

MINUTES
STATE TRANSPORTATION BOARD
STUDY SESSION
10:00 a.m., Wednesday, February 3, 2010
Human Resource Development Center (HRDC)
Grand Canyon Room
1130 N. 22nd Ave.
Phoenix, AZ 85009

BOARD ATTENDANCE

Bob Montoya, Bill Feldmeier, Felipe Zubia, Delbert Householder, and Steve Christy (telephonic). Victor Flores and Bobbie Lundstrom were absent.

PLEDGE

[The Pledge of Allegiance is recited.]

CHAIR MONTOYA: This is a study session; no formal action will be taken at this meeting. The next item on the agenda is Call to the Audience and this is for discussion and information.

CALL TO THE AUDIENCE

Pud Colquitt spoke regarding an individual at an earlier meeting who had characterized supporters of ADOT's lighting project as having had a change of opinion and now oppose the plan for continuous lighting, which he stated is untrue. As a past Mayor and current Council Member involved with the project from the very beginning, a majority of the City Council, as evidenced by the voting record, remains supportive of the plan. A solid majority of Sedona residents understand the need for the plan. ADOT and the City of Sedona must remember that there are three issues of precedence regarding safety of this strip of West Sedona 89A: responsibility, liability, and cost. She added as this process goes on the greater the liability there is to ADOT and the City of Sedona. Ms. Colquitt stressed she was speaking for herself, not on behalf of Sedona or the City Council. This roadway made the top 5% of dangerous roads in the entire State. ADOT asked for a grant from the federal government; it was approved for \$1M. Every accident that has been fatal along that strip of highway has happened at night and every time the cause was that the driver could not see the pedestrian. This is a safety issue. It is a liability issue. The City and State have a responsibility for the public health and the safety of its citizens. For six years or more, John Harper has worked with ADOT and remains courteous, professional, and a credit to ADOT.

Ron Volkman spoke in support of the plan for safe lighting for SR 89A, and in support of a local group, Citizens for Safety, organized by Mr. K.B. Brown. He provided background information of how "this all become so loud in Sedona." A package of materials was provided to the Board Members including minutes of the Sedona Council meeting of October 28 clarifying that Mr. Harper never made the statement "ADOT will shove this light program down your throat." Also in the packet are memos from Mr. Harper to the City Manager at that time, Eric Levitt, clarifying the responsibilities, financial obligation, the time frame for this project. All this has been on the

record a long time. Letters from the State Safety Engineer to Jennifer Brown of the FHWA outline the crash analysis, the Warren study, and her final statement of 2009: "Therefore this proposed safety improvement with the revised estimate cost of up to \$2M is approved and safety funds may be used for this project." Opponents of the lights lit a firestorm by calling the lighting proposal "a river of lights Las Vegas style." The lighting proposal for 89A is going to be just as beautiful as the new lights on 179 at the Y and will be aesthetically minimal in terms of their light production. The new stop light at Andante will be a huge cure for safety also. There has been plenty of open hearing about this for five years, as well as public and professional input. Three successive City Councils of Sedona have voted for the ADOT to move ahead on this project. ADOT knows their responsibility and liability as does the City of Sedona. It is time to close the debate and move ahead. Approval was urged for this project to come to conclusion as soon as possible.

Mike Ward spoke regarding installing lighting along SR-89A, thanking the Board for delaying a decision on the project until after the study session. Documentation was provided regarding the concerns expressed at the meeting on January 15th. The facts have become "obscured" through personal opinions and innuendo. The Board was urged to look at the data and consider everyone's comments. Other speakers will be addressing separate portions of the documentation provided with a primary focus on the questions they believe require consideration by the Board. No one has questioned Mr. Harper's integrity or professionalism, as he was "following the directions of his supervisors to the best of his ability." It was hoped the Board had taken the time to review the video of Mr. Harper's comments at the Sedona City Council in order to understand them in a proper context. The question was, why is two miles of continuous roadway lighting the appropriate solution of a problem in Andante? According to Mr. Halikowski, as quoted in a local newspaper, the decision has already been made. "ADOT intends to install a new lighting system along 89A between Dry Creek and Airport Road," and "if Sedona doesn't like it, they can take the roadway over."

