

Transportation Planning Committee (TPC) Meeting

At or after 9:00 a.m., Wednesday, February 18, 2026
1 E. Broadway Blvd., Fourth Floor
Tucson, AZ 85701

Public Access to Meeting Audio/Presentation: <https://www.youtube.com/live/qc73rG3eXvQ>

Pursuant to A.R.S. 38-431.02, notice is hereby given to the public and to the Committee members that the Transportation Planning Committee (TPC) of Pima Association of Governments will meet at the above stated time and date.

In compliance with open meeting laws, PAG-RTA meeting agendas requiring public notice are posted at the official address referenced above and are available for public review during official PAG/RTA business hours, excluding weekends and legal holidays.

SPECIAL NOTICE: *Members of the TPC may attend the meeting remotely or in person. The meeting room will be open to the public. However, members of the public are invited to attend the meeting via the link above. TPC members will be provided with a separate link to participate. Members of the public may submit written comments relating to this meeting to info@pagregion.com within 24 hours of the meeting's posted start time. These comments will be filed with the committee's records.*

The TPC is a technical advisory committee established by PAG to make recommendations to the PAG Executive Director. The TPC provides technical review and develops recommendations on studies, reports, plans, programs and submittals in support of continuous, comprehensive and cooperative multimodal regional transportation planning and programming within the PAG planning area and in full compliance with PAG policies and procedures.

PAG is committed to maintaining high standards of conduct and prohibits harassment and retaliation against all employees pursuant to Pima Association of Governments' Policy Against Discrimination, Harassment and Retaliation. It is the responsibility of all committee members to comply with and to report violations or suspected violations of the Rules of Conduct, PAG/RTA policies, or state laws.

PAG's Rules of Conduct require committee members to observe high standards of conduct and personal ethics in the conduct of their duties and responsibilities. Committee members are prohibited from interfering with the administrative functions of the organization and must comply with the open meeting law and all other applicable laws, regulations and policies.

AGENDA

1. Call to Order and Introductions

2. In-kind Reporting

PAG staff will ask participants to confirm any estimated in-kind time for this meeting.

3. Election of 2026 TPC Chair and Vice Chair

Each year, following the election of Regional Council officers, a Transportation Planning Committee Chair and a Vice Chair are elected among the eligible jurisdictional transportation representatives to serve a one-year term.

Action: Election of the 2026 TPC Chair and Vice Chair.

4. Approval of Jan. 21, 2026, Meeting Summary

Action: Approval of the Meeting Summary.

5. Review and recommend approval of FY 2025–FY 2029 PAG Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) Amendment #2025.031

Staff will provide details on TIP Amendment #2025.031 as provided in the meeting materials.

Action: The TPC will be asked to recommend approval of an amendment to the PAG FY 2025–FY 2029 Transportation Improvement Program.

6. ADOT Statewide Listening Tour

ADOT staff will provide a presentation on the ADOT Statewide Listening Tour.

This is an information item.

7. RMAP Amendment Procedure

PAG staff will provide an overview of the amendment process for the Regional Mobility and Accessibility Plan.

This is an information item.

8. RTA Delivery Approach and Cash Flow Assessment – Status Update

PAG/RTA staff will provide an update on (1) efforts to gather RTA project and program information, (2) the development of a draft cash flow assessment and (3) related efforts, such as developing a draft list of financially constrained projects.

This is an information item.

9. Updates related to the Transportation Improvement Program (TIP)

Updates will be provided on items related to PAG TIP-related activities.

This is for information and possible action.

10. Request for Future Agenda Items and Announcements

Members of the committee may request agenda topics to be considered for discussion at a future meeting.

Committee members will be given the opportunity to share announcements from their organizations that are relevant to the business of the committee.

****Pursuant to Arizona open meeting laws, the committee cannot discuss or take action today on any matters raised under this agenda item. Under this agenda item, committee members are also prohibited from returning to other agenda items which have been previously discussed and concluded earlier in this meeting*

11. Adjournment

The Transportation Planning Committee meeting packet containing material related to the meeting is available at www.PAGregion.com for public review. In compliance with the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA), those requiring special assistance, such as large typeface print, sign language or other reasonable accommodations, may request those through the administrative offices at: (520) 792-1093 at least two business days before the meeting.

PAG operates its programs without regard to race, color and national origin in compliance with [Title VI](#) of the Civil Rights Act. We invite you to complete our voluntary self-identification survey ([English/Spanish](#)).

