



**SIERRA VISTA METROPOLITAN PLANNING ORGANIZATION  
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE (TAC)  
MEETING MINUTES: MAY 12, 2021**

**APPROVED**

**MEETING LOCATION:**

City of Sierra Vista: Public Works Bld.  
TRAINING CONFERENCE ROOM  
401 Giulio Cesare Ave.  
Sierra Vista, AZ 85635

**MEETING DATE AND TIME:**

May 12, 2021  
10:00 AM

**CDC PROTOCOLS WILL BE FOLLOWED  
FOR PRE-SANITATION AND DISTANCING**

Microsoft Teams Meeting Option

**Join on your computer or mobile app**

[Click here to join the meeting](#)

**Or call in (audio only) [+1 602-704-1809,,17487074#](tel:+1602704180917487074)**

**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 TAC MEMBERS IN ATTENDANCE:**

Chair: Linda Jones, Public Works Operations Manager for Vista Transit  
Member: Sharon Flissar, P.E., Director Public Works, City of Sierra Vista (*virtual*)  
Member: Matt McLachlan, Dir. Community Development, City Sierra Vista (*virtual*)  
Alternate Member: Angela Dixon-Maher, Civil Engineer, City of Sierra Vista (*virtual*)  
Alternate Member: Jim Johnson, Ph.D, CBO,CCI; Building Official (*virtual*)  
Alternative Member: Valerie Fuller, Engineering Tech I; Cochise County (*virtual*)  
Member: Mark Hoffman, Arizona Department of Transportation/Multi-Modal Division (*virtual*)

**SVMPO TAC MEMBERS ABSENT:**

Vice-Chair: Brad Simmons, P.E., Cochise County Civil Engineer  
Member: Jackie Watkins, P.E., Cochise County Engineer  
Member: Jim Halterman, Town of Huachuca City, Public Works Supervisor

**STAFF:**

SVMPO Administrator: Karen L. Lamberton, AICP  
Regional Civil Engineer: Dennis Donovan, P.E.

**OTHERS PRESENT**

Rachel Gray, SVMPO Chair  
Chris Joannes, Kimley-Horn LRTP Consultant Team  
Brent Crowther, Kimley-Horn LRTP Consultant Team (*virtual*)  
Brian Snyder, Michael-Baker SRTP Consultant Team (*virtual*)  
Ed Latimer, Wilson and Company (*virtual*)

## **1. CALL TO ORDER AND ROLL CALL**

Chair Jones called the meeting to order at 10:02 a.m. Roll call was taken, and a quorum was in place.

## **2. ACCEPTANCE OF THE AGENDA**

Chair Jones noted that there was a full agenda for today's meeting. She also noted that previously the TAC had consensus that the agenda acceptance did not need a formal motion and asked if any TAC members had any questions or changes to the May meeting agenda. Hearing none, the Agenda was accepted as presented.

## **3. CALL TO THE PUBLIC**

*This is the time set aside for the public to comment. Members of the Board may not discuss items that are not specifically identified on the agenda. Therefore, pursuant to A.R.S. § 38-431.01 (H) action taken as a result of public comment is limited to directing staff to study the matter, responding to any criticism or scheduling the matter for further consideration and decision at a later date.*

No attendees of the public indicated they wished to address the TAC at this time.

## **4. APPROVAL OF MEETING MINUTES**

Chair Jones asked members if they had any comments or corrections on the March meeting minutes. She noted that the Administrator advises that there is a correction to page 5 of the minutes, (page 9 of the agenda packet) to correct the balances noted on the last sentence of the first paragraph. Hearing no other corrections, Member Fuller moved to accept the meeting minutes for the TAC Regular Meeting of March 10, 2021 with the noted corrections; Member Hoffman seconded, and the motion unanimously passed.

**MOTION:** Member Fuller

**SECOND:** Member Hoffman

**ACTION:** PASSED UNANIMOUSLY 7/0

## **NEW BUSINESS: PRESENTATION/DISCUSSION/POSSIBLE ACTION**

### **5. SVMPO WORK PROGRAM FOR FY22 & FY23**

The SVMPO Administrator presented the pending two-year program for the operation of the MPO for Fiscal Years 2022 and 2023. Administrator Lamberton explained that this document projects forward the potential activities of the MPO and estimates the funding that will be available for operating the MPO and for any plans or projects that are done. Amendments typically do occur after the end of both the state and federal fiscal year to adjust funding carry-forward and appropriation amounts, as well as to add or delete planned work activities as needs change over time.

