Pima Association of Governments

Transportation Planning Committee (TPC) Meeting

At or after 9:00 a.m., April 15, 2026
1 E. Broadway Blvd., Fourth Floor
Tucson, AZ 85701

Public Access to Meeting Audio/Presentation: https://www.youtube.com/live/xubpCq1ae0I

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. **Approval of March 25, 2026, Meeting Summary**

   Action: Approval of the Meeting Summary.

4. **FY 2025–FY 2029 PAG Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) Amendment #2025.050**

   Staff will provide details on TIP Amendment #2025.050 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.

5. **ADOT Route Transfer Handbook Update**

ADOT and the Kimley-Horn consultant will provide an update on the ADOT Route Transfer Handbook.

This is an information item.

6. 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.

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

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

This is for information.

8. RMAP Amendment Procedure Update

PAG staff will provide an update on the amendment process for the Regional Mobility and Accessibility Plan and next steps as a follow-up to the last TPC meeting.

This is an information item.

9. 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*

10. 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.

DRAFT

Pima Association of Governments

Transportation Planning Committee (TPC)
Meeting Summary

Summary of 9 a.m., March 25, 2026, meeting

The meeting can be viewed in its entirety at: https://www.youtube.com/live/MQgL4z6KSXE

Committee Members

Josue Licea - Chair
City of South Tucson

Andy Bemis
City of Tucson

Jose Rodríguez
Town of Oro Valley

Fausto Burruel
Town of Marana

Kathryn Skinner (Virtual)
Pima County DOT

Committee Members Cont.

Jennifer Hobert (Virtual)
ADOT

Mikel Oglesby (Virtual)
Sun Tran

Nathan Barrett (Virtual)
Town of Sahuarita

Tony Bianchi (Virtual)
Tucson Airport Authority

PAG Staff Lead
Jeanette DeRenne

Ex-Officio
Jamie Brown, PAG/RTA

1. **Call to Order and Introductions**

   The Chair called the meeting to order at 9:01 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 February 18, 2026, Meeting Summary**

   Video Timestamp: 1:58

***Action*:** A motion to approve the Feb. 18, 2026, meeting summary was made by Andy Bemis, City of Tucson, seconded by Jose Rodríguez, Town of Oro Valley, and passed unanimously.

The Chair asked that Item 6 be moved up on the agenda to be covered as Item 4.

4. **RTA Delivery Approach and Cash Flow Assessment – Status Update** (previously item 6)

Video Timestamp: 2:47

PAG/RTA staff provided updates 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. PAG Executive Director Michael Ortega provided a synopsis on the direction of implementation with the RTA Next program. Members were informed that it would be imperative to focus on delivery, and the RTA would facilitate ways for the jurisdictions to get projects out the door. Mr. Ortega stated that although IGAs or TIP amendments were necessary steps for projects to proceed, those were subordinate to allowing projects to move forward in the near term and so pre-authorizations would be considered.

Members were informed that there were conditions for approval of pre-authorizations. This includes the organization covering the cost of a project until they can be reimbursed. Jurisdictions will need to ensure an IGA is in place to receive reimbursement, establish the cash flow and include the project schedule. PAG Director of Transportation Services Rick Ellis shared with members that the performance matrix would be a critical component. PAG Director of Strategic Planning, Programing and Policy Jamie Brown indicated that PAG staff would be working with the TIP Subcommittee on the process and analyzing the fiscal year, fund source and phasing to establish fiscal constraint.

Andy Bemis, City of Tucson, inquired if the RTA would be deferring to the jurisdictions internal processes for projects within specific categorical funding components. Members were informed that they would defer to the local jurisdiction while ensuring that projects were eligible within the categorical element.

Jose Rodríguez, Town of Oro Valley, asked if there was intentional bonding on the RTA side of the plan. Members were informed that there had been $5 million allocated within the plan for bonding as a placeholder. Mr. Ortega indicated that it was suggested to the Board that if bonding was something they wanted to do within the plan, the RTA Board would review that option. Members were informed that if the potential additional revenue collected is higher than expected, that money could be used as a buffer for potential bonding moving forward.

This item was for information only.

5. **Review Transportation Art by Youth (TABY) Program Applications – FY 2026**

   Video Timestamp: 21:09

   PAG Project Implementation Administrator Lance Peterson introduced the Town of Sahuarita's TABY application. John Garcia, Town of Sahuarita, provided a presentation for a mural-themed metal frame project that would be located at the northwest corner of Sahuarita Road and La Villita Road.