If you need translation assistance, please call (520) 792-1093 and ask for Zonia Kelley. Si necesita ayuda con traducción, llame por favor al (520) 792-1093 y comuníquese con Zonia Kelley.

SUBJECT: Election of 2026 TPC Chair and Vice Chair

Meeting	Meeting Date	Agenda Category	Agenda Item #
Transportation Planning Committee	February 18, 2026	Action	03

REQUESTED ACTION/SUGGESTED MOTION

Each year, following the election of Regional Council officers, a Transportation Planning Committee Chair and a Vice Chair are elected among the eligible jurisdictional transportation representatives to serve one-year terms. Officers of TPC consist of a Chair and Vice Chair. The TPC officers are nominated and elected annually by the Committee. Neither the Chair nor Vice Chair may be from the same jurisdiction as PAG's Regional Council Chair, which is currently Town of Marana, or Vice Chair, which is currently Town of Sahuarita. Officers must be official voting members of TPC, not ex-officio members.

ASSOCIATED OWP WORK ELEMENT/GOAL

None.

SUMMARY

The term of office begins at the February meeting and continues for one (1) calendar year or when a newly elected Chair and Vice Chair of Regional Council are seated.

Transportation Planning Committee (TPC) Meeting Summary

Summary of 9 a.m., January 21, 2026, meeting

The meeting can be viewed in its entirety at: <https://www.youtube.com/live/Liq2DFylhMI>

Committee Members

Jose Rodríguez (Virtual)
Town of Oro Valley

Andy Bemis (Virtual)
City of Tucson

Christ Stebe (Virtual)
University of Arizona

Jeremy Moore (Virtual)
ADOT – Southcentral District

Davita Mueller (Virtual)
Sun Tran

Galovale Galovale (Virtual)
Town of Sahuarita

Committee Members Cont.

Josue Licea (Virtual)
City of South Tucson

Kathryn Skinner (Virtual)
Pima County DOT

Natalie Shepp (Virtual)
PDEQ

PAG Staff Lead
Jeanette DeRenne (Virtual)

Ex-Officio
Jamie Brown, PAG/RTA (Virtual)

1. Call to Order and Introductions

The Chair called the meeting to order at 9:00 a.m., and introductions were made.

2. In-kind Reporting

Staff informed the participants of the in-kind form, and members were asked to confirm their estimated in-kind time for the meeting.

3. Approval of Dec. 17, 2025, Meeting Summary

[Video Timestamp: 5:01](#)

Action: A motion to approve the Dec. 17, 2025, meeting summary was made by Andy Bemis, City of Tucson, seconded by Jeremy Moore, ADOT, and passed unanimously.

4. Household Travel Study and Assessment (HTSA) Update

[Video Timestamp: 5:39](#)

PAG staff provided members with an update on the Household Travel Study and Assessment (HTSA). PAG Transportation Data Science Coordinator Yunemi Jang gave members an overview of the HTSA and provided a summary of the PAG Household Travel Study data. Members were informed that the survey was concluded in May 2025 and a total of 4,911 households of eastern Pima County and Pinal County, SaddleBrooke area, participated. Ms. Jang indicated that the original target was to collect 4,200 household samples and a total of 4,154 certified household samples were collected. A consulting firm was used to review the household person vehicle and trip diary of each individual record collected, and the team checked for any misinformation or illogical inaccuracies. Ms. Jang explained that once all the records were reviewed that the data was compiled into five separate data files that included: household information, personal information, vehicle information, trip information and GPS information.

This item was for information only.

Presentation can be found here: [Item-4-HTSA-Update-Presentation.pdf](#)

5. RTA Delivery Approach and Cash Flow Assessment – Status Update

[Video Timestamp: 31:59](#)

PAG/RTA staff provided members with an update on efforts to gather RTA project and program information that would be used as a basis for a cash flow assessment. PAG Director of Strategic Planning, Programming and Policy Jamie Brown provided members with presentations regarding potential Surface Transportation Block Grant (STBG) programming. PAG Director of Transportation Services Rick Ellis informed members that staff currently was working on the detailed cash flow and delivery information that had been received. Additional information from the jurisdictions will be critical moving forward. Mr. Ellis indicated that the information received had been plugged in and showed an unbalanced overall assessment. That will be addressed in the next steps of the exercise.