Administrator Lamberton noted that the previous Work Program elements were continued forward and that at least for the first part of the next fiscal year the MPO would be focusing on completing the three existing studies that are underway at this time. The SVMPO Administrator stated that she met with FHWA, FTA and ADOT in late March and had included their comments into this Work Program.

The Administrator asked if any TAC members had any questions about the recommended work activities prior to finalizing the FY22 & Fy23 Work Program for Board consideration later in the month.

Member Flissar raised a concern about the inclusion of any projects on the State Highway system stating that the item in Task 7 for a Highway 90 Corridor study did not seem to be well defined. Partnering with ADOT on safety projects might be a regional priority but describing a main street concept or beatification project seems to be a cost the State should take on, not the region. Member Johnson stated that there were definitely stakeholders in the Town that wanted to see improvements on the Highway. Administrator Lamberton noted that with limited funds in the region partnerships can help leverage projects that are needed in the region, including on the State Highway. SouthCentral District does see the Highway 90 corridor through the Town stretch as a higher priority, ranking 14<sup>th</sup> on their five-year project proposals. However, 14<sup>th</sup> in one District, when added into all the rest of the State projects and given that only a few projects can be done State-wide, just doesn't get to the top without some assistance to better scope and break out desired projects into phases.

The TAC members discussed the detail noted for both the proposed Theater Drive and Highway 90 corridor studies and concurred that at least the descriptions should be more generic, although several TAC members felt that the Corridor study should not be included. The Administrator then remarked that it had been direction to her by the former Chair of the MPO, the City of Sierra Vista's Mayor Mueller, that anything the MPO could do to help that approach into the City should be considered. The Administrator stated she would reword these two proposed projects and advise the Board of the TAC's concerns. These projects are not mandated to be completed, if included, but it does give the MPO direction to take actions to complete them, within available funding.

Hearing no other comments on other Task items or projects, the Administrator asked if the TAC wanted to take formal action or just move the Work Program forward to the Board. It was noted that this is policy document and the TAC concurred with moving it forward for Board consideration without taking a formal position on it.

### **CONTINUING BUSINESS: PRESENTATION/DISCUSSION/POSSIBLE ACTION**

#### **6. TRANSPORTATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM: 2022-2026**

The SVMPO Administrator stated that it was time to again update the annual five-year Transportation Improvement Program. The City was congratulated on obligating their HURF Exchange project on May 5<sup>th</sup>, this leaves the carry-forward amount for future projects zeroed out for FY21. One request for TIP funding has been sent to the MPO from the County for a project on Moson Rd. Administrator Lamberton stated that she had asked the County for additional clarification of several items before presenting this to the TAC. Member Flissar stated that the Fry Corridor is a high priority, and the future phases of the West End project should be completed. Costs for those future phases is still fluid and not yet certain. The Town is currently working on a Roadway Inventory Study and from that at least one future proposed TIP project will be submitted.

Given the limitations in new funding, and the fact that there are three studies nearing completion that will not only prioritize projects but will develop preliminary cost estimates, Administrator

Lamberton recommended that the TAC hold off on programming the TIP until these studies are completed, and the federal fiscal year awards are made in October. Then by early next year the TAC could make informed decisions about which projects to place into the TIP. It is the goal of the MPO to fully program the TIP, as well as develop placeholder projects in the event unexpected funds become available.

Administrator Lamberton also advised the TAC that there is a discussion about presenting a specific project list to the State Transportation Board for rural projects, if the proposed federal transportation funding act is passed. At this time this bill only sends funds to the two largest urbanized areas in MAG and PAG but the State would have discretion to provide funds down through the rural MPO/COG's. Administrator Lamberton stated this is just a discussion item at this time but if it becomes real money, it would be programmed through the MPO TIP sometime next year.

Administrator Lamberton reminded the TAC that the TIP also includes the funding for Vista Transit and is required for them to continue to obtain their FTA allocations. It is also a document that is routinely amended as new information about funding, federal or state funded grants to jurisdictions are awarded, or new regional projects are selected that are required to be in the regional TIP's.

The final draft will be presented to the TAC at their June meeting. Hearing no further questions, the TAC moved to Item 7. No action was taken on this item.

