



## TRANSPORTATION ADVISORY COMMITTEE AGENDA

<b>Date:</b>	January 21, 2021
<b>Time:</b>	10 a.m.
<b>Location:</b>	<b>Zoom Meeting</b>
<b>Call-in No.</b>	<a href="https://us02web.zoom.us/j/86807924073?pwd=dW9hc0hVaWEwNFBUTXIWZXhjSkRmZz09">https://us02web.zoom.us/j/86807924073?pwd=dW9hc0hVaWEwNFBUTXIWZXhjSkRmZz09</a> Meeting ID: 868 0792 4073 Passcode: 148269

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

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

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

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

ITEM	SUBJECT	PRESENTER	PAGE
1.	Call to Order and Introductions	Michael	N/A
2.	Call to the Public	Michael	N/A
3.	Approval of Minutes of November 19, 2020	Michael	3-5
4.	ADOT Traffic Counting Program	Adam	N/A
5.	STBG Ledger Report	Chris	6
6.	TIP Report <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Possible TIP Amendment(s)</li> <li>• Possible Administrative Amendments</li> </ul>	Chris	7-9
7.	SEAGO STBG Project Programming Procedures Review and Revision	Chris	10-21
8.	Election of Officers	Chris	22
9.	12-Month TAC Meeting Schedule	Chris	23
10.	ADOT LPA Section Updates	Jennifer Mark	N/A
11.	District Engineers' Report <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Status of State Highway Projects</li> <li>• Quarterly Project Report</li> </ul>	TBD	N/A

12.	Regional Local Program Reports <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Status of Local Projects <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ STP Projects</li> <li>○ Update on Enhancement Projects</li> <li>○ Update on HSIP Projects</li> <li>○ Update on all Planning Studies</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	Towns, Cities, Counties, & ADOT	N/A
13.	Items for General Discussion	All	N/A
14.	Next Meeting Date: March 18, 2021	Michael	N/A
15.	<b>Adjourn</b>	Michael	N/A

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



# SEAGO TRANSPORTATION ADVISORY COMMITTEE

## DRAFT MEETING MINUTES FOR NOVEMBER 19, 2020

<b>Date:</b>	November 19, 2020		
<b>Time:</b>	10 a.m.		
<b>Location:</b>	Zoom Conference - SEAGO		
<b>Voting TAC Members Present</b>	Michael Bryce, Graham County (Chair) Michelle Johnson, Benson Tom Palmer, Thatcher Mark Hoffman, ADOT Valarie Fuller, Cochise County	Lance Henrie, Safford Jesus Haro, Bisbee Dave Swietanski, Douglas Juan Guerra, Nogales Jesus Valdez, Santa Cruz County	
<b>Guests, Staff, and Other Attendees</b>	Chris Vertrees, SEAGO Mark Henige, ADOT		

### 1. Call to Order and Introductions

Chair Michael Bryce called the meeting to order at 10:05 a.m. Chris Vertrees conducted a roll call of members and guests that were participating on Zoom and on the phone.

### 2. Call to the Public

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

### 3. Approval of September 17, 2020 Meeting Minutes

Chairman Bryce asked the TAC to review the minutes for needed corrections. Michael Bryce asked for a motion to approve the September 17, 2020, Meeting Minutes.

**MOTION:** Mark Hoffman moved to approve

**SECOND:** Jesus Haro

**ACTION: APPROVED UNANIMOUSLY**

### 4. STBG Ledger Report

Chris Vertrees referred the TAC to the STBG Ledger Report located on page 7-9 of their packet. Chris advised that at our last meeting, our Chair (Michael Bryce) requested that since we have several new TAC members a brief training on the ledger would be very beneficial. Chris advised that the memorandum on page 7 and 8 outlined some basic informational items about our Ledger. Chris reviewed the memorandum with the TAC. Mark Hoffman added that the Ledger would also reflect HURF Exchange projects.

Chris noted that SEAGO STBG is fully committed through FFY2024. If there are no significant changes in population data from the 2020 Census we should have \$423,199 in apportionments and \$370,421 in OA available for programming/loan in FY25.

### 5. TIP Report

Chris advised the TAC that SEAGO did not receive any requests to amend our 2021-2025 TIP this period.

Chris advised that the SEAGO 2021-2025 TIP was included in the packet for their records.

## 6. STBG Programming Procedures Discussion

Chris reviewed with the TAC the reason why the programming procedures needed to be updated: In February, members of the SEAGO Executive Board and Administrative Council met to update SEAGO's Strategic Plan. One of the strategic goals they set was to revise the STBG programming process to make it more equitable for smaller jurisdictions. The committee made the following recommendations:

1. Cap on STBG project requests;
2. Eliminate Right-of-Way acquisition as an eligible activity for use of local STBG funds;
3. Establish a rotation of STBG funds by County.