Mr. Brown informed the members that the RTA plan commits over \$237 million of non-RTA dollars to the Element 1A projects, known as deferred or scope change projects. Of that amount, the budgeted total is composed of approximately five years of HURF 12.6% at \$157 million and almost \$80 million of federal STBG funding. Programming of STBG on a project federalizes it which adds time and cost; the goal is to minimize the number of

federalized projects. Mr. Brown shared with members the potential approach to identify those projects and reprogram funding sources.

Natalie Shepp, Pima County, asked if information would be put together for how the RTA 1 projects would be completed should the RTA Next election not pass. PAG Chief of Staff Dan Gabiou indicated that the current efforts were focused on the RTA Next passing and, should it not, they would consult with the Board and committees to discuss a second option.

Jose Rodríguez, Town of Sahuarita, inquired if consolidating federalized projects was doable as those are time sensitive. Mr. Ellis indicated that the overall goal was to strategically identify which projects make the most sense to receive federal funds for the delivery challenges mentioned.

This item was for information only.

Presentation can be found here:

[Item-5-Draft-Potential-Future-Programming-of-STBG-Presentation.pdf](#)

[Item-5-STBG-in-RTA-Next-and-Rebalancing-Programming-draft-Illustrative-example.pdf](#)

6. Updates related to the Transportation Improvement Program (TIP)

[Video Timestamp: 59:59](#)

PAG staff provided members with updates on items related to PAG TIP-related activities. PAG Director of Strategic Planning, Programming and Policy Jamie Brown provided the members with an update on next steps for the Regional Transportation Alternatives Grant (RTAG) Call for Projects process. Members were informed that a selection panel had been formed and meeting had been scheduled with the project sponsors. Mr. Brown mentioned that there had been discussions with the City of Tucson regarding a funding gap for the 22nd Street Bridge Project and allowed the City to update the committee or wait.

Sam Credio, City of Tucson, informed the members that the City had opened bids for the project which had come in \$17 million above the engineers' estimate. Mr. Credio indicated that to close the gap, ineligible costs were pulled out, and that they were thin on contingency. Members were informed that there was still work to be done within ADOT right-of-way due to the connectivity to state Route 210 and were able to come up with the amount that was going to be constructed within the ADOT right-of-way. This work could potentially be eligible for HURF 2.6 funds. Mr. Credio explained that the conversation would be about how they could help shore up the 22nd Street Bridge using some of the HURF 2.6 funds. Mr. Brown indicated that this decision may go through the committee process as a formal TIP amendment in the coming weeks.

Jose Rodríguez, Town of Sahuarita, inquired if there was capacity for the project within the fund balance. Members were informed that on a conservative level there is about \$22 million of unprogrammed HURF 2.6, so there would be capacity.

This item was for information only.

7. Request Future Agenda Items and Announcements

Members of the committee had no requests or announcements.

8. Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned at 10:10 a.m.

SUBJECT: FY 2025–FY 2029 PAG TIP Amendment #2025.031

Meeting	Meeting Date	Agenda Category	Agenda Item #
TPC	Feb. 18, 2026	Action	05

REQUESTED ACTION/SUGGESTED MOTION

The TPC will be asked to recommend approval of an amendment to the PAG FY 2025–FY 2029 Transportation Improvement Program (TIP).

ASSOCIATED OWP WORK ELEMENT/GOAL

- Work Element 40: Transportation Activities

SUMMARY

As the region’s designated metropolitan planning organization (MPO), PAG is responsible for maintaining the transportation improvement program (TIP), including processing amendments to the FY 2025–FY 2029 TIP. The proposed TIP amendment would address a funding gap for the City of Tucson’s 22nd Street bridge project (TIP ID 131.00), which is an RTA plan project approved by Pima County voters in 2006. Discussions with City of Tucson and ADOT staff identified an approach to addressing a funding gap as described below.

Through the programming of \$11,462,000 of HURF 2.6% funds, \$6,758,000 will be directly programmed to the 22nd Street bridge project to cover construction costs directly associated with at-grade improvements within the State Route 210 right of way, such as ramp connections to 22nd Street. Additionally, through a funding exchange with the State Route 86: Kitt Peak Linkage Wildlife Crossing project, an additional \$4,704,000 of RTA funding will be made available to cover preconstruction costs for the 22nd Street bridge project.

Below are the proposed TIP actions:

Item A – SR 86: Kitt Peak Linkage Wildlife Crossing (TIP ID 20.12; sponsor is ADOT)

- Programs \$4,704,000 of HURF 2.6% funds in FY 2027 for construction in place of RTA funds. This makes the RTA funding available for the 22nd Street bridge project.