## **7. SHORT-RANGE TRANSIT PLAN STATUS UPDATE**

Brian Snider, with the Michael-Baker consultant team presented this item. He advised the TAC that the public outreach phase was completed, and the consulting team had completed building GIS shape files for the existing transit routes. The consulting team is now coordinating the five-year transit recommendations with Vista Transit for the TIP process, identifying financial strategies for the Transit Plan, and are looking to have a final draft in early summer.

The TAC was encouraged to review drafted Short-Range Transit Plan sections that are posted on the SVMPO website for review: <https://www.svmopo.org/transportation-planning/short-range-transit-plan-update/>

Mr. Snider presented an updated SRTP project schedule. He stated that this plan is expected to be finalized within the next two months and presented for consideration to the SVMPO Board in August. Chair Jones stated that the consulting team has been working closely with Vista Transit and are providing helpful information to them during this planning effort.

The TAC had no questions for the consultant team at this time. No action was taken on this item.

## **8. SVMPO 2050 LONG-RANGE TRANSPORTATION PLAN UPDATE**

Chris Johannes presented this item for the Kimley-Horn consulting team. The presentation included a short briefing on the process undertaken, the mandated requirements for long-range transportation plans, public outreach activities undertaken to date, the modeling results, available funds over the planning period, project development, Board approved proprieties for project selection and an update on the project schedule. Mr. Johannes stated that they are working with both the consultant team for the Transit Plan and the Huachuca

City Roadway study to ensure that those recommendations and cost estimates were consistent with the final LRTP.

TAC member asked to be reminded how the initial project lists were developed. Mr. Johannes stated that the initial lists came from existing plans from the prior MPO 2040 LRTP and current TIP (for Vista Transit projects), the County's 2040 LRTP, the City's CIP project list, and three projects were specifically developed by the Huachuca City Study team for the 2050 LRTP. Member Flissar asked specifically about the development of the aviation list as she would like to review that in more detail as she was in charge of the Airport in the area. Mr. Johannes noted that they were aware, as was Member Flissar, that eligibility for Federal Aviation Funds (FAA) for General Aviation airports, like the Sierra Vista Airport had changed and they had analyzed which projects in the previous plans met the new criteria. New projects are only beginning to be developed out of the Travel Demand Model, and the preliminary lists are not final at this time. The consultant team indicated that the TAC would be given the full draft project lists to review and comment on before the plan was finalized.

A discussion occurred among TAC members about the planning process to date and the underlying data that informed the modeling effort. The TAC was reminded by the SVMPO Administrator that the decision was made to go to a stand-alone Travel Demand Model back in the November 2020 TAC meeting but that even at that time it was known that there would be weaknesses in that model. Not only would it be the first model run for the expanded boundaries of that TAC (which meant the consulting team had to do some heavy lifting to revisit Transportation Analysis Zones) but that the population data would be old since the Census data has yet to be released and also that the pandemic effect on traffic counts meant that it was likely a better choice to use older traffic counts, not current ones, since not only nation-wide but state-side notable differences in travel patterns occurred.

Member Fuller concurred, stating that as the primary County staff member conducting and entering traffic count data, that any data taken in 2020 would not be useful to a modeling effort. Mr. Snider did note that the consulting team did take several additional targeted traffic counts in areas where there were extremely old counts or gaps had an impact on their ability to adequately calibrate the model. He further stated that the model runs for the SVMPO 2050 LRTP are well within the thresholds set by FHWA for accuracy.

Concern was also stated about the flat and/or declining population projections. The population data is calibrated to the State demographer's office and in earlier TAC discussions there was concurrence that flat projections was likely realistic, not a high growth model. The consulting team stated they would take another look at the projection series but discussion among the consulting team and TAC members included the observations that growth does seem to be slowing, this is an area of more retirees and families are having fewer children. If that trend continues, although there may be a lot of houses, many of them are for seasonal residents that do not show up in the Census decennial counts but do use the roadway network during some parts of the year. It was also acknowledged that this region is very dependent on activities on the Fort.

Member McLachlan questioned the travel to work data stating he felt the numbers of residents traveling in and out of the region for work seemed too high to him.

Several TAC members indicated an interest in learning more about the underlying data development for the model and the modeled results. Mr. Crowther, Kimley-Horns' Project Manager, offered to set up a TEAMS virtual meeting to discuss this topic in depth and also stated he and his team were available to answer individual questions by e-mail, phone or meeting with one or more members in each jurisdiction, if desired.

