



SouthEastern Arizona Governments Organization

MEMO TO: SEAGO TRANSPORTATION ADVISORY COMMITTEE

FROM: EUGENE WEEKS, SEAGO TRANSPORTATION PLANNER

DATE: JANUARY 4, 2007

SUBJECT: THURSDAY, JANUARY 25, 2007, TAC MEETING

The next SEAGO TAC meeting will be held on **Thursday, January 25, 2007**, in Benson. This meeting will focus on the **Election of Officers**, and possible selection of a project for inclusion in the SEAGO TIP. If you are planning to submit a project for the year 2010–2011 time frame, I encourage you to prepare your mini DCR prior to subject meeting; so that I can make it available to all SEAGO TAC members for review. In any case, I would suggest you be ready to present your proposed project at the TAC in sufficient detail to persuade the other TAC members to vote for it.

ADOT representatives are welcome and encouraged to attend all SEAGO TAC meetings; their participation is vital to the success we have here in the SEAGO region.

EW:YU

SEAGO TRANSPORTATION ADVISORY COMMITTEE

DATE: JANUARY 25, 2007

TIME: 9 A.M.

**PLACE: COCHISE COMMUNITY COLLEGE
1025 STATE HWY. 90
BENSON, ARIZONA**

A G E N D A

CALL TO ORDER/INTRODUCTIONS (Robert Porter)

APPROVAL OF MINUTES (Robert Porter) 1

ELECTION OF OFFICERS..... 5

CURRENT SEAGO TRANSPORTATION POLICIES7

NEXT SEAGO PROJECT–Mini DCR (Eugene Weeks)..... 10

SEAGO LEDGER17

ROUND 14 STATE AND LOCAL ENHANCEMENT PROJECT..... 18

SEAGO TIP..... 22

REGIONAL FIVE-YEAR PROGRAM
Status of Local Projects (Project Sponsors)
Local Governments' Report (ADOT)
Current Ledger Balances (Eugene Weeks)

STATE HIGHWAY FIVE-YEAR PROGRAM
District Engineers' Report (Bill Harmon, Greg Gentch)

DATE OF NEXT MEETING (Robert Porter)

OTHER BUSINESS (Eugene Weeks)

ADJOURNMENT (Robert Porter)

**MINUTES OF THE
TRANSPORTATION ADVISORY COMMITTEE
COCHISE COMMUNITY COLLEGE
BENSON, ARIZONA
NOVEMBER 16, 2006**

Members Present:	Scott Dooley Dennis Lines Randy Heiss Michael Bryce Dick Schaffer Clara Walker-Earner Phil Ronnerud Heath Brown Victor Gabilondo Pat Kelly Carlos De La Torre Dawn Bruns Jeffrey Schwartz Jaime Fontes	City of Sierra Vista Town of Pima Town of Patagonia Graham County Cochise County Cochise County Greenlee County Town of Thatcher Santa Cruz County City of Tombstone City of Douglas City of Willcox City of Bisbee City of Nogales
Members Absent:	Robert Porter Will Wright Dale Kelch Anne Thurman	City of Safford Graham County City of Sierra Vista Town of Duncan Town of Clifton Town of Huachuca City
ADOT and Other Staff	Bill Harmon Natalie Clark Jin Snow Jami Garrison Ysidro Solima Brian Fellows	ADOT Safford District ADOT TPD ADOT ITG ADOT ITG ADOT TPD ADOT SRSP
SEAGO Staff:	Richard Gaar Eugene Weeks	Executive Director Transportation Planner
Others:	Rick Ensdorff	URS (Phoenix)

CALL TO ORDER/INTRODUCTIONS

Co-chairman, Scott Dooley, City of Sierra Vista called the meeting to order at approximately 9:16 a.m., and introductions were made.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

A motion to approve the **November 16, 2006**, minutes was made by Mr. Dick Schaffer, Cochise County and was seconded by Mr. Carlos De La Torre, City of Douglas. The minutes were approved as presented.

STATE HIGHWAY FIVE-YEAR PROGRAM

No report.

TUCSON DISTRICT ENGINEERS' REPORT

No report.

ADOT TRANSPORTATION PLANNING

No report.

REGIONAL FIVE-YEAR PROGRAMS

No report.

NEXT SEAGO PROJECT

Santa Cruz County provided a courtesy copy of a mini DCR for Rio Rico West Frontage Road, from Yavapai Drive to Calle Calabasas to all SEAGO TAC members at the **November 17, 2006**, TAC meeting.

FINANCIALLY CONSTRAINED LEDGER BALANCES

The ledger balances were provided to SEAGO TAC members so that all had a better understanding of the TIP and Obligation Authority funding process.

ROUND 14 STATE AND LOCAL ENHANCEMENT PROJECTS

The Transportation Enhancements results were available for information purposes only. There were no comments, suggestions, and/or recommendations to the Transportation Evaluation Review Committee's (TERC) selections/outcome of the round 14 state and local enhancement projects.

MAJOR PROJECTS PROGRAMMING REQUESTS

The programming requests were accepted without comment.