   Mr. Peterson provided the members with an update on the City of South Tucson's TABY project that was approved last year. Members were informed that due to unforeseen circumstances, the project was unable to start but would begin construction this year.

   Tony Bianchi, Tucson Airport Authority, inquired if the allocated funds for the City of South Tucson would be carried over or be impacted by the delay. Members were informed that those funds would be carried forward to be fully funded and would not have an impact on the Town of Sahuarita's application. Mr. Peterson explained that the TABY program allows $25,000 per year per eligible jurisdiction. Typically, jurisdictions like to group three years to receive a maximum of $75,000, which is what the City of South Tucson is doing with this project.

   Action: A motion to approve the Town of Sahuarita's TABY program application was made by Jose Rodríguez, Town of Oro Valley, seconded by Fausto Burruel, Town of Marana, and passed unanimously.

6. **Arizona Department of Transportation (ADOT) 2026 Safety Performance Projections** (previously item 4)

   Video Timestamp: 26:50

   This item was removed from the agenda.

7. **Updates related to the Transportation Improvement Program (TIP)**

   Video Timestamp: 27:16

   Members were informed that the RTAG process was ending, and discussions were underway with sponsors about funding awards. Also, PAG Director of Strategic Planning, Programing and Policy Jamie Brown shared with members that a formal TIP amendment for $11.462M to the City of Tucson's 22nd Street Bridge project was recommended to move forward and would be taken to the Regional Council for approval. Finally, members were informed that proposed dates for the TIP Subcommittee were being established,

and he asked the jurisdictions to reach out if they had any recommendations for committee members.

This item was for information only.

8. Request for Future Agenda Items and Announcements

Video Timestamp: 29:42

Members of the committee shared announcements pertaining to the business of the agencies. PAG Transportation Planning Director Jeanette DeRenne shared with the members that an update on the Surface Transportation Reauthorization would be given by lobbyist Michael Racy at the Regional Council meeting. Members were informed that PAG would be working with him to provide regular updates to committees moving forward.

Paul Casertano, Pima County, asked when the ADOT Safety Projections would be coming back to the committee. Members were informed that due to the Management Committee approving the ADOT Safety Performance Measures in perpetuity, the item would be going to the Regional Council with the same request for action and would not be brought back to the TPC.

Andy Bemis, City of Tucson, inquired about continuing the conversations on safety goals. Members were informed that it was intended to be brought to committees on an annual basis after the safety data was received from ADOT. Ms. DeRenne shared with members that the update to the Safety Explorer tool would happen around October. Members were informed that the discussion around the RMAP will continue when it fits into the cycle and when performance measures are discussed through the TIP process.

****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.*

9. Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned at 9:35 a.m.

SUBJECT: **FY 2025–FY 2029 PAG TIP Amendment #2025.050**

Meeting	Meeting Date	Agenda Category	Agenda Item #
TPC	April 15, 2026	Action	04

REQUESTED ACTION/SUGGESTED MOTION

The Transportation Planning Committee (TPC) will be asked to recommend approval of a formal 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.

Item A programs a total of $2,243,000 in FTA 5311 Year 2 grant awards for the FY 2024 cycle, and $978,000 of RTA TPT as the corresponding non-federal match.

Item B programs a total of $379,000 in FTA 5339 Year 2 grant awards for the FY 2024 cycle, and $76,000 of RTA TPT as the corresponding non-federal match.

Per the most recent ADOT guidance, FTA funds are programmed in the year of fund availability, in this case, FY 2026.

PRIOR BOARD AND/OR COMMITTEE ACTION

None.

FINANCIAL CONSIDERATIONS

- For TIP ID 59.16, $4,000 in FTA funding was from the CARES Act and did not require a non-federal match.
- For TIP ID 60.16, $530,000 in FTA funding was from the CARES Act, $47,000 was from the ARP program, and neither required a non-federal match.
- For TIP ID 7.26, an additional $6,000 RTA is programmed to address cost increases that

occurred after the grant was initially submitted.

TECHNICAL, POLICY, LEGAL OR OTHER CONSIDERATIONS

This TIP amendment complies with ADOT guidelines per ADOT's TIP Amendment Guidelines and aligns with PAG's TIP policies and procedures in Appendix 3 of the approved FY 2025–FY 2029 TIP.

