



**SouthEastern Arizona Governments Organization**

MEMO TO: SEAGO TRANSPORTATION ADVISORY COMMITTEE

FROM: EUGENE WEEKS, SEAGO TRANSPORTATION PLANNER

DATE: MARCH 16, 2007

SUBJECT: THURSDAY, MARCH 22, 2007, TAC MEETING

The next SEAGO TAC meeting will be held on Thursday, March 22, 2007, in Benson. This meeting will focus on the mini design concept reports (Santa Cruz County and Bisbee), functional classification instructions, and a HURF SWAP presentation. If you are planning to submit a project for the year 2010–2011 time frame, I encourage you to address the mini DCR guidelines and prepare your presentation 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.

Please bring your copy of the Santa Cruz and Bisbee mini DCRs with you to the meeting.

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

118 Arizona Street, Bisbee, Arizona 85603

FAX (520) 432-5858

(520) 432-5301

SEAGO MEMBER-ENTITIES: COUNTIES OF COCHISE, GRAHAM, GREENLEE, AND SANTA CRUZ. CITIES AND TOWNS OF BENSON, BISBEE, CLIFTON, DOUGLAS, DUNCAN, HUACHUCA CITY, NOGALES, PATAGONIA, PIMA, SAFFORD, SIERRA VISTA, THATCHER, TOMBSTONE, AND WILLCOX.

G:\Documents\Transportation\8 SEAGO TAC\1 - 2007 TAC Files - Docs\TAC MEETINGS\2 - March 07\07 MAR 22 SEAGO TAC mtg.doc

SEAGO TRANSPORTATION ADVISORY COMMITTEE

DATE: March 22, 2007  
TIME: 10:00 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

HURF PROCESS .....6  
John Dickson (ADOT).

FUNCTIONAL CLASSIFICATION  
Charlene Fitzgerald (ADOT).....7

MINI DESIGN CONCEPT REPORT (DCR) questions.....8

LOCAL GOVERNMENT FIVE-YEAR HIGHWAY CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM  
PROJECT NOMINATION SHEET AND MINI DESIGN CONCEPT REPORT.....10

SANTA CRUZ COUNTY MINI (PRELIMINARY) DESIGN CONCEPT REPORT  
(DCR) Victor Gabilondo (Santa Cruz County).....13

CITY OF BISBEE MINI (PRELIMINARY) DESIGN CONCEPT REPORT (DCR)  
Jeffrey Schwartz (City of Bisbee).....14

REGIONAL FIVE-YEAR PROGRAM  
Status of Local Projects (Project Sponsors)  
Local Governments' Report (ADOT)

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)

Action may be taken on any item on the agenda.

**MINUTES OF THE  
TRANSPORTATION ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
COCHISE COMMUNITY COLLEGE  
BENSON, ARIZONA  
JANUARY 25, 2006**

|                      |  |   |
|----------------------|--|---|
| Members Present:     | Robert Porter<br>Scott Dooley<br>Michael Bryce<br>Carlos De La Torre<br>Dave Bonner<br>Jeffrey Schwartz<br>Dennis Alvarez<br>Byron Robertson<br>Bradley J. Hamilton      | City of Safford<br>City of Sierra Vista<br>Graham County<br>City of Douglas<br>City of Willcox<br>City of Bisbee<br>Santa Cruz County<br>Town of Huachuca City<br>Town of Benson                              |
| Members Absent:      | Manuel Tapia<br>Heath Brown<br>Victor Gabilondo<br>Pat Kelly<br>Dick Schaffer<br>Phil Ronnerud<br>Dennis Lines<br>Randy Heiss<br>Will Wright<br>Anne Thurman<br>Ray Pini | City of Nogales<br>Town of Thatcher<br>Santa Cruz County<br>City of Tombstone<br>Cochise County<br>Greenlee County<br>Town of Pima<br>Town of Patagonia<br>Graham County<br>Town of Duncan<br>Town of Clifton |
| ADOT and Other Staff | Paul David<br>Natalie Clark<br>Charlene Fitzgerald   | ADOT Safford District<br>ADOT TPD<br>ADOT   |
| SEAGO Staff:         | Richard Gaar<br>Eugene Weeks   | Executive Director<br>Transportation Planner  |
| Other(s):            | Antonio Padilla  | Santa Cruz County   |

## **CALL TO ORDER/INTRODUCTIONS**

Chairman, Robert Porter, City of Safford called the meeting to order at approximately 9:11 a.m., and introduced the Public Work Directors, Dave Bonner, City of Willcox, Byron Robertson, Town of Huachuca City, Bradley J. Hamilton, Town of Benson, and the ADOT Representative, Ms Charlene Fitzgerald.

