



ADMINISTRATIVE COUNCIL PACKET

MEMO TO: ADMINISTRATIVE COUNCIL
FROM: RANDY HEISS, EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR
DATE: APRIL 26, 2011
SUBJECT: ADMINISTRATIVE COUNCIL MEETING

See details below for the Administrative Council meeting date, time, and location.

Friday, May 6, 2011 at 9 a.m.
Cochise College Benson Center
1025 State Route 90
Benson, Arizona

If you are unable to attend, please send an alternate to ensure that we will have a quorum at the meeting.

If you have any questions, please call me at (520) 432-5301. You can also send an e-mail to rheiss@seago.org.

Attachment



ADMINISTRATIVE COUNCIL AGENDA

9 A.M., FRIDAY, MAY 6, 2011
COCHISE COLLEGE BENSON CENTER
1025 STATE ROUTE 90
BENSON, ARIZONA

ALL ITEMS SUBJECT TO ACTION.

		Page
I. CALL TO ORDER/INTRODUCTIONS	Chair Pauken	
II. MEMBER ENTITIES' DISCUSSION (Common Critical Issues)	Chair Pauken	
III. ACTION ITEMS		
1. Consent Agenda		
a. Approval of the February 4, 2011 Minutes	Chair Pauken	1
b. Ratification of April 12, 2011 Action by the Administrative Committee	Randy Heiss	7
c. Appointments of ACOA Members	Kathleen Heard	10
d. Funding Levels for SFY 2011-12	Kathleen Heard	12
e. 2012 TIP Draft and Public Participation Process	Luke Droeger	16
2. Election of Officers	Randy Heiss	17
3. SEAGO Annual Assessment and RTAC Membership	Randy Heiss	18
4. FY 2011-2012 Budget	Randy Heiss	21
5. Contract Renewal for SFY 2011-12	Kathleen Heard	23
6. EDA Resolution 2011-01	Akos Kovach	25
7. Request for Authorization to Open a SEAGO EDD Revolving Loan Fund Checking and Savings Account	Akos Kovach	27
8. 5300 Grant Submission	Luke Droeger	28
IV. INFORMATION ITEMS		
1. Future Meeting Dates	Randy Heiss	30
2. Census Comparisons and County Resolutions Process	Randy Heiss	31
3. Water Quality (208) Program Update	Randy Heiss	35
4. Strategic Plan Update	Randy Heiss	44
5. Update on SEAGO's New Facility	Randy Heiss	45

AGENDA CONTINUED

INFORMATION ITEMS CONTINUED

6. CDBG Application Information	Bonnie Williams	46
7. Save My Home Arizona Program Funding Cuts	Julie Packer	47
8. Pathways Out of Poverty Job Program	Chris Vertrees	48
9. Update and Report on Comprehensive Economic Development Strategy (CEDS)	Akos Kovach	50
V. ENERGY CODE WORKSHOP INFORMATION	Susan Buchan	51
VI. RTAC REPORT	Kevin Adam	52
VII. CALL TO THE PUBLIC	Chair Pauken	
VIII. DISCUSSION AND POSSIBLE ACTION TO HOLD AN EXECUTIVE SESSION TO REVIEW THE PERFORMANCE OF THE EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR	Chair Pauken	53
RECONVENE TO REGULAR MEETING		
Discussion and possible recommendations to the Executive Committee regarding the performance of the Executive Director	Chair Pauken	
IX. ADJOURNMENT	Chair Pauken	

**DRAFT MINUTES OF THE
ADMINISTRATIVE COUNCIL
BENSON FIRE DEPARTMENT
360 SOUTH GILA
BENSON, ARIZONA
FEBRUARY 4, 2011**

OFFICER PRESENT: Vice Chair Kay Gale, Greenlee County

MEMBERS PRESENT: George Barnes, City of Tombstone
Barney Bigman, San Carlos Apache Tribe
Espie Castaneda for Alan Baker, Town of Clifton
Terry Cooper, Graham County
Randy Petty for David Kincaid, City of Safford
Jenifer Thornton for Chuck Potucek, City of Sierra Vista
Gerald Schmidt, Town of Pima

STAFF PRESENT: Randy Heiss, Executive Director
Susan Buchan, Pathways Program Manager
Kathleen Heard, Area Agency on Aging Director
Akos Kovach, Economic Development Planner
Luke Droeger, Transportation Planner
Yolanda Urbina, Executive Assistant
Bonnie Williams, Community Development Program Manager

GUEST: Kevin Adam, RTAC Liaison (via telephone)
Kathy Boyle, ADOT
Becky Nutt, Greenlee Chamber of Commerce

CALL TO ORDER/INTRODUCTIONS

Secretary Kay Gale chaired and called the meeting to order at 9:07 a.m. Those in attendance introduced themselves. The meeting location was changed from the Cochise College Benson Center to the Benson Fire Department due to utility problems with the deep freeze conditions.

MEMBER ENTITIES' DISCUSSION

There was no discussion on this item.

ACTION ITEMS

Consent Agenda

- a. Approval of the October 1, 2010 Minutes
- b. Ratification of the December 10, 2010 Action by the Administrative Committee

- c. Appointments of the Advisory Council on Aging (ACOA) Members
- d. SFY 2011-12 Local SSBG Plan
- e. Approval of 2011 TIP Amendment No. 1

Terry Cooper made the motion and the second was made by Gerald Schmidt to recommend approval of the consent agenda items listed above. Motion carried unanimously (Vote: 8/0).

Proposed Amendments to SEAGO's Policy Manual

Randy Heiss provided a handout outlining amendments to SEAGO's Policy Manual. This included changes to the Compensation Plan (reviewed at a minimum every 5 years), Sick Leave (may be used on a one-hour basis after one month of employment), Appeals from Termination, Demotion, and Unpaid Suspension (Personnel Committee shall consist of the Chair and Vice Chair of the Executive Board and the officers of the Administrative Council), Appeal Procedure (at the discretion of the Hearing Officer the losing party may be ordered to bear the costs of the appeal etc.), Termination Pay (employees will be entitled to severance pay according to a set schedule unless they were terminated as a result of the unscheduled discontinuation of program funds), Final Paycheck (employees terminated for cause will be issued their final paycheck within three working days of the termination or at the end of the next regular pay period whichever is sooner), and Travel Advance (employees going into travel status where per diem will be claimed for a period exceeding 48 hours may request a travel advance not the exceed 100 percent). **Jenifer Thornton made the motion and the second was made by Terry Cooper to recommend approval of the proposed amendments to SEAGO's Policy Manual. Motion carried unanimously (Vote: 8/0).**

Records Retention Schedule

Randy Heiss reported that a request had been made by an Executive Board member to retain audio recordings for at least one year. The Arizona State Library, Archives, and Public Records (ASLAPR) approved general records retention schedules for municipalities, counties, school districts, fire districts and other types of governing bodies. There is still not an approved general records retention schedule that applies to COGs but the ASLAPR released a schedule designed for state agencies. Randy provided this schedule in the packet ("It is the policy of SEAGO's Board to retain audio recordings for one year"). He addressed the audio recordings request and will address a complete records retention schedule at a later date. **Terry Cooper made the motion and the second was made by Gerald Schmidt to recommend approval of the records retention schedule. Motion carried unanimously (Vote: 8/0).**

Proposed Amendments to SEAGO's Procurement Policy

Randy provided a handout with changes to SEAGO's Procurement Policy. The primary change was to separate the procurement policies from the process used in the procurement of goods and services over a prescribed dollar value. The former process was deleted in the proposed draft. The amended process will be utilized agency wide for procurement of goods and services valued

over \$10,000. **Jenifer Thornton made the motion and the second was made by Terry Cooper to recommend approval of the proposed amendments to SEAGO's Procurement Policy. Motion carried unanimously (Vote: 8/0).**

Draft Mission and Vision Statements

Randy reported that SEAGO held a strategic planning retreat facilitated by Jane Bristol on **January 13** to refine the draft Mission and Vision Statements. The group revised the Mission Statement to: SEAGO stimulates economic and social progress in our four-county region. The Vision Statement was revised to: SEAGO, as a highly motivated, energetic team, commits to being a respected, credible source of leadership, information, funding, planning, technical expertise, and services. Ms. Bristol provided a written report of the retreat. **Gerald Schmidt made the motion and the second was made by George Barnes to recommend approval of the draft Vision and Mission Statements. Motion carried unanimously (Vote: 8/0).**

Health Promotion Coordinator

Kathleen Heard reported that Tracy Zerkle the health promotion coordinator who was contracted through a Request for Quotes process last year as the certified master trainer in evidence based health promotion programs has moved to San Antonio. A coordinator is needed to replace Ms. Zerkle and attend the upcoming **February 8** Chronic Disease Self Management class and **February 17** Matter of Balance master training class. An existing part-time employee who is a retired teacher could be promoted to this new position. Kathleen is asking for approval to create a new part-time position which will need to be approved by the Executive Board (Committee) for review and concurrence of positions to be created and salaries to be paid to SEAGO employees. **Terry Cooper made the motion and the second was made by Jenifer Thornton to recommend approval of the part-time Health Promotion Coordinator position and place the position within the classification system to establish an equitable salary. Motion carried unanimously (Vote: 8/0).**

INFORMATION ITEMS

Meeting Date

Randy Heiss informed members that the next meeting would be held on Friday, **May 6, 2011.**

Replacement of Graham County Private Sector Representative

Randy informed members that Jackie Brown the Graham County private sector representative was unable to continue serving on the Executive Board. Marie Freestone, President/CEO of the Graham County Chamber of Commerce has been invited to serve in this capacity. Terry Cooper (Graham County) recommended that Marie Freestone's name be forwarded to the Executive Board as the private sector representative for Graham County on the Executive Board.

Bylaws Amendments Relating to Process Concerns

Randy reported that the proposed solutions to process concerns that were raised as a result of the August 19 joint Administrative and Executive Committee needed to be formally adopted. Some of the proposed solutions required amendments to the SEAGO Bylaws. While these amendments were approved by the Administrative Council and Executive Board at their October 2010 meeting, they were not formally adopted by the Executive Board as amendments to the Bylaws. These Bylaws amendments will be considered by the Executive Board at their **February 18** meeting. The specific amendments were: Individuals may also request that meeting materials be sent to them via regular mail, however, timely receipt of such materials is not guaranteed. All members of the Administrative Council/Executive Board are encouraged to participate in the discussion, but only the Administrative/Executive Committee is authorized to vote on the matters under consideration.

Update on SEAGO's New Facility

Randy informed members that after completing acquisition of the property, it was determined that a connection to the City of Bisbee sanitary sewer system was not a cost effective alternative. The existing septic system has been reconstructed to meet current regulations for a maximum occupancy of 23 staff. The cost was \$5,000 less than anticipated in the initial cost estimate. Staff is preparing the plans for the improvement specifications to the building which will be submitted to the City by the end of March. The building improvements will be put out to bid in April and construction to be completed before the end of June. Randy will ask for a three-month extension on the current lease which expires June 30 to give SEAGO the flexibility to complete the construction work and move into the new location.

ADOT Consultation with Rural Elected Officials

Randy informed members that ADOT is moving forward with the State's Long Range Transportation Plan (What Moves You AZ) which requires consultation with non-metropolitan elected officials. He was originally informed that the consultation process would take place in March, but later learned that it would take place later in the year instead. There will be meetings scheduled for key stakeholders including elected officials in Tucson in March, and ADOT has also requested they be allowed to present information to the Executive Board at their meeting on May 20 or 21. Randy invited the Administrative Council to attend the meeting along with the Executive Board.

SEAGO Audit and Finance Report

Randy provided a draft SFY 2010 SEAGO audit. He will be speaking with Colby and Powell to clarify discrepancies in the CDBG and Housing funding numbers and report his findings.

HUD Award FY 11

Julie Packer reported that SEAGO received \$45,324.10 for Comprehensive Counseling which includes Homebuyer Education, pre-Purchase, Foreclosure Prevention, Mortgage Default/Delinquency, Financial Fitness, Predatory Lending, and Rental.

Water Quality (208) Program Update

Susan Buchan reported that the Environmental Review Committee had received and approved the final drafts of two chapters of the 208 Update. The Committee met on **December 29** and had a conference call on **January 20**. The conference call involved discussing the goals for the plan update and trying to reduce the number of amendments required by the plan. The deadline for the 208 Update had been extended to **April 30**. Staff reviewed an upgrade to an existing onsite system at Chiricahua National Monument campground with no expansion. No amendment was required as a result of the review.

Pathways Program Update

Susan reported that the Pathways program currently has 182 enrollees in training throughout the SEAGO region. The program has moved from the intake and assessment phase to the technical training phase. The training tracks students are enrolled in are as follows: 40 percent solar, 30 percent environmental remediation, and 30 percent building performance/weatherization. It is anticipated that the training phase for the majority of the participants will be finished by June 2011.

Economic Development District (EDD) and Comprehensive Economic Development Strategy (CEDS Report

Akos Kovach (Economic Development Planner) asked members to review and comment on the CEDS draft and CEDS timeline. Kovach also requested that member entities submit their list of projects to be included in the CEDS, otherwise they could not be considered for funding. These projects may be for capacity building, technical support, innovations for the marketplace, private sector commercialization, and innovation clusters etc. Kovach requested support in gathering photos and videos which will be incorporated into the CEDS. Also included in the packet was the *SEAGO Newsletter and Digest*, Economic Development District participant roster, and proposed dues structure.