Chris referred the TAC to page 13-17 of their TAC Packet (STBG Project Programming Procedure Outline). Chris discussed the outline with the TAC. The following is a recap of the TAC review:

- The TAC concurred with Section 1.0 (Introduction); 2.0 (Purpose); 3.0 (Program Administration); and 4.0 (STBG Eligible Projects).
- Section 5.0 of the outlined discussed the project location eligibility. It stated "a surface transportation block grant project may not be undertaken on a road functionally classified as a local road or a rural minor collector with the exception of supporting an Off-system Bridge (OSB) project or a Highway Safety Project (HSIP) approved by ADOT and primarily funded by the OSB or HSIP program". Chris **was directed to include a list of functionally classified roads that would be eligible for STBG funding.**
- The TAC concurred with Section 6.0 (Available Funds); 7.0 (Financial Constraint); 8.0 (Federal Participation); 9.0 (Federal Participation); 10. (STBG Funding Cap).
- Section 11.0 discussed County Limitations for STBG projects. It stated "only one (1) active project per County (regardless of sponsor) may be programmed during a TIP period". **After discussion it was agreed upon that "each county may have a maximum of \$1.5 million in active projects (regardless of sponsor) during a TIP period.**
- The TAC concurred with Section 12.0 (Project Phasing); 13.0 (Contiguous Phasing); 14.0 (Right of Way Funding Cap); and 15.0 (Policy Phasing).

The TAC was advised that the next draft procure would include (The Project Selection Process, Ranking Criteria, and Project Review/Tracking Procedures).

## 7. Off-System Bridge Program Call for Projects

Chris referred the TAC to page 18-30 of their TAC Packet. Chris reminded the TAC that there is currently a call for Off-System Bridge Projects. A copy of the application and scoring criteria has been included in the packet. Chris noted that all OSB projects need to be submitted through SEAGO prior to the ADOT due date for TAC review and regional prioritization. Our next TAC meeting before the due date is January 21, 2020. Applications will need to be received no later than January 14, 2020 to be included in the packet for that meeting.

## 8. Sun Cloud Data Portal Update and Data Request

Chris referred the TAC to page 31 and 32 of their TAC Packet. Chris advised the TAC that the Sun Cloud Project is a joint project with ADOT, MAG, PAG, SCMPO, and SVMPO. They have been awarded a grant

by the Center for Accelerating Innovation under the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA). The goal of the project initiated under this grant is the development and implementation of Sun Cloud, a data portal serving the transportation planning needs of the five counties (Cochise, Maricopa, Pima, Pinal and Santa Cruz) within the Sun Corridor of Arizona. The Sun Cloud data portal will share transportation, socioeconomic and IT data and serve as a common data platform. SEAGO is supporting the above agencies in their development of the Sun Cloud data portal. Chris shared a data request sent to the City Managers and County Administrators. Chris advised that much of the data requested is transportation related and the data requests may impact our TAC members in Santa Cruz and Cochise Counties.

## **9. LPA Section Updates**

Mark Henige provided updates for the ADOT LPA section.

## **9. District Engineer's Report**

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

## **10. Regional Program Reports**

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

## **11. Items for General Discussion**

Chris Vertrees stated that we will be reviewing our STBG project programming procedures at our next meeting. Chris noted that our Bylaws require that each January we elect our officers and approve our annual meeting schedule. We will be reviewing OSB applications if any are received and we may have a traffic count discussion led by Adam Langford (Works Consulting). may also be on the agenda.

## **12. Next Meeting Date:** January 21, 2021.

***Meeting adjourned at 12:20 p.m.***

SEAGO  
STBGP Ledger 2021-2025  
January 11, 2021

Action	94.9% * OA Rate	Projected Fed Funds *		Cumulative Balance	
		Apportionment	OA	Apportionment	OA
STBGP Carry Forward FY 2020	94.9%	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
FY 2021 Allocation*	94.9%	\$909,856	\$857,078	\$909,856	\$857,078
<b>STBG ADOT Loan Repayments (IN)</b>		\$183,599	\$183,599	\$1,093,455	\$1,040,677
<b>Loan Funds from ADOT for Safford 20th Ave. (IN)</b>		\$2,800,000	\$2,800,000	\$3,893,455	\$3,840,677
<b>Safford: 20th Avenue</b>		-\$3,653,581	-\$3,653,581	\$239,874	\$187,096
<b>STBG Loan Out (?)</b>		-\$177,096	-\$177,096	\$62,778	\$10,000
<b>Tech Transfer (LTAP)</b>		-\$10,000	-\$10,000	\$52,778	\$0
FY 2021 Balance				\$52,778	\$0
FY 2022 Allocation	94.9%	\$909,856	\$857,078	\$909,856	\$857,078
STBG Loan In (?)		\$177,096	\$177,096	\$1,086,952	\$1,034,174
<b>Partial repayment Safford 20th Ave. Loan (OUT)</b>		-\$971,396	-\$971,396	\$115,556	\$62,778
<b>Tech Transfer (LTAP)</b>		-\$10,000	-\$10,000	\$105,556	\$52,778
<b>STBG Loan Out (?) - Repay in FY2022</b>		-\$52,778	-\$52,778	\$52,778	\$0
FY 2022 Balance				\$52,778	\$0
FY 2023 Allocation	94.9%	\$909,856	\$857,078	\$909,856	\$857,078
<b>Repay SVMPO Loan (OUT) for Thatcher Part 2</b>		-\$395,617	-\$395,617	\$514,239	\$461,461
<b>Partial Repayment Safford 20th Ave. Loan (OUT)</b>		-\$451,461	-\$451,461	\$62,778	\$10,000
<b>Tech Transfer (LTAP)</b>		-\$10,000	-\$10,000	\$52,778	\$0
FY 2023 Balance				\$52,778	\$0
FY 2024 Allocation	94.9%	\$909,856	\$857,078	\$909,856	\$857,078
<b>Partial repayment Safford 20th Ave. Loan (OUT)</b>		-\$847,078	-\$847,078	\$62,778	\$10,000
<b>FY 2022 Loan In - ?</b>		\$52,778	\$52,778	\$115,556	\$62,778
<b>Tech Transfer (LTAP)</b>		-\$10,000	-\$10,000	\$105,556	\$52,778
<b>Loan Out?</b>		-\$52,778	-\$52,778	\$52,778	\$0
FY 2024 Balance				\$52,778	\$0
FY2025 Allocation	94.9%	\$909,856	\$857,078	\$909,856	\$857,078
<b>Final repayment Safford 20th Ave. Loan (OUT)</b>		-\$529,435	-\$529,435	\$380,421	\$327,643
<b>FY 2024 Loan In - ?</b>		\$52,778	\$52,778	\$433,199	\$380,421
<b>Tech Transfer (LTAP)</b>		-\$10,000	-\$10,000	\$423,199	\$370,421
FY 2024 Balance				\$423,199	\$370,421