Rod Veach advised that the assertion of 89A in West Sedona being in the top 5% of dangerous roadways in Arizona is misleading. The fatality rate requires "site specific" solutions as the fatalities occurred in the vicinity of an unsignaled intersection. ADOT studies would show nighttime traffic in that section of roadway is low. It was noted that in 2009 there were 14 nighttime accidents with 11 occurring in currently lit areas. A moderate expenditure of intersection lighting would be more warranted based on the studies. He encouraged abandoning the continuous lighting, and only install intersection lighting at Andante Drive. In a general summary of accident studies, no recommendation was made for the continuous lighting. Questions include whether ADOT is interpreting its data with a view for supporting justification for the continuous roadway lighting, and if Safety Panel recommendations should be focusing solely on the Andante intersection. A copy of the presentation was provided for public record.

Marlene Rayner addressed the Board regarding the 89A Pedestrian Safety Advisory Panel and its recommendations. It is incorrect to refer to the advisory panel as a "citizens committee" as it is a panel of stakeholders which had been established by action of the Mayor and Sedona City Council. Lighting was not the "real" safety issue; it had been pedestrian safety. The Panel's charge had been to examine all safety issues and solutions on SR-89A in West Sedona. It had consisted of 18 members plus a facilitator; 5 from Sedona, including the then City Manager; 4 from ADOT including the District Engineer and several consultants; 4 public representatives, technical assistants from the International Dark Sky Associations; and 2 consultants, one of

which was from the US Naval Observatory. From the first meeting, the Panel recognized its mandate to examine all safety issues and solutions including lighting relying on data-driven solutions. In a meeting with citizens and the Federal Highway Administration on 2/24/09, it was discovered that none of the Panel recommendations included continuous roadway lighting. Three questions to be answered: Why has ADOT minimized and denigrated the Panel report, why has ADOT ignored the Panel's data-driven report particularly when its representatives agreed to it as did all the members, and why was the Federal Highway Administration not given a copy of the Panel's report?

Doug Blackwell, retired engineer and former member of 89A Safety Panel, drew the Board's attention to the Panel's final recommendations. Seven intermediate and short term improvements were shown; continuous lighting was not one of the recommendations. Eight long term improvements were shown and continuous lighting was not among those recommendations. Three specifically significant long term recommendations included: 1) install traffic signal at Andante; 2) install strategically located raised medians which can serve as traffic controls and a refuge island for pedestrians paid by ADOT with support from Sedona, and 3) install targeted "points of light" conflict street lighting if nighttime pedestrian safety study warrants it, again paid by ADOT with support from Sedona. The recommendations were supported by a 5/13/08 City Manager memo to the City Council and in a 8/12/08 letter from John Harper to Sedona Mayor, no continuous lights were recommended. Quoted from the 8/12/08 letter, "We believe that the recommendations submitted by the advisory committee [the 89A Safety Panel] provide a comparable safety solution to the original continuous lighting proposal." The only difference is Mr. Harper was now showing the City would pay for the strategically located raised medians on the State highway; however, the Panel including ADOT representatives had confirmed ADOT would pay for the medians. A consensus had been reached in this regard. An intergovernmental agreement stated the "State is responsible for any required betterments on SR-89A." The City was not meant to be responsible for medians, per the intergovernmental agreement dated 4/17/07. It was wondered if Mr. Harper had made an "honest mistake" getting lights and medians reversed. The questions remain, if the Safety Panel including ADOT representatives had not recommended continuous lights, why are they being forced upon the community and if the Safety Panel put strategic medians in the long term strategic plan for 89A and ADOT would be responsible as they are on Highway 79, why is the City suddenly responsible for medians.

Juliette Colangelo provided copies of communications between ADOT staff and the City of Sedona regarding continuous roadway lighting being the only financially feasible solution. The intergovernmental agreement was quoted: "The State shall be responsible for any required betterments to State Road 179 and State Road 89A." "The agreement gives financial responsibility of continuous roadway lighting to the City." Mr. Harper had agreed to a solution including the traffic signal on Andante with the caveat that he would only agree if a median and pedestrian barriers are included. There was no mention of shifting financial responsibility to the City. The City Council then approved accepting the options of the Safety Panel that did not include continuous roadway lighting. Medians were to be included in the City's long range plan. Additional correspondence was provided to the Board and for public record, portions of which were read into the record addressing the issue of the City's and ADOT's responsibilities for improvements. Clarification of this matter was requested.