RTAC REPORT

Kevin Adam was unable to attend but called into the meeting and gave a state and federal update.

CALL TO THE PUBLIC

There was not any information under this item.

DISCUSSION AND POSSIBLE ACTION TO HOLD AN EXECUTIVE SESSION TO REVIEW THE PERFORMANCE ON THE EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR

This item will be moved to the next Administrative Council meeting.

ADJOURNMENT

There being no further business, the meeting adjourned at 10:10 a.m.



ADMINISTRATIVE COUNCIL PACKET

MEMO TO: ADMINISTRATIVE COUNCIL

FROM: RANDY HEISS, EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR

DATE: APRIL 26, 2011

SUBJECT: RATIFICATION OF APRIL 12, 2011 ACTION BY THE ADMINISTRATIVE COMMITTEE

On **April 12, 2011**, the SEAGO Administrative Committee held a joint telephonic meeting with the Executive Committee for consideration of the following items:

- (1) Discussion and possible approval of the State Fiscal Year 2012 Work Program with the Arizona Department of Transportation.
- (2) Discussion and possible approval of the Audit Proposal Review Committee's recommendation to engage Colby and Powell, PLC, to perform auditing services for SEAGO for the fiscal years ending June 30, 2011, 2012, 2013, 2014, and 2015.

The Administrative Committee voted unanimously to recommend approval of both items to the Executive Committee. The Executive Committee then voted approval of both items under consideration (see attached minutes).

RH:YU

Attachment: Minutes of the April 12, 2012 Joint Conference Call of the Administrative and Executive Committees.

Action Requested: Information Only Action Requested Below:

A motion to ratify the action taken by the Administrative Committee on April 12, 2011.

**DRAFT MINUTES OF
THE JOINT
EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE AND ADMINISTRATIVE COMMITTEE
APRIL 12, 2011
CONFERENCE CALL**

EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE PRESENT: Chair Drew John
First Vice Chair Sam Lindsey
Treasurer David Gomez

ADMINISTRATIVE COMMITTEE PRESENT: Chair Steve Pauken
Kay Gale, Vice Chair
Terry Hinton, Secretary

EXECUTIVE BOARD PRESENT: Marie Freestone, Graham County Representative

OTHER GUEST: Gussie Motter, Cochise County

STAFF PRESENT: Randy Heiss, Executive Director
Deborah Alford, Finance Director
Luke Droeger, Transportation Planner
Yolanda Urbina, Executive Assistant

CALL TO ORDER/INTRODUCTIONS

Chair Drew John called the meeting to order at 1:32 p.m. and members introduced themselves.

BRIEF EXPLANATION OF ADMINISTRATIVE AND EXECUTIVE COMMITTEES' ROLES/DUTIES IN CONDUCTING SEAGO BUSINESS IN BETWEEN REGULARLY SCHEDULED MEETINGS (R. HEISS)

Randy Heiss explained that it was difficult to get the entire Administrative Council and Executive Board to meetings that were not scheduled. Therefore, the Administrative Committee and Executive Committee (officers of the Administrative Council and Executive Board) were delegated to take care of business (not policy) in between regularly scheduled meetings. Officers of both committees would make the motions to approve action items. He asked that after each action item was discussed that the Administrative Committee make a motion to recommend approval to the Executive Committee. The Executive Committee would consider the Administrative Committee's recommendation when voting.

DISCUSSION AND POSSIBLE APPROVAL OF THE STATE FISCAL YEAR WORK PROGRAM (LUKE DROEGER)

Luke Droeger reported that the Work Program was the same as last year's. The Work Program follows the agreement between ADOT and SEAGO which outlines the tasks and elements to be completed. Last year's budget was for a nine-month period because the state was changing from a federal fiscal year to a state fiscal year. The 12-month work program contains the elements and tasks and the budget number may be higher due to the change from the 9-month to the 12-month cycle. Chair John asked the reason for the April 15 deadline. Luke responded that the date was in the Joint Program Agreement between ADOT and SEAGO. **Administrative Committee Chair Steve Pauken made a motion and the second was made by Vice Chair Kay Gale to recommend approval of the SEAGO Work Program for 2012. Motion carried unanimously (3/0). Executive Committee Treasurer David Gomez made a motion and the second was made by First Chair Sam Lindsey to approve the SEAGO Work Program for 2012. Motion carried unanimously (3/0).**

DISCUSSION AND POSSIBLE APPROVAL OF THE AUDIT PROPOSAL REVIEW COMMITTEE'S RECOMMENDATION TO ENGAGE COLBY AND POWELL, PLC, TO PERFORM AUDITING SERVICES FOR SEAGO FOR THE FISCAL YEARS ENDING JUNE 30, 2011, 2012, 2013, 2014, AND 2015 (DEBORAH ALFORD)

Deborah Alford reported that SEAGO is audited yearly and goes out to bid every five years. This year, SEAGO received six proposals. Kathleen Heard, Randy Heiss, and Deborah Alford reviewed the proposals and agreed the best proposal was from Colby and Powell. They agreed that Colby and Powell's experience with SEAGO, other COGs, and Area Agencies on Aging were some of the factors that they were chosen. The cost was also among the lowest, although not the lowest bid. Deborah asked approval of this firm and the ability to renew them for the next four years. Chair Drew John added that Colby and Powell was not the lowest bidder. There was one firm with a lower bid for the price but did not have as much experience. Colby and Powell did a good job for SEAGO. The lowest bidder is not always the best choice. **Administrative Committee Vice Chair Kay Gale made a motion and the second was made by Secretary Terry Hinton to recommend approval of the contract for Colby and Powell for the next audit. Motion carried unanimously (3/0). Executive Committee Vice Chair Sam Lindsey made a motion and the second was made by Treasurer David Gomez to approve the contract for Colby and Powell. Motion carried unanimously (3/0).**

ADJOURNMENT

Treasurer David Gomez made a motion which was seconded by Vice Chair Sam Lindsey to adjourn the meeting. The meeting adjourned at 1:41 p.m.



ADMINISTRATIVE COUNCIL PACKET

MEMO TO: ADMINISTRATIVE COUNCIL
THROUGH: RANDY HEISS, EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR
FROM: KATHLEEN HEARD, AREA AGENCY ON AGING DIRECTOR
DATE: APRIL 26, 2011
SUBJECT: APPOINTMENT OF ACOA MEMBERS

There are four vacancies on the Advisory Council on Aging (ACOA) that need to be filled:

1. Gary Clark of Douglas is not eligible for re-appointment since he is completing his second term under the new bylaws. He recommends that Sergio Garcia be appointed to fill his seat. Sergio is an area specialist with the USDA Rural Development office in Willcox, but lives in Douglas. He is very active in his community and is a member of both the Douglas ARC board and the Douglas Community Foundation board.
2. Yolanda Soto of Nogales is also eligible for re-appointment, but has been unable to attend most of the meetings. Reyna Salas has been recommended to take Yolanda's place. Reyna is the manager of the Casitas de Santa Cruz, which is the Section 202 apartment complex on the Holy Cross Hospital campus.
3. Rev. Stewart Elson of Willcox has retired and he recommends that Don Ulses be appointed to fill his position. Don is retired and has been active in Willcox by serving as chair of the Nursing Home Committee for the Willcox hospital, as a member of the Willcox Planning and Zoning Commission, the Sulphur Springs Historical Society, the Sacred Heart Catholic Church Project Development Committee, and as commander of the local American Legion post.
4. Linda Joyner of Thatcher resigned in early March. Linda Wenham has agreed to serve. She has worked for Arizona's Children Association, Inc., and is very involved in her church, and their charity work.

The Advisory Council on Aging met on April 21, and nominated these individuals.

KH:YU

Board Action Requested: Information Only Action Requested Below

A motion to recommend to the Executive Board appointment of Sergio Garcia, Reyna Salas, Don Ulses, and Linda Wenham for membership on the SEAGO Advisory Council on Aging.



ADMINISTRATIVE COUNCIL PACKET

MEMO TO: ADMINISTRATIVE COUNCIL
THROUGH: RANDY HEISS, EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR
FROM: KATHLEEN HEARD, AREA AGENCY ON AGING DIRECTOR
DATE: APRIL 26, 2011
SUBJECT: FUNDING LEVELS FOR SFY 2011-12

Attached are spreadsheets with tentative allocations for next year. They were used to issue contract renewal offers on March 25. These figures are based on figures provided by the DES Division of Aging and Adult Services (DAAS) on February 28. DAAS is giving an estimate of Older Americans Act (OAA) funding based on their grant award for last year, since the current year's federal budget as approved by Congress was not yet available. This estimate gives SEAGO \$32,220 less funding than we have in current year funding. In addition, the Nutrition Services Incentive Program (NSIP) estimate is \$2,126 less than it is in this current year. OAA Title III carryover this year is \$128,265, and I have conservatively projected carryover of \$10,000 for health promotion and \$15,000 in carryover for the congregate meals program. The first page in the attached document shows the differences between the current funding levels and the draft levels for next year. However, the current levels include the one-time Social Services Block Grants (SSBG) funding that we received this year. Therefore, there is a column on the far right that gives these one-time SSBG funding levels by service. Chart A gives breakdowns for transportation within Cochise County. Since Benson is now a public transit 5311 system, I propose that funding be reduced and that Douglas be given an increase. The level is based on the age 60 population in Bisbee, Benson, and Douglas all which have 5311 systems. Willcox is a transportation program for the elderly, and has no other federal operating funding other than from the AAA.

The Advisory Council on Aging met on April 21, to act on staff's funding recommendations.

KH:YU

Attachments: Tentative Allocation Spreadsheets

Board Action Requested: Information Only Action Requested Below

A motion to recommend to the Executive Board approval of the tentative funding levels for the new year.

Comparison Total Funding Proposed v.s. Prior Approval

	Cochise	Graham	Greenlee	Santa Cruz	Regional Total	SFY 2010-11 One-Time SSBG
AAA Administration	0	0	0	0	(2,766)	
Unobligated	(33,039)	(8,416)	(1,510)	(8,815)	(51,780)	
LTC Ombudsman	0	0	0	0	(8,821)	
Transportation	(5,000)	0	0	(5,000)	(10,000)	10,000
Home Care	(7,000)	(4,691)	(1,583)	(4,212)	(17,486)	27,240
Legal Assistance	(326)	(68)	(16)	(100)	(510)	
Congregate Meals	(12,365)	0	0	(526)	(12,891)	27,447
Bisbee Meals Voucher	(5,102)	0	0	0	(5,102)	
Home Delivered Meals	(7,814)	(3,817)	0	725	(10,906)	7,665
Health Promotion	(3,258)	(797)	(242)	(950)	(5,247)	
Case Management	(7,500)	(1,500)	(1,500)	(3,000)	(13,500)	
Grandparent Case Mgt.	0	0	0	0	0	
Grandparent Support	0	0	0	0	0	
In-Home Respite	(20,703)	(11,845)	(3,391)	(11,064)	(47,003)	5,607
Insurance Counseling	0	0	0	0	(21,599)	
Non-Respite Caregiver	0	0	0	0	0	
Total Funding	(102,107)	(31,134)	(8,242)	(32,942)	(207,611)	77,959

Funding SFY 2010-11 With Carryover Approved by Executive Board 12/10/10

	Cochise	Graham	Greenlee	Santa Cruz	Regional Total
AAA Administration					245,425
Unobligated	33,039	8,416	1,510	8,815	51,780
LTC Ombudsman					69,159
Transportation	141,814	28,006	14,713	24,725	209,258
Home Care*	316,134	125,627	92,485	153,074	687,320
Legal Assistance	9,987	2,086	510	3,086	15,669
Congregate Meals	139,065	23,921	14,910	79,915	257,811
Bisbee Meals Voucher	17,762	0	0	0	17,762
Home Delivered Meals	321,454	107,362	48,454	80,625	557,895
Health Promotion	22,675	5,094	1,391	6,832	35,992
Case Management	203,796	50,503	25,272	75,718	355,289
Grandparent Case Mgt.	0	0	0	0	0
Grandparent Support					0
In-Home Respite	65,155	23,475	8,928	20,928	118,486
Insurance Counseling					69,342
Non-Respite Caregiver	60,000	14,512	0	18,920	93,432
Total Funding	1,330,881	389,002	208,173	472,638	2,784,620

* Unobligated subtracted 33,039 8,416 1,510 8,815 51,780

Proposed Funding SFY 2011-12

	Cochise	Graham	Greenlee	Santa Cruz	Regional Total
AAA Administration					242,659
Unobligated	0	0	0	0	0
LTC Ombudsman					60,338
Transportation	136,814	28,006	14,713	19,725	199,258
Home Care	309,134	120,936	90,902	148,862	669,834
Legal Assistance	9,661	2,018	494	2,986	15,159
Congregate Meals	126,700	23,921	14,910	79,389	244,920
Bisbee Meals Voucher	12,660	0	0	0	12,660
Home Delivered Meals	313,640	103,545	48,454	81,350	546,989
Health Promotion	19,417	4,297	1,149	5,882	30,745
Case Management	196,296	49,003	23,772	72,718	341,789
Grandparent Case Mgt.	0	0	0	0	0
Grandparent Support					0
In-Home Respite	44,452	11,630	5,537	9,864	71,483
Insurance Counseling					47,743
Non-Respite Caregiver	60,000	14,512	0	18,920	93,432
Total Funding	1,228,774	357,868	199,931	439,696	2,577,009

**PART IX
AREA AGENCY SERVICES FUNDED BY GEOGRAPHICAL AREA**

This display provides a listing of the anticipated allotments of Area Agency resources for the fiscal year for the delivery of services within each of the four counties in the Planning and Service Area.