Item B – 22nd St: I-10 to Tucson Blvd (TIP ID 131.00; sponsor is the City of Tucson)

- Programs \$4,704,000 of RTA funds in FY 2026 for design made available through the action in Item A.
- Programs \$6,758,000 of HURF 2.6% in FY 2026 for construction.
- Changes the phase source of \$743,000 of HURF 12R from right of way to design in FY 2026.

In addition to a TIP amendment, an RTA IGA amendment will be prepared for consideration by the RTA Board. Therefore, a hybrid approval approach is recommended for this TIP amendment, requesting approval of an administrative TIP amendment from the TPC and Management Committees followed by a recommendation of approval for the RTA IGA by the RTA Board. Once the RTA Board approves the IGA amendment, PAG staff will process the administrative TIP amendment.

PRIOR BOARD AND/OR COMMITTEE ACTION

No action taken yet. This concept was described verbally at the January TPC meeting for initial feedback from committee members.

FINANCIAL CONSIDERATIONS

ADOT has confirmed the availability of HURF 2.6% funding for this TIP amendment.

TECHNICAL, POLICY, LEGAL OR OTHER CONSIDERATIONS

HURF 2.6% funds are made available from the state highway fund through the [Arizona State Transportation Board Policy](#) for “use on state routes and highways that are within MAG and PAG regions.” ADOT has confirmed the eligibility of HURF 2.6% funds for the purposes described in the summary above.

This TIP amendment aligns with PAG’s TIP policies and procedures in Appendix 3 of the [approved FY 2025–FY 2029 TIP](#). The TIP Policies and Procedures list the priorities for use of HURF 2.6, the first of which is to “1. Fund RTA projects that are on a state facility.”

Per the table at the end of the PAG TIP Policies and Procedures, an administrative amendment can occur for “Incorporation of projects or funding from grants and other funds previously approved by a public funding agency.” Once the RTA Board approves the funding in the IGA amendment, this condition will be met.

ATTACHED ADDITIONAL BACKUP INFORMATION

- Proposed Amendment No. 2025.031 to the PAG FY 2025–FY 2029 TIP

Staff Contact/Phone	Jamie Brown, (520) 792-1093, ext. 4473 Adam Ledford, (520) 792-1093, ext. 4434
----------------------------	---

TipID	RTAID	STREET/PROJECT NAME	PROPOSED FUNDING (IN THOUSANDS OF DOLLARS)					
			FISCAL YEAR					
SponsorID	Length	LOCATION	TOTAL COST	2025	2026	2027	2028	2029
StateID	Existing Lanes	PROJECT DESCRIPTION						
FedID	After Lanes	AQ STATUS						

ITEM A

Existing Approval

20.12	42_m	SR 86: Kitt Peak Linkage Wildlife Crossing R			4704 RTA C		
	7.0	State Route 86 - Mile posts 127-134			4704 TOTAL		
	2	Construct 2 over-crossings					
	2	Conforms					

Proposed Request

20.12	42_m	SR 86: Kitt Peak Linkage Wildlife Crossing R			4704 HURF26 C		
	7.0	State Route 86 - Mile posts 127-134			4704 TOTAL		
	2	Construct 2 over-crossings					
	2	Conforms					
			\$5,704				

SPONSOR: ADOT ACTION: Remove \$4,704,000 of RTA C in FY27 and replace with same amount of HURF12R

Note: ACTION will be updated to include IGA resolution numbers once RTA Board action has been taken.

TipID	RTAID	STREET/PROJECT NAME	PROPOSED FUNDING (IN THOUSANDS OF DOLLARS)					
			FISCAL YEAR					
SponsorID	Length	LOCATION	TOTAL COST	2025	2026	2027	2028	2029
StateID	Existing Lanes	PROJECT DESCRIPTION						
FedID	After Lanes	AQ STATUS						

ITEM B

Existing Approval

131.00 SR5A	19_a	22nd St: I-10 to Tucson Blvd	1642 HURF12R D	33 HURF12R D	3081 HURF12R C	15069 HURF12R C	2318 HURF12R C
		I-10 to Tucson Blvd	57 HURF12R R	743 HURF12R R	8402 STP C	9450 STP C	15956 STP C
	3.7	Widen to 6 lanes	0 HURF12R C	1940 HURF12R C	11483 TOTAL	24519 TOTAL	18274 TOTAL
	5	Conforms	0 RTA C	6177 HURF12R C			
	6		15643 STP C	44422 RTA C			
			25000 RAISE C	15956 STP C			
			42342 TOTAL	69271 TOTAL			

