



# SIERRA VISTA METROPOLITAN PLANNING ORGANIZATION EXECUTIVE BOARD: WORK SESSION AGENDA: NOVEMBER 14, 2019

---

## MEETING LOCATION:

City of Sierra Vista: City Hall  
City Manager's Conference Room  
1011 North Coronado Drive  
Sierra Vista, AZ 85635

To attend the meeting by telephone:  
Call 1-415-655-0001. Meeting # 287 957 271.  
Enter # for Attendee ID. For Arizona Relay  
Service use 1-800-367-8939, or dial 7-1-1.

## MEETING DATE AND TIME:

November 14, 2019  
1:00 p.m.

## FOR MORE INFORMATION OR TO REQUEST ACCOMMODATION FOR SPECIAL NEEDS:

Website: [www.svmppo.org](http://www.svmppo.org)  
Email: [SVMPO@SierraVistaAZ.gov](mailto:SVMPO@SierraVistaAZ.gov)  
Administrator Phone: 520-515-8525

---

## SVMPO BOARD OF DIRECTORS

*One or more members may participate via teleconference*

Chair:	Rick Mueller, Mayor, City of Sierra Vista
Vice-Chair:	Tom Borer, Supervisor, Cochise County Designated Alternate: Peggy Judd, Supervisor, Cochise County
Member:	Rachel Gray, Councilmember, City of Sierra Vista
Member:	Sarah Pacheco, Councilmember, City of Sierra Vista
Member:	Joy Banks, Councilmember, Town of Huachuca City
Member (Non-Voting)	Rod Lane, Arizona Department of Transportation

**STAFF:** SVMPO Administrator: Karen L. Lamberton, AICP

---

### 1. CALL TO ORDER AND ROLL CALL

### 2. SVMPO and CITY OF SIERRA VISTA HOSTING AGREEMENT

The Board will discuss possible revisions to the existing SVMPO and City of Sierra Vista agreement for hosting the SVMPO and providing various support services.

### 3. SVMPO EXECUTIVE BOARD COMPOSITION

The Board will discuss possible revisions to the existing SVMPO Executive Board composition and approved voting members.

### 4. WORK SESSION BREAK

The Board may take a short 5-10 minute break, if desired by Board members, before the next Work Session item.

## **5. SVMPO MEMBER JURISDICTION MATCH REQUIREMENTS**

The Board will discuss existing regional match requirements and review different methods for determining local match contributions to the regional MPO work efforts. Member jurisdictions may share their preferences for contributing to the MPO operations; these may include cash contributions; in-kind contributions for services or staff participation. The Board may also discuss the existing reimbursement process requirements and the financial sponsorship of the City of Sierra Vista towards MPO activities.

## **6. FUTURE DISCUSSION ITEMS AND BOARD REQUESTS**

This is an opportunity for Board members to identify other potential discussion items and/or dates for additional Board Work Sessions. Future work session items may include:

- ❖ Advisory Committee Structure; Possible Changes to the Bicycle/Pedestrian Advisory Committee Membership
- ❖ SVMPO Administrator's relationship to the Board; Contract Job Description

## **7. DIRECTION TO THE SVMPO ADMINISTRATOR**

The Executive Board may provide direction to the SVMPO Administrator, based on the Work Session discussion, for future action items to be presented at either the scheduled November 21, 2019 Executive Board meeting, or for additional discussion at another Work Session at a future date/time to be scheduled.

## **8. ADJOURNMENT**

SVMPO Work Sessions are informal meetings where Board members may prepare for upcoming regular Board meetings, have staff and/or agency briefings on issues, and provide an opportunity for detailed discussions on topics of regional concern among themselves. These meetings are open to the public but time is not reserved for public comment. Members of the public may attend in person, or by phone, and may share written comments through the SVMPO website.

The meeting room is accessible to those individuals with mobility impairments. Individuals with disabilities who require special accommodations or have limited English proficiency and are in need of an interpreter may contact Karen Lamberton at 520.515.8525 at least 72 hours before the meeting time to request accommodations.

