination | Pendleton Drive Dip at Sonoita Creek Wash | .25 miles | Design | Major Callagton | 2 | 2 | HSIP | \$241,408 | \$14,592 | | \$256,000 |
| GGH 21-01 | Graham County | Cottonwood Wash Road - | Avenue to just west of 20th | 5.1 miles | Design Design | Major Collector Major Collector | 2 | 2 | HSIP | \$241,408 | \$14,592 | | \$225,454 |
| 001121-01 | Granam County | Collonwood Wash Noad - | East side of Grand Avenue from | J. I IIIIes | Design | Iviajor Collector | | | 11011 | Ψ212,003 | ψ1Z,031 | | Ψ223,434 |
| | | | Baffert Drive to Country Club | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | Drive. Intersects with Grand Avenue path on south side of | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | Pathway Project, Baffert D | r Frank Reed Road to Nogales High | | | | | | | | | | |
| NOG 20-02 | City of Nogales | to Nogales High School | School | 3 miles | Construction | N/A | N/A | N/A | CMAQ | \$637,780 | \$38,551 | | \$676,331 |
| | LTAP | | | | | | | | STP | \$10,000 | *** | | \$10,000 |
| | TOTAL FOR 2021 | | | | | | | | | \$647,780 | \$38,551 | | \$686,331 |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 2022 | | | Obstate Dead C | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | Charleston Road from Tombstone to 4.8 miles south of Tombstone; | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | Double Adobe Road from SR 80 to | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | Charleston, Double Adobe | | | | | | | | | | | |
| CCH 24 04 | Cochise County | Barataria Rds - E & C Rumble Strips | Boulevard from Moson Road to Ranch Road. | 10.7 miles | Construction | Major Collector | 2 | 2 | HSIP | \$383,940 | | \$0 | \$383,940 |
| OUN 21-01 | Counts County | runible onlys | Nation Audu. | io.i iiiies | CONSTRUCTION | iviajoi Collectol | | ۷ | поіг | φ303, 94 0 | | \$ 0 | φ303, 94 0 |

SEAGO REGION 2019- 2023 TIP Amendment #1 Approved By: TAC - 11/15/18 Admistrative Council-11/29/18 Executive Board - 11/29/18