- \* Notes:
1. OA = Obligated Authority. This is the amount of money that can actually be obligated to SEAGO based upon the OA %.
  2. STBGP = Surface Transportation Block Grant Program. This amount is allocated to SEAGO based upon the 2010 population
  3. OA Rate of 94.9% is subject to change
  4. in addition to the OA Rate of 94.9%, \$6,375 of OA is taken annually for the SPR funding to the SEAGO region.
  5. STBGP Apportionments are SEAGO estimates and subject to change.
  6. Reflects loss of \$86,326 from SVMPO boundary expansion
  7. Balance carry forward is no longer allowed. Excess funds must be utilized or loaned to another COG or to the State.

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



# TAC PACKET

---

**TO: SEAGO TAC**  
**FROM: CHRIS VERTREES, TRANSPORTATION PROGRAM ADMINISTRATOR**  
**DATE: JANUARY 12, 2021**  
**RE: SEAGO 2021-2025 TIP REPORT**

---

SEAGO did not receive any requests to amend our 2021-2025 TIP this period.

**Our SEAGO 2021-2025 TIP is attached for your records.**

SEAGO REGION  
2021- 2025 TIP (Updated 11/3/20)  
Approved By: TAC - 3/19/20 Administrative Committee- 4/2/20 Executive Committee - 4/2/20