Si necesita acomodaciones especiales o un interprete para esta conferencia, debe pnerse en contacto con Karen Lamberton al numero 520.515.8525 por lo menos setenta y dos (72) hora antes de la conferencia.



# Sierra Vista Metropolitan Planning Organization Memorandum

**To:** SVMPO Executive Board  
**From:** Karen L. Lamberton, AICP, SVMPO Administrator  
**Date:** November 14, 2019  
**Subject:** SVMPO and City of Sierra Vista Agreement

---

The Sierra Vista MPO (SVMPO) has been operating since its inception with a June 2014 Agreement with the City of Sierra Vista for hosting staff and providing various services. This Intergovernmental Agreement was executed by the City of Sierra Vista Council and the signatory of the Vice-Chair of the SVMPO. One Amendment was processed to adjust the value of the office space and site services in May of 2015 (*Resolution 2015-052*)

In 2019 two compliance audits were conducted by the Arizona Dept. of Transportation of SVMPO operations and underlying documentation. Recommendations were made to the SVMPO regarding clarification of what hosting services were being provided and how those costs were being reimbursed.

## Background

The City of Sierra Vista has indicated their willingness to continue the hosting agreement with the SVMPO and, to date, the SVMPO Board has supported that coordination continuing forward. The Board may discuss that burden upon the City of Sierra Vista but previous guidance of the Board was to continue that relationship and to re-visit the existing Agreement with the Sierra Vista's City Manager's office.

Host services in the existing Agreement are described in generic sentences to include the provision of: employees, office space, office equipment, financial, grant administration and accountings services; procurement of goods and services for operating and planning; legal services; conference meeting space, telecommunications equipment, internet services, mail, transportation to conduct SVMPO business, mapping facilities or service as well as all associated furnishing, equipment and supplies, including the hosting of a website, telephone services and legal notice posting.

The existing Agreement combines all hosting and site services into one single cost item to the SVMPO of \$24,000 a year/\$2,500 a month. These costs have been credited to the City of Sierra Vista's In-Kind Match amounts. In addition, the SVMPO has also included ESRI ArcMap software licenses and the MPO Cell Phone Service costs as Sierra Vista In-Kind contributions.

## SVMPO/Sierra Vista Agreement Proposed Changes

**The SVMPO Board members will discuss any questions or concerns that they might have about the proposed changes to the existing SVMPO/Sierra Vista hosting Agreement. Suggestions will be shared for discussion among SVMPO Board members.**

- 1) Specific services would be defined in individual sections for the following departments: Procurement; Legal; Human Resources.
- 2) The City of Sierra Vista would be explicitly identified as the SVMPO's Fiscal Agent. Language from the executed Joint Project Agreement with ADOT regarding Fiscal Agent requirements would be stated verbatim within the Agreement.
- 3) The SVMPO Board would be explicitly noted as the signatory for all SVMPO documents and stated as holding signatory authority.
- 4) Employment of SVMPO Personnel would be clarified that these employees are employees of the Sierra Vista MPO, but in all other aspects would be considered to be employees of the City of Sierra Vista (for the purposes of hiring, processing payroll, handling health insurance and other benefits, etc).
- 5) Office hosting costs would be based upon current commercial cost rates for leasing commercial B space within the City of Sierra Vista (currently estimated at \$14 dollars a square foot). Two office spaces and dedicated SVMPO posting board area equate to 340 square feet of dedicated MPO space within the City's Public Works (Pete Castro Building). Annual cost would be \$4,760 annually/\$397 monthly. Invoicing would occur once annually at the beginning of each fiscal year. This office space cost would include the use of utilities, telephone and internet connections, accessory office spaces, conference rooms and light janitorial services. It is recommended that this cost be re-evaluated every other year or if other changes in office space needs occur.
- 6) Other services would be billed as either direct costs (fully loaded labor rates) or as indirect costs through an Indirect Cost Allocation Plan or similar attachment to the Agreement.
- 7) Additional language would be included to clarify the intent of both agencies to comply with various state and federal laws. (e.g. Non-Discrimination; conflicts of interest; no boycott of Israel; immigration laws)).