MAJOR PROJECTS SCOPING REQUESTS

The scoping requests were accepted without comment.

STATE ACCESS MANAGEMENT PROGRAM (SAMP)

The SAMP presentation provoked many questions from the SEAGO TAC members. Legality was often the most asked question. Definition of highways, roads, and streets are in conflict with the definitions offered in the Highway Performance Monitoring System manual.

SAFE ROUTES TO SCHOOL

The Safe Routes to School program was enthusiastically received and the SEAGO TAC members were excited to learn more about the program.

HIGHWAY PERFORMANCE MANAGEMENT SYSTEM (HPMS)

SEAGO TAC members from Bisbee, Cochise County, Douglas, Graham County, Greenlee County, Nogales, Patagonia, Pima, Santa Cruz County, Sierra Vista, Thatcher, Tombstone, and Willcox participated in the HPMS training.

SEAGO TRANSPORTATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM (TIP)

The SEAGO TIP was made available for information purposes only. It is important to keep the TIP up to date and move projects forward when construction is complete or not completed in the year in which the original project was listed. The available funding is pretty much spoken for through 2010, but the feasibility of adding another project to the TIP can be discussed at the next meeting.

THE LOCAL TRANSPORTATION ASSISTANCE FUND II (LTAF II)

SEAGO was able to get the LTAF II applications to ADOT, but not without a lot of hand holding, foot dragging, and gnashing of the teeth along the way. We will be looking for well-defined applications in the future. Gene asked that applicants read all the documents carefully before submitting an application and to call him with any questions.

DATE OF NEXT MEETING

The date of the next meeting was set for **January 25, 2007**. The January 25, 2007, date provides SEAGO time to include the mini DCRs and the SEAGO TIP amendments to the SEAGO Administrative Council, and Executive Board for their review and approval prior to sending it to ADOT.

OTHER BUSINESS

There was no other business.

ADJOURNMENT

The meeting adjourned at approximately 12:45 p.m.



SouthEastern Arizona Governments Organization

MEMO TO: SEAGO TRANSPORTATION ADVISORY COMMITTEE

FROM: EUGENE WEEKS, SEAGO TRANSPORTATION PLANNER

DATE: JANUARY 4, 2007

SUBJECT: ELECTION OF OFFICERS

The SEAGO TAC Bylaws call for election of a TAC Chairperson and Vice Chairperson the first meeting of the calendar year. Current occupants of these esteemed positions are:

TAC Chairperson	Robert Porter
TAC Vice Chairperson	Scott Dooley

Please give some thought to who you would like to see in these offices. The SEAGO TAC Bylaws are provided below for your review, comments, and suggestions. We can discuss changes to these if you like.

TAC ACTION REQUESTED:

A motion to recommend candidates for the TAC Chairperson.

A motion to recommend candidate for the TAC Vice-Chairperson.

GW:YU

SEAGO TAC BYLAWS

1. Authority - The Transportation Advisory Committee (TAC) serves as an advisory committee to the SEAGO Executive Board. Recommendations to the Board are generally made through the SEAGO Administrative Council. Relevant Executive Board Bylaws not addressed in these TAC bylaws also apply to the TAC.
2. Purpose - The purpose of the TAC is to:
 - a. Provide technical input to the Executive Board and the Arizona Department of Transportation (ADOT) regarding various transportation issues in the SEAGO region including, roadway priorities and funding strategies; and
 - b. Provide a forum for the exchange of information between ADOT and SEAGO local governments.
3. Membership - Membership of the SEAGO TAC consists of:
 - a. Membership shall consist of one member (and one alternate) from each SEAGO member entity. The member shall be an engineer, public works director, transportation planner or other appropriate technical staff as appointed by that jurisdiction. Terms of membership shall be indefinite and subject to change by the appointing jurisdiction.
 - b. The Arizona Department of Transportation is also authorized membership on the SEAGO TAC. This member is usually the Regional Transportation Liaison or an alternate selected by ADOT.
4. Quorum - A quorum shall consist of members present.
5. Majority - A majority shall consist of 50 percent of members present.
6. Election of Officers

A Chairperson and Vice-Chairperson will be elected at the first meeting of the new calendar year.
7. Agenda - Meeting agenda will be mailed no later than 5 days prior to a meeting date.



SouthEastern Arizona Governments Organization

MEMO TO: SEAGO TRANSPORTATION ADVISORY COMMITTEE

FROM: EUGENE WEEKS, SEAGO TRANSPORTATION PLANNER

DATE: JANUARY 4, 2007

SUBJECT: CURRENT SEAGO TRANSPORTATION POLICY GUIDELINES

As we prepare to add a new project to the SEAGO TIP, I think it appropriate to provide you a copy of the current guidelines under which we operate. These guidelines are old, but still in effect until the SEAGO Executive Board chooses to revoke or amend them.

I think the TAC should look at these and see if there is anything that we feel we need to recommend to the SEAGO Executive Board to change. As you read them, you can see that we don't always follow these guidelines "to the letter" partially because of some changes in the way that ADOT operates, and the introduction of the "HURF SWAP" process. We can talk about this at length at the meeting, so please try to attend or send a representative.