TIP YEAR Project ID	PROJECT SPONSOR	PROJECT NAME	PROJECT LOCATION	LENGTH	TYPE OF IMP - WK - STRU	Functional Classifications	LANES BEFORE	LANES AFTER	FED AID TYPE	FEDERAL FUNDS	HURF EXCHANGE	LOCAL MATCH	OTHER FUNDS	TOTAL COST
<b>2021</b>														
SAF12-02	City of Safford	20th Ave, Phase II	Relation St to Golf Course Rd to 4.8 miles south of Tombstone;	.63 Miles	Construction	Urban Minor Arterial	3	5	STP	\$3,653,581		\$220,842		\$3,874,423
CCH 21-01	Cochise County	Charleston, Double Adobe, Barataria Rds - E & C Rumble Strips	Double Adobe Road from SR 80 to Frontier Road; Barataria Boulevard from Moson Road to	10.7 miles	Design	Major Collector	2	2	HSIP	\$264,000		\$0		\$264,000
SCC 21-01	Santa Cruz County	Pendleton Drive - Roadway Dip Elimination	Pendleton Drive Dip at Sonoita Creek Wash	.25 miles	Design/PDA	Minor Arterial	2	2	HSIP	\$241,408		\$14,592		\$256,000
CLF21-01	Town of Clifton	Chase Creek Bridge #1 Replacement	Structure# 08536 Frisco Avenue - 0.1 mile north of Junction with Park Avenue	.01 mile	Design/PDA	Rural Local	2	2	Off System Bridge	\$273,179		\$16,512		\$289,691
GGH 21-01	Graham County	Golf Course Road, Cottonwood Wash Road - Shoulders and Rumble Strips	Golf Course Road from Hoopes Avenue to just west of 20th Avenue; Cottonwood Wash Road from Cottonwood Wash Loop to 1200 South.	5.1 miles	Design	Major Collector	2	2	HSIP	\$212,603		\$12,397		\$225,000
	LTAP								STP	\$10,000				\$10,000
<b>TOTAL FOR 2021</b>										<b>\$4,654,771</b>		<b>\$264,344</b>		<b>\$4,919,115</b>
<b>2022</b>														
CCH 21-01	Cochise County	Charleston, Double Adobe, Barataria Rds - E & C Rumble Strips	Charleston Road from Tombstone to 4.8 miles south of Tombstone; Double Adobe Road from SR 80 to Frontier Road; Barataria Boulevard from Moson Road to Ranch Road.	10.7 miles	Construction	Major Collector	2	2	HSIP	\$383,940		\$0		\$383,940
SCC 21-01	Santa Cruz County	Pendleton Drive - Roadway Dip Elimination	Pendleton Drive Dip at Sonoita Creek Wash	.25 miles	Construction	Minor Arterial	2	2	HSIP	\$424,350		\$25,650		\$450,000
CLF21-01	Town of Clifton	Chase Creek Bridge #1 Replacement	Structure# 08536 Frisco Avenue - 0.1 mile north of Junction with Park Avenue	.01 mile	Construction	Rural Local	2	2	Off System Bridge	\$726,821		\$43,933		\$770,754
GGH 21-01	Graham County	Golf Course Road, Cottonwood Wash Road - Shoulders and Rumble Strips	Golf Course Road from Hoopes Avenue to just west of 20th Avenue; Cottonwood Wash Road from Cottonwood Wash Loop to 1200 South.	5.1 miles	Construction	Major Collector	2	2	HSIP	\$1,991,490		\$113,715		\$2,105,205
GGH-BR-02	Graham County	Ft. Thomas River Structure No. 8131 Phase 3	Ft. Thomas River Road @ Gila River		Construction	Minor Collector	2	2	Off System Bridge	\$602,011		\$36,389		\$638,400
	LTAP								STP	\$10,000				\$10,000
<b>TOTAL FOR 2022</b>										<b>\$4,138,612</b>		<b>\$219,687</b>		<b>\$4,358,299</b>
<b>2023</b>														
NOG 20-02	City of Nogales	Pathway Project, Baffert Dr to Nogales High School	East side of Grand Avenue from Baffert Drive to Country Club Drive. Intersects with Grand Avenue path on south side of Frank Reed Road to Nogales High School	3 miles	Construction	N/A	N/A	N/A	CMAQ	\$891,135		\$53,865		\$945,000
	LTAP								STP	\$10,000				\$10,000
<b>TOTAL FOR 2023</b>										<b>\$10,000</b>		<b>\$0</b>		<b>\$10,000</b>
<b>2024</b>														
	LTAP								STP	\$10,000				\$10,000
<b>TOTAL FOR 2024</b>										<b>\$10,000</b>		<b>\$0</b>	<b>\$0</b>	<b>\$10,000</b>
<b>2025</b>														
DGS17-01	City of Douglas	Chino Road Extension Phase 2	Chino Road: 9th Street to SR90	.85 miles	Design	Urban Minor Arterial	2	2	STP	\$75,440		\$4,560		\$80,000
DGS17-01	City of Douglas	Chino Road Extension Phase 2	Chino Road: 9th Street to SR90	.85 miles	Construction	Urban Minor Arterial	2	2	STP	\$2,829,000		\$171,000		\$3,000,000
	LTAP								STP	\$10,000				\$10,000
<b>TOTAL FOR 2025</b>										<b>\$2,914,440</b>		<b>\$175,560</b>		<b>\$3,090,000</b>

<b>FUNDING OBLIGATED IN 2020</b>														
NOG 20-02	City of Nogales	Pathway Project, Baffert Dr to Nogales High School	East side of Grand Avenue from Baffert Drive to Country Club Drive. Intersects with Grand Avenue path on south side of Frank Reed Road to Nogales High School	3 miles	Design	N/A	N/A	N/A	CMAQ	\$358,340		\$21,660		\$380,000
SCC 20-01	Santa Cruz County	Santa Cruz County Chip Seal Road Improvement Project	10.39 miles of 27 unpaved road segments in unincorporated Santa Cruz County.	10.39 miles	PMDR Fee	Rural Local	2	2	CMAQ	\$28,290		\$1,710		\$30,000
SCC20-01	Santa Cruz County	Santa Cruz County Chip Seal Road Improvement Project	10.39 miles of 27 unpaved road segments in unincorporated Santa Cruz County.	10.39 miles	Construction	Rural Local	2	2	CMAQ	\$719,917		\$43,516		\$763,433

SEAGO REGION  
2021- 2025 TIP (11/3/20)  
Approved By: TAC - 3/19/20 Administrative Committee- 4/2/20 Executive Board - 4/2/20

GGH-BR-02	Graham County	Ft. Thomas River Structure No. 8131 Phase 1	Ft. Thomas River Road @ Gila River		PDA Fees	Minor Collector	2	2	Off System Bridge	\$28,290		\$1,710		\$30,000
GGH-BR-02	Graham County	Ft. Thomas River Structure No. 8131 Phase 1	Ft. Thomas River Road @ Gila River		Scoping, Design, Environmental	Minor Collector	2	2	Off System Bridge	\$369,699		\$22,347		\$392,046
SCC12-03	Santa Cruz County	Rio Rico and Pendleton Drive Intersection Improvements	Intersection		Construction	Rural Major Collector			HRRRP	\$984,555		\$59,512		\$1,044,067
		LTAP							STP	\$10,000				\$10,000
		<b>TOTAL FOR 2020</b>								<b>\$2,499,091</b>	<b>\$0</b>	<b>\$150,454</b>	<b>\$0</b>	<b>\$2,649,545</b>