Barbara Litrell gave a brief overview of community reaction to the lights. The project had started as a desire to improve safety on 89A, but has turned into a question of lights or no lights

and the concept of safety has gotten lost in the discussion. The real safety solution is a signalized intersection at Andante. The Sedona community overwhelmingly opposes continuous roadway lighting as shown in polls, surveys, referendums, petitions, demonstrations, and testimony at City Council meetings. ADOT needs to understand that community opposition is far greater than community support. It will be important to ask regarding the comments that have been received by ADOT, including emails and phone calls. Another question is if all of the recommendations were done before deciding on continuous highway illumination if they would even be talking about continuous lights, and, if the highway safety signal were implemented, will they need the continuous roadway lighting. A context sensitive solution was requested.

Clifford Ochser, a member of the 89A Safety Panel, agreed that consensus had been reached on the best safety solution for the roadway. A freedom of information request had been sent to ADOT relating to public comment on the project. After delay, the public comments had been received; however, a staff analysis of the public comment was unavailable. It was assumed that the Board had not seen those comments. An analysis by Mr. Ochser to determine public sentiment revealed 1) 60 people stated they were against the roadway lighting during a meeting in 2009 at the public library, 2 were in favor; 2) public comment forms submitted to ADOT showed 167 against, 30 in favor of continuous roadway lighting. Environmental assessment clearly states there can be no community controversy on the project in order for it to move forward. Statistics show the Sedona community is overwhelming against the project. Questions to be considered are with the installation of the continuous lighting showing a nearly zero improvement in safety over those that show substantial safety benefit, will that increase the Agency's liability and expose negligence by ignoring documented safety solutions? By delaying the traffic signal at Andante, for which no one is opposed, does ADOT increase its liability and negligence? Does Mr. Harper's statement that Sedona will be responsible for medians if they don't choose continuous lighting, conflict with the intergovernmental agreement in place signed in 2007 governing 89A and 179? Is ADOT's conduct consistent with their value statements? Is the potential global bad publicity associated with this project worth the effort to cram this down Sedona's citizens' throats? If, after installing continuous roadway lighting, someone should die can ADOT successfully defend itself after installing a substandard safety treatment over more statistically valid treatments? ADOT needs to be transparent and perform its due diligence on this project before moving forward. A request was made to cancel the project in order to look forward to legitimate safety solutions.

Robert Carabell, Officer of "Keep Sedona Beautiful" and "amateur lighting expert" stated the liability issue is Andante, not the lack of continuous roadway lighting. It is a site specific issue. All of the accidents have occurred almost exactly the same way, westbound lane, westbound cars crossing at Andante. The ADOT 2006 crossing study had not studied Andantee; quoted as stating "Rather than focus on the fatal pedestrian locations, it was decided to expand the area of study between the intersections of Dry Creek Road and Soldier's Pass Road." In driving at night through the area, it was discovered when reaching the crest glare significantly diminished the ability to see pedestrians. A context sensitive solution was requested in the form of a signalized intersection and crosswalk with lighting at Andante. The intersection is dangerous in the daytime as well for pedestrians.

Stephen DeVol, President of "Keep Sedona Beautiful." As a resident living just off of 89A, the lights would shine directly into his residence. There is video showing Council Member Hamilton saying to Mr. Harper, "We are having these lights shoved down our throats." The

testimony heard today was from concerned and informed citizens, who have quoted from reports prepared by ADOT's engineer and consultants and nowhere is continuous roadway lighting recommended. All reports recommend a traffic light at Andante and SR-89A, plus other safety measures. Lighting is the least effective safety measure and does not address all the other safety measures combined. ADOT agreed to pay for the medians and the City would fund lights; however, somehow in "all the excitement" this agreement had been lost. It has been proven "beyond a shadow of a doubt" that continuous roadway lighting is not the solution. Communications from Sedona City Council Members "betrayed ADOT's trust" by stating that their true motive for these lights is a no-cost way to get infrastructure installed. This plan backfired and they are now stuck with their strategy with unintended consequences. Somewhere out there is a law firm waiting to try a case on negligence from a known safety hazard. Highway 179 is nearing completion and its answer to safety and efficiency was achieved using context sensitive design. Why not on SR-89A in West Sedona? A compromise was suggested to install a traffic light at Andante Drive and 89-A and associated intersection lighting, forego the continuous roadway lighting, and settle the controversy. The community would find this acceptable and an intelligent way to settle this.