ATTACHED ADDITIONAL BACKUP INFORMATION

- Proposed Formal Amendment No. 2025.050 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

Pima Association of Governments 2025-2029 TIP Projects

TIP Amendment #2025.050 Open

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

ITEM A

Existing Approval

57.16	46__	**FTA 5311 Administration** Administration of FTA 5311 Grant Conforms	95 RTA O 379 FTA5311 O **474 TOTAL**				

Proposed Request

57.16	46__	**FTA 5311 Administration** Administration of FTA 5311 Grant Conforms $972	95 RTA O 379 FTA5311 O **474 TOTAL**	100 RTA O 398 FTA5311 O **498 TOTAL**			

SPONSOR: RTA

ACTION: Program FTA5311 Year 2 (FY24 cycle) Grant funding in FY 2026

DRAFT

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

ITEM A

Existing Approval

58.16	48__	**FTA 5311 Preventative Maintenance** Maintenance for FTA 5311 grant Conforms	20 RTA PMX 80 FTA5311 PMX **100 TOTAL**				

Proposed Request

58.16	48__	**FTA 5311 Preventative Maintenance** Maintenance for FTA 5311 grant Conforms $200	20 RTA PMX 80 FTA5311 PMX **100 TOTAL**	20 RTA PMX 80 FTA5311 PMX **100 TOTAL**			

SPONSOR: RTA

ACTION: Program FTA5311 Year 2 (FY24 cycle) Grant funding in FY 2026

DRAFT

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

ITEM A

Existing Approval

59.16	48__	**FTA 5311 Intercity Transit** Intercity Transit Conforms	110 RTA O 152 FTA5311 O **262 TOTAL**				

Proposed Request

59.16	48__	**FTA 5311 Intercity Transit** Intercity Transit FTA 5311 Conforms $658	110 RTA O 152 FTA5311 O **262 TOTAL**	141 RTA O 24 RTA O 195 FTA5311 O 32 FTA5311 O 4 FTA5311 O **396 TOTAL**			

SPONSOR: RTA

ACTION: Program FTA5311 Year 2 (FY24 cycle) Grant funding in FY 2026

DRAFT

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

ITEM A

Existing Approval

60.16	48__	**FTA 5311 Operating Grant** Transit Operations Conforms	731 RTA O 1010 FTA5311 O **1741 TOTAL**				

Proposed Request

60.16	48__	**FTA 5311 Operating Grant** Transit Operations FTA 5311 Conforms $3,968	731 RTA O 1010 FTA5311 O **1741 TOTAL**	693 RTA O 957 FTA5311 O 47 FTA5311 O 530 FTA5311 O **2227 TOTAL**			

SPONSOR: RTA

ACTION: Program FTA5311 Year 2 (FY24 cycle) Grant funding in FY 2026

DRAFT

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

ITEM B

Existing Approval

6.26	48__	**5339 Bus Replacements <30 FT** FTA 5339 FY 2024 Year 2 Award N/A					

Proposed Request

6.26	48__	**5339 Bus Replacements <30 FT** FTA 5339 FY 2024 Year 2 Award N/A $422		32 RTA P 32 RTA P 179 FTA5339 P 179 FTA5339 P **422 TOTAL**			

SPONSOR: RTA

ACTION: Program FTA5339 Year 2 (FY24 cycle) Grant funding in FY 2026

DRAFT

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

ITEM B

Existing Approval

7.26	48__	**5339 Bus Stop Seats** FY 2024 FTA 5311/5339 Year 2 Grant Award N/A					

Proposed Request

7.26	48__	**5339 Bus Stop Seats** FTA 5339 FY 2024 Year 2 Award N/A $33		12 RTA P 21 FTA5339 P **33 TOTAL**			

SPONSOR: RTA

ACTION: Program FTA5339 Year 2 (FY24 cycle) Grant funding in FY 2026

DRAFT

SUBJECT: ADOT Route Transfer Handbook Update

Meeting	Meeting Date	Agenda Category	Agenda Item #
Transportation Planning Committee	April 15, 2026	Information Item	05

REQUESTED ACTION/SUGGESTED MOTION

This is an information item.

ASSOCIATED OWP WORK ELEMENT/GOAL

Work Element 40, Transportation Planning

SUMMARY

ADOT is updating its Route Transfer Handbook which will outline the formal process of shifting ownership and maintenance responsibility into or out of ADOT's State Highway System.

Representatives from ADOT and Kimley-Horn will provide an update on the process and solicit any feedback.

PRIOR BOARD AND/OR COMMITTEE ACTION

None.

FINANCIAL CONSIDERATIONS

None.