Proposed Request

131.00 SR5A	19_a	22nd St: I-10 to Tucson Blvd	1642 HURF12R D	776 HURF12R D	3081 HURF12R C	15069 HURF12R C	2318 HURF12R C
		I-10 to Tucson Blvd	57 HURF12R R	4704 RTA D	8402 STP C	9450 STP C	15956 STP C
	3.7	Widen to 6 lanes	0 HURF12R C	1940 HURF12R C	11483 TOTAL	24519 TOTAL	18274 TOTAL
	5	Conforms	0 RTA C	6177 HURF12R C			
	6		15643 STP C	44422 RTA C			
			25000 RAISE C	15956 STP C			
			42342 TOTAL	6758 HURF26 C	80733 TOTAL		

SPONSOR: Tucson ACTION: Add \$6,758,000 of HURF26 C and \$4,704,000 of RTA D in FY26

SUBJECT: ADOT Statewide Listening Tour

Meeting	Meeting Date	Agenda Category	Agenda Item #
Transportation Planning Committee	February 18, 2025	Information	06

REQUESTED ACTION/SUGGESTED MOTION

None requested.

ASSOCIATED OWP WORK ELEMENT/GOAL

N/A

SUMMARY

ADOT staff along with the Central Creative consulting team will present on the ADOT Statewide Listening Tour. ADOT's Statewide Listening Tour is an initiative to listen, learn and build strong relationships with communities toward a shared vision for the future of transportation in Arizona.

PRIOR BOARD AND/OR COMMITTEE ACTION

N/A

FINANCIAL CONSIDERATIONS

N/A

TECHNICAL, POLICY, LEGAL OR OTHER CONSIDERATIONS

N/A

ATTACHED ADDITIONAL BACKUP INFORMATION

None.

Staff Contact/Phone	Jeanette DeRenne, (520) 792-1093, ext. 1477
----------------------------	---

SUBJECT: RMAP Amendment Process

Meeting	Meeting Date	Agenda Category	Agenda Item #
Transportation Planning Committee	February 18, 2026	Information Item	07

REQUESTED ACTION/SUGGESTED MOTION

This is an information item.

ASSOCIATED OWP WORK ELEMENT/GOAL

Work Element 40, Transportation Planning

SUMMARY

A member of PAG staff will provide an overview of the RMAP amendment process. Staff developed a table that summarizes the differences between administrative modifications and amendments, including their definitions and the steps required for their incorporation into the 2055 RMAP.

PRIOR BOARD AND/OR COMMITTEE ACTION

None.

FINANCIAL CONSIDERATIONS

None.

TECHNICAL, POLICY, LEGAL OR OTHER CONSIDERATIONS

None.

ATTACHED ADDITIONAL BACKUP INFORMATION

Amendment Process Table

Staff Contact/Phone	Nicolas Giraldo, (520) 792-1093, ext. 4472 Hannah Oden, (520) 792-1093, ext. 4418 Dustin Fitzpatrick, (520) 792-1093, ext. 4417 Jeanette DeRenne, (520) 792-1093, ext. 4477
----------------------------	--

Summary Table — Modification vs. Amendment

Step	Administrative Modification	Amendment
Define	<p>An administrative modification is a minor revision to the RMAP. Administrative modifications include minor changes to project/phase costs that do not adversely impact the fiscal constraint, funding sources, or project/phase initiation dates. They do not require public review and comment, a demonstration of fiscal constraint, or a conformity determination (in nonattainment and maintenance areas) (23 CFR 450.104).</p>	<p>An amendment is a major revision to the RMAP. This may include adding or deleting projects from the plan as well as making major changes to project costs (in excess of 25%), initiation dates, or design concepts and scopes for existing projects that require new travel demand modeling. An amendment requires public review and comment in accordance with the RMAP amendment and public involvement processes and demonstrating fiscal constraint. Changes to projects that are included only for illustrative purposes do not require an amendment (23 CFR 450.104). If an amendment involves “non-exempt” projects in nonattainment and maintenance areas, a conformity determination is required.</p>
Adds/deletes project	No	Yes
Major cost/scope change	No	Yes (if change in total project cost meets or exceeds 25% of original estimate or exceeds the total fiscal constraint)
Initiated By	PAG or project sponsor	Project sponsor
Public involvement	Not required	Required per 23 CFR 450.316
Fiscal constraint	No redemonstration (if project cost does not exceed	Required per 23 CFR 450.104 and 23 USC 134