## Review Requirements of ADOT of SVMPO/Sierra Vista Agreement

Per the executed May 13, 2019, SVMPO Intergovernmental Agreement with ADOT (GRT-19-0007317-T), before this Hosting Agreement is finalized, ADOT requires review and may note regulatory changes that may need to be revised prior to adoption. A preliminary review has been completed and no major issues have been identified with the proposed Amendment to the 2014 Agreement.

**The SVMPO Board members will discuss next steps once this Agreement has been finalized, reviewed by ADOT and is ready to be brought back to the Executive Board for approval. The timing of approval and implementation may also be discussed.**



# Sierra Vista Metropolitan Planning Organization Memorandum

**To:** SVMPO Executive Board  
**From:** Karen L. Lamberton, AICP, SVMPO Administrator  
**Date:** November 14, 2019  
**Subject:** SVMPO Executive Board Composition

---

The Sierra Vista MPO Executive Board may set their By-Laws, policies and practices to best serve the dual goals of meeting Federal/State mandates for MPO's and, secondly, serving their member jurisdictions to coordinate shared regional planning activities and funding.

## Background

The Sierra Vista MPO (SVMPO) first adopted By-Laws to govern the formation of a SVMPO Executive Board on December 18, 2013. At that time the SVMPO consisted of two member jurisdictions: the urbanized area of Cochise County and the City of Sierra Vista. Sierra Vista held about 89.2 % of the square miles and 76.5 % of the population within the new MPO.

On January 18, 2018, the SVMPO Board voted to expand their boundaries to include a third member jurisdiction, the Town of Huachuca City, and increased the square miles of Cochise County within the SVMPO. Additional lane miles of the State Highway system as well as Federal and State land areas moved from the Southeastern Area Council of Governments (SEAGO) into the expanded boundaries of the SVMPO.

## SVMPO Executive Board Composition Discussion

**The SVMPO Board members will discuss if they wish to continue with the existing formation and composition of the SVMPO Executive Board OR if they wish to consider one or more changes to the structure of the SVMPO Executive Board.**

- 1) Maintain the existing Board composition: Three (3) voting members of the City of Sierra Vista; one (1) voting member of Cochise County; one (1) voting member of the Town of Huachuca City and one (1) non-voting member from the Arizona Dept. of Transportation.
- 2) Change the non-voting status of the Arizona Dept. Of Transportation to a voting position. This position is reserved for the State Transportation Board representative for this area's district or their designee, typically the District Engineer.
- 3) Change the number of members of one or more of the member jurisdictions. SVMPO Board members have brought up various options that have included dropping a City of

Sierra Vista member; adding a Cochise County Supervisor; developing a weighted vote procedure, or leaving the membership of each of the three jurisdictions the same.

### Executive Board Membership Requirements

The Composition of the Board is within the discretion of the Board itself. The SVMPO current By-Laws requires that these members all be elected officials, or appointed by the Governor (State Transportation Board). *By-Laws Section III A. 1 (a)*.

Designation of both primary and alternative members should be provided in writing annually to the SVMPO. *By-Laws Section III A. 1 (b)*.

**The SVMPO Board members will discuss if they wish to continue with the existing structure OR make a change that written notification of members to the SVMPO would only be made in the event of changes in membership, rather than annually, OR add a date in which this annual notification would occur OR if they wish to consider one or more changes to the membership requirements and notifications.**

### Arizona State Transportation Dept. Membership Background

SVMPO is one of eight (8) MPO's in the State. The SVMPO is the only MPO that does not provide for a voting seat for ADOT. Typically, the State DOT's are included as voting members because the regional governments are required for the State to receive funding for the state highway miles within the MPO; adopted MPO plans are required by the State to be included in the State Plans in order to receive funding and one important coordination activity of the MPO is with the State DOT. In the larger MPO's it is the Governor appointed State Transportation Board member that often attends. Otherwise, the designee is typically the District Engineer.