FUNDING LEVELS FOR SERVICES BY TYPE FOR SFY 2011-12 (Including Projected Carryover)

SERVICE BY COUNTY	AAA Admin.	Bisbee Meal Voucher	LTC Advocacy	Transportation	Home Care	Legal Assist.	Cong. Meals	H. Del. Meals	Health Promotion Dis. Prev.	Case Mgmt.	In-Home Respite	Insurance Counseling	Non-Resp. Caregiver Support	Non-Resp. Caregiver Support	Non-Resp. Caregiver Support	TOTAL
COCHISE													Training	Case Mgt.	Outreach	
OAA		11,001		118,802	129,786	9,124	78,123	178,138	18,139	69,386	22,688		4,000	51,000	5,000	695,187
NSIP		1,659					11,150	41,557								54,366
SEAGO/SSBG					23,120		0	56,600		7,340						87,060
STATE/SSBG				0	8,955		8,028	8,727		45,520	8,727					79,957
STATE				18,012	147,273	537	29,399	28,618	1,278	74,050	13,037					312,204
TOTAL	0	12,660	0	136,814	309,134	9,661	126,700	313,640	19,417	196,296	44,452	0	4,000	51,000	5,000	1,228,774
GRAHAM													Training	Adapt. Aids	Home Rep.	
OAA				21,146	16,933	1,906	21,642	51,981	4,010	8,540	2,758		3,000	6,512	5,000	143,428
NSIP							1,116	9,863								10,979
SEAGO/SSBG					9,600			24,350		0	4,420					38,370
STATE/SSBG					1,844			0		23,915	1,745					27,504
STATE				6,860	92,559	112	1,163	17,351	287	16,548	2,707					137,587
TOTAL	0	0	0	28,006	120,936	2,018	23,921	103,545	4,297	49,003	11,630	0	3,000	6,512	5,000	357,868
GREENLEE																
OAA				0	4,187	467	14,003	9,766	1,071	1,955	4,230				0	35,679
NSIP							907	6,929								7,836
SEAGO/SSBG				2,400	16,530			20,350		0						39,280
STATE/SSBG				0	0			0		14,861	646					15,507
STATE				12,313	70,185	27	0	11,409	78	6,956	661					101,629
TOTAL	0	0	0	14,713	90,902	494	14,910	48,454	1,149	23,772	5,537	0	0	0	0	199,931
SANTA CRUZ													Training	Case Mgt.	Outreach	
OAA				18,725	32,476	2,820	62,762	46,577	5,497	15,162	6,641		0	15,920	3,000	209,580
NSIP							11,643	9,000								20,643
SEAGO/SSBG					11,200			23,750		0	0					34,950
STATE/SSBG				0	330			0		27,530	0					27,860
STATE				1,000	104,856	166	4,984	2,023	385	30,026	3,223					146,663
TOTAL	0	0	0	19,725	148,862	2,986	79,389	81,350	5,882	72,718	9,864	0	0	15,920	3,000	439,696
DISTRICT VI																
OAA	133,681	11,001	14,736	158,673	183,382	14,317	176,530	286,462	28,717	95,043	36,317	0	7,000	73,432	13,000	1,232,291
ELDER ABUSE			3,395													3,395
NSIP/CMS		1,659		0	0	0	24,816	67,349	0	0	0	47,743	0	0	0	141,567
SEAGO/SSBG				2,400	60,450	0	0	125,050	0	7,340	4,420		0	0	0	199,660
STATE/SSBG	26,724			0	11,129	0	8,028	8,727	0	111,826	11,118	0	0	0	0	177,552
STATE	82,254		42,207	38,185	414,873	842	35,546	59,401	2,028	127,580	19,628	0	0	0	0	822,544
TOTAL	242,659	12,660	60,338	199,258	669,834	15,159	244,920	546,989	30,745	341,789	71,483	47,743	7,000	73,432	13,000	2,577,009

CHART A

FUNDING LEVELS FOR SERVICES BY TYPE FOR SFY 2011-12 (Including Projected Carryover)

BY COUNTY	LTC Advocacy	Transportation					Home Care	Legal Assist.	Cong. Meals	H. Del. Meals	Case Mgmt.	In-Home Respite	Caregiver Support	Caregiver Support	Caregiver Support	TOTAL
		Douglas	Bisbee	Benson	Willcox/Bowie	Total										
COCHISE												<i>Training</i>	<i>Case Mgt.</i>	<i>Outreach</i>		
OAA		43,029	19,123	21,917	34,734	118,802	129,786	9,124	78,123	178,138	69,386	22,688	4,000	51,000	5,000	666,047
NSIP		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	11,150	41,557	0	0	0	0	0	52,707
SEAGO/SSBG		0	0	0	0	0	23,120	0	0	56,600	7,340	0	0	0	0	87,060
STATE/SSBG		0	0	0	0	0	8,955	0	8,028	8,727	45,520	8,727	0	0	0	79,957
STATE		6,524	2,899	3,323	5,266	18,012	147,273	537	29,399	28,618	74,050	13,037	0	0	0	310,926
TOTAL		49,553	22,022	25,240	40,000	136,814	309,134	9,661	126,700	313,640	196,296	44,452	4,000	51,000	5,000	1,196,697
GRAHAM		Safford											<i>Training</i>	<i>Adapt. Aids</i>	<i>Home Rep.</i>	
OAA		21,146				21,146	16,933	1,906	21,642	51,981	8,540	2,758	3,000	6,512	5,000	139,418
NSIP		0				0	0	0	1,116	9,863	0	0	0	0	0	10,979
SEAGO/SSBG		0				0	9,600	0	0	24,350	0	4,420	0	0	0	38,370
STATE/SSBG		0				0	1,844	0	0	0	23,915	1,745	0	0	0	27,504
STATE		6,860				6,860	92,559	112	1,163	17,351	16,548	2,707	0	0	0	137,300
TOTAL		28,006	0	0	0	28,006	120,936	2,018	23,921	103,545	49,003	11,630	3,000	6,512	5,000	353,571
GREENLEE			Duncan	Clifton												
OAA			0	0		0	4,187	467	14,003	9,766	1,955	4,230	0	0	0	34,608
NSIP			0	0		0	0	0	907	6,929	0	0	0	0	0	7,836
SEAGO/SSBG			1,200	1,200		2,400	16,530	0	0	20,350	0	0	0	0	0	39,280
STATE/SSBG			0	0		0	0	0	0	0	14,861	646	0	0	0	15,507
STATE			6,156	6,157		12,313	70,185	27	0	11,409	6,956	661	0	0	0	101,551
TOTAL		0	7,356	7,357	0	14,713	90,902	494	14,910	48,454	23,772	5,537	0	0	0	198,782
SANTA CRUZ		County											<i>Training</i>	<i>Case Mgt.</i>	<i>Outreach</i>	
OAA		18,725				18,725	32,476	2,820	62,762	46,577	15,162	6,641	0	15,920	3,000	204,083
NSIP		0				0	0	0	11,643	9,000	0	0	0	0	0	20,643
SEAGO/SSBG		0				0	11,200	0	0	23,750	0	0	0	0	0	34,950
STATE/SSBG		0				0	330	0	0	0	27,530	0	0	0	0	27,860
STATE		1,000				1,000	104,856	166	4,984	2,023	30,026	3,223	0	0	0	146,278
TOTAL		19,725	0	0	0	19,725	148,862	2,986	79,389	81,350	72,718	9,864	0	15,920	3,000	433,814
DISTRICT VI																
OAA	7,368	82,900	19,123	21,917	34,734	158,673	183,382	14,317	176,530	286,462	95,043	36,317	7,000	73,432	13,000	1,051,524
ELDER ABUSE	1,698															1,698
NSIP/CMS	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	24,816	67,349	0	0	0	0	0	92,165
SEAGO/SSBG	0	0	1,200	1,200	0	2,400	60,450	0	0	125,050	7,340	4,420	0	0	0	199,660
STATE/SSBG	0	0	0	0	0	0	11,129	0	8,028	8,727	111,826	11,118	0	0	0	150,828
STATE	21,104	14,384	9,055	9,480	5,266	38,185	414,873	842	35,546	59,401	127,580	19,628	0	0	0	717,159
TOTAL	30,169	97,284	29,378	32,597	40,000	199,258	669,834	15,159	244,920	546,989	341,789	71,483	7,000	73,432	13,000	2,213,033



ADMINISTRATIVE COUNCIL PACKET

MEMO TO: ADMINISTRATIVE COUNCIL
THROUGH: RANDY HEISS, EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR
FROM: LUKE DROEGER, TRANSPORTATION PLANNER
DATE: APRIL 26, 2011
SUBJECT: 2012 TIP DRAFT AND PUBLIC PARTICIPATION PROCESS

ADOT is requiring that SEAGO provide a public participation and community review of the final Transportation Improvement Program (TIP), prior to submission to ADOT in August. In order to adhere to the 45-day requirement for public review, SEAGO needs to obtain approval by the Administrative Council and Executive Board in order to schedule the public participation review.

SEAGO will submit the draft 2012 TIP no later than June 1, for review by ADOT and FHWA. This will allow the 45-day public review, and for ADOT to review any warranted comments by August 1.

The draft 2012 TIP will be approved by the **SEAGO TAC on May 5, 2011**, for submission to the Administrative Council and Executive Board for review and approval and the TIP will be distributed at the meeting on May 6.

LD:YU

Board Action Requested: Information Only Action Requested Below:

A motion to recommend to the Executive Board approval of the 2012 Draft Working TIP.



ADMINISTRATIVE COUNCIL PACKET

MEMO TO: ADMINISTRATIVE COUNCIL
FROM: RANDY HEISS, EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR
DATE: APRIL 26, 2011
SUBJECT: ELECTION OF OFFICERS

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

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

The current slate of officers is as follows:

Chair: Steve Pauken, City of Bisbee Manager
Vice Chair: Kay Gale, Greenlee County Administrator
Secretary: Terry Hinton, Town of Thatcher Manager

No officer has served in their current capacity for three consecutive years, and therefore all are considered eligible for re-election. The Council could also opt to elect an entirely new slate of officers or any combination of the existing slate and new officers that may be desired.

RH:YU

Action Requested: Information Only Action Requested Below:

A motion to nominate and elect the officers of the Administrative Council for Fiscal Year 2012.



ADMINISTRATIVE COUNCIL PACKET

MEMO TO: ADMINISTRATIVE COUNCIL
FROM: RANDY HEISS, EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR
DATE: APRIL 26, 2011
SUBJECT: SEAGO ANNUAL ASSESSMENT AND RTAC MEMBERSHIP

In May of last year, the Administrative Council was presented 5, 10, and 15 percent scenarios for reducing the 2011 SEAGO annual assessment. After discussion and consideration, the Council voted to recommend the 15 percent assessment reduction scenario to the Executive Board, and the 15 percent reduction scenario was subsequently adopted.

The 15 percent reduction scenario was proposed and adopted in response to the budgetary distress our member entities were suffering at that time. As we all know, the recently adopted FY 2012 State Budget will result in further revenue reductions and cost shifts to local governments. This combined with the negative impact to revenue sharing that some member governments will experience as a result of the 2010 Census count will make budget constraints substantially worse than last year.

Although I recognize the challenges our member entities are facing, and would like to offer additional reductions to the member assessments again this year, due to the operating deficit we experienced in 2010, the steep reduction in Housing Program administration fees that we have experienced, and considering the reduction in federal funding sources we are anticipating in the current and upcoming fiscal year, further reducing the member assessments is not recommended.

Therefore, I have prepared the FY 2011-2012 assessment schedule based on the 15 percent reduction scenario adopted last year, with updated population numbers from the 2010 Census. The impact to SEAGO's fund balance under this scenario will be approximately \$11,250 over 2009 assessment levels. This in itself is sustainable over the next few years without a foreseeable impact on services.

Once again, this fiscal year, the biggest negative impact on SEAGO's budget may be the anticipated increase in our health insurance costs, which could be 50 percent or more.

Attachment: SEAGO 2012 Assessment Schedule

Action Requested: Information Only Action Requested Below:

A motion to recommend the attached 2012 Assessment Schedule to the Executive Board for approval.