Please call or e-mail if you have any questions.

GW:YU

Attachment

**TRANSPORTATION POLICY GUIDELINES APPROVED BY THE
SEAGO EXECUTIVE BOARD**

1. When a project is submitted for inclusion in the Five-Year Construction Program, the project sponsor will include a formal resolution stating their commitment to build the project based on its estimated cost and their willingness to:
 - Pay for all preliminary engineering work including the costs for the Design Concept Review.
 - Pay for engineering review costs to ADOT, a minimum of \$5,000, at the time ADOT begins review of the plans and documents submitted by a local sponsor.
 - Provide local match portion for the estimated amount of the project, as well as any excess above the maximum ceiling allowed for federal funds.
 - Provide the TAC a detailed scope of the project, i.e., type of work, length of project.
 - Provide a schedule for completing the project based upon ADOT's project scheduling process and adhere to said schedule.

Included with the resolution, will be preliminary cost estimate data and pertinent technical information about the project. This will be based on the ADOT format and developed by the TAC.

2. When the final estimate is received from ADOT, approximately four months prior to advertisement for bid, the entity will provide a reaffirmation of the local support for the project and the availability of required resources.
3. All projects will be limited to no more than two year's worth of federal aid apportionment. Any costs in excess of two years worth of apportionment, i.e., bids in excess of final cost estimates, or change orders or cost overruns in excess of two year's worth of apportionment, must be paid for by some other funding source, to include local funds from the project sponsor. In computing project costs, sponsors must include an allowance for inflation, 15 percent for construction engineering and no less than 10 percent for contingencies that may arise during project completion. SEAGO will assist the sponsor in attempting to locate or borrow funds from some other sources when the total cost exceeds two year's worth of apportionment, but sponsors should plan for contingencies or be prepared to reduce the scope of their projects within budgetary constraints or increase the amount of local matching funds.
4. The TAC will become more closely involved in the preliminary stages of project development. At a minimum, the TAC will review the detailed scope of the projects submitted by the entities, and visit site locations. The intention of such review is to ensure that federal funds are used for project necessities, rather than amenities. Construction costs for design standards in excess of those allowable (as determined by ADOT and FHWA) are the responsibility of the project sponsor.

SEAGO TRANSPORTATION POLICY GUIDELINES (CONT.)

5. A sponsor can switch a project with another of equal or lesser value if there is no impact on all other scheduled projects, and preliminary work can be completed in time for that project to be ready when originally scheduled (in accordance with ADOT's project scheduling process). However, these projects will still require a resolution of support from the project sponsor (as stated in number 1 above). Exceptions may have to be made to this policy if the total amount of any substitute project costs more or delays subsequently scheduled projects and the region would be at risk of losing Obligation Authority if the substitution were not made.
6. A project that is not ready to go to bid when scheduled will drop out of the program, unless the sponsor can substitute it for another project of equal or lesser value without interfering with other scheduled projects, or it can trade places with a previously scheduled project with no impact on the other projects. All substitute projects will require the same formal resolution and subsequent reaffirmation of support as projects already approved for the Five-Year Plan. Any substitute project must be accompanied by a resolution from the sponsors governing body (as stated in number 1 above) and scheduled in accordance with ADOT's project scheduling process.
7. The policy for change orders remains the same. SEAGO staff shall review and approve the proposed changes unless:
 - a. There is a cost increase of more than 10 percent or \$50,000, whichever is greater for the project.
 - b. Approval of the cost increase would delay other projects in the SEAGO Five-Year Construction Program.

In the event of (a) or (b), approval of the Transportation Advisory Committee would be required. SEAGO staff shall consult with the Chair of the TAC to determine whether this approval may be obtained by a telephone survey of members, or whether a meeting is necessary.

8. When a bid comes in for more than the estimated amount, but less than the two-year ceiling on funds, staff will analyze the affect of the bid amount on subsequently scheduled projects, provide this information to the members of the TAC and conduct a telephone poll in order to determine a timely response to any queries from ADOT.
9. All changes to the scheduling of projects to the Five-Year Construction Program must be approved by the SEAGO Executive Board.



SouthEastern Arizona Governments Organization

MEMO TO: SEAGO TRANSPORTATION ADVISORY COMMITTEE

FROM: EUGENE WEEKS, SEAGO TRANSPORTATION PLANNER

DATE: JANUARY 4, 2007

SUBJECT: NEXT SEAGO PROJECT

The SEAGO TAC is accepting Mini Design Concept Reports (DCR). The mini DCRs are used by the SEAGO TAC membership to help them select a project for inclusion to the SEAGO TIP.

Since we have some new members on the TAC and a project is added so infrequently, let me go over the SEAGO process once more. All Transportation Improvement Programs must be “financially constrained.” In simple terms, this means we can’t add projects to the TIP unless we show the “funding flow” to support it. Also, our policies allow for a maximum of two year’s worth of federal funding for any one project, so our program often does not build a project every year. In light of this, it looks like we will have accrued enough federal funds based on our current program and our current federal allocation to add a project in the 2010-2011 timeframe.