For the SVMPO region the State Transportation Board member (pending confirmation by the Az. Senate) is Richard Searle, former Cochise County Supervisors. The District Engineer is Rod Lane, P.E. Once formally confirmed, an invitation from both SVMPO and SEAGO would typically be extended to the new Transportation Board member.

### Current SVMPO Member Jurisdiction Statistics

<b>SVMPO Region</b>	<b>Square Miles</b>	<b>Population ACS 2013-2017</b>	<b>Households ACS 2013-2017</b>
<b>Cochise County</b>	<b>458.65</b>	<b>23,216</b>	<b>9,831</b>
<b>Sierra Vista</b>	<b>152.55</b>	<b>43,585</b>	<b>17,053</b>
<b>Huachuca City</b>	<b>2.83</b>	<b>2,348</b>	<b>918</b>
<b>TOTALS</b>	<b>614.03</b>	<b>69,149.00</b>	<b>27,802.00</b>
<b>Cochise County</b>	<b>74.70%</b>	<b>33.57%</b>	<b>35.36%</b>
<b>Sierra Vista</b>	<b>24.84%</b>	<b>63.03%</b>	<b>61.34%</b>
<b>Huachuca City</b>	<b>0.46%</b>	<b>3.40%</b>	<b>3.30%</b>
	<b>100.00%</b>	<b>100.00%</b>	<b>100.00%</b>

## Other Existing Practices of the SVMPO Executive Board

**Executive Board Appointed Alternatives:** The SVMPO Board allows for the appointment by member jurisdictions of a designated alternate. At this time, only Cochise County has formally appointed an alternate representative to the SVMPO Board (Supervisor Peggy Judd for Supervisor Tom Borer). *By-Laws Section III 1 (a); Cochise County Board of Supervisors Letter of July 9, 2019.*

**Telephonic Representation:** The SVMPO Board currently allows for telephonic participation and voting of both members and alternates. *By-Laws Section III 5 (e)*

**Parliamentary Procedure/Tie Votes:** In the event of a tie vote, either because of an even number of appointed or attending Board members, or due to reclusion of one or more members from the vote at hand, the vote then fails. Members then may call for a reconsideration of the failed vote either at that time or at a later date. *By-Laws Section III 5 (b)*

**Parliamentary Procedure/Quorum with no Chair/Vice-Chair:** The SVMPO Board attorney advises that the standard protocol for a meeting at which there is no Chair or Vice-Chair, but a quorum does exist, is as follows:

- a) Any member of the Board may call the meeting to order.
- b) The presence of a quorum is noted, the absence of both the Chair and Vice-Chair is also noted.
- c) A call is made for nominations of a Pro-Tem Chair, nominations and a vote is made to select a Chair for the meeting at hand.
- d) The Pro-Tem Chair then runs the meeting until such time as the Chair or Vice-Chair arrive.
- e) *By-Laws Section III 5 (b) & (c).*

**Parliamentary Procedure/No Quorum:** In cases where a quorum does not exist, a meeting may still be held and items discussed, but no action may be taken on any agenda item. This may occur when unexpected member conflicts or adverse travel conditions occur and the Executive Board meeting has already been fully noticed and posted to the public. *By-Laws Section III 5 (b) & (d)*

**The SVMPO Board members may discuss if they wish to continue with existing parliamentary procedures OR wish to consider changes to one or more standard procedural policies in the adopted By-Laws at this time.**



# Sierra Vista Metropolitan Planning Organization Memorandum

**To:** SVMPO Executive Board  
**From:** Karen L. Lamberton, AICP, SVMPO Administrator  
**Date:** November 14, 2019  
**Subject:** SVMPO Member Jurisdictions Match Requirements

---

The Sierra Vista MPO (SVMPO) acts as the conduit to move Federal and State construction dollars down to the local cities, towns and counties. Those funds typically have match requirements associated with them. The regional government also receives both Federal and State funds for the operations of the mandated activities of the MPO: these funds also have match requirements.