| | | 1 | 1 | | I | | | | | | | | |
|------------------------------|--|--|---|------------------------------|---|--|---------|-----|----------------------|---|-----------------------------------|-----------|--|
| | | Pendleton Drive - | Pendleton Drive Dip at Sonoita | | | | | | | | | | |
| SCC 21-01 | Santa Cruz County | Roadway Dip Elimination | Creek Wash | .25 miles | Construction | Major Collector | 2 | 2 | HSIP | \$424,350 | \$25,650 | | \$450,000 |
| | | 0-15 0 Bd | Golf Course Road from Hoopes | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | Golf Course Road, Cottonwood Wash Road - | Avenue to just west of 20th Avenue; Cottonwood Wash Road | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | Shoulders and Rumble | from Cottonwood Wash Loop to | | | | | | | | | | |
| GGH 21-01 | Graham County | Strips | 1200 South. | 5.1 miles | Construction | Major Collector | 2 | 2 | HSIP | \$1,991,490 | \$120,376 | | \$2,111,866 |
| | LTAP | | | | | | | | STP | \$10,000 | | | \$10,000 |
| 2023 | TOTAL FOR 2022 (Place Holder) | | | | | | | | | \$10,000 | | \$0 | \$10,000 |
| 2023 | (Flace Holder) | 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 | \$2,829,000 | \$171,000 | | \$3,000,000 |
| SAF12-02 | City of Safford | 20th Ave, Phase II | Relation St to Golf Course Rd | .63 Miles | Construction | Urban Minor Arterial | 3 | 5 | STP | \$2,300,000 | \$139,024 | | \$2,439,024 |
| DGS17-01 | City of Douglas | Chino Road Extension Phase 2 | Chino Road: 9th Street to SR90 | .85 miles | Design | Urban Minor Arterial | 2 | 2 | STP | \$75,440 | \$4,560 | | \$80,000 |
| 50011 01 | LTAP | 1 1100 2 | Ormio ricadi. Giri Girigot to Ortos | .00 111100 | 2 doign | Orban Millor / Italian | _ | | STP | \$10,000 | ψ1,000 | | \$10,000 |
| | TOTAL FOR 2023 | | | | | | | | | \$5,214,440 | \$314,584 | | \$5,529,024 |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | 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 |
| | , and the second | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | TOTAL BRIDGE PROJECTS | | | | | | | | | \$1,424,350 | \$86,095 | \$0 | \$1,510,445 |
| | TOTAL FOR FIVE YEAR | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | PROGRAM | | | | | | | | | \$14,926,275 | \$716,142 | \$0 | \$15,642,417 |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | FUNDING OBLIGATED IN 20 | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| CCH18-01 | Cochise County | Davis Road Project Assessment and DCR | Davis Road from Hwy 191 to N. Central Highway | 1.7 miles | ROW | Rural Major Collector | 2 | 2 | STP | \$404,438 | \$24,446 | \$116,116 | \$545,000 |
| 001110 01 | Coomico County | | Valle Verde Dr. and Paseo Verde | 117 1111100 | 1.011 | rtarar major conceter | _ | | 011 | \$101,100 | ψ21,110 | ψ110,110 | ψο 10,000 |
| | | Valle Verde/Paseo Verde Paving Project | Drive between Grand Ave. and W. | | | | | | | | | | |
| NOG 19-01 | City of Nogales | . army r rojocc | Mesa Verde Dr. Valle Verde Dr. and Paseo Verde | 1150 Feet | Design | Urban Local | 2 | 2 | CMAQ | \$80,593 | \$4,871 | | \$85,464 |
| | | Valle Verde/Paseo Verde | Drive between Grand Ave. and W. | | | | | | | | | | |
| NOG 19-01 | City of Nogales | Paving Project | Mesa Verde Dr. | 1150 Feet | Design (PMDR Fee) | Urban Local | 2 | 2 | CMAQ | \$28,290 | \$1,710 | | \$30,000 |
| | | River Road and Pendleton | | | | | | | | | | | |
| SCC12-12 | Santa Cruz County | Drive Safety Improvements | River Road and Pendleton Drive | Varies | Construction | Rural Major Collector | 2 | 2 | HRRRP | \$2,664,700 | \$159,865 | | \$2,824,565 |
| 0001212 | Curita Graz Gourty | Rio Rico and Pendleton | Tuver read and residence Brive | 741100 | Concuracion | rtarar major conceter | _ | | 111000 | Ψ2,001,100 | ψ100,000 | | Ψ2,02 1,000 |
| | | Drive Intersection | | | | | | | | | | | |
| SCC12-03 | Santa Cruz County | Improvements Rio Rico and Pendleton | Intersection | | Design | Rural Major Collector | | | HSIP | \$70,725 | \$4,275 | | \$75,000 |
| | | Drive Intersection | | | | | | | | | | | |
| SCC12-03 | Santa Cruz County | Improvements | Intersection | | ROW | Rural Major Collector | | | HSIP | \$188,600 | \$11,400 | | \$200,000 |
| | | River Road and Pendleton | | | | | | | | | | | |
| SCC12-12 | Santa Cruz County | Drive Safety Improvements | River Road and Pendleton Drive | Varies | Construction | Rural Major Collector | 2 | 2 | HSIP | \$181,340 | \$10,961 | | \$192,301 |
| 0001212 | Curia Graz Gourty | Zorilla Street Bridge | Tavel House and Foliateten Brive | ¥41100 | Concuracion | rtarar major conceter | _ | | | \$101,010 | ψ10,001 | | ψ102,001 |
| | | Rehabilitation, Structure | Zorilla Street between US 191 and | | | | _ | _ | | | | | |
| | | | | | Construction | Rural Local | 2 | 2 | STP | \$150,000 | \$9,067 | | \$159,067 |
| CLF16-01 | Town of Clifton | #9633 | Park, Avenue, Clifton, AZ | 216 Feet | 00 | | | | | | | | |
| CLF16-01 | Town of Clifton | #9633 Zorilla Street Bridge Rehabilitation, Structure | Park, Avenue, Clifton, AZ Zorilla Street between US 191 and | 210 Feet | | | | | Off-System | | | | |
| CLF16-01 | Town of Clifton | Zorilla Street Bridge | | 216 Feet | Construction | Rural Local | 2 | 2 | Bridge | \$729,896 | \$44,118 | | \$774,014 |
| | Town of Clifton | Zorilla Street Bridge Rehabilitation, Structure | Zorilla Street between US 191 and | | | Rural Local | 2 | 2 | | \$10,000 | | \$120,000 | \$10,000 |
| | Town of Clifton | Zorilla Street Bridge Rehabilitation, Structure | Zorilla Street between US 191 and | | | Rural Local | 2 | 2 | Bridge | | \$44,118 \$270,714 | \$130,000 | |
| | Town of Clifton LTAP TOTAL FOR 2018 | Zorilla Street Bridge Rehabilitation, Structure #9633 | Zorilla Street between US 191 and | | | Rural Local | 2 | 2 | Bridge | \$10,000 | | \$130,000 | \$10,000 |
| | Town of Clifton | Zorilla Street Bridge Rehabilitation, Structure #9633 | Zorilla Street between US 191 and | | Construction | Rural Local | 2 | 2 | Bridge | \$10,000 | | \$130,000 | \$10,000 |
| CLF16-01 | Town of Clifton LTAP TOTAL FOR 2018 Future Construction Pro | Zorilla Street Bridge Rehabilitation, Structure #9633 | Zorilla Street between US 191 and Park, Avenue, Clifton, AZ | 216 Feet | Construction Construction of Safety & | | 2 | | Bridge STP | \$10,000 \$4,508,582 | \$270,714 | \$130,000 | \$10,000 \$4,779,296 |
| | Town of Clifton LTAP TOTAL FOR 2018 | Zorilla Street Bridge Rehabilitation, Structure #9633 | Zorilla Street between US 191 and | | Construction | Rural Local Rural Major Collector | 2 | 2 | Bridge | \$10,000 | | \$130,000 | \$10,000 |
| CLF16-01 CCH12-10 CCH15-01 | Town of Clifton LTAP TOTAL FOR 2018 Future Construction Pro Cochise County Cochise County | Zorilla Street Bridge Rehabilitation, Structure #9633 jects Davis Rd. Improvements Davis Rd. Improvements | Zorilla Street between US 191 and Park, Avenue, Clifton, AZ Davis Road MP 13 Davis Road MP 5 | 216 Feet 1 mile 0.61 miles | Construction Construction of Safety & Drainage Improvements Construction of Safety & Drainage Improvements | Rural Major Collector Rural Major Collector | 2 2 2 | 2 2 | Bridge STP STP | \$10,000 \$4,508,582 \$924,560 \$1,045,000 | \$270,714 \$55,885 \$63,165 | \$130,000 | \$10,000 \$4,779,296 \$4,779,296 \$980,445 \$1,108,165 |
| CLF16-01 CCH12-10 | Town of Clifton LTAP TOTAL FOR 2018 Future Construction Pro Cochise County | Zorilla Street Bridge Rehabilitation, Structure #9633 jects Davis Rd. Improvements | Zorilla Street between US 191 and Park, Avenue, Clifton, AZ Davis Road MP 13 | 216 Feet | Construction Construction of Safety & Drainage Improvements Construction of Safety & | Rural Major Collector | 2 2 2 3 | 2 | Bridge STP | \$10,000 \$4,508,582 \$924,560 | \$270,714 \$55,885 | \$130,000 | \$10,000 \$4,779,296 \$980,445 |