<b>Future Construction Projects</b>														
CCH12-10	Cochise County	Davis Rd. Improvements	Davis Road MP 13	1 mile	Construction of Safety & Drainage Improvements	Rural Major Collector	2	2	STP	\$924,560		\$55,885		\$980,445
CCH15-01	Cochise County	Davis Rd. Improvements	Davis Road MP 5	0.61 miles	Construction of Safety & Drainage Improvements	Rural Major Collector	2	2	STP	\$1,045,000		\$63,165		\$1,108,165
TBD	City of Willcox	Bisbee Ave	729 N. Bisbee Ave to 165 S. Bisbee Ave	0.57 miles	Design	Rural Major Collector	2	2	STP	\$4,715		\$285		\$5,000
TBD	City of Willcox	Bisbee Ave	729 N. Bisbee Ave to 165 S. Bisbee Ave	0.57 miles	Construction	Rural Major Collector	2	2	STP	\$730,526		\$44,157		\$774,683
TBD	City of Safford	14th Avenue Improvement	14th Ave from Relation Street to 8th Street	1 mile	Construction	Rural Major Collector	2	3	TBD	\$11,771,300		\$711,521		\$12,482,821



# TAC PACKET

---

**TO: SEAGO TAC**  
**FROM: CHRIS VERTREES, TRANSPORTATION PROGRAM ADMINISTRATOR**  
**DATE: JANUARY 11, 2021**  
**RE: STBG PROJECT PROGRAMMING PROCEDURES REVIEW AND REVISION**

---

Attached for your review is the latest version of our revised STBG Project Programming Procedures. The following is a recap of the procedure development process:

***In February 2020, members of the SEAGO Executive Board and Administrative Council met to update SEAGO's Strategic Plan. One of the strategic goals they set was to revise the STBG programming process to make it more equitable for smaller jurisdictions. The committee made the following recommendations:***

1. Cap on STBG project requests;
2. Eliminate Right-of-Way acquisition as an eligible activity for use of local STBG funds;
3. Establish a rotation of STBG funds by County.

***To facilitate discussion and to draft an update our Federal Fund Programming Procedures a survey was sent to each of our TAC members. We had 11 responses. Some of the survey results provided clear direction while other response data was less definitive.***

A cap on STBG funding requests was highly supported. However no consensus cap number could be determined by the data.

A consensus on eliminating ROW acquisition as an eligible funding activity was not established. There was consensus that if it continues to be allowed it should be capped. However, no clear determination could be made as to the cap number.

The responses for and against a by county STBG rotation were close with 6 no responses and 5 yes responses. There was clear consensus on not including additional criteria if a by county rotation was established.

There was no clear direction on how to address our future project list in any revised project programming procedures.

***At our September meeting, we reviewed the survey results and the TAC provided direction involving the survey data.***

---

As a result of the direction, I drafted a procedure outline for our November meeting included the following:

1. Meeting participants agreed that a cap was a good idea. Direction was provided to me to develop a procedure outline and make project cap recommendations that considered population. The procedure outline included a STBG cap based on population as outlined in the following table:

Population	Single Sponsor	Joint Sponsor with County
1,500 or Less	\$450,000	\$900,000
1,501 to 5,000	\$750,000	\$1,000,000
5,001 to 10,000	\$900,000	\$1,500,000
10,001 +	\$1,500,000	N/A

2. Meeting participants agreed the Right of Way acquisition should remain an eligible activity. The TAC set the cap at \$150,000. The cap was included in the procedure outline.

3. No consensus was reached on County Rotation limitations. Direction was given to make a recommendation in the procedure outline. I made a recommendation that “only one (1) active project per County (regardless of sponsor) may be programmed during a TIP period”.

4. After discussion, it was determined that projects on the Future Project Section of our TIP should be grandfathered if Federal funds have been invested in the project. This direction was provided in the procedure outline.

***At our November meeting, I provided the TAC with the STBG Programming Procedure Outline. The following is a recap of the TAC review:***

1. The TAC concurred with Section 1.0 (Introduction); 2.0 (Purpose); 3.0 (Program Administration); and 4.0 (STBG Eligible Projects).

2. Section 5.0 of the outlined discussed the project location eligibility. It stated “a surface transportation block grant project may not be undertaken on a road functionally classified as a local road or a rural minor collector with the exception of supporting an Off-system Bridge (OSB) project or a Highway Safety Project (HSIP) approved by ADOT and primarily funded by the OSB or HSIP program”. ***I was directed to include a list of functionally classified roads that would be eligible for STBG funding. Those roads have been included in the procedure.***

3. The TAC concurred with Section 6.0 (Available Funds); 7.0 (Financial Constraint); 8.0 (Federal Participation); 9.0 (Federal Participation); 10. (STBG Funding Cap).

4. Section 11.0 discussed County Limitations for STBG projects. It stated “only one (1) active project per County (regardless of sponsor) may be programmed during a TIP period”. ***After discussion it was agreed upon that “each county may have a maximum of \$1.5 million in active projects (regardless of sponsor) during a TIP period. That direction has been included in the procedure.***

5. The TAC concurred with Section 12.0 (Project Phasing); 13.0 (Contiguous Phasing); 14.0 (Right of Way Funding Cap); and 15.0 (Policy Phasing).