## Background

When the SVMPO was initially designated on May 6, 2013, the majority of the land mass and population was within the City of Sierra Vista. Sierra Vista took on the task of ensuring that the SVMPO was formed and had adequate funding to complete mandated regional activities and tasks. Then in January of 2018, the SVMPO expanded its boundaries. The newest member jurisdiction, the Town of Huachuca City, took on the same match assessment as Cochise County (based on previous Work Program budgets), and the City of Sierra Vista carried the remaining burden for operating expenses of the MPO.

At this time, the SVMPO covers its entire match requirements for federal funds using In-Kind commitments of member jurisdiction staff towards regional activities. Historically, it has been the provision of office space and services by the City of Sierra Vista, in the amount of \$30,000 per year, which has actually covered the majority of In-Kind match requirements. In addition, the City of Sierra Vista commits in their annual budget the full potential operating expenses of the SVMPO during their annual budget deliberations each Spring.

The SVMPO Board may set up their financial arrangements at their discretion in any way that ensures that the SVMPO can effectively operate. The SVMPO Board has also expressed a desire that regional funds are maximized in an equitable manner between member jurisdictions.

## TYPES OF MATCH REQUIREMENTS

The SVMPO member jurisdictions have three types of match requirements that they must consider:

1. **Construction project match funds:** These match funds are associated with Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) projects and are typically tied to one specific member jurisdiction. The jurisdiction awarded the project has historically been

solely responsible for their match requirements as per the fund source that they have received. It has not been suggested that this practice be changed.

2. **MPO Operating Funds:** These match funds are associated with the Annual Work Program. These funds are not jurisdiction specific and are typically shared among the member jurisdictions to ensure that shared regional transportation concerns are addressed. Projects tied more specifically to one jurisdiction usually then has professional and technical staff from that jurisdiction supporting that effort, thereby raising their direct In-Kind match towards that planning effort.
3. Ensuring adequate funds are available on the **front-end for MPO expenses:** At this time, these funds are fronted entirely by the City of Sierra Vista and then refunded by the SVMPO. The question has been raised if this is an inequitable burden on one member jurisdiction and if funds should be raised, either through a one-time contribution or through an on-going accumulation of contributions, to separately fund the SVMPO with an available pool of non-federal dollars.

**The SVMPO Board may either concur with the current practice of assigning project specific match to the awarded jurisdiction, to sharing the operating costs among all member jurisdictions and relying on the City of Sierra Vista to front all funds for the MPO operating expenses OR may suggest changes to these long-standing practices.**

## MATCH DETERMINATION FOR MEMBER JURISDICTIONS

There are two steps the SVMPO Board will discuss regarding how match amounts are determined. First, is reaching agreement on the process that the SVMPO Board would like to use to determine match requirements for the MPO's operating budget. Second, is the actual determination of what that match amount is each year is and how each member jurisdiction is going to agree with the SVMPO to cover their share.

### Match Determination Policy

A specific process has not yet been identified in the SVMPO By-Laws to share operating MPO costs. The SVMPO Board has discussed using a formula to determine how each year's operating costs are divided. Factors that have been discussed with the SVMPO Board have included square miles, population, housing units, vehicle miles traveled, number of federally functionally classified roadways.

The division of operating match requirements between member jurisdictions should be included in the SVMPO By-Laws. All other Arizona MPO's use a formula to allocate responsibility of operating costs; however, no formula is the same. Most MPO's rely on a population based formula or a combination of square miles and population. Federally functionally classified roads heavily influence which projects may be included in the Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) but are not a primary factor for funding eligibility for the planning side of the MPO work.