TO: SEAGO TAC

FROM: CHRIS VERTREES, SEAGO TRANSPORTATION PLANNER

DATE: JANUARY 7, 2019

RE: ELECTION OF OFFICERS

Article 6 of the **SEAGO TAC Bylaws** requires that a Chairperson and Vice-Chairperson be elected at the first meeting of the new calendar year. Our current officers are:

Chairperson: Michael Bryce – Graham County **Vice Chairperson**: Randy Petty – City of Safford

The Bylaws provide no direction in regards to length of service limitations. Therefore, the TAC could elect to keep the current Chair and Vice-Chair in place or elect new officers.

Note: During the election of officer discussion last January, a recommendation was made that a rotation should be established in which the Vice-chair be elevated to the Chair position and a new Vice-chair be elected. There appeared to be support for this idea. However, no action was taken on this recommendation. This is a process that may want to be considered by the TAC.



TO: SEAGO TAC

FROM: CHRIS VERTREES, SEAGO TRANSPORTATION PLANNER

DATE: JANUARY 7, 2019

RE: 2019 TAC MEETING CALENDAR

The SEAGO TAC is scheduled to meet on the third Thursday of every other month. Below for your approval is our 2019 meeting calendar.

| Date | Scheduled Business | Location | | | | | |
|--------------------|---|-----------------|--|--|--|--|--|
| | Election of Officers, Approval of 2019 TAC | Cochise College | | | | | |
| January 17, 2019 | uary 17, 2019 Meeting Calendar, Crash Data Review | | | | | | |
| | 2019-2023 Draft TIP, Final FY 18 Project | | | | | | |
| March 21, 2019 | Status Reviews, Off-system Bridge | Cochise College | | | | | |
| | Programming, HSIP Application Reviews | Benson Center | | | | | |
| | | Cochise College | | | | | |
| May 16, 2019 | General Business | Benson Center | | | | | |
| | | Cochise College | | | | | |
| July 18, 2019 | General Business | Benson Center | | | | | |
| | | Cochise College | | | | | |
| September 19, 2019 | General Business | Benson Center | | | | | |
| | Initial FY 19 Project Status Reviews, | Cochise College | | | | | |
| November 21, 2019 | Transportation Issues Position Statement | Benson Center | | | | | |
| | Discussion and Development | | | | | | |



TO: SEAGO TAC

FROM: CHRIS VERTREES, SEAGO TRANSPORTATION PROGRAM MANAGER

DATE: JANUARY 7, 2018

RE: SEAGO REGION 2017 CRASH DATA

The 2017 crash data for the SEAGO region was provided at our November meeting. Members were provided a table that reflected the crashes within the region by severity. For review, I have again attached the tables. There are two data sets for each jurisdiction. The first line reflects the total crashes that occurred within a specific jurisdiction regardless of road ownership. Because we cannot apply for projects on ADOT facilities, the second line identifies the crashes that occurred on locally owned roads within a specific jurisdiction.

I indicated at our last meeting that our next step would be to locate the crashes by jurisdiction using GIS to ensure accuracy. In addition, I indicated that the 2017 data would be merged with 2013-2016 crash data to provide us an updated 5-year crash data window. That work has been completed and crash location maps have been developed. Due to the size of the map files, the maps will be distributed in a separate email from the TAC packet. I will also bring copies to the meeting.