## **APPROVAL OF MINUTES**

A motion to approve the January 25, 2007, minutes was made by Scott Dooley, City of Sierra Vista and was seconded by Mr. Carlos De La Torre, City of Douglas. The minutes were approved as presented.

## **STATE HIGHWAY FIVE-YEAR PROGRAM**

Mr. Paul David, ADOT, Safford District provided members of the TAC a list of Safford District's Major projects complete or under construction FY 07 and FY 08. Ms Natalie Clark provided additional project as follows: York Valley pathway and the Clifton Fencing projects.

## **TUCSON DISTRICT ENGINEERS' REPORT**

No Report. Tucson district engineer was unable to attend.

## **ADOT TRANSPORTATION PLANNING**

ADOT Representative, Ms Charlene Fitzgerald reported on the various studies.

Douglas – SATS – received final draft and will have a Douglas TAC meeting for final comments and review.

Nogales – A final transit feasibility review and implementation plan was completed in November, 2006.

Benson – SATS – is preparing for a 2<sup>nd</sup> round of open houses and working paper # 2 is in the process of being finalized.

Greenlee – SATS – has completed revisions to working paper for existing and future conditions, completed the transit element and is waiting on safety data.

Safford/Graham/Thatcher – An IGA is in progress.

## **REGIONAL FIVE-YEAR PROGRAMS**

Robert Porter, City of Safford reported the Discovery Park and Glenn Meadows path sections are ready to bid. The City of Safford will be self-administering these projects.

Scott Dooley, City of Sierra Vista reported on the Charleston road widening project. A RFQ is out to obtain a design consultant and that process should be completed by the end of February, 2007 with a final design ready to bid in July, 2007.

The Buffalo Soldier Trail MUP project has completed the environmental process and is proceeding to 65% design.

The Snyder road MUP project is in the initial environmental process and preliminary design.

The city was awarded a grant to go proceed with the Coronado MUP project.

## **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, City of Safford     |
| TAC Vice Chairperson | Scott Dooley, City of Sierra Vista |

The incumbent TAC Chair, Mr. Porter, stated that he was able to hold the office again, but felt that if anyone else wanted to serve in that capacity, they would be more than welcome. The TAC listened graciously, and with little discussion reelected Mr. Robert L. Porter as the TAC Chair, and Mr. Scott Dooley, as the TAC Vice-Chair.

## **CURRENT SEAGO TRANSPORTATION POLICY GUIDELINES**

The new SEAGO TAC members were appreciative to have the policy guidelines available. There was little discussion, but Ms Fitzgerald requested some changes and those will be reflected in The next update.

## **NEXT SEAGO PROJECT**

Santa Cruz County provided a courtesy copy of a mini (Preliminary) Design Concept Report (DCR) for Rio Rico West Frontage Road, from Yavapai Drive to Calle Calabasas to all SEAGO TAC members at the November 16, 2006, TAC meeting. Mr. Dennis Alvarez, representing Santa Cruz County, updated the members on the history of the project and asked for comments, suggestions, and recommendation on how to proceed. Mr Gaar, SEAGO, provided additional insight on how projects should proceed for approval and subsequently to be added to the SEAGO TIP. After much discussion and many questions, the TAC recommended that the mini (Preliminary) Design Concept Report (DCR) for Rio Rico West Frontage Road, from Yavapai Drive to Calle Calabasas to be held over for further review.

## **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. There were no questions on this subject.

## **ROUND 14 STATE AND LOCAL ENHANCEMENT PROJECTS**

SEAGO TAC members accepted the results as presented.

## **SEAGO TRANSPORTATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM (TIP)**

The TAC ACTION REQUESTED:

A motion to recommend approval of the SEAGO TIP.

Made by Mr. Michael Bryce, Graham County and seconded by Mr. Carlos De La Torre, City of Douglas. The SEAGO TIP was approved unanimously with one project added: The **Coronado Dr. MUP Carmelita Dr. to Tacoma St., Sierra Vista, Az.**

## **DATE OF NEXT MEETING**

The date of the next meeting was set for March 22, 2007. The March 22, 2007, date provides SEAGO time to prepare the mini DCRs for the SEAGO Administrative Council on May 4, and Executive Board on May 19 for their review and approval prior to sending them to ADOT.