<b>SVMPO Region</b>	<b>Square Miles</b>	<b>Population ACS 2013-2017</b>	<b>Households ACS 2013-2017</b>	<b>Vehicle Miles Traveled (ADT) Per ITE Trip</b>	<b>Fed Functionally Classified Roadways</b>
<b>Cochise County</b>	<b>458.65</b>	<b>23,216</b>	<b>9,831</b>	<b>94,083</b>	<b>11.754</b>
<b>Sierra Vista</b>	<b>152.55</b>	<b>43,585</b>	<b>17,053</b>	<b>163,197</b>	<b>12.535</b>
<b>Huachuca City</b>	<b>2.83</b>	<b>2,348</b>	<b>918</b>	<b>8,785</b>	<b>0.408</b>
<b>TOTALS</b>	<b>614.03</b>	<b>69,149.00</b>	<b>27,802.00</b>	<b>266,065</b>	<b>24.70</b>
<b>Cochise County</b>	<b>74.70%</b>	<b>33.57%</b>	<b>35.36%</b>	<b>35.36%</b>	<b>47.59%</b>
<b>Sierra Vista</b>	<b>24.84%</b>	<b>63.03%</b>	<b>61.34%</b>	<b>61.34%</b>	<b>50.76%</b>
<b>Huachuca City</b>	<b>0.46%</b>	<b>3.40%</b>	<b>3.30%</b>	<b>3.30%</b>	<b>1.65%</b>
	<b>100.00%</b>	<b>100.00%</b>	<b>100.00%</b>	<b>100.00%</b>	<b>100.00%</b>

The SVMPO Board may continue to keep the existing process of working out match funds throughout the year as Work Program activities are implemented OR they may develop a formula for the division of match funds for the operations of the SVMPO to include in the SVMPO By-Laws.

#### Jurisdiction Match Requirements

The SVMPO develops a Work Program that identifies the work activities and funds for each fiscal year. These fund amounts adjust throughout the year; however, the initial budget is set by June of each year. Match amounts are estimated and member jurisdictions should commit to their share of the identified match in the SVMPO adopted Work Program.

The current Work Program for FY20 and FY21 has only stated that member jurisdictions will provide match but no specifics were included, pending the SVMPO Board reaching agreement on a process to equitably divide the match requirements. At this time, the SVMPO covers its entire match requirements for federal funds using In-Kind commitments of member jurisdiction staff towards regional activities. During the early start-up days of the MPO this proved to be adequate for the activities planned by the SVMPO. However, in 2018, the MPO expanded its boundaries, brought in a third member jurisdiction and increased its Work Program.

All other COGs and MPOs function with some combination of both cash match and In-Kind match, although under federal policies a MPO can rely entirely upon In-Kind match, if they so desire. Cash match is sometimes preferred because not only can it be actually spent on a given work program activity (*e.g. pay an invoice*) it can also be applied to desired, but not allowable, federal expenses (*e.g. provide match to a non-profit/pay for refreshments for outreach*).

**The current FY20 Work Program requires a total of \$81,493 in member jurisdiction match.**  
**The projected FY21 Work Program requires a total of \$47,427 in member jurisdiction match.**  
*See attached extract from adopted SVMPO Work Program.*

## Cash vs In-Kind Match Implications

The federal process of calculating match is different for cash funds vs In-Kind contributions. Both have pros and cons. The advantage to cash match is that your regional program can actually spend those funds on non-federally eligible activities in behalf of approved regional projects and that you can carry forward those funds into future fiscal years. The advantage to In-Kind match is that a jurisdiction can leverage existing staff skills and resources to partner with the MPO to accomplish regional activities and reimbursement is then 100% of any actual expenditures for those approved regional activities. However, In-Kind match does not carry forward for FHWA funded projects. (recent guidance has allowed for limited carry forward of In-Kind contributions on FTA funded projects).

Regional funds cannot be used to pay for salaries of jurisdiction staff supporting regional activities *e.g. for TAC member attendance*. Regional funds can be used to pay for direct services *e.g. for legal counsel*.

One potential approach of the SVMPO is to fully fund required match amounts in cash and then the use of In-Kind contributions then buffer the MPO budget allowing for the accumulation, over time, of a sufficient balance to relieve the City of Sierra Vista of the current obligation to front the entirety of the regional budget. Another approach is to identify a percentage split between cash and In-Kind match that each jurisdiction would like to contribute.

There is no requirement that all member jurisdiction make the same agreement with the SVMPO. Some MPO's front all payments at the beginning of each fiscal year, others split these costs throughout year and still others invoice for any amounts not covered by In-Kind contributions at the end of the fiscal year. There is no best practice for how match is covered other than this: that the agreement to meet the estimated match requirement is typically set out in the annual Work Program, adopted by the MPO and then approved by both ADOT and FHWA/FTA.