	25% of the original estimate or exceed the fiscal constraint)	An amendment requires revenue and cost estimates supporting the plan to use an inflation rate(s) to reflect year of expenditure dollars, based on reasonable financial principles and information. All in-plan projects must update cost estimates to demonstrate fiscal constraint as part of the amendment process.
Air Quality Conformity	No new determination	Required per 23 CFR 450.104 and 23 USC 134 if the amendment involves “non-exempt” projects in nonattainment and maintenance areas.
Interagency Consultation for Air Quality Conformity	Not required	Required per 40 CFR 93.105 , 40 CFR 93.104 and 40 CFR 93.112 if the amendment involves “non-exempt” projects in nonattainment and maintenance areas.
Recommendation for Approval	PAG Executive Director	TPC and Management Committee
Final Approval	PAG Executive Director	PAG Regional Council
Examples	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Minor text revisions due to a scrivener’s error etc. • Minor changes to project name, description, or scope as determined by the PAG Executive Director that does not require modeling 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Additions or deletions of “non-exempt” projects that require an air quality conformity analysis in nonattainment and maintenance areas • Addition of a project or change to an existing project that impacts the fiscal constraint • Any change to a project that requires modeling for

	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Transfer of funds between projects in the RMAP as long as the fiscal constraint is not impacted and the change for each project is not impacted by more than 25%	congestion, traffic volume, job accessibility, etc.
--	--	---

SUBJECT: RTA Delivery Approach and Cash Flow Assessment

Meeting	Meeting Date	Agenda Category	Agenda Item #
TPC	Feb. 18, 2026	Information	08

REQUESTED ACTION/SUGGESTED MOTION

None. Information only.

ASSOCIATED OWP WORK ELEMENT/GOAL

Work Element 40: Transportation Activities

SUMMARY

PAG/RTA staff will provide an update on (1) efforts to gather RTA project and program information, (2) the development of a draft cash flow assessment, and (3) related efforts, such as developing a draft list of financially constrained projects.

PRIOR BOARD AND/OR COMMITTEE ACTION

None.

FINANCIAL CONSIDERATIONS

None.

TECHNICAL, POLICY, LEGAL OR OTHER CONSIDERATIONS

The Regional Transportation Authority (RTA), established by the state Legislature as a state taxing district, is an independent governing authority to develop a regional transportation plan and collect funding from the RTA taxing district within the boundaries of Pima County. In August, the RTA Board finalized a new 20-year regional transportation plan (RTA Next) that will be presented to Pima County voters for consideration on March 10, 2026.

ATTACHED ADDITIONAL BACKUP INFORMATION

- Illustrative example of federal STBG programming for RTA Next (Working Draft), Feb. 3, 2026, version

Staff Contact/Phone	Rick Ellis, (520) 792-1093, ext. 4478 Jamie Brown, (520) 792-1093, ext. 4473 James Towe, (520) 792-1093, ext. 4471 Adam Ledford, (520) 792-1093, ext. 4434
--------------------------------	---

Illustrative Example (1) Addressing Use of Federal STBG in FY 2027 - FY 2031 and (2) Rebalancing Programming to Match Cost to Complete

Notes:

Funding sources for this example only include RTA 1 TPT, RTA Next TPT, HURF 12.6% and STBG (no grants, local funds, etc.)
 Total HURF and STBG (committed, non-RTA committed dollars) in FY 2027-2031 = **\$237,363,000**
 HURF 12.6% FY 2027 - FY 2031 = **\$157,583,000** (\$31,516,600 annual)
 STBG FY 2027 - FY 2031 = **\$79,780,000** (\$15,956,000 annual)
Bolded blue amounts are the key amounts above

Projects with dark orange text are, or would likely be, federalized

Updates from previous version: (1) Increased cost to complete for Grant/UPRR by \$3M to correct error (2) Shifted addition of RTA 1 TPT from Tangerine Phase 2B to Grant Rd. 5/6 to be more consistent with current programming. This resulted in corresponding adjustments to HURF 12.6%.