TECHNICAL, POLICY, LEGAL OR OTHER CONSIDERATIONS

None.

ATTACHED ADDITIONAL BACKUP INFORMATION

None.

Staff Contact/Phone	Hannah Oden, (520) 792-1093, ext. 4418 Jeanette DeRenne, (520) 792-1093, ext. 4477

Pima Association of Governments

SUBJECT: RTA Delivery Approach and Cash Flow Assessment

Meeting	Meeting Date	Agenda Category	Agenda Item #
TPC	April 15, 2026	Information	06

REQUESTED ACTION/SUGGESTED MOTION

None. Information only.

ASSOCIATED OWP WORK ELEMENT/GOAL

Work Element 40: Transportation Activities

SUMMARY

PAG 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 draft financially constrained TIP project lists.

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.

ATTACHED ADDITIONAL BACKUP INFORMATION

None.

Packet Material Prepared: April. 7, 2026

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

Pima Association of Governments

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

Meeting	Meeting Date	Agenda Category	Agenda Item #
TPC	April 15, 2026	Information	07

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. This will include an update on the recently completed competitive selection process for the Regional Transportation Alternatives Grants.

PRIOR BOARD AND/OR COMMITTEE ACTION

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

- RTAG Competitive Selection Process Report, 2026

Packet Material Prepared: April 7, 2026

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

Pima Association of Governments

FY 2026 PAG Regional Transportation Alternatives Grants (RTAG)
Competitive Selection Process Report (FY 2027 and FY 2028 funding)

March 2026

In September 2025, a detailed Call for Projects memo was distributed to PAG's member agencies for "Regional Transportation Alternatives Grants." These RTAG funds are for bicycle and pedestrian projects that also align with the 2006 RTA plan ballot #41 category of "Greenways, pathways, bikeways and sidewalks."

The funding is anticipated to be available in FY 2027 and/or FY 2028 through a combination of federal Surface Transportation Block Grant (STBG) and Transportation Alternatives (TA) funding, with the RTA contributing 5.7% in non-federal match. Future federal funding is not guaranteed and can vary based on new federal authorization and adjustments to apportionments. Therefore, as emphasized in the Call for Projects, the amounts identified are preliminary and are based on the latest information available. With the current, federal surface transportation bill expiring in September, there is additional uncertainty about funding levels beyond federal fiscal year 2026.

Based on the six RTAG applications submitted, demand for funding far exceeded the total available, with nearly three times as much funding requested. Since TA funding requires a competitive process, a selection panel of Transportation Planning Committee members was formed. Through its deliberations, the selection panel acknowledged the value and significance of all six projects that were submitted for consideration. Ultimately, the selection panel unanimously approved fully funding the top two scoring projects, which were:

- **Midtown Bicycle Boulevards**
- **Kolb Irvington Shared Use Path**

This decision was determined first by the overall project scores and resulting ranking and then by the priority established in the Call for Projects to fully fund as many projects as possible as opposed to awarding partial funding. The **Valencia Road Bicycle and Pedestrian Improvement** project scored third and was awarded the remainder of the available federal funding ($120,988) for either FY 2027 or FY 2028, depending on the preference of the sponsor. No other projects were awarded funding. Awarded funding amounts are shown in table 1, and the project scores are shown in table 2.

Key points from the selection panel decision process include:

- The scoring criteria and percentages for each were included in the Call for Projects memo. Additionally, the memo emphasized, with bold and underline text, that **"scoring priority will be weighted to prioritize most miles and least cost per mile"** Thus, all applicants were made aware of the scoring emphasis.

- The memo stated that "The priority will be to fully fund as many projects as possible, as opposed to partially funding multiple projects, since reductions in funding can jeopardize the viability of the project." Therefore, to be consistent with the information provided to all applicants, the selection panel followed the priority of fully funding the top scoring projects.

- For future competitive funding awards, it is recommended that the process consider the following:

    - Project types should be differentiated to compete in separate categories or with adjusted weighting by type. This purpose would be to level the playing field of new infrastructure projects (e.g., multi-use paths, sidewalks) with those that use existing facilities (e.g., bicycle boulevards). If project types are not differentiated, the Call for Projects should mention the project types that would be most competitive for funding if mileage continues to be emphasized.

    - Scoring criteria should reduce the emphasis on mileage.

    - The selection panel recommends that the TPC, or other PAG committees as appropriate, review and provide input on these process recommendations prior to the next competitive process.