I have also attached 2018 Potential HSIP Project List developed by Greenlight consulting last March. The projects highlighted were pursued and awarded by ADOT in July. As you will see, there are several potential projects identified, but not pursued last year.

At our January meeting, we will review the region for high priority locations for potential HSIP projects that the region might want to pursue when ADOT announces its next call for HSIP applications. If any agency is considering an application, SEAGO will further analyze the crash data to determine cause, potential countermeasures, and related crash modification factors (CMF). The next HSIP call for applications is expected to occur in late January.



2017 Crash Severity by Agency

| Agency | Fatal | Incapacitating Injury | Non- Incapacitating Injury | Possible Injury | No Injury | Total |
|------------------------|-------|--------------------------|----------------------------------|--------------------|-----------|-------|
| Benson | 1 | 2 | 10 | 6 | 62 | 81 |
| City Road | 0 | 0 | 6 | 3 | 22 | 31 |
| Bisbee | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 |
| City Road | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Clifton | 0 | 1 | 5 | 7 | 18 | 31 |
| Town Road | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 6 | 9 |
| Cochise County | 11 | 15 | 95 | 45 | 399 | 565 |
| County Road | 4 | 6 | 25 | 6 | 65 | 106 |
| Douglas | 2 | 2 | 7 | 11 | 69 | 91 |
| City Road | 2 | 2 | 7 | 11 | 69 | 91 |
| Duncan | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 3 |
| Town Road | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Graham County | 7 | 8 | 20 | 5 | 84 | 124 |
| County Road | 3 | 0 | 8 | 2 | 20 | 33 |
| Greenlee County | 0 | 3 | 15 | 3 | 31 | 52 |
| County Road | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 |
| Nogales | 1 | 2 | 9 | 17 | 138 | 167 |
| County Road | 0 | 2 | 6 | 13 | 106 | 127 |
| Patagonia | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 3 |
| Town Road | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Pima | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 2 |
| Town Road | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Safford | 0 | 5 | 17 | 27 | 79 | 128 |
| City Road | 0 | 4 | 15 | 23 | 60 | 102 |
| Santa Cruz County | 5 | 12 | 16 | 20 | 175 | 228 |
| County Road | 0 | 2 | 6 | 5 | 59 | 72 |
| Thatcher | 0 | 3 | 12 | 8 | 44 | 67 |
| Town Road | 0 | 1 | 11 | 6 | 30 | 48 |
| Tombstone | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 2 |
| City Road | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 2 |
| Willcox | 0 | 0 | 4 | 2 | 18 | 24 |
| City Road | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 12 | 15 |
| Totals | 29 | 54 | 211 | 152 | 1,124 | 1,570 |

2018 Potential HSIP Projects for SEAGO based on 2012-2016 Crashes

| Agency | Project # | Road | Location | Length (miles) | Countermeasures | Estimated Cost | B/C Ratio |
|----------------------|-----------|--|---|----------------|---------------------------------|----------------|--------------|
| Cochise County | 1 | Charleston Rd | Tombstone to 4.8 miles S of Tombstone | 4.8 | Rumble strips | \$253,000 | 34.3 |
| | 2 | Purdy Rd/Arizona St | Naco Hwy to Hazzard St | 6.8 | Rumble strips | \$340,000 | 12.8 |
| | 3 | Double Adobe Rd | SR 80 to US 191 | 13.9 | Rumble strips | \$648,000 | 6.7 |
| | 4 | Frontier Rd | Davis Rd to Double Adobe Rd | 9.2 | Rumble strips | \$444,000 | 9.8 |
| | 5 | Sanders/Adams/ Jefferson/Truman | SR 82 to SR 82 | 5.4 | Rumble strips | \$279,000 | 15.5 |
| | 6 | Barataria Blvd | Moson Rd to Ranch Rd | 1.0 | Rumble strips | \$88,000 | 48.2 |
| | 7 | Cascabel Rd | E3 Links Rd to Pomerene Rd | 13.5 | Rumble strips | \$630,000 | 6.9 |
| | 8 | Projects 1-7 combined | | 54.6 | Rumble strips | \$2,412,000 | 14.3 |
| Santa Cruz County | 9 | Pendleton Dr | Camino Olympia to Julie Ann Rd | 12.5 | Rumble strips | \$587,000 | 7.4 |
| | 10 | Calle Toruno/ Camino Ramanote/ Corrida de Toros | W Frontage to End of Pavement | 6.0 | Rumble strips | \$305,000 | 14.2 |
| | 11 | Harshaw Rd | Red Rock Dr to near Harshaw Creek Rd (S) | 4.6 | Rumble strips | \$253,000 | 17.1 |
| | 12 | Projects 9-11 combined | | 23.1 | Rumble strips | \$1,061,000 | 12.3 |
| Graham County | 13 | US 191/20 th St/Lone Star Intersection | ADOT/Graham Co/Safford | | Pedestrian Hybrid Beacon (HAWK) | \$330,000 | 16.1 |
| | 14 | Cottonwood Wash Rd | 1200 South to Saguaro Dr | 3.5 | Rumble strips | \$197,000 | 22.0 |
| | 15 | Golf Course Rd | Hoopes Ave to Elizabeth Ann Dr | 1.6 | Rumble strips | \$114,000 | 37.5 |
| | 16 | Projects 14-15 combined | | 5.1 | Rumble strips | \$281,000 | 30.9 |