6. The TAC was advised that the next draft procure would include (The Project Selection Process, Ranking Criteria, and Project Review/Tracking Procedures). ***Those procedure recommendations have been included in the procedure.***

***Attachment:*** Draft - Surface Transportation Block Grant (STBG) Project Programming Procedures



# **Surface Transportation Block Grant (STBG)**

## **Project Programming Procedures**

DRAFT

## 1.0 Introduction

The SouthEastern Arizona Governments Organization (SEAGO), acting in its role as a Council of Governments (COG), is responsible for programming future Surface Transportation Block Grant (STBG) funding that will come to the SEAGO region. STBG funds are reimbursable federal aid funds, subject to the requirements of Title 23, United States code. Eligible costs include preliminary engineering, right-of-way acquisition, and constructions costs associated with an eligible activity. This policy outlines the standards, criteria, and procedures for managing SEAGO's STBG programming process.

## 2.0 Purpose

The purpose of this procedure is to ensure that the SEAGO region utilizes all STBG funds allocated to our region. Federal obligation authority (OA) is the total amount of federal funds that may be obligated in a given fiscal year. It expires at the end of each federal fiscal year. It is SEAGO's goal to utilize all OA made available to the region to avoid loss of federal funding and to ensure the competitiveness of the region in obtaining funding from statewide sources. To do this, jurisdictions must consistently report on progress to ensure that OA is fully used.

## 3.0 Program Administration

**3.1** The **SEAGO Transportation Program Administrator** is responsible for the development and maintenance of the Regional Transportation Improvement Program (TIP), development and maintenance of the SEAGO STBG Ledger, scheduling Transit Advisory Committee Meetings, development of TAC Meeting agendas and minutes, facilitating Call for Projects process, and making programming recommendations to the TAC.

**3.2** The **Technical Advisory Committee (TAC)** is responsible for monitoring the STBG program funding attributable to SEAGO and making project recommendations to the SEAGO Advisory Council and Executive Board.

**3.3** **Project Review Meetings** – Project review meetings will be held by the TAC each September, January, and March to monitor the status of programmed projects. Project sponsors or their representative are required to attend.

**3.4** **Project Initiation**– Sponsors must submit a Project Initiation Request Packet to the ADOT LPA Section by May of each year for projects that are scheduled in the next federal fiscal year. Failure to submit may result in the project being delayed into a future TIP year.

**3.5** **Future Projects** – In order to protect our limited STBG funding a future project list by phase shall be maintained on the TIP. Future projects shall be reviewed each March and July for progression into a programming year.

**3.6** **STBG Fund Management** – STBG funds are subject to ADOT “use or lose” policy. If a fund balance remains at the March Project Review meeting one or more of several options will be pursued to avoid a loss of funds. These options include but are not limited to moving a future project up as needed, swapping programmed TIP projects, and/or a trade/transfer of funds with ADOT or another COG/MPO.

- 3.7** If a shortfall in of funds is a concern, projects may be switched or split into additional phases for needed to progress the project or the sponsor may need to take on an additional financial commitment to their local contribution.
- 3.8** SEAGO receives sub-allocated funds at the discretion of ADOT. If ADOT's current funding policy changes in regards to amount of funds sub-allocated or the elimination of a funding program, SEAGO assumes no liability in funding projects that have been affected by these changes.

#### **4.0 STBG Eligible Projects**

**23 U.S. Code § 133** (Surface Transportation Block Grant Program) **section 104(b)(2)** identifies the construction projects eligible for STBG funding. A list of projects eligible for Federal funding can be found at <https://www.fhwa.dot.gov/specialfunding/stp/160307.cfm> .

#### **5.0 Location of Projects**

STBG applications may only be submitted by a SEAGO member agency and only for a road owned by that member agency.

**5.1** A surface transportation block grant project may not be undertaken on a road functionally classified as a local road or a rural minor collector with the exception of supporting an Off-system Bridge (OSB) project or a Highway Safety Project (HSIP) approved by ADOT and primarily funded by the OSB or HSIP program.

**5.2** The following functionally classified roads are eligible funding:

**5.2.1** Urban Minor Collectors

**5.2.2** Major Collectors

**5.2.3** Minor Arterials

**5.3** The ADOT Statewide Federal Functional System Map shall be used by SEAGO to verify project location eligibility. The map can be found at: <https://works.maps.arcgis.com/apps/webappviewer/index.html?id=4bcb96763e48482799906407a0cdb7cb> .

#### **6.0 Available Funds**

In FY2021, SEAGO was apportioned \$909,856 STBG funds. The apportionment had an obligation rate of 94.9%, making \$857,078 in obligation authority (OA) available for programming. Current funding is allocated to SEAGO based upon the 2010 Census. The 2020 Census will reset our STBG apportionment. The obligation rate is subject to change.

#### **7.0 Financial Constraint**

The TIP must always be fiscally constrained, meaning that all projects in the TIP must identify the funding source that is paying for the improvements. The funds used to pay for the improvements cannot exceed the amount of available funding per funding source. Programmed funding can only include funds that can be reasonably expected to be made available during the year the project is programmed.

**7.1.1** SEAGO also ensures that the TIP is fiscally constrained over a consecutive 4-year period, referred to in this document as **TIP period**. SEAGO’s STBG Ledger is the planning document that tracks fiscal constraint of the current program year and over the TIP period.