Bobbie Surber spoke on behalf of herself expressing concerns about the misinformation presented by special interest group, KSB. It was stated that 97% of their members oppose the plan, however, it is unknown how many of those members are Sedona residents. The group has stated 70% of the residents are against the lights, although this survey was based on an online poll. Several other instances of misinformation were cited including an unsupported complaint against four Sedona Council Members. The goal of the International Dark Sky Association was read, reflecting that a "good lighting program that's Dark Sky compliant can actually help Sedona become an international Dark Sky designation." The area is filled with residents, visitors, and children walking at night to nearby restaurants, theaters, and grocery stores. This special interest group has ignored the fact that other solution to Dark Sky Compliance is to place continuous medians and pedestrian barricades either in the middle of the roadway or on sidewalks for the entire length of the corridor, with the financial burden being placed on the City of Sedona. Mr. Harper was thanked for going "beyond the call of duty in working with Sedona" including community outreach. Appropriate lighting is needed, which is sensitive to a heritage of dark skies and protection of the nocturnal environment while protecting residents and visitors.

Ron Martinez, referring to a letter from Mr. Halikowski, gave apologies for the unauthorized use of the ADOT logo and the misinformation which has been sent out. Safety is the main issue. Personal experiences of near-misses were shared. The problems are not just at Andante and will not be solved solely by a light at the intersection. There is darkness and shadows in those areas throughout 89A. A second component is getting a pedestrian friendly area. Nearby hotel owners agree they would not advise their patrons walk down the street to a restaurant. From an economic standpoint, alternatives have been continually offered to allow travel in safety, provide a pedestrian friendly atmosphere, and also is Dark Sky Compliant. There have been numerous testimonials in favor; a request was made to continue with the process for the continuous roadway lighting.

Mark DeNunzio, said he had his share of near-misses also. This stretch of 89A is not a rural highway; it's a business district [unintelligible]

ITEM 1: Sedona 89A Lighting Project Update (John Harper)

JOHN HARPER: A presentation was given on the issues and history of the lighting study and proposed project including the number of fatalities, residential and commercial populations; pedestrian, vehicle, and bicycle traffic; and action taken by the Sedona City Council, as well as the various recommendations and options considered. Photographs of the intersection and roadway were viewed. There has been support of and opposition to the project; however, a decision has to be made on which direction to take to resolve the problems. Lighting will increase visibility and decrease chances of future accidents, allowing motorists to see ahead. Progress and community outreach meetings were held and multiple studies done, all of which was presented to the Sedona City Council for their review. As ADOT has liability for and jurisdiction over the route, they have deemed the safest solution is continuous roadway lighting, providing the minimum light levels recommended by ADOT engineers.

STEVE CHRISTY: Asked regarding the status of the median issue and ADOT's position.

JOHN HARPER: Funding of \$2M has been secured for the lighting project; there is no funding for medians. It is ADOT's position that "they have a perfectly good road out here," and installing medians will create additional turnaround and travel flow directional issues. In addition, installation of the lights will resolve the safety issues eliminating the necessity of medians.

FLOYD ROEHRICH: At the time the alternatives the Pedestrian Advisory Committee had recommended for ADOT to consider, the guidance given to the Director was that the funding was provided to the install lighting and to increase the scope of the project to include medians and barriers would change the project significantly and add greater cost by having to reconstruct the roadway, require widening, and adding pedestrian amenities. The strategy was to utilize the \$2M to its greatest extent and provide the best measure of safety available. It was felt that in order to change the scope of the project, the City should participate.

FELIPE ZUBIA: There were two different reports; one produced by ADOT and the other by the Advisory Panel. The ADOT report had been prepared with the assistance of experts in lighting sciences and engineering. You mentioned the lighting is Dark Sky Compliant. Had there been any such technical experts on the Advisory Panel? Particulars were requested regarding lighting height, etc.