2018 Potential HSIP Projects for SEAGO based on 2012-2016 Crashes

| Greenlee County/ | 17 | SR 75 Duncan | Old | 0.8 | Sidewalk both sides, high | \$312,000 | 31.4 |
|-------------------------|----|----------------------|----------------------|------|-----------------------------|-----------|------|
| Duncan/ADOT | | | Virden/Fairgrounds | | visibility crosswalk at Old | | |
| | | | Rd to Family Dollar | | Virden/Fairgrounds | | |
| | | | Store | | | | |
| | 18 | SR 75 | Virden Hwy to US 191 | 17.4 | Rumble strips | \$799,000 | 16.4 |
| Safford/ADOT | 19 | US 70/just west of | | | Pedestrian Hybrid Beacon | \$330,000 | 16.1 |
| | | 11 th Ave | | | (HAWK) | | |



TO: SEAGO TAC

FROM: CHRIS VERTREES, SEAGO TRANSPORTATION PROGRAM MANAGER

DATE: JANUARY 7, 2019

RE: OFF-SYSTEM BRIDGE PROGRAM CALL FOR PROJECTS

On December 20, 2018, the ADOT LPA section issued a call for Off System Bridge (OSB) projects. That email was forwarded to the TAC that same day. I have attached a copy of the call for project email, the OSB application, and the LPA OSB Scoring Criteria. I distributed the OSB Guidelines at our November meeting.

OSB applications are due back to the ADOT LPA Section **no later than Friday, February 22, 2019.** However, ADOT's LPA section is requiring that all Off-System Bridge applications be submitted through the Regional COG/MPO or the application will not be considered. This will ensure that each project will appropriately be considered for regional prioritization at the COG/MPO level before submission to ADOT. **Therefore, SEAGO will need your applications no later than Monday, February 18, 2019, so we can review and provide support for your application.**

Chris Vertrees

Cc:

From: Mark Henige <MHenige@azdot.gov>
Sent: Thursday, December 20, 2018 12:54 PM

To: arobles@cagaz.org; Travis Ashbaugh; Christopher Bridges;

Daniel.Harmonick@yavapai.us; David Wessel; mince@flagstaffaz.gov; Vinny Gallegos; BuckleyJ@lhcaz.gov; eanderson@azmag.gov; Tim Strow; Bob Hazlett; Chris Fetzer; Jason James; fmoghimi@pagnet.org; Karen.Lamberton@SIERRAVISTAAZ.GOV; Randy Heiss; cvertrees@seago.org; Irene Higgs; Jason Hafner; Brian Babiars; Justin Lee Hembree; Paul

Ward; Charles Gutierrez; Teresa Kennedy; NBARRETT@PAGREGION.COM;

pcasertano@pagregion.com

David Eberhart; David Benton; Pe-Shen Yang; Patrick Stone; Reed Henry; Mark Hoffman;

Jason Bottjen; Clemenc Ligocki; Bret Anderson; Korina Lopez; Steve O'Brien; Ralph Ellis; John Eckhardt III; Vicki Bever; Audra Merrick; Alvin Stump; Matt Moul; Bill Harmon; Roderick F. Lane; Paul Patane; Lisa Pounds; Jennifer Henderson; Tricia Lewis A; John Wennes; Randy Everett; Paul O'Brien; Charla Glendening A; Ermalinda Gene; Iqbal

Hossain; Todd A. Emery; Jesse Gutierrez; Steve Boschen; Barry Crockett

Subject: Off System Bridge Program (OSB) Call for projects (FY20)

Attachments: FY20 LPA OSB Application.docx; FY20 LPA OSB Scoring Criteria.pdf; Off-System Bridge

Guidelines 2018.pdf

Please share this information with your staff, local, and tribal government partners (Project Sponsors).

To All COG/MPO Partners:

The Arizona Department of Transportation (ADOT) Local Public Agency (LPA) Section is issuing a formal call for projects for the Off-System Bridge (OSB) Program for State Fiscal Year (SFY) 2020. Please distribute this message to your member agencies.

The Purpose of the Off-System Bridge Program is to fund the Design and/or Construction for replacement or rehabilitation of roadway bridge structures over waterways, other topographical barriers, other roadways, railroads, canals, ferry landings, etc. on bridge structures that are not on the Federal-aid Highway System (local roads or rural minor collectors) when those bridge structures have been determined deficient because of structural deficiencies, physical deterioration, or functional obsolescence.