2012 Member Assessments

Total Assessment	\$63,750		\$4,827		\$68,577	
SEAGO Member	2010 Census	Percent	Annual Dues	RTAC Membership	Total Assessment	Amount Reduced
Benson	5,105	2.27%	\$1,450	\$105	\$1,555	\$501
Bisbee	5,575	2.48%	\$1,584	\$133	\$1,716	\$589
Douglas	17,378	7.74%	\$4,936	\$381	\$5,318	\$1,761
Huachuca City	1,853	0.83%	\$526	\$38	\$565	\$183
Sierra Vista	43,888	19.56%	\$12,467	\$939	\$13,406	\$4,392
Tombstone	1,380	0.61%	\$392	\$35	\$427	\$152
Willcox	3,757	1.67%	\$1,067	\$82	\$1,149	\$380
Cochise County*	52,410	23.35%	\$14,888	\$1,167	\$16,055	\$5,351
Pima	2,387	1.06%	\$678	\$47	\$725	\$229
Safford	9,566	4.26%	\$2,717	\$199	\$2,916	\$943
Thatcher	4,865	2.17%	\$1,382	\$110	\$1,492	\$500
San Carlos Apache Tribe	5,871	2.62%	\$1,668	\$121	\$1,789	\$576
Graham County*	14,531	6.47%	\$4,128	\$308	\$4,436	\$1,447
Clifton	3,311	1.48%	\$941	\$52	\$993	\$288
Duncan	696	0.31%	\$198	\$17	\$215	\$75
Greenlee County*	4,430	1.97%	\$1,258	\$107	\$1,365	\$471
Nogales	20,837	9.28%	\$5,919	\$457	\$6,376	\$2,110
Patagonia	913	0.41%	\$259	\$19	\$279	\$91
Santa Cruz County*	25,670	11.44%	\$7,292	\$509	\$7,801	\$2,474
SEAGO Total Population	224,423	100.00%	\$63,750	\$4,827	\$68,577	\$22,512

*Unincorporated area only

Notes:

Total Assessment is based on \$63,750 assessment plus membership in the RTAC
 RTAC dues are based on 2007 population at 7 cents per capita, then reduced 70%
 \$63,750 is a 15% reduction over 2009 assessments



ADMINISTRATIVE COUNCIL PACKET

MEMO TO: ADMINISTRATIVE COUNCIL
FROM: RANDY HEISS, EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR
DATE: APRIL 26, 2011
SUBJECT: FISCAL YEAR 2011-2012 BUDGET

The assumptions in the FY 2011–2012 budget are as follows:

- A sustained reduction from 2009 assessment levels from \$91,089 to \$68,577.
- A \$281,649 overall reduction from 2010 funding levels.
- A projected 15 percent increase in health insurance costs.
- A possible need to utilize \$20,000 from the fund balance to sustain Housing Program operations.
- Salary increases continue to be unsustainable. However, in order to maintain current compensation levels, SEAGO will pick up the 1.55 percent increase in employee contributions to the ASRS.

The primary reductions in funding levels are from the Pathways Program (\$250,102), Housing Program (\$64,200), and the Truck Stop Electrification (TSE) Program (\$26,000). The reasons for these reductions are expiration of grants (Pathways and TSE), and the elimination of the Your Way Home Program (Housing) which offered down payment and closing cost assistance for homebuyers. Most of the remaining program funding levels are anticipated to remain relatively flat for the remainder of FFY 2011, but are unpredictable for FFY 2012. As a result, successful budget implementation will depend on diligent monitoring of revenue over expenditures by each program, and instituting program changes or budget reductions as may be necessary to minimize the impact on the agency fund balance.

The draft budget sheet included in your packets provides a detailed overview of each program's budget. This year, Program Managers once again participated in the development of their program budgets. This allowed them to increase their understanding of the process and gain a sense of ownership in their budgets.

Attachment: Draft FY 2012 Budget Sheet

Action Requested: Information Only Action Requested Below:

A motion to recommend approval of the SFY 2011-2012 Budget to the Executive Board.

**SEAGO
2012 Budget DRAFT**

	SPR	53.10 Transit	53.11 Transit	AAA Adm	AAA LTC	AAA IR1	AAA HPR	AAA MED	AAA SMP	AAA AM5	ADEQ TSE	Pathways	CDBG 1%	CDBG Projects	CDBG TAAP	Unrest CDBG	Agency Resp	EDA	ADEQ	Housing	HUD Counsel	Central Admin	Total	
Revenues																								
Federal/State	125,000	18,000	20,000	226,293	30,170	51,640	23,059	7,686	16,103	16,367	24,000	617,250	10,000					82,500	9,387	95,000	45,324		1,417,780	
Local Contract														131,700	15,000					1,950	10,000		158,650	
Assessment																	63,750						63,750	
Deferred Revenue																20,000							20,000	
Use of Fund Balance																	18,000						18,000	
Pass-Through																		35,357		20,000			55,357	
In-Kind																							0	
TOTAL REVENUE	125,000	18,000	20,000	226,293	30,170	51,640	23,059	7,686	16,103	16,367	24,000	617,250	10,000	131,700	15,000	20,000	81,750	117,857	9,387	116,950	55,324	0	1,733,537	
Expenditures																								
Direct Costs																								
Salaries	60,000	1,650	1,850	118,750	15,018	21,140	11,700	3,900	9,060	6,250	8,100	115,451	3,450	63,400	5,950	7,300	23,125	55,000	4,050	55,250	24,750	67,000	682,144	
Fringe	21,000	578	648	39,764	1,275	8,012	993	331	3,638	1,805	2,835	38,675	1,208	22,190	2,083	2,555	8,094	19,250	1,418	19,338	8,663	23,450	227,800	
Audit																						14,000	14,000	
Pass-Through														20,000			35,357						55,357	
Contracted Services	1,450	14,000	14,350	3,928						2,167	2,900	369,774					500	2,500		13,000	6,236	11,000	441,805	
Supplies	900	78	100	3,388	522	339	632	280	200	100	237	8,325		175	100	1,150	100	1,100	250	2,500	200	11,000	31,675	
Postage	151	69	100	1,420	156	1,077	297	126	130	100	196	112		575	250	100	150	1,000	229	2,000	200	1,100	9,538	
Copy	300	100	100	1,683	1,043	1,076	632	280	188	100	160	315		370	200	100	100	650	160	500	150	1,600	9,787	
Travel	6,900	1,000	1,500	9,971	4,820	12,189	4,037	1,012		3,853	7,000	19,200	2,500	4,784	3,700	1,500	2,000	5,056	2,000	4,478	7,238	1,000	105,738	
Rent												9,800										0	9,600	19,400
Telephone	500											2,100				1,000		800			0	8,200	12,600	
Internet	0																				0	2,200	2,200	
Utilities																						12,500	12,500	
Equipment Maintenance																					0	1,000	1,000	
Equipment Purchase												2,625				1,527				1,500	0	2,000	7,652	
Advertising	500				1,500							5,000						8,200			0	250	15,450	
Dues/Subscriptions	12,500			4,950	500											1,000	4,854	1,750		700	0	4,400	30,654	
Miscellaneous												1,078			822		100			77		10,900	12,976	
Professional In-Kind																					0		0	
Travel In-Kind																					0		0	
Insurance																					0	14,250	14,250	
Workshops/Conferences	1,677		763	4,593	550	1,070	1,039	514				8,000	1,743			1,441		5,022				600	27,011	
Total Direct Costs	105,878	17,474	19,410	188,447	25,384	44,903	19,330	6,443	13,216	14,375	21,418	580,455	8,900	111,494	13,104	17,673	74,380	100,328	8,096	99,342	47,436	196,050	1,733,537	
Indirect Costs	19,122	526	590	37,846	4,786	6,737	3,729	1,243	2,887	1,992	2,582	36,795	1,100	20,206	1,896	2,327	7,370	17,529	1,291	17,608	7,888	-196,050	0	
TOTAL PROGRAM COSTS	125,000	18,000	20,000	226,293	30,170	51,640	23,059	7,686	16,103	16,367	24,000	617,250	10,000	131,700	15,000	20,000	81,750	117,857	9,387	116,950	55,324	0	1,733,537	
Surplus/Deficit	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	



ADMINISTRATIVE COUNCIL PACKET

MEMO TO: ADMINISTRATIVE COUNCIL
THROUGH: RANDY HEISS, EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR
FROM: KATHLEEN HEARD, AREA AGENCY ON AGING DIRECTOR
DATE: APRIL 26, 2011
SUBJECT: CONTRACT RENEWAL FOR SFY 2011-12

Attached is a list of the providers that have been offered contract renewal for the year that begins July 1, 2011. Contract Renewal packets are due May 3, so I will let you know if there are any changes. We have frozen rates for fixed rate contracts for a third year. There is a possibility that the Northern Cochise Community Hospital will decide to stop providing congregate meals, but will not know for certain until we review the packet.

KH:YU

Attachment: Provider List

Board Action Requested: Information Only Action Requested Below

A motion to recommend to the Executive Board the award of contracts for the year that begins July 1, 2011.

SEAGO AAA SFY 2011-12 SERVICE PROVIDERS

COUNTY	SERVICE	AGENCY
Cochise	Housekeeping	AccentCare
	Personal Care	AristoCare
	In-Home Respite	Comfort Keepers (Not Willcox & Douglas) Lutheran Social Services
	Personal Care, Home Health Aid & Home Nursing (In Willcox)	Mount Graham Regional Medical Center, Home Health
	Home Health Aid & Home Nursing (In balance of County)	AristoCare
	Congregate Meals (In Benson & Sierra Vista)	Catholic Community Services of Southern Arizona
	Home Delivered Meals (Not in Bisbee & Douglas)	
	Transportation (Douglas & Through City of Bisbee)	
	Caregiver Training	Cochise Aging and Social Services
	Caregiver Case Management	
	Case Management	
	Congregate Meals (Douglas)	Douglas ARC
	Home Delivered Meals (Bisbee & Douglas)	
	Congregate Meals & Transportation - Willcox	Northern Cochise Community Hospital
	Congregate Meals - Tombstone	City of Tombstone
Transportation - Benson	City of Benson	
Graham	Housekeeping	Southeastern Arizona Community Unique Services
	Personal Care	
	In- Home Respite	
	Home Nursing	Southeastern Arizona Community Unique Services
	Congregate	
	Home Delivered Meals	
	Health Promotion and Disease Prevention	
	Adaptive Aids & Home Repairs for Caregivers	
	Case Management	SouthEastern Arizona Community Action Program
	Transportation	
Greenlee	Congregate	Southeastern Arizona Community Unique Services
	Home Delivered Meals	
	Housekeeping	Greenlee County Health Department
	Personal Care	
	In-Home Respite	Greenlee County Health Department
	Home Nursing	
	Case Management	
	Transportation	SouthEastern Arizona Community Action Program
Santa Cruz	Congregate	Santa Cruz Council on Aging
	Home Delivered Meals	
	Transportation	
	Housekeeping	AccentCare
	Personal Care	
	In-Home Respite	Dependable Home Health Lutheran Social Services
	Home Health Aid	
	Home Nursing	AristoCare
	Caregiver Outreach	Dependable Home Health
	Caregiver Case Management	Santa Cruz County Public Fiduciary
	Case Management	
District VI	Long Term Care Ombudsman (w/o S. Cochise)	SouthEastern Arizona Community Action Program
	Legal Assistance	Southern Arizona Legal Aid



ADMINISTRATIVE COUNCIL PACKET

MEMO TO: ADMINSTRATIVE COUNCIL
THROUGH: RANDY HEISS, EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR
FROM: AKOS KOVACH, ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT PLANNER
DATE: APRIL 26, 2011
SUBJECT: EDA RESOLUTION 2011-01

Attached for your consideration is SEAGO's Resolution No. 2011-01. This resolution is for an Economic Development Administration (EDA) partnership planning assistance grant for funds in the amount of \$82,500 to continue the ability of SEAGO to administer the Economic Development District (EDD) program.

The SEAGO EDD will utilize these funds for existing and expanded activities which further the cause of economic development within the SEAGO EDD of Cochise, Graham, Greenlee, and Santa Cruz Counties plus the San Carlos Apache Tribe. While completion of the Comprehensive Economic Development Strategy is nearing completion, work must begin immediately on the first annual update.

The \$35,357 is needed to fund the required matching amount; these proceeds are funded through annual assessment (membership) dues paid by SEAGO member entities and, eventually, SEAGO EDD members.

AK:YU

Attachment: Resolution 2011-01

Board Action Requested: Information Only Action Requested Below

A motion to recommend approval to the Executive Board of Resolution 2011-01 for an EDA Partnership Planning Assistance Grant in the amount of \$82,500 and matching funds of \$35,357 funded through annual assessment (membership) dues paid by SEAGO member entities.