Santa Cruz County has submitted a mini DCR for Rio Rico West Frontage Road, from Yavapai Drive to Calle Calabasas. A courtesy copy was provided to all SEAGO TAC members at the **November 17, 2006**, TAC meeting. It is asked that you review the mini DCR and provide the SEAGO TAC with your comments, suggestions, and recommendations at the meeting, or prior to the meeting in writing if you cannot attend.

The local government Five-Year Highway Construction Program project nomination sheet and mini design concept report process is provided for your information below.

As you can see, our current and projected ledger balances and available funding is pretty much spoken for through 2010/2011, but we can discuss the feasibility of adding another project to the TIP with due process. Figures for fiscal years after 2007 are estimates only, as the OA rate will undoubtedly change and allocations of federal funds may also change as the population growth of the other rural COGs outpaces that in SEAGO.

TAC ACTION REQUESTED:

Recommended action on current SEAGO Transportation Policies.

Made by: _____

Seconded by: _____

EW:YU

**LOCAL GOVERNMENT FIVE-YEAR HIGHWAY CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM
PROJECT NOMINATION SHEET AND
MINI DESIGN CONCEPT REPORT**

A. TITLE PAGE

B. INTRODUCTION

The introduction contains the project program information, The project route name including termini and functional classification, length of project, location, estimated cost, funding type, construction fiscal year, expected project development start and completion dates should also be provided.

C. BACKGROUND DATA

This section addresses the year of construction, previous upgrade projects, existing typical section, general features such as structures, major drainage, major traffic control items, railroad crossings, major utilities, and accident history. This section should address the comparison of the design speed of the existing vertical and horizontal alignment to the current standards. Provide current and future traffic data, to include K, D, and T factors if known.

D. PROJECT SCOPE

Describe the project limits and the recommended project scope.

E. PROJECT DEVELOPMENT CONSIDERATIONS

1. Environmental requirements as determined by the project scope.

- a. Potential Hazardous Waste sites
- b. Permit requirements
- c. Section 4(f) lands
- d. Flood plain encroachment
- e. Wetlands
- f. Scenic or Historic Route
- g. Archaeological clearance
- h. Social or Economic impacts

2. Critical Outside Agency Involvement

Describe any project locations that are likely to involve lengthy clearance procedures (Forest Service, BLM, Indian Reservation, railroads, irrigation companies, and major utilities).

3. Right-of-Way Requirements

Describe the general corridor right-of-way. Describe the general land ownership (Private, Forest Service, Bureau of Land Management, BLM, etc.) Describe any R/W that will have to be acquired and how the R/W is expected to be acquired for the project (donation, purchase, or condemnation).

4. Utility Relocation Requirements

Describe any utility impacts, and how the relocation of the utilities is expected to be accomplished (work done by the utility company, bid item in the construction project). How is the work financed (local funds, fed-aid funds)? Are there any "Prior Rights" issues for any utilities?

5. Seasonal Considerations

Is there any field survey work to be accomplished? Is there any mapping, field data collection or testing required? Describe the limits of the construction season.

6. Traffic Requirements

Is there a need for a traffic control plan for this project? Will pavement markings and signing be included in the project? Will there be new traffic signals installed as a part of this project?

7. Design Concept Report Requirements

Identify any issues or design alternates that the DCR should address and evaluate.

8. Design Criteria

Describe the design criteria to be used. Are the design criteria in concert with AASHTO criteria? Features that do not comply with AASHTO criteria are described along with recommendations for either meeting the criteria or requesting a design exception. Design exceptions are approved by the appropriate ADOT Technical Section Manager.

F. OTHER REQUIREMENTS

Describe the funding sources for this project. State the desired bid advertisement date. The construction start date will be 2 1/2 months after the project has initially advertised for bid. Describe how the project will be developed (design in-house, or hire a consultant firm). Will ADOT perform construction administration or will the request be made to approve the local jurisdiction to perform construction administration?

G. ESTIMATED COST

Describe the Project Cost by Category

- a. Design cost to be funded with local funds or reimbursed with federal funds? (Note, this is usually not allowed for projects in the SEAGO Five-year Highway Construction Program).
- b. Right of Way costs to be funded with local funds or reimbursed with federal funds? (Note, this is usually not allowed for projects in the SEAGO Five-year Highway Construction Program).

- c. Utility relocation costs to be funded with local funds or reimbursed with federal funds?
- d. Construction cost (partial local funds or all to be reimbursed with federal funds.
- e. Total Cost.

F. ITEMIZED ESTIMATE

Utilize the Project Cost Estimate Sheet.

G. VICINITY MAP

Provide a project vicinity map

H. TYPICAL SECTION SKETCH

Provide a typical section sketch for the project including R/W limits and the proposed pavement structural section, slopes, and lane and shoulder dimensions.