**8.0 Federal Participation**

The maximum federal share for projects under the STBG program is 94.3% of the total eligible project costs. **Federal funds are capped at the approved amount shown in the current TIP.**

**9.0 Local Participation**

The minimum local share is 5.7% of total eligible project costs. The local share for STBG projects is required to be in cash from local or other non-federal sources. These projects are not eligible for soft-match credit, or 100% Federal funding participation, regardless of Federal or state eligibility.

**10.0 STBG Funding Cap**

To ensure programming flexibility and equitable distribution of our limited STBG funds, a funding cap has been established based upon jurisdiction population. STBG projects have a combined design/preliminary engineering, right-of-way, and construction cap in **federal funds** as indicated in the table below:

Population	Single Sponsor	Joint Sponsor with County
1,500 or Less	\$450,000	\$900,000
1,501 to 5,000	\$750,000	\$1,000,000
5,001 to 10,000	\$900,000	\$1,500,000
10,001 +	\$1,500,000	N/A

**10.1 Local Responsibility** - Any cost above the amount listed is the responsibility of the local sponsor.

**10.2 Joint Sponsor** - Cities and Towns may partner with their County to increase funding capacity. However, the sponsoring County will be ineligible to compete for STBG funding until the project has been completed or a new TIP period has been started.

**11.0 County Limitations**

Each county may have a maximum of \$1.5 million in active projects (regardless of sponsor) during a TIP period.

**12.0 Project Phasing**

TIP projects must be phased to ensure fiscal constraint. A project or phase of a project may only be programmed if full funding can reasonably be anticipated for the time period contemplated to complete the project. STBG funding may be used to fund the Preliminary Engineering

(Design), Right of Way (ROW), and Construction phases of a project. The following table is the expected phasing programming schedule for TAC approved projects:

Project Year	Phase
Year 1	Preliminary Engineering
Year 2	ROW (if requested)
Year 3	Construction

**13.0 Contiguous Phasing**

Project sponsors that have contiguous phases, such as a phase one and two, may combine their phases if supported by the project schedule and after the original approval for funding by the SEAGO TAC and Executive Board. Combining of phases is subject to the availability of funds and approval by the SEAGO TAC and Executive Board. SEAGO funding for the combined phases is not to exceed the sum of the individual project caps that were originally approved for funding.

**14.0 Right of Way Funding Cap**

To ensure programming flexibility and equitable distribution of our limited STBG funds, Right of Way acquisition shall be capped at \$150,000. Additional ROW funding may be considered by the TAC as long as project costs do not exceed the total project cap.

**15.0 Policy Phasing**

Existing Projects in the future projects section of the TIP shall only be grandfathered and have funding priority if federal funds have been spent on the project. Identification of projects will begin in SFY 2023 (July 2022).

**16.0 Project Selection Cycle**

Project selection shall be competitive. SEAGO will issue a call for projects on a 2-year cycle. Call for projects shall occur each even-numbered year. The selection cycle shall adhere to the following schedule:

<i>Action</i>	<i>Month</i>
SEAGO issues Call for STBG Projects	July
STBG Applications Due	November
SEAGO Eligibility Review	December
SEAGO TAC Review and Scoring	January
Project Programming	March
SEAGO Executive Board Approval	April
45-Day Public Comment Period	April-May
Upcoming Fiscal Year TIP Submitted to ADOT	June

## 17.0 Project Selection Process

- 17.1 SEAGO will use a competitive selection process to determine allocation of federal funds.
  - 17.1.1 Application due dates and presentations will be established by the SEAGO TAC.
  - 17.1.2 Completed applications must be before or on established due dates. Late applications will not be accepted.
  - 17.1.3 Applications may be submitted via fax, mail, e-mail (must include scan of signed signature), or in person.
  - 17.1.4 Jurisdictions will be issued a receipt indicating date and time of submission and whether the application was complete or incomplete. If incomplete, jurisdictions will be advised of the incomplete requirements.
  - 17.1.5 SEAGO staff will pre-screen the application for:
    - 17.1.5.1.1 **Eligibility** - Project type meets STBG eligibility requirements.
    - 17.1.5.1.2 **Functional Classification** – Project is located on a eligible functionally classified road.
    - 17.1.5.1.3 **Completeness** – the application must address all of the questions in the application package.
    - 17.1.5.1.4 **Funding Amount** - the full funding must be identified for the project phase for which funding is requested. If the STBG funds for which the applicant is applying exceed project caps and/or are not sufficient to complete the project phase, the applicant must identify sufficient available supplemental funding with which the project can be completed.
  - 17.1.6 The sponsoring agency will be given five days to correct incomplete information. The due date and time will be noted on the receipt.
  - 17.1.7 Eligible project applications will be forwarded to the SEAGO TAC in the TAC packet provided to the TAC membership prior to January meeting of the SEAGO TAC.
  - 17.1.8 The SEAGO TAC will evaluate, rank, and make project selection recommendations considering the Project Selection Criteria established in Section 18.0.
  - 17.1.9 Project selection information will be sent to the SEAGO Administrative Council for their approval and recommendation to the SEAGO Executive Board. Projects selected and approved by the SEAGO Executive Board to be programmed will be included in the SEAGO Transportation Improvement Plan (TIP).