**The SVMPO Board may continue to keep the existing process of using only In-Kind Match to fund regional MPO Operational Costs OR they may choose to develop a division of Cash and In-Kind Match that all member jurisdictions agree to follow OR they may choose to have each member jurisdiction reach their own Agreement with the SVMPO on meeting their match requirements each year OR may suggest other changes to how match requirements are covered for the SVMPO work.**

## Rural Transportation Advocacy Council Dues

The SVMPO covers 70% of member jurisdictions dues to the Rural Transportation Advocacy Council (RTAC). Member jurisdictions receive an invoice for the remaining 30% of RTAC dues as a distinctly separate cost from all other MPO work activities.

## TimeLine of Implementation

**The SVMPO Board may discuss the timeline for implementation of any suggested changes to the SVMPO By-Laws, adopted Work Program and new Agreements with the SVMPO on match contributions.** Implementation timeframes could potentially vary by member jurisdictions.

## ANNUAL WORK PROGRAM BUDGET : FY20

	FHWA PL	FHWA SPR	FTA Sec 5305	TOTALS
FED/STATE FUNDS	\$294,004	\$181,990	\$72,899	\$548,894
LOCAL MATCH	\$17,771	\$45,497	\$18,224	\$81,493
<b>TOTAL BUDGET</b>	<b>\$311,776</b>	<b>\$227,488</b>	<b>\$91,124</b>	<b>\$630,387.99</b>

*October 2019*

## ANNUAL WORK PROGRAM BUDGET : FY21

	FHWA PL	FHWA SPR	FTA Sec 5305	TOTALS
FED/STATE FUNDS	\$131,885	\$125,990	\$31,832	\$289,708
LOCAL MATCH	\$7,971	\$31,497	\$7,958	\$47,427
<b>TOTAL BUDGET</b>	<b>\$139,857</b>	<b>\$157,488</b>	<b>\$39,790</b>	<b>\$337,136.37</b>

*October 2019*

## CONTRIBUTIONS FROM STBG FUNDS

In addition, the SVMPO receives \$378,229 annually in Obligation Authority for Surface Transportation Block Grant (STBG) funds. These funds may, by separate action of the Board, be identified in the Transportation Improvement Program for eligible expenditures in the Work Program.

## MATCHING FUNDS

The SVMPO preference is to use in-kind contributions whenever possible for match. In-Kind contributions are tracked on a quarterly basis and are used as applicable match for all funding received. Member jurisdiction In-Kind match includes hosted office space, supplies and equipment for operation of the MPO as well as jurisdiction project and meeting support.

## PROJECTED EXPENDITURES

The SVMPO Budget is made up of three major categories: MPO Operating Expenses; Direct Expenses and Consultant Services. Operating Expenses are reflected in the Administration work element. The remaining eight tasks may incur direct costs or consultant services expenses.



# Sierra Vista Metropolitan Planning Organization Memorandum

**To:** SVMPO Executive Board  
**From:** Karen L. Lamberton, AICP, SVMPO Administrator  
**Date:** November 14, 2019  
**Subject:** Future Discussion Items and Board Requests

---

**This item is to allow the SVMPO Board to discuss any other items that they may wish brought forward for future discussion by the SVMPO Board and/or by smaller subcommittees of the Board for future action or direction to the SVMPO Administrator.**

## Future Discussion Items

The SVMPO Executive Board has already identified two other items for future SVMPO Board Discussion:

1. Advisory Subcommittee Structure; Possible Changes to the Bicycle/Pedestrian Advisory Subcommittee. *By-Laws Section V*
2. SVMPO Administrator's Contract Job Description. *Assigned to Executive Board subcommittee Sept. 19<sup>th</sup>.*

**The SVMPO Board may discuss dates and/or times to address these, or other possible Work Session or Executive Board action Items.**

The next SVMPO Executive Board meeting is scheduled for Thursday, November 21<sup>st</sup> at 3:00 p.m.