SouthEastern Arizona Governments Organization

Serving our member governments and their constituents since 1972

SEAGO Member Entities

Cochise County

*Benson
Bisbee
Douglas
Huachuca City
Sierra Vista
Tombstone
Willcox*

Graham County

*Pima
Safford
San Carlos
Apache Tribe
Thatcher*

Greenlee County

*Clifton
Duncan*

Santa Cruz County

*Nogales
Patagonia
San Carlos Apache
Tribe*

**SEAGO Office
Administration
CDBG
Economic Dev.
Housing
Transportation**

*118 Arizona Street
Bisbee, AZ 85603
520-432-5301
520-432-5858 Fax
Housing Fax
520-432-2646*

Area Agency on Aging Office

*300 Collins Road
Bisbee, AZ 85603
520-432-5301
520-432-9168 Fax*

RESOLUTION NO. 2011-01 A RESOLUTION OF THE SOUTHEASTERN ARIZONA GOVERNMENTS ORGANIZATION AUTHORIZING SUBMISSION OF AN APPLICATION FOR FY 2011 PARTNERSHIP PLANNING ASSISTANCE GRANT FUNDS FROM THE ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT ADMINISTRATION

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

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

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

WHEREAS, the economic distress in these four counties is demonstrated by high unemployment levels and persistent low median family incomes.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that the SEAGO Executive Board authorize an application to be made to the U.S. Department of Commerce, EDA for a 2011-2012 planning grant in the amount of \$82,500; and

THAT, \$35,357 is hereby committed as matching funds for the EDA grant, funded through annual assessment (membership) dues paid by its members; and

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

Passed and adopted by the SEAGO Executive Board on this 13th day of May 2011.

Randy Heiss, Executive Director
SouthEastern Arizona
Governments Organization

Drew John, Chair
Executive Board



ADMINISTRATIVE COUNCIL PACKET

MEMO TO: ADMINISTRATIVE COUNCIL
THROUGH: RANDY HEISS, EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR
FROM: AKOS KOVACH, ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT PLANNER (EDP)
DATE: APRIL 26, 2011
SUBJECT: REQUEST FOR AUTHORIZATION TO OPEN A SEAGO EDD REVOLVING LOAN FUND CHECKING AND SAVINGS ACCOUNT

1. The EDP requests permission to open two new bank accounts in order to establish a Revolving Loan Fund (RLF) banking relationship and financial industry presence.
2. The EDP requests dual signatory control. Requests the following individuals as authorized on accounts: Randy Heiss, Ylda Guillen, Luke Droeger, and Stephen Pauken.
3. The first stage of creating an RLF is fundraising. SEAGO has at least three viable options:
 - a. SEAGO can raise their own funds and loan only those funds on a revolving basis.
 - b. Or, SEAGO may raise money to create a matching contribution to an EDA funded RLF. (EDA generally requires a 50-50 match for the creation of a RLF.)
 - c. Or, SEAGO can do both, and operate two or more RLFs which may have differing loan size objectives.
4. By opening these initial accounts, the SEAGO EDP can begin fundraising activities.

Board Action Requested: Information Only Action Requested Below

Motion to recommend to the Executive Board the authorization to open dual signature banking accounts (checking and savings) for a SEAGO EDD Revolving Loan Fund.



ADMINISTRATIVE COUNCIL PACKET

MEMO TO: ADMINISTRATIVE COUNCIL
THROUGH: RANDY HEISS, EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR
FROM: LUKE DROEGER, TRANSPORTATION PLANNER
DATE: APRIL 26, 2011
SUBJECT: 5300 GRANT SUBMISSION

This year, SEAGO received and reviewed 28 applications from 16 applicants for the 5310, 5316, and 5317 transit programs. These programs provide transit services to the elderly and disabled in the 5310 program, job service transportation in the 5316 program, and special transit needs for the disabled in the 5317 program.

The SEAGO review panel met on March 16, with representation from; Graham County, Cochise County, Santa Cruz County, and SEAGO's Area Agency on Aging. The panel reviewed all 28 applications, provided feedback to each applicant, and ranked each application according to an ADOT review process. Attached are the rankings for the applications.

The total amount for the SEAGO region in applications exceeded \$1.25 million.

Attachment: Ranking Sheet for 5300 2011 Grant Submission

Board Action Requested: Information Only Action Requested Below

A motion to recommend the list of applications to ADOT Transit Division for funding to the Executive Board.

E=Expansion - R=Replacement										Type of Vehicle or Equipment	Fed Amt of vehicle	5316 Operations	5317 Operations	Mobility Management	Rank	Recommendations			
5310 Applications, Recommendations, and Ranking																			
R	Blake SAGE Graham 5310	Cheryl Wilson	527 Main St., Safford, AZ 85546	928-428-5990	Graham	cwilson@blakefoundation.org	(3) 5 pass. Mini van	\$139,930				\$39,600	1	fully fund MM		A List			
E	City of Nogales	Martha Sparling	779 N. Grand Ave, Nogales, AZ 85621	520-285-5759	Santa Cruz	mchavez@cityofnogales.gov						\$17,600	2	fully fund MM		A List			
R	Blake SAGE Greenlee 5310	Cheryl Wilson	527 Main St., Safford, AZ 85546	928-428-5990	Greenlee	cwilson@blakefoundation.org	(2) 5 pass mini w/ramp	\$78,200				\$12,318	3	fully fund MM		A List			
R	Cochise Co. Association for the Handicapped	Luis Ruiz	PO Drawer AM, Bisbee, AZ 85603	520-432-5771	Cochise	lruiz@ccahbisbee.org	(1) Lift Equip. Maxi Van (1) 5 pass. Mini with ramp	\$83,600					4			A List			
R	Douglas ARC 5310	John Vaughn	PO Box 252, Douglas, AZ 85608	520-364-7473	Cochise	douglasarc@theriver.com	lift equip. maxi van	\$50,160					5			A List			
R	Patagonia Sr. Citizens	Richard Ohnstad	PO Box 1121, Patagonia, AZ 85623	520-287-2227	Santa Cruz	rohnstad@yahoo.com	7 pass mini van no ramp	\$22,880					6			A List			
E	Santa Cruz Training Program	Marina Galhouse	70 La Casteallana Dr. Nogales, AZ 85621	520-287-2043	Santa Cruz	mgalhouse@mchsi.com	(2) 5 passenger mini-vans with ramp	\$66,800					7			A List			
R	Mary's Mission	Art Barcelo & Alicia Lewis	345 Taylor St., Sierra Vista, AZ 85635	520-417-2115 520-266-2658	Cochise	abarcelo@marys-mission.com epaguayo8@gmail.com	12 Pass no Lift	\$23,760					8			A List			
R	Horizon - Nogales	Marsha Ashcroft	998 E. Fry Blvd. Ste 303, Sierra Vista AZ 85635	520-836-1687	Santa Cruz	mashcroft@horizonhumanservices.org	7 pass minivan no ramp	\$22,880					9			A List			
R	Horizon - Sierra Vista	Marsha Ashcroft	999 E. Fry Blvd. Ste 303, Sierra Vista AZ 85635	520-836-1688	Cochise	mashcroft@horizonhumanservices.org	(1)Lift Equip. Cutaway (1) 7 pass mini van no lift	\$77,440					10			A List			
5316 Applications, Recommendations, and Ranking																			
E	Blake SAGE Graham 5316	Cheryl Wilson	527 Main St., Safford, AZ 85546	928-428-5990	Graham	cwilson@blakefoundation.org			\$30,530				1	recommend funding all A List Vehicles and Operating		A List			
R	CCAH	Luis Ruiz	PO Drawer AM, Bisbee, AZ 85604	520-432-5772	Cochise	lruiz@ccahbisbee.org	(1) Quad cab 2/4 ton pickup (1) Quad cab 1/2 tone pickup	\$50,048	\$36,597				2			A List			
E	City of Nogales	Martha Sparling	778 N. Grand Ave, Nogales, AZ 85621	520-285-5758	Santa Cruz	mchavez@cityofnogales.gov			\$30,186				3			A List			
E	Santa Cruz Training Program	Marina Galhouse	70 La Casteallana Dr. Nogales, AZ 85621	520-287-2043	Santa Cruz	mgalhouse@mchsi.com			\$37,852				4			A List			
E	Blake SAGE Greenlee 5316	Cheryl Wilson	527 Main St., Safford, AZ 85546	928-428-5991	Greenlee	cwilson@blakefoundation.org			\$9,721				5			A List			
R	Douglas ARC 5316	John Vaughn	PO Box 252, Douglas, AZ 85609	520-364-7474	Cochise	douglasarc@theriver.com	7 pass minivan no ramp	\$21,120	\$41,800				6			A List			
R	Mt. Graham Safe House	Heather Ballard	PO Box 1202, Safford, AZ 85546	928-348-9104	Graham	heatherballard@vtc.net	7 pass minivan no ramp & computers	\$28,928	\$37,480				7			A List			
E	City of Benson	Glenn Nichols Denise Wolford	120 W. 6th St, Benson AZ 85602	520-586-2245 729-6329	Cochise	dwolford@cityofbenison.com			\$32,479				8			A List			
E	Women's Transition Project	Mary Jo Silcox	PO Box 943, Bisbee, AZ 85603	520-882-5608	Cochise	msilcox@compasshc.org	Pick up Truck	\$19,200	\$12,144				9			A List			
5317 Applications, Recommendations, and Ranking																			
E	Santa Cruz Training Program	Marina Galhouse	70 La Casteallana Dr. Nogales, AZ 85621	520-287-2043	Santa Cruz	mgalhouse@mchsi.com				\$98,410			1	recommend no less than 25k		A List			
E	CCS - Douglas Rides	Connie Gastelum	1445 E. 15th St Douglas, AZ 85607	520 364-4474	Cochise	connieg@ccs-seaz.org				\$30,000			2	recommend no less than 25k		A List			
E	City of Bisbee	Lisa Marra	118 Arizona Street, Bisbee AZ 85603	520-432-6016	Cochise	lmarra@cityofbisbee.com				\$17,000			3	Recommend Full Funding		A List			
E	City of Benson	Glenn Nichols Denise Wolford	121 W. 6th St, Benson AZ 85602	520-586-2245 729-6330	Cochise	roxyschubert@yahoo.com				\$35,000			4	recommend no less than 25k		A List			
E	Blake SAGE Graham	Cheryl Wilson	PO Box 1202, Safford, AZ 85546	928-428-5990	Graham	cwilson@blakefoundation.org				\$30,530			5	recommend no less than 25k		A List			
E	City of Nogales	Mauricio Chavez	777 N. Grand Ave, Nogales, AZ 85621	520-285-6571	Santa Cruz	mchavez@cityofnogales.gov				\$13,856			6	Recommend Full Funding		A List			
E	Patagonia Sr. Citizens	Richard Ohnstad	PO Box 1121, Patagonia, AZ 85624	287-2228	Santa Cruz	rohnstad@yahoo.com				\$10,211			7	Recommend Full Funding		A List			
E	Blake SAGE Greenlee	Cheryl Wilson	PO Box 1202, Safford, AZ 85546	928-428-5990	Greenlee	cwilson@blakefoundation.org				\$20,880			8			A List			
E	Northern Cochise Community Hospital	Dave Reed	901 W. Rex Allen D., Willcox AZ 85643	(520) 384-3541 x 228	Cochise	dreed@nchc.com				\$16,000			9			A List			
E	Douglas ARC	John Vaughn	PO Box 252, Douglas, AZ 85610	520-364-7475	Cochise	douglasarc@theriver.com				\$15,000			10			A List			
E	Community Food Bank	Tony Bruno		520-622-0525	Cochise	tbruno@communityfoodbank.org				\$19,907			11			A List			
TOTAL																			
								\$707,826	\$268,789	\$208,384	\$69,518								
								Approx.imate Funding Available State Wide			\$1,500,000	\$1,000,000	\$466,000						



ADMINISTRATIVE COUNCIL PACKET

MEMO TO: ADMINISTRATIVE COUNCIL
FROM: RANDY HEISS, EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR
DATE: APRIL 26, 2011
SUBJECT: FUTURE MEETING DATES

The Administrative Council will meet at 9 a.m. at Cochise College in Benson the first Friday of October, February, and May. The Executive Board will meet at 10 a.m. on the Friday or Saturday two weeks following the Administrative Council meeting unless there is a holiday, or unless the Board sets an alternative date. The location of each Executive Board meeting is determined by the jurisdiction hosting the meeting, and therefore varies.

Administrative Council	Executive Board
October 7, 2011	October 20 or October 21, 2011 Graham County
February 3, 2012	February 17 or February 18, 2012 Greenlee County
May 4, 2012	May 18 or 19, 2012 Santa Cruz County

RH:YU

Action Requested: Information Only Action Requested Below:



ADMINISTRATIVE COUNCIL PACKET

MEMO TO: ADMINISTRATIVE COUNCIL
FROM: RANDY HEISS, EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR
DATE: APRIL 26, 2011
SUBJECT: CENSUS COMPARISONS AND COUNT RESOLUTION PROCESS

The attached spreadsheet compares the April 1, 2010 Census count with 2000 Census count and the 2005 Population Estimates that have been used for city and town revenue sharing distributions for the last five years. Due to the complexity of the HURF and VLT revenue sharing distribution formulas, the population figures for counties used in those formulas are not included in the spreadsheet.

As you can see, there were four cities and towns (Bisbee, Tombstone, Duncan, and Nogales) and one county (Greenlee) in the SEAGO region that lost population compared to the 2000 Census. Although the losses were substantial, there were only three cities and towns in the region (Bisbee, Willcox, and Nogales) that lost population over the 2005 Urban Revenue Sharing population figures. Tombstone, Duncan, and Patagonia would have also lost population as compared to the 2005 URS populations, but will be spared due to the 1,500 revenue sharing population threshold that was passed into law in 2007.