The SVMPO Administrator reminded the TAC members that the modeled results and LRTP project lists are only one tool that member jurisdiction may use to determine projects and project priorities. The LRTP is not a mandated list of projects but are intended to guide priorities for placing projects into the regional TIP and to assist jurisdictions in competing for grants.

TAC members were encouraged to review the six drafted sections of the 2050 LRTP available on the SVMPO website: <https://www.svmppo.org/transportation-planning/2050-long-range-transportation-plan-update-2050-lrtp/> The SVMPO Administrator stated that the SVMPO Board would be deciding at their May 27<sup>th</sup> meeting if they wanted a Joint Work Session on this topic and/or if they wanted a more traditional Open House opportunity. There was not a clear consensus about a recommendation for either of these potential events or from TAC members or an indication of availability to attend, if these were scheduled.

Direction was given by the TAC to coordinate a meeting with City staff and the LRTP consulting team to address concerns mentioned during this discussion item. *This meeting was then set for May 26<sup>th</sup> but not as a formal TAC meeting/No TAC quorum would be present.* Member Fuller stated she would brief the County Engineer, Jackie Watkins, on this item and let her know of the opportunity to participate. Member Johnson, for the Town, stated that he was comfortable with the direction taken to date and had no specific questions for the consultant team at this time. No action was taken on this item.

## **INFORMATIONAL ITEMS/DIRECTION TO SVMPO ADMINISTRATOR MAY BE GIVEN**

### **9. SOUTHCENTRAL DISTRICT REPORT**

SouthCentral District had no report at this time. Member Hoffman noted that ADOT was developing their five-year program and there would be a public hearing on it at the next State Transportation Board meeting on May 21<sup>st</sup>. The proposed State five-year plan is available on the ADOT website.

This was an information item. No action was taken.

### **10. JURISDICTION PROJECT UPDATES & ANNOUNCEMENTS**

Member Fuller stated that the County was working on some bridge projects. Member Johnson stated a lot of good work was being done for the Town on their Roadway Inventory and they were appreciating the information being gathered and presented to them. The City stated they had nothing to add at this time.

This was an information item. No action was taken.

### **11. UPCOMING SCHEDULED MEETINGS and ADMINISTRATOR'S REPORT**

SVMPO Board Meeting: May 27, 2021 at 2:30 p.m. SV City Managers Conference Room

Land Law Workshop: June 4, 2021; Tempe, AZ

**Possible** Joint TAC/Board Work Session: June 10<sup>th</sup>

BPAC Mtg: August 3, 2021 at 10 a.m. Public Works Training Room or Virtually/Telephonic

AzPlanning Conference/Western States Planning Conference: August 22-25, 2021

County staff, Member Watkins and Member Simmons had indicated interest in attending the October Roads and Streets Conference. Administrator Lamberton asked TAC members to let her know if they would like assistance with registration for any of these pending conferences.

The SVMPO Administrator noted briefly for the TAC the following items:

- ❖ The 2020 Census population numbers have not yet been released: currently the re-districting population numbers are projected to be released end of September of 2021 (*per discussion with Census Bureau Statistician on May 6, 2021*).
- ❖ The SVMPO Board did submit a formal letter to the Office of Management and Budget about the potential impact on existing MPO's that may fall below proposed new urbanized area thresholds, if implemented.
- ❖ The Town of Huachuca City Roadway Inventory & Assessment project is approximately 40% completed and is currently on schedule and within contracted budget.
- ❖ The TAC was advised that the SVMPO Board had elected Mayor Pro Tem Rachel Gray as the SVMPO Chair and Council Member Carolyn Umphrey is taking the vacated seat of Mayor Mueller as a regular member of the Board.

This was an information item. No action was taken.

## **12. FUTURE AGENDA ITEMS**

The next TAC meeting is scheduled for **June 9, 2021 at 10:00 a.m.**

The SVMPO Administrator stated that she would let the TAC know if the Board chooses to schedule a June 10<sup>th</sup> LRTP Work Session or a Public Open House.

The SVMPO Administrator noted she is still working on setting up the requested meeting with ADOT on a Traffic Counts/Data Collection with the TAC, but a date is not yet set.

This was an informational item. No action was taken.

## **13. ADJOURNMENT**

Hearing no further questions or comments, by general consensus, Chair Jones adjourned the meeting at 12:06 p.m.