Key Assumptions

RTA Next TPT can (1) be exchanged with Moore Rd. TI and Sonoran Corridor and (1) can be added back to RTA Next 1A
 There is sufficient unprogrammed RTA 1 TPT.
 There is sufficient unexpended HURF 12.6% in FY 2026 for a funding exchange
 Additional STBG can be programmed on the 22nd St. bridge project

RTA 1 Roadway Element and RTA Next 1A	Cost to complete as of Summer 2025 (less any non-regional, e.g., local, grants)	FY 2025 / 2026 TIP						FY 2027 - FY 2031 RTA Next (plus STBG recipients)									Current FY 25/26 Programming and RTA Next allocation compared to Proposed		
		RTA 1 TPT		HURF 12.6%		STBG		RTA Next TPT		HURF 12.6%			STBG			Column O	Column P	Column Q	
		Column A	Column B	Column C	Column D	Column E	Column F	Column G	Column H	Column I	Column J	Column K	Column L	Column M	Column N	Column O	Column P	Column Q	
	Est. Amount	Current Programming	Proposed (illustrative)	Current Programming	Proposed (illustrative)	Current Programming	Proposed (illustrative)	RTA Next Allocation	Proposed (illustrative)	Current Programming	RTA Next Allocation	Proposed (illustrative)	Current Programming	RTA Next Allocation	Proposed (illustrative)	Current FY 25/26 Programming + RTA Next Allocation (A+C+E+G+J+M)	Proposed (illustrative) (B+D+F+H+K+N)	Difference (P-O)	
RTA 1 Element 1 projects																			
Tangerine, Phase 2A	\$30,574,000	\$16,601,000	\$25,632,000	\$9,032,000	\$4,942,000	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$25,633,000	\$30,574,000	\$4,941,000	
Silverbell, Phase 2	\$52,159,000	\$8,467,000	\$52,159,000	\$34,515,000	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$42,982,000	\$52,159,000	\$9,177,000	
UPRR @ Grant	\$15,900,000	\$4,060,000	\$7,060,000	\$16,426,000	\$8,840,000	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$20,486,000	\$15,900,000	-\$4,586,000	
Downtown Links	\$14,672,000	\$15,074,000	\$14,672,000	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$15,074,000	\$14,672,000	-\$402,000	
Broadway	\$7,263,000	\$0	\$7,263,000	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$15,074,000	\$0	\$7,263,000	
Grant Rd., Phases 3/4	\$63,050,000	\$22,360,000	\$49,789,000	\$33,767,000	\$13,261,000	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$56,127,000	\$63,050,000	\$6,923,000	
22nd; Bridge [Federalized]	\$145,389,000	\$44,422,000	\$62,884,000	\$10,592,000	\$10,592,000	\$29,554,000	\$29,554,000	\$0	\$0	\$20,468,000	\$0	\$0	\$35,853,000	\$0	\$42,359,000	\$84,568,000	\$145,389,000	\$60,821,000	
Aviation	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	
Irvington: SC to E. of I-10	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	
Valencia: I-19 to Alvernon [Federalized]	\$9,800,000	\$0	\$0	\$1,747,000	\$2,246,000	\$2,045,000	\$2,045,000	\$0	\$0	\$499,000	\$0	\$0	\$5,509,000	\$0	\$5,509,000	\$3,792,000	\$9,800,000	\$6,008,000	
Valencia: Kolb to Houghton	\$38,091,000	\$47,752,000	\$38,091,000	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$47,752,000	\$38,091,000	-\$9,661,000	
22nd: CS to Houghton	\$39,785,000	\$1,231,000	\$27,151,000	\$12,634,000	\$12,634,000	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$17,251,000	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$13,865,000	\$39,785,000	\$25,920,000	
Harrison: Golf Links to Irvington	\$14,250,000	\$989,000	\$14,250,000	\$13,261,000	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$14,250,000	\$14,250,000	\$0	
Houghton: 22nd St. to Irvington Rd.	\$62,413,000	\$20,608,000	\$52,451,000	\$9,962,000	\$9,962,000	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$24,152,000	\$0	\$0	0	\$0	\$0	\$30,570,000	\$62,413,000	\$31,843,000	
Subtotal	\$493,346,000	\$181,564,000	\$351,402,000	\$141,936,000	\$62,477,000	\$31,599,000	\$31,599,000	\$0	\$0	\$62,370,000	\$0	\$0	\$41,362,000	\$0	\$47,868,000	\$355,099,000	\$493,346,000	\$138,247,000	
RTA Next 1A Projects																			
Silverbell, Phase 3 [RTA Next]	\$135,205,000	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$70,660,000	\$70,660,000	\$0	\$64,545,000	\$64,545,000	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$135,205,000	\$135,205,000	\$0	