**LOCAL GOVERNMENT FIVE-YEAR HIGHWAY CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM
PROJECT COST ESTIMATE**

ITEM	UNIT	QTY.	UNIT PRICE	TOTAL PRICE
Site clearing and grubbing	L. Sum	1		
Roadway Excavation	Cu. Yd.			
Drainage Excavation	Cu. Yd.			
Borrow	Cu. Yd.			
Aggregate Base	Cu. Yd.			
Asphaltic Concrete (AC)	Ton			
Pipe Culvert	Ln. Ft.			
Guardrail	Ln. Ft.			
Signing and Pavement Marking	Sq. Ft.			
Sidewalk	Sq. Ft.			
Curb and Gutter	Ln. Ft.			
SUBTOTAL ROADWAY				
Construction Survey (1-3%)*	L. Sum			
Furnish Water Supply, Dust Palliative (1-2 %)*	L. Sum			
Traffic Control (8%)*	L. Sum			
Mobilization (10%)*	L. Sum			
Quality Control (1 - 2%)*	L. Sum			
Contingencies (___%)*	L. Sum			
Construction Engineering (15%)*	L. Sum			
Change Orders (5%)*	L. Sum			
CONSTRUCTION TOTAL				
INFLATION FACTOR (___%/YR) X Const. Total=Future Year Cost				

*Percentages are averages based on past construction history for Arizona.



SouthEastern Arizona Governments Organization

MEMO TO: SEAGO TRANSPORTATION ADVISORY COMMITTEE

FROM: EUGENE WEEKS, SEAGO TRANSPORTATION PLANNER

DATE: JANUARY 4, 2007

SUBJECT: LEDGER BALANCES

Projected SEAGO ledger balances are shown below.

GW:YU

Projected SEAGO Ledger Balances – 2003 to 2011

Action	OA Rate	Impacts		Running Balances	
		\$	OA	STP	OA
FY 2003 Carry-Forwards:				657,037	1,130,007
FY 2004 Allocation:	97.97%	1,499,738	1,469,351	2,156,775	2,599,358
Old Tucson Highway (Santa Cruz)		(2,846,783)	(2,999,476)	(690,008)	(400,118)
LTAP		(10,000)	(10,000)	(700,008)	(410,118)
Loan from NACOG		700,008	273,046	0	(137,072)
Loan from ADOT		0	137,072	0	0
FY 2004 Carry Forwards				0	0
FY 2005 Allocation	98.55%	1,499,738	1,477,970	1,499,738	1,477,969
Payback to NACOG		(700,008)	(273,046)	799,730	1,204,923
Payback to ADOT		0	(137,072)	799,730	1,067,851
Tech Transfer (LTAP)		(10,000)	(10,000)	789,730	1,057,851
FY 2005 Carry Forward		0	0	789,730	1,057,851
FY 2006 Allocation	93.31%	1,499,738	1,399,375	2,289,468	2,457,226
20th Ave. (Safford)		(2,846,783)	(2,999,476)	(557,315)	(542,250)
Tech. Transfer (LTAP)		(10,000)	(10,000)	(567,315)	(552,250)
Loan from NACOG		567,315	552,250	0	0
FY 2006 Carry Forward		0	0	0	0
FY 2007 Allocation	93.31%	1,499,738	1,399,375	1,499,738	1,399,375
Payback to NACOG		(567,315)	(552,250)	932,423	847,125
Tech. Transfer (LTAP)		(10,000)	(10,000)	922,423	837,125
FY 2007 Carry Forward				922,423	837,125
FY 2008 Allocation	93.31%	1,499,738	1,399,375	2,422,161	2,236,500
Tech. Transfer (LTAP)		(10,000)	(10,000)	2,412,161	2,226,500
FY 2008 Carry Forward				2,412,161	2,226,500
FY 2009 allocation	93.31%	1,499,738	1,399,375	3,911,899	3,625,875
Charleston Road (Sierra Vista)		(2,999,476)	(2,999,476)	912,423	626,399
Tech. Transfer (LTAP)		(10,000)	(10,000)	902,423	616,399
FY 2009 Carry Forward				902,423	616,399
FY 2010 Allocation	93.31%	1,499,738	1,399,375	2,402,161	2,015,773
Tech. Transfer (LTAP)		(10,000)	(10,000)	2,392,161	2,005,773
FY 2010 Project (No project)		0	0	2,392,161	2,005,773
FY 2010 Carry Forward				2,392,161	2,005,773
FY 2011 Allocation	93.31%	1,499,738	1,399,375	3,891,899	3,405,148
Tech. Transfer (LTAP)		(10,000)	(10,000)	3,881,899	3,395,148
FY 2011 Project		(2,999,476)	(2,999,476)	882,423	395,672
FY 2011 Carry Forward				882,423	395,672

*Estimated appropriation and OA Rate.