## 18.0 Project Selection Criteria

The SEAGO TAC shall consider the following when scoring STBG applications:

- 18.1.1 Project readiness to proceed and demonstration of a reasonable timeline for implementation.
- 18.1.2 Project cost estimates are accurate and based upon sound cost evaluation principles.

- 18.1.3** The project cost fits appropriately into the SEAGO project caps, and it can be reasonably anticipated that match funding will be available within the time period contemplated for completion of the project.
- 18.1.4** Safety impact of the project (project includes provisions to help prevent accidents, reduce fatalities and serious injuries on the project roadways).
- 18.1.5** Economic development potential of the project (project serves an area with commercial and/or industrial development opportunities, enhances tourism, and/or the movement of freight).
- 18.1.6** Emphasizes the preservation of the existing transportation system (project includes provisions for multimodal system preservation, such as resurfacing, rehabilitation of pavement, and/or bridge replacement).
- 18.1.7** Project included in regional or local plans that had a public input process associated with the plan.
- 18.1.8** Benefit/Cost Consideration: This value will be calculated by SEAGO staff after receiving the above scores. The calculation will be determined as follows: Total average score divided by total STBG request.

## **19.0 Project Development and Reporting**

- 19.1** Sponsors must submit a Project Initiation Request Packet to the ADOT LPA Section by May of each year for projects that are scheduled in the next federal fiscal year. Failure to submit may result in the project being delayed into a future TIP year. Project Initiation Materials can be found at: <https://azdot.gov/node/14142> .
- 19.2** **A copy of the Initiation Packet and any additional correspondence with the ADOT LPA Section must be provided to SEAGO for tracking purposes.**
- 19.3** Once a Project is initiated, the project sponsor must show continuous progress towards obligation and completion. Failure to demonstrate progress can lead to the moving or deletion of a project from the TIP.
- 19.4** Project sponsors with an active project shall provide verbal status reports to the TAC at each meeting.
- 19.5** ADOT has set a June 30 deadline for all fiscal year allocated funds to obligate. Status report due dates are based upon that schedule.
- 19.6** Written Status Reports are due November 1 and March 1 of each year.

## **20.0 Project Failure to Progress**

- 20.1** Projects that are not showing progress to obligation will be forwarded to the SEAGO TAC for review, discussion and action, at its November and March meetings.
- 20.2** Sponsors for projects that are not demonstrating progress towards obligation shall be required to present the specific reasons that has caused the projects delay and a revised schedule and plan that addresses the specific issues identified.
- 20.3** The SEAGO TAC may take one of the following actions:



- 22.1.1** Reprogram them to a project that has a high chance of obligating within the given fiscal year.
- 22.1.2** Swap TIP year with a project that is ready for advancement.
- 22.1.3** Identify another COG/MPO that can obligate the funds within the given fiscal year. A loan agreement will be implemented prior to any transfer of funding.
- 22.1.4** Enter into a loan agreement with ADOT.

**23.0 Post Obligation Responsibilities**

- 23.1** All local sponsored federally funded projects that have obligated need to show financial activity within six (6) months of obligation and on a routine basis until completion of the project. If for a 12-month consecutive period, an obligated project has not shown financial activity, it may in some cases be deemed by FHWA as inactive and may be subject to de-obligation by the Federal Highway Administration.
- 23.2** Once a project is obligated, the sponsor agency shall notify SEAGO of the date of obligation.
- 23.3** Project status reports shall be submitted to SEAGO via e-mail in November and March of each year demonstrating that financial activity is occurring.

DRAFT



# TAC PACKET

---

**TO:** SEAGO TAC  
**FROM:** CHRIS VERTREES, TRANSPORTATION PROGRAM ADMINISTRATOR  
**DATE:** JANUARY 12, 2021  
**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:** Tom Palmer – Town of Thatcher

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.

During the election of officer discussion last January, the TAC voted to keep the current set of officers in place (Michael Bryce-Chair and Randy Petty–Vice Chair). Randy Petty left the City of Safford last March. An election of a new Vice-Chair occurred at our May TAC meeting. Tom Palmer/Town of Thatcher was elected as Vice-Chairperson.

During previous election discussions, recommendations have been 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. After discussion, Randy Petty indicated his preference was to keep our current officers the same. The group concurred. However, this is a process that may want to be re-considered by the TAC.



# TAC PACKET

**TO: SEAGO TAC**  
**FROM: CHRIS VERTREES, TRANSPORTATION PROGRAM ADMINISTRATOR**  
**DATE: JANUARY 12, 2021**  
**RE: 12-MONTH TAC MEETING SCHEDULE**

The SEAGO TAC is scheduled to meet on the third Thursday of every other month. Below for your approval is the TAC meeting calendar for the next 12 months:

Date	Scheduled Business	Location
January 21, 2021	Election of Officers, Off-system Bridge Programming	Zoom Meeting
March 18, 2021	2021-2025 Draft TIP, Final FY 21 Project Status Reviews	Zoom Meeting
May 20, 2021	General Business	TBD
July 15, 2021	General Business	TBD
September 16, 2021	General Business	TBD
November 18, 2021	Initial FY 21 STBG Project Status Reviews, Transportation Issues Statement	TBD
January 20, 2022	Election of Officers, Off-system Bridge Programming	TBD