1st. Ave. (North) [RTA Next]	\$11,868,000	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$6,290,000	\$6,290,000	\$2,583,000	\$5,578,000	\$5,578,000	\$6,506,000	\$0	\$0	\$11,868,000	\$11,868,000	\$0	
1st. Ave. (South) [RTA Next]	\$136,300,000	\$63,748,000	\$2,800,000	\$321,000	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$70,755,000	\$70,755,000	\$0	\$0	\$62,745,000	0	\$62,745,000	\$0	\$197,569,000	\$136,300,000	-\$61,269,000	
22nd; Final Phase [RTA Next]	\$79,233,000	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$40,632,000	\$40,632,000	\$0	\$38,601,000	\$38,601,000	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$79,233,000	\$79,233,000	\$0	
Houghton: Broadway to TV [RTA Next]	\$47,992,000	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$25,435,000	\$25,435,000	0	\$5,522,000	\$22,557,000	0	\$17,035,000	\$0	\$47,992,000	\$47,992,000	\$0	
Tangerine, Phase 2B [RTA Next]	\$41,594,000	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$7,200,000	\$7,200,000	\$27,401,000	\$6,993,000	\$34,394,000	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$14,193,000	\$41,594,000	\$27,401,000	
Grant Rd., Phases 5/6 [RTA Next]	\$111,394,000	\$40,000,000	\$33,874,000	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$36,665,000	\$68,577,000	\$0	\$36,344,000	\$8,943,000	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$113,009,000	\$111,394,000	-\$1,615,000	
Subtotal	\$563,586,000	\$103,748,000	\$36,674,000	\$321,000	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$257,637,000	\$289,549,000	\$29,984,000	\$157,583,000	\$237,363,000	\$6,506,000	\$79,780,000	\$0	\$599,069,000	\$563,586,000	-\$35,483,000	
Totals	\$1,056,932,000	\$285,312,000	\$388,076,000	\$142,257,000	\$62,477,000	\$31,599,000	\$31,599,000	\$257,637,000	\$289,549,000	\$92,354,000	\$157,583,000	\$237,363,000	\$47,868,000	\$79,780,000	\$47,868,000	\$954,168,000	\$1,056,932,000	\$102,764,000	
		Difference	\$102,764,000	Difference	-\$79,780,000	Difference	\$0	Difference	\$31,912,000	Difference	\$79,780,000	Difference	-\$31,912,000	Difference	-\$31,912,000	Difference	\$102,764,000		
Other RTA Next Period 1 projects (likely to be federalized)																			
Moore Rd TI [likely Federalized]	\$30,000,000	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$30,000,000	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$30,000,000	\$30,000,000	\$0	
Sonoran Corridor study [likely Federalized]	\$5,000,000	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$5,000,000	\$3,088,000	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$1,912,000	\$5,000,000	\$5,000,000	\$0	
Subtotal	\$35,000,000	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$35,000,000	\$3,088,000	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$31,912,000	\$35,000,000	\$35,000,000	\$0	
Totals (RTA Roadway Element projects above)	\$1,091,932,000	\$285,312,000	\$388,076,000	\$142,257,000	\$62,477,000	\$31,599,000	\$31,599,000	\$292,637,000	\$292,637,000	\$92,354,000	\$157,583,000	\$237,363,000	\$47,868,000	\$79,780,000	\$79,780,000	\$989,168,000	\$1,091,932,000	\$102,764,000	

SUBJECT: Updates related to the Transportation Improvement Program (TIP)

Meeting	Meeting Date	Agenda Category	Agenda Item #
TPC	Feb. 18, 2026	Information	09

REQUESTED ACTION/SUGGESTED MOTION

None. Information only.

ASSOCIATED OWP WORK ELEMENT/GOAL

Work Element 40: Transportation Activities

SUMMARY

As the region’s designated metropolitan planning organization (MPO), PAG is responsible for developing and maintaining the federally required transportation improvement program (TIP). Staff will be available to provide updates on TIP-related activities.

None.

FINANCIAL CONSIDERATIONS

None.

TECHNICAL, POLICY, LEGAL OR OTHER CONSIDERATIONS

PAG develops the TIP consistent with federal regulations for metropolitan transportation planning as described in 23 CFR §450.326.

ATTACHED ADDITIONAL BACKUP INFORMATION

None.

Staff Contact/Phone	Jamie Brown, (520) 792-1093, ext. 4473 James Towe, (520) 792-1093, ext. 4471 Adam Ledford, (520) 792-1093, ext. 4434
----------------------------	--