SouthEastern Arizona Governments Organization

MEMO TO: SEAGO TRANSPORTATION ADVISORY COMMITTEE

FROM: EUGENE WEEKS, SEAGO TRANSPORTATION PLANNER

DATE: JANUARY 4, 2007

SUBJECT: ROUND 14 ENHANCEMENT APPLICATIONS

The State Transportation Board (STB) met on Friday, **December 15, 2006**, at the City of Tucson Council Chambers, 255 West Alameda St. The enhancement projects were approved by the STB as presented below. The TERC opted to recommend funding above this year's available allocation in the amount of \$109,166 using monies left over from previous years.

Accordingly, we must add these projects to the SEAGO TIP. Also attached is a copy of a proposed amendment to the SEAGO TIP which includes the addition of the one "Local" Transportation Enhancement Project.

EW:YU

Attachment

Round 14 TERC Evaluation Results

App. No.	Sponsor	Project Name	Federal Aid	Allocation	Total	TERC	Avg.
LOCAL APPLICATIONS					\$7,000,000		
MAG8L	Avondale	Pedestrian & Bicycle Safety Program	\$11,316	\$6,988,684	117	15	7.80
PAG1L	Pascua Yaqui Trb	Vat Itom Voo'o Pedestrian Path	\$500,000	\$6,488,684	126	15	840
YMPO2L	Yuma	Yuma Main Canal Shared-Use Pathway Extension	\$500,000	\$5,988,684	151	15	10.07
FMPO1L	Flagstaff	Rte 66 E Flagstaff Urban Trails Sys: Country Club Dr.-Mall Dr.	\$466,569	\$5,522,115	167	15	11.13
MAG1L	Phoenix	So. Mtn. Community College Pedestrian Crossing	\$491,151	\$5,030,964	168	15	11.20
SEAGO1 L	Sierra Vista	Coronado Dr. MUP Carmelita Dr. to Tacoma St.	\$375,991	\$4,654,973	188	15	12.53
NACOG2L	Winslow	Renaissance on Route 66 Ph. III	\$500,000	\$4,154,973	189	15	12.60
CYMP0IL	Prescott Valley	PV Pipeline MUP Ph. I Southern Terminus	\$500,000	\$3,654,973	199	15	13.27
MAG3L	Glendale	Grand Canal Ped. Pathway: Loop 101 to N. 107 th Ave.	\$500,000	\$3,154,973	211	15	14.07
PAG9L	Tucson	Treat Avenue Pedestrian Bridge and Walkway	\$170,087	\$2,984,886	219	15	14.60
PAG2L	Pima County	Picture Rocks and Desert Winds Safe Routes to School	\$500,000	\$2,484,886	230	15	15.33
WACOG2L	Kingman	Eastern Pathway Ph. 1: Hualapai Mtn. Rd. to Louise Ave.	\$500,000	\$1,984,886	231	15	15.40
NACOG5L	Apache Go.	Tsaile Mutti-Use Trail	\$471,500	\$1,513,386	242	15	16.13
MAG9L	Gilbert	Heritage District Downtown Pedestrian Project	\$500,000	\$1,013,386	249	15	16.60
NACOG3L	Coconino Co.	Pinewood Blvd. Sidewalk	\$500,000	\$513,386	257	15	17.13
NACOG&	Pinetop/Lkside	Woodland Road Sidewalk	\$164,719	\$348,667	269	15	17.93
PAG3L	Tucson/Pima Co.	El Paso & Southwestern Greenway, Ph 1: 22nd St. to Cushing St.	\$457,833	(\$109,166)	289	15	19.27
NACOG1L	Williams	Arizona State Railroad Museum	\$500,000		292	15	19.47
YMPO3L	Yuma	W. Wetlands Pkwy. Scenic Beautification & Landscaping	\$500,000		293	15	19.53
MAG2L	Scottsdale	AZ Canal MUP: 64th St. to Goldwater Blvd.	\$500,000		294	15	19.60
MAG6L	Mesa/ASU	Twining Ped. And Bicycle Mall, ASU Polytechnic Campus	\$395,000		300	15	20.00
SEAG02L	Safford	Golf Course Rd. & Highland Canal Path Segments	\$236,669		304	15	20.27
PAG4L	Pima County	Divided Urban Pathway: Campbell Ave. to First Ave.	\$326,597		306	15	20.40
WACOG3L	La Paz County	Northern Riverside Dr. MP 2.3 Murd-Use Lane and Beautification	\$500,000		340	15	22.67
PAG5L	Marana	Santa Cruz River Shared Use Path Ph. III	\$389,459		343	15	22.87
YMPOIL	Somerton	Somerton Canal Shared-Use Path: US95 to Co. 17th St.	\$496,534		349	15	23.27
PAGIOL	Pima Co.	Trails End Wash Commuter Bridge	\$469,203		359	15	23.93
PAG11L	Tucson	Five Points Historic Gateway Pedestrian Safety	\$452,211		376	15	25.07
MAG4L	Scottsdale	AZ Canal MUP: Chaparral Rd. to McDonald Dr.	\$500,000		407	15	27.13
PAG8L	Tucson	Tucson Blvd. Enhancement	\$152,046		413	15	27.53
PAGM	Oro Valley	Canada del Oro Shared Use path Ph. 11	\$500,000		418	15	27.87