Eligible activities include, but are not limited to:

- Replacement (including replacement with fill material)
- Rehabilitation
- Preservation/Preventative Maintenance (As identified under FHWA's Bridge Preservation Guide)
- Protection (including painting, scour countermeasures, seismic retrofits, impact protection measures, security countermeasures, and protection against extreme events)
- Real Property Interest Rights for required access and permits or other uses as needed as part of the Right of Way requirements needed for the project

Project Selection:

• The Selection Committee consists of ADOT Bridge Group Administration, Bridge Design, Bridge Hydraulics, Bridge Geotechnical Services and representatives from the ADOT Technical Groups and Districts as appropriate.

 Applications will require a description of work that includes scope of work, justification (system prioritization), schedule, and detailed cost estimates for Design and Construction phases. Entities submitting multiple applications will need to regionally prioritize projects and submit justification for the selected projects.

Funding:

- All eligible project costs will be paid for with federal Surface Transportation Block Grant Program (STBGP) funds and must follow the Federal-aid process.
- Eligible bridge project costs are funded at 94.3% federal share with a 5.7% local match, up to a maximum federal amount of a \$1,000,000 per project.

Timeline:

- OSB applications are due back to the ADOT LPA Section no later than February 22, 2019.
- ADOT Selection Committee will review and prioritize all projects based on submitted applications and established scoring criteria March 2019.
- Eligibility determination letters will be sent to applicants (with a copy to the Regional COG/MPO) April 2019.
- Project Sponsors with projects selected can start working with their Regional COG/MPO to program the project into the Regional TIP as soon as program eligibility determination letter is received.
- Project Sponsors with selected projects may start working with ADOT LPA Section to initiate the project and start IGA process as soon as the project has been programmed in the Régional TIP.
- Funding for Development Activities such as consultant selection, Environmental, ROW, and Utility and Railroad consultations will not be available until after **July 1, 2019**.

Attached is the Off-System Bridge Guidelines, application, and scoring criteria. Ensure that all OSB applications submitted to ADOT are on the attached application form.

All Off-System Bridge applications must be submitted through the Regional COG/MPO or the application will not be considered. This will ensure that each project will appropriately be considered for regional prioritization at the COG/MPO level before submission to ADOT.

If you have questions or need further information please contact Mark Henige, ADOT LPA Program Manager at (602) 712-7132 or ADOT LPA Section Program Coordinators Tricia Lewis at (928) 326-1062 or Jennifer Henderson at (602) 712-4173.

More information about the OSB Program can be found on the ADOT LPA Section website at https://www.azdot.gov/business/programs-and-partnerships/local-public-agency/off-system-bridge.

Thank you.

Mark Henige Program Manager Local Public Agency Section 205 South 17th Avenue, Room 291 Phoenix, AZ 85007 602.712.7132 mhenige@azdot.gov





OFF-SYSTEM BRIDGE (OSB) PROGRAM APPLICATION

OSB Funding is a set-aside of the Surface Transportation Block Grant (STBG) Program and must follow all federal-aid requirements

| | G | ENERAL PROJECT INFO | RMATION | V | | | | |
|---|-------------------|-------------------------------------|----------------------|------------------------|--------|---------------|----------|-----|
| SPONSORING AGENCY: | | | DATE SU | BMITTE | D: | | | |
| CONTACT NAME: | | TITLE: | | | | | | |
| EMAIL ADDRESS: | | | PHONE # | #: | | | | |
| | | Bridge Name | e: | | | | | |
| | | Bridge Structure # | # : | | | | | |
| | | Road Name | e: | | | | | |
| | | County | y: | | | | | |
| PROJECT LOCATION | | ADOT Distric | t: | | | | | |
| | | Starting Location | ո։ | | | | | |
| | | Ending Location | ո։ | | | | | |
| | | Length (to the 0.1 of a mile |): | | | | | |
| | | # of Lanes (Before & After |): Before: | | | After: | | |
| | | Rehabilitation | Bridge Suff | ficiency Raf | ting | | | |
| BRIDGE IMPROVEMEN | NT | Replacement | Structurall | tructurally Deficient? | | Yes | Yes No | |
| | | | Functional | Functionally Obsolete? | | Yes No | | No |
| PROJECT INCLUDED IN LOC | AL CAPITAL IMF | PROVEMENT PLAN (CIP) | | | | Yes | □No |) |
| FEDERAL FUNCTIONAL CLA | SSIFICATION — (| LINK: FEDERAL FUNCTIONAL CLASSIFICA | TION MAPS): | | | | | |
| AVERAGE ANNUAL DAILY T (AADT) COUNT (LINK: AAD COUNTS): | | | DATE OF AADT COUN | NT: | | | | |
| Crash Data (5 Years): | | | | | | | | |
| PROJECT WORK DESCRIPTION Provide a brief work description that describes the work to be performed, existing and/or proposed conditions, its benefits and | | | | | | | | |
| overall cost estimate. | ition that descri | bes the work to be performed, e | xisting and/o | r propos | ea cor | naitions, its | benefits | and |
| PROJECT WORK DESCRIPTION | DN: | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | |

| COST ESTIMATE & PROJECT PROGRAMMING | | | | | | |
|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|
| Total Proje | ect Estimated Cost (includes Design & Construction): | \$ | | | | |
| DESIGN | FY Program Year: | | | | | |
| | Estimated Total Cost for Project Development (Includes ROW, Utilities, Environmental, and ICAP): | \$ | | | | |
| | Federal Share (94.3%) | \$ | | | | |
| | Local Match (5.7%): | \$ | | | | |
| | Additional Local Funding: | \$ | | | | |
| | Other Non-Local Funding Sources to be Utilized: | \$ | | | | |
| | ADOT Project Delivery Administration (PDA) Fee (\$30,000): | Use Federal \$ Use Local \$ | | | | |
| | FY Program Year: | \$ | | | | |
| | Estimated Total Cost for Project Construction (includes CE, CC, and ICAP): | \$ | | | | |
| CONSTRUCTION | Federal Share (94.3%) | \$ | | | | |
| | Local Match (5.7%): | \$ | | | | |
| | Additional Local Funding: | \$ | | | | |
| | Other Non-Local Funding Sources to be Utilized: | \$ | | | | |
| ATTACH a detailed scopin (system prioritization), sc Samples are available on Guidelines, and Sample So ATTACH a Project Vicinity | lication without the required attachment(s) willing document that includes an alternative analysis, prohedule identifying critical milestones, and detailed conthe ADOT LPA Section Website (LINK), including the Acoping Document based on the ADOT Pre-Design Section Project Location Map WA Functional Classification Map | ject background, scope of work, justification st estimates for Design and Construction phases. DOT Cost Estimate Tool, Project Scoping Document | | | | |

| BRIDGE PARAMETERS |
|--|
| Provide the following bridge information: |
| Overall Condition of the bridge (include items described in the bridge inspection report) |
| Vertical Clearance |
| Bridge Geometry (lanes, shoulders, clear roadway and other features) Lead Good in Good in the Control of |
| Load Carrying Capacity Ago of Bridge |
| Age of BridgeWeight Restriction (if any) |
| Weight Restriction (if any) Detours if restrictions or service is impacted |
| Beloard II restrictions of service is impacted |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |

| AGENCY PRIORITIZATION | | | | | |
|--|--|--|--|--|--|
| Describe the agencies top (up to three) priorities of off-system bridges in your inventory. Provide justification as to | | | | | |
| why the bridge project in this application is the top priority. (Refer to section of Priority Ranking of Candidate Bridges in the Off-System Bridge Program Guidelines.) | | | | | |
| , | | | | | |
| | | | | | |
| | | | | | |
| | | | | | |
| | | | | | |
| | | | | | |
| | | | | | |
| | | | | | |
| | | | | | |
| | | | | | |
| | | | | | |
| | | | | | |
| | | | | | |
| | | | | | |
| | | | | | |
| | | | | | |
| | | | | | |
| | | | | | |
| | | | | | |
| | | | | | |
| | | | | | |
| | | | | | |
| | | | | | |
| | | | | | |
| | | | | | |
| | | | | | |
| | | | | | |
| | | | | | |
| | | | | | |
| | | | | | |
| | | | | | |
| | | | | | |
| | | | | | |

| OPERATIONAL IMPROVEMENT | | | | | |
|---|--|--|--|--|--|
| How will this bridge project improve the agency's operations? | | | | | |
| Are there other operational improvements? If so, what are they and how will this project improve them? | | | | | |
| Topics to consider addressing in application: | | | | | |
| Effect on lifecycle Maintenance and Renainteducend fragments | | | | | |
| Maintenance and Repair tasks and frequency Annual maintenance and repair costs | | | | | |
| Allitual maintenance and repair costs | | | | | |
| | | | | | |
| | | | | | |
| | | | | | |
| | | | | | |
| | | | | | |
| | | | | | |
| | | | | | |
| | | | | | |
| | | | | | |
| | | | | | |
| | | | | | |
| | | | | | |
| | | | | | |
| | | | | | |
| | | | | | |
| | | | | | |
| | | | | | |
| | | | | | |
| | | | | | |
| | | | | | |
| | | | | | |
| | | | | | |
| | | | | | |
| | | | | | |
| | | | | | |
| | | | | | |
| | | | | | |
| | | | | | |
| | | | | | |
| | | | | | |
| | | | | | |
| | | | | | |
| | | | | | |
| | | | | | |
| | | | | | |

| COMMUNITY IMPACTS |
|--|
| How important is this bridge crossing and access to the community? |
| Topics to consider addressing in this application: |
| • Emergency Access |
| Local Business and Industry Access Educational Access |
| Other areas important to the community |
| Strict dieds important to the community |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |

| OTHER |
|---|
| This is an opportunity to add project-specific items or unique issues that are not addressed in another category. |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |

DEVELOPMENT CONSIDERATIONS

Projects that have identified challenges and risks to delivery will encounter fewer hurdles and allow for a project to have fewer complications and provide the best opportunity for a project to be delivered on time and within budget. **CHALLENGES/RISKS** Please describe any challenges that **TO DELIVERY AND** may impact the scope, schedule, **CONSTRUCTION OF** budget and/or delivery of this **PROJECT** project. Are there any potential environmental impacts or challenges of the project that you can foresee? **ENVIRONMENTAL** (e.g. endangered species, cultural resources, hazardous materials sites, Section 4(f) properties, Title VI populations, significant community opposition, wetlands that would be affected, etc.) Please describe any ROW items associated with this project. (e.g. Will ROW be required? How much **RIGHT-OF-WAY** ROW? Is the State Land Department (ROW) involved? Consider Right of Way requirements associated with Traffic Control/Detour Requirements; Access, Construction Area Needs and on-going Maintenance Requirements. Please describe any Utilities and/or Railroad items associated with this project. **UTILITIES & RAILROAD** (e.g.Will the project include/require any utility relocation(s) by the project sponsor? What utilities may be impacted? Are there prior rights? If Yes, please explain.)

| OSB RANKING CRITERIA | | | | | |
|----------------------------|---|---|-----------------|-------|--|
| CATEGORY | CRITERIA | DEFINITIONS | POSSIBLE POINTS | SCORE | |
| PROJECT WORK | Scoping Document | Does the recommendation address the bridge deficiencies? | 5 | | |
| DESCRIPTON | | Is the recommendation supported by an alternative analysis or clearly justified if no alternative analysis is available? | 5 | | |
| | Sufficiency Rating | SR 30 and below (25pts) SR 40 -30.1 (20pts) SR 50-40.1 (15pts) SR 60-50.1 (10pts) SR 70-60.1 (5pts) SR 80-70.1 (2pts) | 25 | | |
| | Age of Bridge | 75 years or greater (5pts) Less than 75 years but greater than 50 years (3pts) Less than 50 years (0pts) | 5 | | |
| | | Deck Condition Rating (NBI #58) ≤ 4 (10pts) Deck Condition Rating (NBI #58) = 5 (5pts) Deck Condition Rating (NBI #58) ≥ 6 (0pts) | 10 | | |
| BRIDGE PARAMETERS | Bridge Condition Ratings | Superstructure Condition Rating (NBI #59) ≤ 4 (10pts) Superstructure Condition Rating (NBI #59) = 5 (5pts) Superstructure Condition Rating (NBI #59) ≥ 6 (0pts) | 10 | | |
| | | Substructure Condition Rating (NBI #60) ≤ 4 (10pts) Substructure Condition Rating (NBI #60) = 5 (5pts) Substructure Condition Rating (NBI #60) ≥ 6 (0pts) | 10 | | |
| | Other Bridge Criteria | Structural Deficient (SD) due to Load Carrying Capacity (NBI #67 Table 1 ≤ 2) (5pts) Scour Critical Rating (NBI #113) ≤ 3 (5pts) Scour Critical Rating (NBI #113) ≥ 4 (0pts) Bridge Geometry (5pts) Vertical Clearance (5pts) Weight Restriction (5pts) Detour plan if restrictions or service is impacted (5pts) | 30 | | |
| AGENCY PRIORITIZATION | Priority Ranking | Agency has provided clear prioritization and justification for its priority rankings. • Agency provided justification (5pts) • Prioritization is supported by data (5pts) | 10 | | |
| OPERATIONAL IMPROVEMENT | How will this bridge project improve the agency's operations? | Effect on lifecycle (5pts) Maintenance and Repair tasks and frequency (5pts) Annual maintenance and repair costs (5pts) | 15 | | |
| COMMUNITY IMPACTS | Community Transportation Benefits | Emergency Access (5pt) Local Business and Industry Access (5pts) Educational Access (5pts) Access to other areas important to the community (i.e. major shopping areas, community centers, etc.) (5pts) NONE (0pts) | 20 | | |
| OTHER | Project Specific Unique Issues | This is an opportunity to add project-specific items or unique issues that are not addressed in another category. | 5 | | |

| OSB RANKING CRITERIA (CONT) | | | | |
|-------------------------------|---------------------|---|-----------------|-------|
| CATEGORY | CRITERIA | DEFINITIONS | POSSIBLE POINTS | SCORE |
| DEVELOPMENT CONSIDERATIONS | Delivery Risks | Projects that have identified challenges and risks to delivery will encounter fewer hurdles and allow for a project to have fewer complications and provide the best opportunity for a project to be delivered on time and within budget. Identifies requirements and impacts for the following: Environmental (5pts) Right of Way (5pts) Utilities & Railroad (5pts) | 15 | |
| COST ESTIMATE | Cost Considerations | Design complete/ready for construction (5pts) Local contributions over local match (5pts) Cost Estimates appear to be reasonable based on all provided information for the project. (5pts) | 15 | |
| | | TOTAL SCORE: | 180 | |