Table 1. RTAG project awards and funding amounts

Project Name	**Sponsor**	**Federal funding type awarded**	**FY 2027 federal RTAG Award**	**FY 2027 RTA Match** (5.7% of project total)	**FY 2028 federal RTAG Award**	**FY 2028 RTA Match** (5.7% of project total)	**Total Awarded**
Midtown Bicycle Boulevards	City of Tucson	TA >200k	$0	$0	$3,385,000	$204,608	$3,589,608
Kolb Irvington SUP - Kolb Segment*	City of Tucson	TA >200k	$0	$0	$1,009,000	$60,989	$1,069,989
Kolb Irvington SUP - Irvington Segment*	City of Tucson	STBG < 5k	$0	$0	$2,987,000	$180,550	$3,167,550
Valencia Rd. Bicycle and Pedestrian Improvements**	Pima County	TA >200k	120,988	$7,313	$0	$0	$128,301
Totals			**$120,988**	**$7,313**	**$7,381,000**	**$446,147**	**$7,955,448**

*The Kolb Irvington SUP was submitted as one project, but the segments fall within different population areas. Therefore, the funding, by population area, is shown in separate rows.
**Funding could be made available in FY 2028 instead of FY 2027 if preferred by the project sponsor.

Table 2. RTAG scoring sheet

Juris-dictional Sponsor	Project Name	Population Area	Project Cost (Federal TA/STBG funding only)	Miles to be delivered	Cost per Mile	Miles Score (35%)	Cost per Mile Score (35%)	Project readiness (5%)	Regional significance and benefit (5%)	Ability to address network gaps (5%)	Anticipated safety benefits (5%)	Level of community involvement, and support for the development/ planning of this project to date (5%)	Proximity to high need areas (5%)	Total Score	Rank
City of Tucson	Midtown Bicycle Boulevards	>200k	$3,385,000	22	$153,864	35.00	35.00	4.00	4.00	4.33	4.00	4.33	5.00	**95.66**	**1**
City of Tucson	Kolb Irvington Shared Use Path (SUP)	Combination of both	$3,996,000	10	$399,600	29.17	29.17	3.67	4.67	4.67	4.33	4.33	5.00	**85.00**	**2**
Pima County	Valencia Road Bicycle and Pedestrian Improvements	>200k	$7,303,601	5.4	$1,352,519	23.33	17.50	5.00	4.67	4.33	4.33	4.33	5.00	**68.50**	**3**
Town of Sahuarita	Camino de las Quintas Multi-use Path (MUP)	≤49k	$1,177,483	2.2	$535,220	17.50	23.33	2.67	3.00	4.33	4.33	3.33	5.00	**63.50**	**4**
Pima County	Sunrise Drive Bicycle and Pedestrian Improvements	>200k	$2,107,626	1.17	$1,801,390	11.67	11.67	2.67	4.00	4.00	5.00	3.67	0.00	**42.67**	**5**
Pima County	Madera Canyon Road Small Wash Culvert Improvements	≤49k	$4,077,617	1.02	$3,997,664	5.83	5.83	2.33	3.00	3.00	4.67	3.00	0.00	**27.67**	**6**

SUBJECT: RMAP Amendment Process

Meeting	Meeting Date	Agenda Category	Agenda Item #
Transportation Planning Committee	April 15, 2026	Information Item	08

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 update on the RMAP Amendment Process Table, which was presented at the Feb. 18 meeting.

On Feb. 19, a formal request from PAG for comments on the proposed RMAP amendment process from TPC members was sent via email.

The deadline for comments was Friday, March 6. No comments were submitted by this date.

On Thursday, March 12, comments were received from the Pima County Department of Transportation and are included as an attachment.

The amendment process table has been revised to address some of these suggestions and is included as an attachment to this memo.

PRIOR BOARD AND/OR COMMITTEE ACTION

None.

FINANCIAL CONSIDERATIONS

None.

TECHNICAL, POLICY, LEGAL OR OTHER CONSIDERATIONS

None.