App. No.	Sponsor	Project Name	Federal Aid	Allocation	Total	TERC	Avg.
MAG5L	Avondale	Agua Fria Connedor Trail Ph. If	\$500,000		453	15	30.20
SEAG04L	Greenlee Co.	Rehabilitation of Two Historic Bridges	\$265,025		465	15	31.00
MAGIOL	Surprise	Bell Rd. Sidewalk Replacement Project: 141stAve.to101	\$500,000		467	15	31.13
WACOGIL	Quartzsite	Town of Quartzsite Welcome Signs	\$150,352		473	15	31.53
MAG11L	Litchfield Park	Landscap)e Enhancements for the Litchfield Park Trails System	\$85,000		481	15	32.07
NACOGM	Navajo Nation	Antelope Canyon Interpretive Visitor Center	\$200,000		485	15	32.33
MAG7L	Litchfield Park	Litchfield Rd. & Wigwam Blvd. Ped. Underpass & Art	\$500,000		499	15	33.27
NACOG8L	Navajo Nation	Ejinetah Scenic Rd. Interpretive Center	\$116,555		517	15	34.47
SEAG03L	Greenlee Co.	Restoration of Four Wooden Bridges	\$456,892		522	15	34.80
			\$16,762,764				

STATE APPLICATIONS

				\$4,000,000.00			
SEAGO1S	ADOT	US70 Duncan Sandra Day O'Connor Walkway MP 378.9	\$205,178.00	\$3,794,822.00	101	15	6.73
NACOG2S	ADOT	SR1 79 Sedona Pedestrian Lighting and Landscaping Improvements	\$450,000.00	\$3,344,822.00	106	15	7.07
CAAG2S	ADOT	SR347 & SR238 Maricopa Sidewalk Improvements Phase 1	\$479,834.00	\$2,864,988.00	127	15	8.47
MAG2S	ADOT	US60 MUP MP1 07.5 to 108.9	\$855,708.00	\$2,009,280.00	138	15	9.20
NACOG4S	ADOT	SR64 Tusayan Enhancement Project	\$759,162.00	\$1,250,118.00	149	15	9.93
CAAG1S	ADOT	US60 Apache Junction E)dt 197 Land form Graphics	\$623,761.00	\$626,357.00	150	15	10.00
YMPO1S	ADOT	US95 Somerton West Gateway	\$540,936.00	\$85,421.00	156	15	10.40
CYMPO1S	ADOT	SR69 Prescott Valley MUP Phase III Western Terminus	\$851,010.00		163	15	10.87
NACOG1S	ADOT	SR260 Lakeside Village Redevelopment Area Streetscape	\$170,583.00		169	15	11.27
SEAGO2S	ADOT	SR80 St. David Shared Use Path MP 300	\$237,051.00		176	15	11.73
SEAGO3S	ADOT	SR90 Sierra Vista MUP Seventh St. to Coronado Dr.	\$895,731.00		180	15	12.00
CYMPO2S	ADOT	SR89 Chino Valley Median Landscaping MP324	\$340,838.00		183	15	12.20
WACOG1S	ADOT	US95 Lake Havasu City Landscaping Phase III	\$498,522.00		183	15	12.20
PAG1S	ADOT	1-19 Esperanza Blvd. Bicycle & Pedestrian Enhancement	\$571,863.00		188	15	12.53
NACOG3S	ADOT	SR89A Rdabout Landscp Blk Hills DrJVerde Hts Dr., Cottonwd	\$277,239.00		208	15	13.87
PAG2S	ADOT	SR77 Oracle Rd. Calle Concordia to Tangerine Rd. Ped. Path	\$401,427.00		211	15	14.07
SEAGO7S	ADOT	1-10(SR90 Traffic Interchange Enhancement	\$412,657.00		242	15	16.13
NACOG5S	ADOT	US60 Show Low Douce of Clubs Old Linden to Show Low Creek	\$750,000.00		251	15	16.73
SEAGO6S	ADOT	SR92 Sierra Vista MUP Buffalo Soldier Trail To Kachina Trail	\$753,680.00		251	15	16.73
SW1	ASM/UA	AZSite Cultural Resource Inventory Public Access	\$334,215.00		252	15	16.80
WACOG2S	ADOT	SR72 Multi-Use Lane from SR72/US60 to MP45 – Vicksburg	\$952,305.00		253	15	16.87
SEAGO5S	ADOT	SR82/83 Sonoita Crossroads Enhancement	\$756,805.00		260	15	17.33

App. No.	Sponsor	Project Name	Federal Aid	Allocation	Total	TERC	Avg.
SW2	ADOT	State Highway System Wildlife Use of Culverts Inventory	\$354,897.00		301	15	20.07
SW3	ADOT	State Highway System Mountain Lion Corridor Inventory	\$435,532.00		339	15	22.60
			\$13,919,321.00				

10/5/2006



SouthEastern Arizona Governments Organization

MEMO TO: SEAGO TRANSPORTATION ADVISORY COMMITTEE

FROM: EUGENE WEEKS, SEAGO TRANSPORTATION PLANNER

DATE: JANUARY 4, 2007

SUBJECT: SEAGO TIP

As you can see from the TIP, our available funding is pretty much spoken for through 2010/2011, but we can discuss the feasibility of adding another project to the TIP with due process. The Graham County Safford Bridge and **SIERRA VISTA, CORONADO DR. MUP** projects have been added to the SEAGO TIP.