Many communities were shocked to find their Census counts were much lower than the 2010 state population estimates. As I understand it, this is due to the methodology used in computing the state's population estimates, which was apparently more generous than it should be. The Council on Technical Solutions, the panel that makes recommendations on how the annual population estimates are computed, is currently working on revisions to the formulas used for computation of the population estimates in order to make future population estimates more realistic.

It's my understanding that some of SEAGO's member entities are considering filing a challenge of the 2010 Census count for their communities. The attached brochure on the Count Resolution Process was previously e-mailed to the Administrative Council and Executive Board. I had inquired if someone from the Census Bureau would be available to explain the process for appealing the census count at the May 13, Executive Board meeting, but was told that no staff was available. Most of the support staff hired for the enumeration process has been released, but it is anticipated that the agency will staff up for the Count Resolution Process as the date by which a jurisdiction can file an appeal (June 1) approaches.

Attachments: SEAGO Census Comparison spreadsheet; Count Resolution Brochure.

Action Requested: Information Only Action Requested Below:

SEAGO 2010 CENSUS COMPARISONS					
PLACE	2000 CENSUS	2005 URS POPULATION	2010 CENSUS APRIL 1	DIFFERENCE FROM 2000 CENSUS	DIFFERENCE FROM 2005 URS POPULATION
COCHISE COUNTY (OVERALL)	117,755		131,346	13,591	
BENSON	4,711	4,740	5,105	394	365
BISBEE	6,090	6,570	5,575	-515	-995
DOUGLAS	14,312	17,195	17,378	3,066	183
HUACHUCA CITY	1,751	1,830	1,853	102	23
SIERRA VISTA	37,775	43,690	43,888	6,113	198
TOMBSTONE	1,504	1,610	1,380	-124	120
WILLCOX	3,733	3,885	3,757	24	-128
COCHISE COUNTY (UNINCORPORATED)	47,879		52,410	4,531	
GRAHAM COUNTY (OVERALL)	33,489		37,220	3,731	
PIMA	1,989	2,182	2,387	398	205
SAFFORD	9,232	9,360	9,566	334	206
THATCHER	4,022	4,550	4,865	843	315
SAN CARLOS APACHE TRIBE					
GRAHAM COUNTY (UNINCORPORATED)	18,246		20,402	2,156	
GREENLEE COUNTY (OVERALL)	8,547		8,437	-110	
CLIFTON	2,596	2,596	3,311	715	715
DUNCAN	812	812	696	-116	804
GREENLEE COUNTY (UNINCORPORATED)	5,139		4,430	-709	
SANTA CRUZ COUNTY (OVERALL)	38,381		47,420	9,039	
NOGALES	20,878	21,830	20,837	-41	-993
PATAGONIA	881	920	913	32	587
SANTA CRUZ COUNTY (UNINCORPORATED)	16,622		25,670	9,048	
SEAGO REGION	198,172		224,423	26,251	

BASIC FACTS

SCOPE:

The Census Bureau's 2010 Census Count Question Resolution (CQR) Program provides state, local, and tribal officials, or their designated representatives, in the United States and Puerto Rico a process to challenge the census counts of housing units and group quarters.

The Census Bureau will make corrections on the basis of appropriate documentation provided by the challenging governmental units and through research of official 2010 Census records at the Census Bureau.

The 2010 CQR corrections are based on housing and population counts as of April 1, 2010, and geographic boundaries in place in the United States and Puerto Rico as of January 1, 2010. The Census Bureau will not add living quarters that did not exist in the 2010 Census universe.

The 2010 CQR Program is not a mechanism or process to challenge or revise the population counts sent to the President by December 31, 2010, which are used to apportion the U.S. House of Representatives. The Census Bureau will not make any changes to the apportionment, redistricting counts, or official 2010 Census data products.

THREE TYPES OF CHALLENGES ACCEPTED BY THE CQR PROGRAM

Boundary Challenges correct inaccurate reporting or recording of boundaries legally in effect on January 1, 2010.

Geocoding Challenges correct the placement of living quarters and associated population within the correct governmental unit boundaries and 2010 census tabulation blocks.

Coverage Challenges add or delete specific living quarters and people associated with them, identified during the census process, but erroneously included as duplicates or excluded due to processing errors.

The U.S. Census Bureau estimates that, on average, it will take 5.2 hours to prepare a CQR challenge. Send comments regarding this burden estimate or any other aspect of this burden to:

Paperwork Reduction Project 0607-0879
U.S. Census Bureau
AMSD-3K138
4600 Silver Hill Road
Washington, DC 20233

You may e-mail comments to <Paperwork@census.gov>; use "Paperwork Project 0607-0879" as the subject.

CQR submissions are confidential and protected by law under Title 13, U.S.C.

Participation in the CQR Program is required to obtain or retain benefits.

You are not required to respond to any information collection unless it displays a valid approval number from the Office of Management and Budget.

For more information about the 2010 Census Count Question Resolution Program, please contact:

Count Question Resolution Program
Decennial Management Division
U.S. Census Bureau
Washington, DC 20233

Telephone: **301-763-9329**

Fax: **301-763-9321**

E-mail: **dmd.cqr@census.gov**

For detailed information about the 2010 Census CQR Program, visit:

<http://2010census.gov/about/cqr>

United States®
**Census
2010**

United States®
**Census
2010**

2010 CENSUS COUNT QUESTION RESOLUTION PROGRAM

IT'S IN OUR HANDS

FREQUENTLY ASKED QUESTIONS:

1. What is the Count Question Resolution (CQR) Program?

The 2010 CQR Program is the mechanism for state, local, or tribal officials of governmental units in the United States and Puerto Rico to challenge the 2010 Census counts of housing units and group quarters.

2. When can I submit a CQR challenge?

The 2010 CQR Program will accept challenges beginning June 1, 2011, and ending with challenges that are postmarked, faxed, or e-mailed by June 1, 2013. The Census Bureau will review challenges in the order received.

3. Who can submit a CQR challenge?

The Census Bureau will only accept challenges from the highest elected or appointed official of state, local, and tribal area governmental units or those representing them or acting on their behalf.

4. Where can I submit a CQR challenge?

All 2010 CQR challenges must be submitted through the mail or electronically to the CQR Program staff at Census Bureau headquarters. The addresses are on the back panel of this brochure.

5. What documentation is required for a CQR challenge?

The Census Bureau requires specific documentation before committing resources to investigate a challenge. The submitted challenges must specify whether the challenge disputes the location of a governmental unit boundary, the location or number of housing units and/or group quarters counts in one or more 2010 census tabulation blocks, or both.

Maps must identify the state, county, 2010 census tracts, and 2010 census tabulation blocks associated with the challenge.

WHICH GOVERNMENTAL UNITS ARE ELIGIBLE TO SUBMIT A 2010 Census Count Question Resolution (CQR) CHALLENGE?

1. States and statistically equivalent entities can submit challenges for their state or equivalent, plus any counties or equivalent entities, minor civil divisions, incorporated places (including consolidated cities), state designated tribal statistical areas, state-recognized American Indian Reservations, Hawaiian Home Lands, and (in Hawaii and Puerto Rico only) census designated places within their jurisdiction. Puerto Rico may also submit challenges for sub-minor civil divisions.
2. Counties and statistically equivalent entities can submit challenges for their county or equivalent entity plus any minor civil divisions, incorporated places, and (in Hawaii and Puerto Rico only) census designated places within their jurisdiction. Municipios in Puerto Rico may also submit challenges for sub-minor civil divisions.
3. Actively functioning minor civil divisions can submit challenges for their minor civil division plus any incorporated place within their jurisdiction.
4. Incorporated places (including consolidated cities) can submit challenges for their place.
5. Federally-recognized American Indian tribes can submit challenges for American Indian reservations or off-reservation trust lands, tribal designated statistical areas, and Oklahoma tribal statistical areas, plus any American Indian tribal subdivisions within their jurisdiction.
6. Alaska Native Regional Corporations can submit challenges for their regional corporation and for Alaska Native Village statistical areas (ANVSAs) within their jurisdiction.
7. Alaska Native Village statistical areas can submit challenges for their ANVSA.

If a challenge involves an American Indian reservation or off-reservation trust land, the maps must identify the American Indian area and census tabulation block boundary.

The following is a list of acceptable maps:

- 2010 Census Public Law 94-171 County Block Maps,
- 2010 Census County Block Maps,
- Maps derived from 2010 TIGER/Line shapefiles, and
- Other maps or GIS data showing Census Bureau 2010 tabulation block numbers and boundaries.

Address lists of housing units and/or group quarters located in the challenged areas are also required.

Acceptable address lists include:

- City-Style Address Lists,
- Non-City-Style Address Lists, and
- Group Quarters Address Lists.

The Census Bureau requests that challengers use one or more of the address list templates provided on the 2010 CQR Web site, as appropriate, when submitting challenge documentation. In addition, mark the exact location of each challenged address on a map containing 2010 census tract and tabulation block(s).

For a more detailed explanation of the documentation requirements, refer to the 2010 CQR Federal Register Notice located on the CQR Web site at <http://2010census.gov/about/cqr> or call the CQR Office at 301-763-9329.

2010 CENSUS COUNT RESOLUTION PROGRAM (CQR) CHALLENGE RESULTS

- The Census Bureau will notify all affected governmental units of any corrections to their official counts as a result of a CQR Program decision.

- Corrections made to the population and housing unit counts by this program will result in the issuance of new official 2010 Census counts to the officials of governmental units affected.
- Governmental units may use CQR corrections for future programs requiring official 2010 Census data. The Census Bureau will use the CQR corrections to:
 - Modify the 2010 Census file for use in annual postcensal estimates beginning in December 2012, and
 - Create errata and make it available on the American FactFinder.
- The Census Bureau will not incorporate the CQR corrections into any 2010 Census data products.



ADMINISTRATIVE COUNCIL PACKET

MEMO TO: ADMINISTRATIVE COUNCIL
FROM: RANDY HEISS, EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR
DATE: APRIL 26, 2011
SUBJECT: WATER QUALITY (208) PROGRAM UPDATE

The Environmental Review Committee (ERC) has received and reviewed the final drafts of three chapters of the 208 Update. Members of the ERC participated in a conference call on **February 24, 2011** to review the goals of the strategic plan, and the ERC is currently reviewing the pre-final drafts of the Executive Summary, Strategic Plan, and Implementation chapters.

As mentioned previously, the deadline for delivery of the 208 Update has been extended to **April 30, 2011** for recipients of ARRA funding for 208 Plan updates made possible through the ADEQ. As of this writing, SEAGO has submitted a pre-final draft of the updated Plan to ADEQ for review and comment, and it is virtually assured that a public review-ready draft will be submitted by the deadline.

After the public review draft 208 plan is delivered, the Environmental Review Committee will review and comment on it. Public hearings will be held, after which, any public comments and the comments of the ERC will be incorporated into the plan if practicable. The updated Plan must then be adopted by the Executive Board.

I have attached a copy of the Executive Summary chapter for your review. You will note that the conditions requiring a Plan amendment are greatly reduced over the conditions of the current Plan (see Table 1.1). Consistency Reviews will still occur for all wastewater projects, but the amendment process will seldom be triggered.

Attachment: DRAFT Executive Summary

RH:YU

Board Action Requested: Information Only Action Requested Below

CHAPTER 1, EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

OVERVIEW

The SEAGO 208 Water Quality Management Plan (SEAGO 208 Plan) establishes strategies and processes to provide regional coordination in developing wastewater treatment facilities and for efforts to protect water quality. The SEAGO 208 Plan is essentially an agreement between SEAGO, entities operating wastewater utilities within the region, the Arizona Department of Environmental Quality (ADEQ), and the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) to implement these strategies and processes. It is referred to as the SEAGO 208 Plan because it fulfills water quality planning requirements established in Section 208 of the federal Clean Water Act. The purpose of this planning effort is to update the existing SEAGO 208 Plan to:

- Assure adequate wastewater facilities in the SEAGO region;
- Take advantage of economies of scale, treatment efficiencies, new and better treatment technology, and conservation practices where possible;
- Identify and address water quality and wastewater issues; and
- Improve effectiveness and efficiency of 208 Plan Consistency Reviews.

The previous SEAGO 208 Plan, adopted in 1994, was primarily an inventory of then-existing wastewater treatment facilities in the region and the 20-year capacity projections for those facilities. As new facilities were proposed or capacity projections needed modification, a “plan amendment” was required to update the regional plan. The plan amendment process is both time-consuming, costly and of questionable value, especially when it involves a city, town, or sanitary district. Expansion of a public wastewater treatment facility requires multiple public processes including planning and zoning hearings and approval of capital expenditures by the governing body for design and construction. The requirement for a separate 208 amendment often resulted in a large amount of expended effort with little to no public participation because the project was already well publicized and approved through other processes.

The new SEAGO 208 Plan incorporates a Strategic Plan of goals with strategies and tactics to achieve those goals. For example, the expansion of an existing treatment facility will not trigger a plan amendment if it is found consistent with the goals and strategies in the 208 Plan. Only those proposed actions that are not found consistent with the Strategic Plan will require a plan amendment as outlined in Chapter 6, Plan Implementation.