## **OTHER BUSINESS**

Ms Charlene Fitzgerald asked that if she and Mr John Dickson could provide a Functional Classification update and a HURF PROCESS update presentations in the hope that this would help in getting some of our questions answered on HMPS data and on getting projects through the process for funding. These presentations are on the agenda for March 22, 2007.

## **ADJOURNMENT**

The meeting adjourned at approximately 11:10 A.M.



SouthEastern Arizona Governments Organization

**MEMO TO: SEAGO TRANSPORTATION ADVISORY COMMITTEE**

**FROM: EUGENE WEEKS, SEAGO TRANSPORTATION PLANNER**

**DATE: MARCH 16, 2007**

**SUBJECT: Highway User Revenue Fund (HURF) PROCESS**

The HURF PROCESS presentation will assist SEAGO and local agencies with planning, project development, and receiving of HURF exchange funds for local government's projects. The HURF exchange program, in accordance with Arizona Revised Statue 28-6993.G, allows a local agency to exchange their Federal funds programmed in the appropriate Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) for state HURF funds at a 90% exchange rate.



SouthEastern Arizona Governments Organization

MEMO TO: SEAGO TRANSPORTATION ADVISORY COMMITTEE

FROM: EUGENE WEEKS, SEAGO TRANSPORTATION PLANNER

DATE: MARCH 16, 2007

SUBJECT: FUNCTIONAL CLASSIFICATION

The 1991 Intermodal Surface Transportation Act required each state to functionally reclassify its public roads and streets. ADOT was assigned to lead Arizona's efforts. Arizona's rural councils of governments were consulted to provide input on functional reclassification within their jurisdictional areas. The new functional classification of Arizona's public roadways was completed in 1992. Arizona's submission was reviewed and approved by the Federal Highway Administration and the Secretary of Transportation, and reported to Congress in 1993. This presentation will bring us up to speed on the process on where we are today.



**SouthEastern Arizona Governments Organization**

MEMO TO: SEAGO TRANSPORTATION ADVISORY COMMITTEE

FROM: EUGENE WEEKS, SEAGO TRANSPORTATION PLANNER

DATE: March 14 2007

SUBJECT: MINI DESIGN CONCEPT REPORT (DCR) questions

**PURPOSE: To make the progression of a project to the mini DCR stage less formal, much less costly, garnish support, and to expedite the project through the SEAGO process.**

Can Funding only be used for new construction; not maintenance?

Is a local match of 5.7% required from the entity?

ARE only Functional Classified streets are eligible?

Is a maximum of two years of funding (\$3 million) is available for any one project?

Can funding be used to buy right of way?

Are design costs eligible for reimbursement?

How will OA impact the funding available?

If HURF SWAP is an option and how it will impact design, funding, reviews etc?

Who reviews and approves the construction plans and plan review costs?

Does the applicant pay the cost of the mini DCR preparation after?

It is tentatively approved for funding?

Can the TAC set a date (or dates) every year when we accept projects for the TIP instead of just when ever they come in?



## SouthEastern Arizona Governments Organization

### 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).

3. 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.



SouthEastern Arizona Governments Organization

MEMO TO: SEAGO TRANSPORTATION ADVISORY COMMITTEE

FROM: EUGENE WEEKS, SEAGO TRANSPORTATION PLANNER

DATE: March 16, 2007

SUBJECT: Santa Cruz County mini Design Concept Report (DCR)  
for Rio Rico West Frontage Road, from Yavapai Drive to Calle Calabasas

This project will complete the frontage road connections between the Rio Rico and Ruby road TI's.

The completed length of roadway will be a distance of approximately 3.1 miles and the estimated cost for this project is \$2,842, 617.00.

**TAC ACTION REQUESTED**

A motion to recommend subject project go forward to the SEAGO Administrative Council on May 4, 2007.



SouthEastern Arizona Governments Organization

MEMO TO: SEAGO TRANSPORTATION ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
FROM: EUGENE WEEKS, SEAGO TRANSPORTATION PLANNER  
DATE: MARCH 16, 2007  
SUBJECT: CITY OF BISBEE MINI DESIGN CONCEPT REPORT (DCR)  
For Arizona St from Cole Ave. to Hazard Street

**TAC ACTION REQUESTED**

A motion to recommend subject project go forward to the SEAGO Administrative Council on May 4, 2007.