SETH CHALMERS: ADOT, Traffic Engineering, indicated the study cited was a research study done by ADOT five years ago to look at three different types of lighting: high pressure sodium lighting, metal halide lighting, and low pressure sodium. The scope of the study was to look at safety differences between the three light sources. It was concluded by the study that there were no differences in the safety aspects of each type of lighting. The safety issue imbedded in that report recognized that roadway lighting is a safety benefit especially where there are pedestrian conflicts. For 89A, a variety of heights has been looked at to optimize utilization of light; between 30-35 feet have been determined to be optimal.

CHAIR MONTOYA: After having read comments from the Sedona City Council, it is apparent the City has adopted the plan and would like ADOT to move forward.

[Steve Christy withdrew from the meeting.]
[A 15-minute break was then taken.]

ITEM 2: ARRA II Priority List

FLOYD ROEHRICH: With regard to the jobs creation bill, ARRA II, second recovery or stimulus funding, a couple of things have transpired recently. There is still a lot of talk nationally and in the Senate about doing something, but it continues to run into obstacles as to exactly what degree a second recovery fund bill might have. Originally, when President Obama gave the State of the Union last week and identified creating jobs as a first priority, the House had previously passed their jobs creation bill and it looked like it was going to be funded at pretty much the same level that the states had received before. In this case, Arizona got \$522M. Earlier indications were that an ARRA II bill would be similar with the caveat that it would be delivered in a much quicker time frame. In the past week, as the Senate has taken up the issue, they have run into more obstacles with members on the debate as far as how it would be funded, where the funding would come from, and even to what level they would need to fund. There is also talk that instead of funding infrastructure with a second stimulus bill, that component can be split out and pass the Highway Trust Fund and new highway authorization bill and put the additional funding in there, which might help infrastructure. There is still no clear direction on what the Senate might do with the jobs creation or a second stimulus bill. However, it is starting to take the form that, if all the components of a second recovery bill are kept like the first recovery bill and it gets large enough, there may not be enough support to fund it. There has been discussion regarding doing smaller bills in components to include one that is infrastructure, but at a reduced amount. There is still no definitive direction or guidance from the Federal Highway Administration or from Washington.

The direction being taken, as discussed with the Federal Highway Administration in weekly meetings, is to move forward with the development of the job project listing, continue to move forward with getting these groups of projects ready, and be prepared that if and when something comes in, whether the magnitude of the same amount of funding, reduced, or in some other component, we will still be ready to act quickly. The second benefit is with the regular federal program, as these projects get ready and the funding is available, we will continue to get projects out. There are still projects in the queue that can be developed in a quick amount of time to push them out as an ARRA, if those funds do become available.

Each of the Board Members has been provided a list of preliminary ARRA funded projects worked on. Last week when it was presented, we were still coordinating with PAG. That project listing has not yet been finalized, but is closer to identifying projects and studying those with PAG to ensure they can be ready. It is hoped between now and the next regular Board meeting or Study Session, updated information can be provided. At some point, necessary program actions will have to be undertaken.

ITEM 2: ARRA II Funding Allocation (John Fink)

JOHN FINK: As Floyd indicated there is still uncertainty relative to a second stimulus bill; however, what we know currently is that the House has passed a "Jobs for Main Street Act of 2010", which for now is being called "ARRA II." The funding level for highways and transit is the same; highways \$27.5B, transit \$8.4B. The Highway TIGER Grants Program is not funded

as it is a discretionary program. Airport funding is reduced to approximately \$500M. All other categories are reduced to approximately \$900M, resulting in a net reduction of \$2.8B. It is expected if ARRA II passes in its current form, the funding for highways and transit in Arizona would be essentially the same as it was under ARRA I. Statewide the highway portion component was \$350M or 67%. The amounts distributed in areas with population over 200K was \$111M or 21%. There is about \$46M or 9% designated for areas under 200K in population and \$15.7M or 3% designated for transportation enhancement. Statewide funding was distributed according to the RAC distribution. The amount for populations over 200K was distributed according to FHWA requirements of Title 23. Distributions of the other monies in total were 46% in the MAG region, 15.7% in the PAG region, 38.3% in Greater Arizona.