The planning effort encourages and tries to assure the development and maintenance of sufficient, efficient, cost effective, reliable, and sustainable wastewater treatment and disposal systems. The new Plan includes strategies that encourage the use of sustainability and resource conservation practices and address water quality problems from sources other than wastewater treatment and disposal. The SEAGO 208 Plan also encourages local land use decision makers to consider the goals of the SEAGO 208 Plan when making planning and zoning decisions that involve development, wastewater management, and stormwater impacts.

Consistency Reviews

Federal and state regulations require that certain proposed actions related to wastewater facilities must be consistent with the SEAGO 208 Plan. According to state regulations, the following actions can only be approved if ADEQ determines that the proposal is consistent with the SEAGO 208 Plan:

- Permitting the proposed construction or expansion of a sewage treatment facility with combined flows over 24,000 gallons per day (gpd) ¹
- Discharges to surface waters that require an individual Arizona Discharge Elimination System (AZPDES) permit ²
- Provision of a grant or loan through the Water Infrastructure Finance Authority (WIFA) ³ A.A.C. R18-15-202.B.8

State regulations do not require a 208 consistency determination for on-site wastewater systems (e.g. septic systems) under 3,000 gpd, on-site systems if combined flows would be under 24,000 gpd, sewer collections systems, subdivisions served by on-site systems, or reclaimed water systems.

Although consistency determinations (e.g., Consistency Reviews) *are not* required by regulation for developments such as subdivisions that rely on-site systems, ADEQ 208 staff will work with SEAGO to complete a preliminary 208 review of these to determine whether the proposal is consistent with the 208 Plan strategies (e.g. Wastewater Treatment Options Table), if it is within an existing Service or Planning Area, and to coordinate with county and municipal officials in the region.

Similarly, 208 Consistency Review may be necessary when approving new or replacement on-site systems (e.g., septic systems), small satellite treatment plans, or community systems to assure that strategies in the 208 Plan are implemented (e.g. high priority areas for sewer lines, coordination with Designated Management Agencies, economies of scale, the Wastewater Options Table in Chapter 6, etc).

Issues and the Strategic Plan

The major water quality and wastewater issues were identified to initiate plan development by a stakeholder group representing the municipalities in the SEAGO region and other interested parties. The issues and strategies developed in this plan are summarized below:

Issue 1 – Strategies to assure adequate future wastewater treatment facilities:

- A. Designated Management Agencies and Wastewater Management Utilities – The Clean Water Act requires each CWA 208 Plan identify entities that have the legal, institutional, financial, and managerial capabilities to carry out aspects of the 208 Plan. These public entities include local, regional, or state agencies and political

¹ A.A.C. R18-9-A201(B)(6)(a) & A.A.C. R18-5-303(1)

² A.A.C. R18-9-A903(6)

³ A.A.C. R18-15-202.B.8

subdivisions. In the SEAGO 208 Plan, a wastewater treatment facility operated by a public entity must be able to demonstrate that it has the legal, institutional, financial, and managerial capabilities and resources to construct, operate, and maintain the wastewater facilities it is proposing, or is already operating, and be certified as a Designated Management Agency (DMA).

Non-public entities that are wastewater providers (e.g. a private utility) cannot be approved as a “DMA” because they are not an agency or political subdivision. However, ADEQ will still require the entity to demonstrate that it has the same capabilities to function as a DMA within its Certificated Area of Convenience and Necessity as approved by the Arizona Corporation Commission. If ADEQ finds adequate demonstration, the entity would be approved as a Wastewater Management Utility (WMU) under the SEAGO 208 Plan.

Approval of some large developments or expansion of some wastewater facilities would be contingent on being certified as a DMA or approved as a WMU. Development of model ordinances for consideration by local jurisdictions is recommended as a strategy to address this issue (see Chapter 5, Strategy 1.1.A.).

- B. Expansion triggers and capacity assurance – The expansion design phase for wastewater facilities will be triggered by the expected flow of wastewater coming into the plant compared to the facility's design capacity approved under its Aquifer Protection Permit (see equation below).

Operational Flow	Design Phase Trigger Equation			Capacity Assurance
(entering facility)	+ 85% of Approved	+ Expected New Flows	+ (promised to developers)	= (Design Capacity)
	+	+	=	

As discussed in Chapter 6, new capacity assurance procedures and local ordinances are needed so that a wastewater treatment plant's capacity is not committed indefinitely to proposed developments that will no longer be built. Development of model ordinances for consideration by local jurisdictions is recommended as a strategy to address this issue (see Chapter 5, Strategy 1.1.A.). SEAGO will work closely with ADEQ to ensure that state rules and policies are also met.

Issue 2 – Determining Best Options for Wastewater Treatment

- A. Wastewater Treatment Options Table - Criteria for determining options for a proposed development or replacement wastewater system is established in the Wastewater Treatment Options Table in Chapter 6. A second *guidance* table provides criteria for determining whether a development should connect to a sewer based on the distance from the sewer lines. Both tables will be used for 208 Consistency Reviews. However, additional local ordinances will be needed to implement the criteria in these tables (beyond existing consistency requirements) for wastewater facilities (e.g. on-site systems, dry sewer collection systems, connections to sewers when available).

- B. Development of model ordinances for consideration by local jurisdictions is recommended as a strategy to address this issue (see Chapter 5, Strategy 1.1.C.).
- C. Cost-effectiveness, economies of scale, treatment efficiencies, and sustainability and resource conservation - Proposed wastewater treatment facilities should demonstrate the best cost-effective technologies. Facility design should consider sustainability and resource conservation, economies of scale, and treatment efficiencies even though these are not required in regulations. For example, in some cases it may be less expensive and more effective in the long-term for the utility to expand an existing wastewater treatment system, rather than create new smaller facilities. Reuse of gray water, effluent, and biosolids should be included in the design, when appropriate. The facility should be designed to have a low impact on the surrounding community and to conserve resources (i.e. low impacts, low energy, and "green" infrastructure). New technologies should be considered, such as the regional reuse of biosolids to create electricity. Development of model ordinances for consideration by local jurisdictions is recommended as a strategy to address this issue (see Chapter 5, Strategy 4.1.B.).
- C. High priority areas for sewer lines and sensitive areas - Some areas are not suitable for on-site wastewater septic systems according to current Aquifer Protection Permit regulations due to high groundwater, floodways, or other concerns. These could be considered "sensitive areas." There may be other areas in the SEAGO region where older wastewater systems have begun to fail. Also, some wells in the region are nearing the Aquifer Water Quality Standard for nitrate (10 mg/L), making these areas unsuitable for additional nitrogen loading from septic systems. SEAGO intends to develop a GIS database to track these areas in order to encourage development of centralized wastewater treatment facilities rather than the use of conventional on-site septic systems. Where densities are too low to justify centralized treatment, alternative treatment technologies to reduce nitrogen should be considered. Development of model ordinances for consideration by local jurisdictions is recommended as a strategy to address this issue (see Chapter 5, Strategies 1.1.B. and 1.1.C.).

Issue 3 – Communication and Coordination Strategies:

- A. The SEAGO Environmental Review Committee (ERC) - The purpose of the ERC is to improve coordination and communication within the region and with ADEQ to assure that new and replacement wastewater facilities and systems are consistent with the regional 208 Plan. The ERC will help support the public review process portion of 208 Consistency Reviews and will also help implement other strategies in this Plan. The committee will include representatives from the Designated Management Agencies, Wastewater Management Utilities, and other interested stakeholders. Formalization of the ERC as a standing committee pursuant to the SEAGO Bylaws is recommended (see Chapter 5, Strategy 3.1.A.).
- B. Memorandums of Understanding (MOU) and Intergovernmental Agreements (IGA) - Additional MOUs and IGAs may be needed to implement this plan and minimize potential conflicts as wastewater treatment plants, sewer collection systems, service areas, and planning areas are modified. Formal understandings may be needed to

- C. Assure long-term, cost effective wastewater services to an area. For example, if new development is on the fringe of a municipal service area but adjacent to the service area of a neighboring municipality's treatment facility, an IGA could be developed to have service provided by the neighboring municipality if it is more cost effective.
- D. SEAGO Web site – In order to help direct development of wastewater treatment facilities in the region and to facilitate 208 Consistency Reviews, SEAGO will be posting information to its existing Web site. This Web site will incorporate and integrate information from existing facilities and GIS databases developed over time in response to the strategies contained in this Plan. This information will then be available to a broad audience - developers, community members, and other agencies. It is anticipated that this Web site will initially provide the following information:
- The inventory of public and private wastewater treatment facilities: location, design capacity, existing disposal methods;
 - A record of Consistency Reviews performed, which may include information on the proposal such as location, capacity, change in service or planning area, treatment and disposal methods, AZPDES discharge location(s), subdivision information, etc.;
 - The Wastewater Treatment Options Table; and
 - Other information that may support Consistency Reviews.

Over time, should funding become available to do so, the Web site may be expanded to include the following additional information (see Chapter 5, Strategies 1.1.B., 1.1.C., 2.1.A., 4.1.A., and 5.1.B.):

- Existing wastewater treatment facilities service areas and planning areas;
- Sensitive areas, where on-site wastewater treatment systems may not be appropriate;
- High priority areas for sewer lines;
- Surface waters classified as "impaired" or "outstanding Arizona waters (OAWs);"
- Surface waters with established Total Maximum Daily Loads;
- Wells sampled for nitrate, highlighting wells near or exceeding 10 mg/L (the Aquifer Water Quality Standard); and
- A listing of funding sources for water quality management projects.

The Web site will eventually replace the facility maps and information presently in **Appendix B** because this information will become outdated over time. Information at this Web site will be updated annually based on Consistency Reviews, approved facilities, and other information provided by ADEQ.

Issue 4 – Public Support Strategies:

- A. Improve Educational Opportunities – Increasing public awareness about water quality issues through outreach and education would encourage citizen involvement. Citizens would become educated about a wide range of water quality issues, including wastewater treatment issues, the harmful effects of improper disposal of chemicals, drugs, grease, and other products unsuitable for sewer disposal, the adverse impacts of sediment discharged in stormwater from unpermitted grading and development

- B. Activities, the proper care and maintenance of septic systems and more. Local, state, and federal agency members can assist with their knowledge and resources. Through these educational endeavors, citizen support needed to create or expand wastewater treatment facilities may be improved. Fostering partnerships with local, state, and federal agencies, and academic institutions to develop local outreach and education programs is a recommended strategy under several of the goals in Chapter 5.
- C. Incentives to connect to sewer collection lines - Once sewer collection lines are available to an area, property owners should connect to these centralized collection and treatment systems, especially where there are failing on-site systems. Clear incentives and ordinances are recommended to avoid disputes if individuals are expected to discontinue using existing wastewater treatment and pay to connect to centralized sewer (see Chapter 5, Strategy 1.1.C.). These ordinances and incentives should be established when an area becomes a service area, a planning area, or a "high priority area for sewer lines."

Issue 5 – Impaired Surface Waters and Wells not Meeting Aquifer Water Quality Standards Strategies:

- A. Stormwater best management practices - Stormwater runoff from certain sources often contains many toxic and pathogenic pollutants. Stormwater can also cause extensive damage from flooding to soil erosion. Stormwater management practices would mitigate further pollutant loading to streams, canals, lakes, and rivers. Partnerships and efforts (see discussion above) can help provide landowner education about stormwater Best Management Practices. Practices that retain rainwater on the property can reduce stormwater impacts, provide water for landscaping, and help recharge the aquifer. Expanding education efforts and development of model ordinances for consideration by local jurisdictions is recommended as a strategy to address this issue (see Chapter 5, Strategies 2.2.A., 2.2.C., and 5.1.A.).
- B. Agricultural best management practices - Agricultural Best Management Practices for crop production and livestock grazing need to be further encouraged to mitigate pollutant loading to surface water and groundwater. Increased collaboration, education, and development of model ordinances for consideration by local jurisdictions is recommended as a strategy to address this issue (see Chapter 5, Strategy 2.2.B.).
- C. Consider impacts to impaired waters - The review of proposed developments and wastewater facilities needs to consider potential impacts to:
 - A surface water assessed as "impaired" or "not attaining uses;"
 - Adopted Total Maximum Daily Load (TMDL) allocations to an impaired surface water; and
 - Ground water quality if nearby wells is at or near an Aquifer Water Quality Standard (e.g., nitrates near or above 10 mg/L).

Development of model ordinances for consideration by local jurisdictions is recommended as a strategy to address this issue (see Chapter 5, Strategy 2.2.A.).