TAC ACTION REQUESTED:

A motion to recommend approval of SEAGO TIP.

Made by:_____.

Seconded by:_____.

EW:YU

SPONSOR	PROJECT LOCATION	TYPE WORK	LANES BEFORE	LANES AFTER	LENGTH	FED AID TYPE	FEDERAL FUNDS	LOCAL MATCH	TOTAL COST
FISCAL YEAR 2007									
SANTA CRUZ	OLD TUCSON HWY	RECONSTR.	2	2	2.10	STP	\$2,999,476	\$161,672	\$3,161,148
BISBEE	OLD BISBEE	ENHNCMNT				ENHNCMNT	\$188,600	\$10,750	\$199,350
DOUGLAS	FOUNTAIN RESTORATION	ENHNCMNT				ENHNCMNT	\$47,432	\$2,704	\$50,136
DOUGLAS	A AVENUE	ENHNCMNT				ENHNCMNT	\$195,000	\$11,115	\$206,115
DOUGLAS	PASEO DE LA AMISTAD	ENHNCMNT				ENHNCMNT	\$442,000	\$25,194	\$467,194
DOUGLAS	CHINO ROAD	RECONSTR.	2	2	2.50	HURF	\$1,469,322	HURF @ 90%	\$1,322,390
DOUGLAS	CHINO ROAD*	RECONSTR.	2	2	0.50	HURF	\$178,418	HURF @ 90%	\$160,576
NOGALES	MAIN ST.	ENHNCMNT				ENHNCMNT	\$235,750	\$13,438	\$249,188
NOGALES	TERRACE AVE	ENHNCMNT				ENHNCMNT	\$500,000	\$30,223	\$530,223
SAFFORD	DISCOVERY PARK	ENHNCMNT				ENHNCMNT	\$152,295	\$135,206	\$287,501
SAFFORD	GLEN MEADOWS PATH	ENHNCMNT				ENHNCMNT	\$287,500	\$16,388	\$303,888
SANTA CRUZ COUNTY	TUBAC (ANZA PLAZA)	ENHNCMNT				ENHNCMNT	\$155,950	\$31,190	\$187,140
SIERRA VISTA	BUFFALO SOLDIER TRAIL	ENHNCMNT				ENHNCMNT	\$500,000	\$71,236	\$571,236
SIERRA VISTA	SNYDER BLVD	ENHNCMNT				ENHNCMNT	\$499,225	\$26,460	\$525,685
WILLCOX	TRAIN DEPOT	ENHNCMNT				ENHNCMNT	\$245,735	\$14,855	\$260,590
WILLCOX	FT. GRANT RD	ENHNCMNT				ENHNCMNT	\$393,943	\$20,879	\$414,822
USFS	THREE-WAY	ENHNCMNT				ENHNCMNT	\$293,783	\$29,090	\$322,873
SANTA CRUZ COUNTY	RIO RICO	ENHNCMNT				ENHNCMNT	\$437,472	\$35,777	\$473,249
PATAGONIA	PATAGONIA TOWN HALL	ENHNCMNT				ENHNCMNT	\$111,060	\$6,700	\$117,760
GRAHAM COUNTY	SAFFORD BRIDGE	CONSTRUCTION				HPP/BR	\$12,036,699	\$1,911,093	\$13,947,792
GRAHAM COUNTY	SAFFORD BRIDGE	BRIDGE DESIGN				BR/SEC 115	\$1,000,000	\$0	\$1,000,000
COCHISE COUNTY	DAVIS ROAD	RECONSTR.				SEC 115	\$3,000,000	\$0	\$3,000,000
SAFFORD/THATCHER	20th AVENUE	ENHNCMNT				ENHNCMNT	\$486,712	\$34,427	\$521,139
SAFFORD/THATCHER	20th AVENUE	RECONSTR.	2-3	5	0.83	STP	\$2,999,476	\$161,672	\$3,161,148
SIERRA VISTA	CORONADO DR. MUP	ENHNCMNT				ENHNCMNT	\$375,991	??	??
LTAP						STP	\$10,000		\$10,000
FISCAL YEAR 2008									
SIERRA VISTA	CHARLESTON ROAD	RECONSTR.	2	5	1.6	STP	\$2,999,476	\$161,672	\$3,161,148
LTAP						STP	\$10,000		\$10,000
FISCAL YEAR 2009									
LTAP						STP	\$10,000		\$10,000
FISCAL YEAR 2010									
LTAP						STP	\$10,000		\$10,000
FISCAL YEAR 2011									
LTAP						STP	\$10,000		\$10,000

* This section to be accomplished using local forces.