Adding in transit funding components of ARRA, there was \$100M allocated to Arizona; \$65M distributed to MAG region, \$16M to PAG region, and \$18.7M to Greater Arizona. This took the total funding for transit and highways to \$622M with a percentage breakdown of 49% to Maricopa County, 15.7% to Pima County, and 35.3% in Greater Arizona.

There are a number of options that can be considered for distributing of funding under ARRA II. There are a number of options including:

- Taking the current distribution, excluding enhancement funding allocated by TURF, of \$506M; \$234M, or 46.2% to Maricopa County; \$80.4M or 15.9% to Pima County; and \$192M or 37.9% to Greater Arizona. Adding in transit to the totals there is an estimated regional distribution of 49.3% in Maricopa County, 15.9% in Pima County, and 34.8% in Greater Arizona.
- Assuming the RAC allocation or distribution applied to the highway funds in total, the estimate local share of the State is the same, primarily driven by funds in the bill. State share is calculated to drive the total distribution for highways to the RAC formula. \$82.7M of the State funding allocated for MAG, \$30.9 allocated for PAG, and then \$36.1M to Greater Arizona. In this case the MAG total would be \$47M less, PAG would be \$15M less, and Greater Arizona picks up \$61M. Adding in adjustments for regional distributions, a calculation is arrived at of 41.6% in Maricopa County, 13.5% in Pima County, and 45% in Greater Arizona.
- This option is the same calculation, but using the STAN percentages to calculate the total, with distributions of 60% in Maricopa County, 16% in Pima County, and 24% in Greater Arizona. Maricopa County would have to be allocated \$199.2M of the State's share, Pima County allocated \$46.1M and Greater Arizona allocated \$104.4M. The MAG share would increase about \$70M from current distributions, PAG share would stay the same, and Greater Arizona's share would drop slightly. With the transit added in, MAG distributions are 61%, PAG 16%, and Greater Arizona 23%.

There will be an opportunity to discuss this and make decisions in the future.

ITEM 4: 2011-2015 Tentative Program (Jennifer Toth)

JENNIFER TOTH: Presented recommended proposed changes to the 5-year program and programming of the 5th year of the fiscal year 2011 through 2015 transportation facilities construction program.

Both federal regulations and State statutes govern the 5-year program. The first two years need to be fully funded projects; the last three years can be illustrative projects. The overall program does need to be fiscally constrained. There are a number of subprograms for which increases were recommended. The first category is the federal aid programs. Some of the federal aid programs had not been programmed to the apportionments received in the past years. This year a concerted effort is being made to bring all federal aid programs in the 5-year program up to 90% of the apportionment level received each year. On the Bridge and Replacement Rehabilitation Program, an increase is recommended from \$10.5M to \$12.3M per year. The Highway Safety Improvement Program will be broken into different categories. The ADOT program for fiscal years 2011-2015 proposes an increase from \$17.1M to \$23M per year. For the local government section for the same period will be a breakout of \$5.95M per year and for the High Risk Rural Road Program a request has been made for \$4.84M per year for 2011-2012 and the years 2013-2015 of \$1.84M.

In some of the federal aid programs which include Safe Routes to School and the Highway Safety Program there are certain programs that do not lapse. Funds have been built-up to a point where the funds need to now be spent down. There is an effort to take the money and program them within the first two years of the 5-year program to take the balance down. With the High Risk Rural Roads, the \$1.84M is at 90% apportionment, which will be carried through the other three years. The Railway Highway Crossings Program is requesting \$2.3M per year across all five years.

The State Planning and Research Funds receive an apportionment of \$10.1M per year; an increase is being requested across the five years from \$7.5M to \$10.1 and increasing the State match portion in fiscal year 2015 from \$0.6M to \$0.7M. The Recreational Trails Program is being increased from \$1.3M to \$1.5M per year across all five years. Safe Routes to School Program, fiscal year 2011-2012, is asking for an increase from \$2.5M to \$5.5M and in the following three years from \$2.5m to \$3.2M which brings the funds to 90% apportionment. The Coordinated Border Infrastructure Program in fiscal year 2011-2012 is requesting \$9.14M per year. This subprogram has never been in the 5-year program. It is monies received and used which previously have never been put into that program. In fiscal years 2013-2015 there is a request for \$7M which is 90% of the apportionment. The Transportation Enhancement Improvement Program has three separate line items, i.e., design, construction, and contingency. It would be easier to combine the three areas to manage the overall program and move monies between the different sections.