ATTACHED ADDITIONAL BACKUP INFORMATION

- Comments from the Pima County Department of Transportation
- Revised 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

Pima County Department of Transportation Comments - Received March 12, 2026

Below are suggested additional notification requirements, considerations, and comments for RMAP Administrative Modifications and Amendments from the PCDOT team:

1. All proposed Administrative Modifications and Amendments should be considered to first be presented to TIP subcommittee and/or TPC/Mgt. Committee so that jurisdictions are at a minimum aware of proposed changes prior to exec director approval (if authorized by PAG Regional Council). If TPC/Mgt Committee were set up to take action on the matter, this could change the "Recommendation for Approval" action for Administrative Amendments from PAG Executive Director to TPC or Management Committee. The current proposed Decision Flow diagram does not reflect any review by PAG committees prior to Regional Council (Amendments) and Executive Director (Administrative Modifications). RMAP Administrative Modifications should follow a process similar to a TIP Administrative Amendment whereby subcommittees of Regional Council that are involved in RMAP development, management, and implementation (TPC, Mgt. Committee etc) are part of the process (approval or simply notification by/of TPC/Mgt Committee is up to Regional Council). The information item should include the project ID, name, cost, scope, and proposed change, along with details of applicable thresholds and impacts to financial plan and allocation of RMAP.
2. All Administrative Modifications, once approved, should require notification, via email (or formal correspondence), to TPC members or should be included in the next TPC meeting agenda packet as a non-voting information item if TPC especially if TPC is not involved in the "Recommendation for Approval" step. Again, RMAP Administrative Modifications should follow a process similar to a TIP Administrative Amendment whereby subcommittees of Regional Council that are involved in RMAP development, management, and implementation (TPC, Mgt. Committee etc) are part of the process and involved or notified as appropriate. Additional notification to ADOT/FHWA and the public should be considered and put in place as appropriate. It is unclear what level of Administrative Modifications would require approval from ADOT/FHWA. That should be made clear to PAG Regional Council and its subcommittees that are involved in RMAP development, management, and implementation (TPC, Mgt. Committee etc).

3. PAG should prepare annual reports, provided to TPC/Mgt. Committee as an informational item, of all Administrative Modifications and Amendments that were approved in the previous year, and the total cost changes resulting from those modifications and amendments. This should follow some Public Involvement or notification process to inform the public that their long-range transportation plan has been modified. Notification to ADOT/FHWA should also be accommodated in order to maintain compliance of the long-range transportation plan and Public Involvement process.

4. The 25% threshold could be substantial for a large project or multiple projects. TPC/Mgt. Committee and jurisdictions do not know what the available financial capacity or buffer is, so it would be unclear how proposed Administrative Modifications may impact the total program. Clear information of how Administrative Modifications or full Amendments are impacting the 25% threshold and impact to the total program funding for RMAP should be made clear to Regional Council and its subcommittees that are involved in RMAP development, management, and implementation (TPC, Mgt. Committee etc). Administrative Modifications and Amendments should carefully consider involvement from affected project sponsors as early in the process as possible.

5. It is unclear if/how Administrative Amendments might be processed separately or in groups. Processing these in groups could violate the intent and constitute a wholesale change that is more aligned with a full Amendment. If there are six project changes all under the 25% threshold, should they be processed together? What if they are projects with cost estimates in the hundreds of millions of dollars resulting in an overall change of tens of millions of dollars to the RMAP? How many Administrative Modifications constitute change that is more aligned with a full Amendment? There should be guardrails established to avoid this kind of pitfall.

6. Any authorization of the PAG Executive Director to approve Administrative Modifications to the RMAP should be granted by Regional Council through an agendized action item authorizing this authority to be granted. This can be a one-time thing but should be done through a RC action and not simply implied. The ultimate responsibility for meeting requirements of a long-range transportation plan lies with the Regional Council, not the Executive Director. If RC is comfortable authorizing the Executive Director to process Administrative Modifications without them taking action each time, they should enact that authorization through action. Any new process and authorization granted to the PAG Executive Director should be communicated with ADOT/FHWA as oversight parties.

Summary Table — Modification vs. Amendment

Step	Administrative Modification	Amendment
Define	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). Modifications submitted at the same time by the same sponsor will be processed together and any fiscal impact will be treated cumulatively. Overall fiscal impact will be evaluated as each additional modification is requested. If the fiscal constraint is exceeded, the request will be treated as an amendment.	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.
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 but notification will be sent to jurisdictional partners (including applicable working groups) and posted online for the public a minimum of 10 calendar days before final approval. If appropriate, the administrative modification may be presented to TPC and/or Management Committee as an informational item during a public meeting.	Required per 23 CFR 450.316

Fiscal constraint	No redemonstration (if project cost does not exceed 25% of the original estimate or exceed the fiscal constraint).	Required per 23 CFR 450.104 and 23 USC 134 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 and ADOT/FHWA as appropriate.
Examples	• 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 • 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%	• 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 congestion, traffic volume, job accessibility, etc.