Issue 6 – 208 Process Inefficiencies Strategies:

- A. The 208 review process - The 208 review process is being revised to avoid past inefficiencies and reduce costs. The new process, including the public review component, is described in Chapter 6. The process efficiency is supported by the development and use of the Wastewater Treatment Options Table, the SEAGO ERC, the SEAGO Web site, and other strategies in this plan.
- B. Quarterly reporting to AOEQ - SEAGO will report quarterly to ADEQ concerning progress on implementing the 208 Plan. The report will include any barriers to accomplishing objectives, recommendations concerning strategy modifications, and highlights of any achievements.
- C. Annual updates - The SEAGO Web site information will need to be updated annually based on the Consistency Reviews performed and other information that may become available.
- D. The 208 Plan revisions process - The 208 Plan should be reviewed and revised (if needed) every five years using the process described in Chapter 6. Revisions could also be done during interim years, if needed. Revisions would be required for changes in:
 - Strategic plan goals, objectives, or strategies (Chapter 5)
 - The processes described in Chapter 6 (if significant)
 - The Wastewater Treatment Options Table (in Chapter 6)

Unlike requirements under the previous SEAGO 208 Plan, this improved and updated 208 Plan will not need to be revised to approve new or expansion of wastewater treatment facilities. A comparison of the plan amendment conditions under the previous SEAGO 208 Plan and the current 208 Plan is presented in Table 1.1. Although a Consistency Review will still be required for these conditions, the process for such is much less burdensome and costly for the applicant than amending this Plan (see Chapter 6, and Table 6.1).

Table 1.1 – Comparison of Plan Amendment Conditions

Condition	Previous 208 Plan	Current 208 Plan
New Designated Planning Agency (DPA)	Yes	Yes
New Designated Management Agency (DMA) or Wastewater Management Utility (WMU) approval	Yes	Yes
New or renewed Arizona Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (AZPDES) or Aquifer Protection Permits (APP)	Yes	No
Changes in DMA or WMU Service Areas or Planning Areas	Yes	No
Proposed construction and permitting of a Wastewater Treatment Plant (WWTP)	Yes	No
Expansion of existing WWTPs	Yes	No
Changes in or adoption of site specific water quality standards or Total Maximum Daily Loads (TMDL)	Yes	No
Proposed subdivision or planned community	Yes	No

Plan Implementation

This plan will be implemented by instituting the processes, criteria, and tools described in Chapter 6. Where 208 Consistency Reviews are required, the processes and criteria are also established in this Chapter 6.

To adequately implement several strategies of this plan, additional local ordinances are recommended to provide additional regulatory authority. Another impediment to full plan implementation is a lack of funding mechanisms. For example, many of the tactics underlying certain strategies in this plan involve the development and deployment of GIS data and mapping capabilities beyond SEAGO’s current capacity to carry out. While SEAGO will pursue funding to implement the strategies in this plan, the a



ADMINISTRATIVE COUNCIL PACKET

MEMO TO: ADMINISTRATIVE COUNCIL
FROM: RANDY HEISS, EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR
DATE: APRIL 26, 2011
SUBJECT: STRATEGIC PLAN UPDATE

As you may recall, at their February meetings, the Administrative Council recommended and the Executive Board approved the draft mission and vision statements that were developed at the January retreat held for that purpose. Since the February meeting, there has been no progress on the developing goals, objectives, and strategies for the strategic plan.

After the departure of Susan Buchan, who took a job in the private sector, there was a need to re-organize the Pathways Program and redistribute the work load that Susan was carrying. One significant task that Susan had been working on was the re-write of the SEAGO 208 Water Quality Management Plan. Because there is no other person on staff with the necessary time or skills to delegate this work to, and because there is a deadline of April 30 for the delivery of a public review ready draft of the document, this work fell on me to complete.

After the draft 208 plan is delivered, the Environmental Review Committee will need to review and comment on it. Public hearings will need to be held, after which, any public comments and the comments of the ERC will be incorporated into the plan if practicable. The updated Plan will then need to be adopted by the Executive Board. Once the 208 Plan update is complete, I will be able to return my focus to leading the strategic planning efforts.

RH:YU

Action Requested: Information Only Action Requested Below:



ADMINISTRATIVE COUNCIL PACKET

MEMO TO: ADMINISTRATIVE COUNCIL
FROM: RANDY HEISS, EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR
DATE: APRIL 26, 2011
SUBJECT: UPDATE ON SEAGO'S NEW FACILITY

Since the February Executive Board meeting, we have secured an extension to our lease with the City of Bisbee, through the end of September in order to give us adequate time to complete the improvements to the building and move into the new location. We have also secured an agreement with the Arizona Department of Corrections to utilize inmate labor at the new facility. Inmate labor may be utilized to perform certain pre-construction activities, landscaping improvements, and ongoing maintenance, thus lowering the cost estimates for the improvements, and stabilizing operation and maintenance costs for the facility.

Plans and specifications for the improvements to the building have been developed and will be submitted to the City before the end of April. Once the plans are approved, the improvements to the building will be put out to bid. We hope to complete construction before the end of July or early August.

RH:YU

Action Requested: Information Only Action Requested Below:



ADMINISTRATIVE COUNCIL PACKET

MEMO TO: ADMINISTRATIVE COUNCIL
THROUGH: RANDY HEISS, EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR
FROM: BONNIE WILLIAMS, CDBG PROGRAM MANAGER
DATE: APRIL 26, 2011
SUBJECT: CDBG APPLICATIONS INFORMATION

For those communities who will be applying for CDBG funds this year, here is an update:

1. The Arizona Department of Housing (ADOH) was just notified of the amount of their CDBG allocation on Friday, **April 22**, and it is approximately 2 million less than last year. They anticipate releasing the amount of SEAGO's funding in about a week. At this point in time, we are expecting the cuts to be in the range of 16-21 percent. As soon as I receive our funding amount, I will calculate each applicant's share according to the population/poverty formulas in our Method of Distribution, and release that information to you.
2. Currently, the application due date to SEAGO has been changed to **June 1**, instead of the usual date of May 1. SEAGO must review, finalize, and get the applications to ADOH by **July 1, 2011**. Most of you have held off publishing your intended projects due to the budget uncertainties, but hopefully you have narrowed the possible project(s), and how you could decrease the scope of work to fit into your allocated funds once I have provided that figure to you. I have spoken with your staff and recommended that they now proceed with the final publication which sets the date for the passing of the required resolutions.
3. Normally at this meeting, you would be approving the actual applications. Since this process has been delayed, I will need to call a joint conference call of the Administrative and Executive Committees (officers of the Administrative Council and Executive Board) to accomplish this before **July 1**.

As always, feel free to contact me if you have any questions or concerns. Thank you.

BW:YU

Board Action Requested: Information Only Action Requested Below



ADMINISTRATIVE COUNCIL PACKET

MEMO TO: ADMINISTRATIVE COUNCIL
THROUGH: RANDY HEISS, EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR
FROM: JULIE PACKER, HOUSING PROGRAMS MANAGER
DATE: APRIL 26, 2011
SUBJECT: SAVE MY HOME ARIZONA PROGRAM FUNDING CUTS

SEAGO received notice on April 20, that funding for the Save My Home Arizona (SMHAZ) program has been cut. We were also informed that April is the last month that SEAGO can bill for any services rendered under this program. There was no indication from the Department of Housing that this cut was or would be coming. Housing received \$6,250 a month for administration of this program in the SEAGO region. This funding cut is a huge loss for the housing program.

While the funding is gone for SEAGO to administer the SMHAZ program, the program is still open and we can refer people to the SMHAZ Web site. There is a new component of the Save My Home Arizona program and that is an unemployment piece that began in March. The unemployment piece offers families up to 24 months of assistance while seeking new employment. The unemployment piece requires quarterly face to face counseling and families were not to travel to get that counseling. If enough people apply from the SEAGO region, the state may reinstate some administration money back to SEAGO to continue with that component of the program.

JP:YU

Board Action Requested: Information Only Action Requested Below



ADMINISTRATIVE COUNCIL PACKET

MEMO TO: ADMINISTRATIVE COUNCIL
THROUGH: RANDY HEISS, EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR
FROM: CHRIS VERTREES, PATHWAYS PROGRAM MANAGER
DATE: APRIL 26 , 2011
SUBJECT: PATHWAYS OUT OF POVERTY JOB PROGRAM

The Pathways Program experienced several staffing changes in February and March. Program Manager (Susan Buchan), Case Manager (Arturo Escalante) and Financial Assistant (Miriam Salcedo) left the program. **Chris Vertrees** was promoted from Lead Case Manager to **Program Manager**. A Job Developer and two Junior Case Managers were hired. Areas of responsibility for program staff are listed below:

Alison Van Gorp - Job Developer. Alison is responsible for employer outreach throughout the SEAGO region. Her duties include developing, locating, and securing job openings for our program participants.

Edith Lee - Lead Case Manager: Edith's areas of responsibility include San Carlos Apache Tribe, Safford, Thatcher, Pima, Clifton, Duncan, and unincorporated Graham and Greenlee Counties.

Steve Roybal - Junior Case Manager: Steve's areas of responsibility include Douglas, Bisbee, Tombstone, and unincorporated Cochise County.

Sarah Montoya - Junior Case Manager: Sarah's areas of responsibility include Sierra Vista, Benson, Willcox, Nogales, Patagonia, and unincorporated Santa Cruz County.

To improve accessibility to clients and potential employers, offices were established at 125 East Fry Blvd. in Sierra Vista and at 7 Bisbee Road, Suite G in Bisbee. The Pathways program now has regularly staffed offices in Bisbee, Douglas, Sierra Vista, and Safford. The program also conducts regularly scheduled visits to Benson, Willcox, Elfrida, Nogales, and the San Carlos reservation to bring services to our clients in those areas.

The SEAGO Pathways Program continues to be one of the national leaders in recruitment, enrollment, training courses completed, and nationally recognized certification obtained. The program is still in its training phase. The program has 228 active participants that are training in solar panel installation, environmental remediation, and building performance, and weatherization. The program's training phase is expected to run through May. National certification testing and on-

the-job training shall begin in June. Job placement services are expected to begin in earnest the beginning of the state fiscal year (July 1, 2011).

CV:YU

Board Action Requested: Information Only Action Requested Below



ADMINISTRATIVE COUNCIL PACKET

MEMO TO: ADMINISTRATIVE COUNCIL
THROUGH: RANDY HEISS, EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR
FROM: AKOS KOVACH, ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT PLANNER (EDP)
DATE: APRIL 26, 2011
SUBJECT: UPDATE AND REPORT COMPREHENSIVE ECONOMIC
DEVELOPMENT STRATEGY (CEDs)

1. The EDP to provide 2010-2015 CEDs, version 4B, for your review and comment electronically. The CEDs is over 200 pages in length, thus an electronic version for each member was deemed to be more appropriate and cost efficient.
2. The EDP will also provide the Web address for members to view an online copy of the CEDs.
3. We have now officially entered into the final public comment phase of the CEDs process.
4. The EDP asks each member entity to scrutinize data most pertinent and relevant to their city, town, county, or tribe. If you have suggestions or recommendations, now is the time to provide that feedback.
5. The new SEAGO EDD Web site, interactive region wide, Five Year Calendar of Events is live, Twitter account is active, You Tube page is scoring good results posting videos, the Blog page has seen some activity, updates to the main SEAGO Web site include the addition of a NEW Announcements Page and a gradual approach to updating the look and feel of the Web site for all users.
6. The SEAGO Newsletter and Digest, has a wide initial distribution with recipients in all 15 counties of Arizona, COGs in New Mexico, economic development practitioners in Mexico, practitioners and providers in some 11 states and several others. Some of these recipients further the readership by forwarding copies as far away as South Korea.
7. In conclusion, as you will see the SEAGO 2010-2015 CEDs is a resource guide, regional handbook, and roadmap for the SEAGO region to follow in a cooperative manner, assisting one another to save existing businesses and jobs while promoting our region as a bright spot on the horizon of sustainable economic expansion.

Board Action Requested: Information Only Action Requested Below



ADMINISTRATIVE COUNCIL PACKET

MEMO TO: ADMINISTRATIVE COUNCIL
FROM: RANDY HEISS, EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR
DATE: APRIL 26, 2011
SUBJECT: ENERGY CODE WORKSHOP PRESENTATION

The Department of Energy in conjunction with the Arizona Commerce Authority is supporting a program to bring awareness of the existence of the 2009 International Energy codes to administrators and elected officials throughout the state. Susan Buchan is a trainer for the “Energy Code Workshop” and will provide a brief introduction to the program and provide informational resources to interested members.

Board Action Requested: Information Only Action Requested Below:



ADMINISTRATIVE COUNCIL PACKET

MEMO TO: ADMINISTRATIVE COUNCIL
FROM: RANDY HEISS, EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR
DATE: APRIL 26, 2011
SUBJECT: RTAC REPORT

Kevin Adam will give an RTAC report.

Board Action Requested: Information Only Action Requested Below:



ADMINISTRATIVE COUNCIL PACKET

MEMO TO: ADMINISTRATIVE COUNCIL
FROM: RANDY HEISS, EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR
DATE: APRIL 26, 2011
SUBJECT: EXECUTIVE SESSION

I would like to meet annually with the Administrative Council in executive session for purposes of evaluating my performance. Even if the Council chooses not to evaluate my performance, meeting privately with you will provide an opportunity to discuss issues impacting the organization that we would not otherwise have.

My evaluation is technically the responsibility of the Executive Committee, but as I have mentioned to many of you, I am working to strengthen SEAGO's relationships with the City, Town, and County Managers. Any direction or recommendations from this body will be forwarded to the Executive Committee for their consideration.

RH:YU

Action Requested: Information Only Action Requested Below:

A motion to adjourn to executive session for purposes of evaluating the performance of the Executive Director.