With regard to subprograms, in terms of overall need especially relating to preservation of infrastructure, there is the Preventative Pavement Preservation Program which has an increase request in fiscal year 2015 of \$12M to \$15M; the Bridge Inspection and Repair Program, an increase in fiscal year 2015 from \$5M to \$7.5M; Deck Replacement from \$4.5M to \$7M, and Bridge Design from \$1M to \$1.5M. In the Ports of Entry Program there is an increase request from \$1.5M to \$2M and the Right-of-Way Acquisition and Appraisals from \$2M to \$3M and the Right-of-Way Plans and Title Preparation Program from \$5M to \$5.5M. Contract Auditing has an increase request of \$1.5M to \$2M. Privatization Alternative Funding to help the P3 Program, there is a fiscal year 2011-2015 increase from \$300K to \$1M.

There are two new subprograms. The Roadside Improvement with a fiscal year 2011-2012 request for \$0.25M per year, 2013-2014 of \$0.5M, and then increasing to \$0.75M per year. The

Environmental Stewardship Program in terms of wildlife connectivity, mitigation banking, things that will help in relation to open space and wild life, for fiscal year 2011-2012 \$0.25M, 2013-2014 of \$.5M, and then \$0.75M.

There are three Greater Arizona subprograms: Major Project Design (\$1.2M), the DCR and Corridor Studies (\$4M), the Passing Lane Design (\$.9M) and Construction (\$5M). Last year, no monies were programmed into those two subprograms for fiscal year 2014, resulting in a request for both 2014 and 2015 for this year.

Major projects include:

Greater Arizona

- I-17, requesting an additional \$6.2 in 2015.
- I-40 Rancho Santa Fe, asking to defer \$5M in fiscal 2014 to 2015 to allow ADOT to work on the Intergovernmental Agreement with the City.
- Reconstruct roadway and provide new grid, US89, Cameron section, \$17M to be programmed.
- SR260, between junction of 77 and 260, widening to five lanes, \$6.8M

PAG

- Asking to defer from fiscal year 2013 to 2014 - I-10, Grand to Ina Road; requesting an increase from \$10M to \$30M
- I-10 widening project - Ina Road to Ruthrauff, defer design concept report and environmental assessment from fiscal year 2011 to 2012 with no change in current funding structure of \$4M.
- I-10 Kino Road TI - defer design project from fiscal year 2014 to 2015, currently funded at \$4M.
- Defer design project at the Country Club TI from fiscal year 2013 to 2014, currently funded at \$4M.
- I-10 Valencia TI - there is \$25M programmed in fiscal year 2013 being requested to move to fiscal year 2015, and \$17.824M programmed for fiscal year 2014 requesting to be moved to 2015; combining the projects to be programmed in one year.
- I-10, Wilmot Road TI - defer design from fiscal year 2013 to 2014 of \$4M and construction from 2014 to 2015 of \$6M.
- I-19 San Xavier - increase in fiscal year 2014 from \$66.4M to \$86.4.
- Tangerine Road on SR-77 to Pinal County line - asking to increase budget by \$2.5M for fiscal year 2013, currently at \$30.47M.
- SR-86 Valencia - increase budget in fiscal year 2011 by \$7.5M from \$23.5M to \$31M.

STEVE HULL: Last year, MAG had been looking at adopting a 5-year program but it was clear that the program was out of balance as far as cost and revenues expected to come in. There was a \$6B gap between cost and revenue. Rather than adopt a revised 5-year program, MAG spent most of the past year working with their members going through the process to identify how to correct that gap. A large part comes by deferring projects to the future, taking the Prop 400 projects which run through 2026 and spreading them out over a new, longer time period running through 2031 and 2032. Prop 400 funding does not go that far out into the future; however,

MAG will still have revenue coming in during that time. There will be federal and other funds in the program. MAG will also work with member agencies to reenact a new version of the half-cent sales tax for those future years. There are substantial changes in the MAG Long Range Plan, as 15 years of remaining Prop 400 projects have been spread out over 20 years. MAG is going to reevaluate all of this in approximately 18 months to look at projected revenues, as no one knows what the long term impacts are going to be on the program.

For the Regional Transportation Freeway Program, it means there will be adjustments in the 5-year plan, but the adjustments come by MAG and ADOT working together on the plan. MAG took the lead in developing a scenario of how to correct that \$6B gap in the Long Range Plan; ADOT had the lead in developing a set of specific projects to conform with that scenario and has worked with MAG in developing that list of projects. MAG will be going through their approval process with public meetings on projects. ADOT adopts in June; MAG adopts in July, under current schedules, which means that whatever is adopted by the Transportation Board in June will be contingent on MAG adopting a similar or identical program in July. Whatever changes come out because of public comment will have to be resolved.

In fiscal year 2011-2013, there are adjustments to the current program for projects which were in the past 5-year program and carried forward with changes. Last year a set of specific projects for fiscal year 2014 was not adopted because of the \$6B gap. As the program spreads out in time, some projects have been moved from one fiscal year to another within the 5-year program. The biggest changes in the 2011-2013 program are adjusting schedules to fit the MAG tentative scenario which has been approved by the Regional Council to balance costs and revenue in the Regional Transportation Program. All project costs have been updated for design, right-of-way and construction based on current market prices, translating into lower cost estimates for a majority of the projects. There have also been adjustments for project schedules in this time period to align with current status of work in progress.

Changes have included:

- Repackaging of SR-303 corridor from overall study limits for the design concept report to specific segments for design and right-of-way purchasing and construction. All of the old items for those projects have been deleted out of the program and are being replaced by new projects with the net result of the same overall beginning and ending points, but now broken down into different segments for construction.
- The I-10 Broadway curve project has been repackaged into more logical segments for design and construction; same with the Loop 202 South Mountain Corridor.
- In fiscal year 2014, there are 24 new projects and 14 being added, plus 6 deferred from 2010 through 2013.
- In fiscal year 2015, there are 21 new projects, plus 5 which have been deferred from 2010 through 2013.

System-wide items in the program have funding such as maintenance and landscaping; there are funds in the program for right-of-way advance acquisition, TI improvements, freeway management system, and other items. In an effort to rebalance the program, some of these system-wide programs have been scaled back to what was promised in the Prop 400 legislature. When money was good, those programs grew a little bit, but have been cut back now due to revenue losses.

The fiscal year 2011-2015 program averages about \$770M per year; some years more than others. With the half-cent sales tax, there is still money coming into the program, although not as much as previously. It totals \$3.8B over the 5-year period. The biggest projects include Loop 303, coming up early in the 5-years with roughly \$900M worth of work beginning in fiscal year 2011; I-10 corridor from 32nd Street to San Tan, with about \$600M worth of right-of-way design and construction scheduled to start the middle of the 5-year period and running through the end. The first segments of Loop 202 South Mountain area also included toward the end of the five year program with a cost of about \$900M. Collectively, these projects account for about 60% of the money in the program. HOV lane projects on Loop 202 and 101 are also in the 5-year window. If ARRA II funds materialize, the HOV lane projects will be accelerated.

A handout was provided to the Board summarizing all the projects in the program, showing new projects in fiscal year 2014 and 2015, and including all changes for years 2011 through 2013 and projects for the 5-Year Program.

Funding levels in FY 2012 are lower than the other years due in part to project readiness, with a bit of a lull going on with project readiness in fiscal year 2012 and may be in part also due to cash flow issues. Part of the major project of I-10, the local express lanes around the Broadway curve would include HOV lanes. ADOT is currently undertaking an environmental impact study on the entire section of I-10 from SR-51 down to Loop 202. With the recommended changes for I-17, they will be "taking it as it comes" in figuring out a design plan. Getting the section on I-10 from 32nd Street to Loop 202 will correct deficiencies on the SR-143 interchange to get directional ramps. In order to accomplish that, I-10 mainline will have to be done to receive those lanes. The I-17 study recently launched looks from the split up to Loop 101. Concern had been expressed regarding accommodating traffic at the tunnel. They are working with I-17 EIS and coordinating it with the I-10 EIS to make certain there is good transition for better receiving lanes and to take better advantage of that portion of the inner loop system. There are placeholders in the 20-Year Program for these projects. Currently, there is a program for improvements in the 20-Year Program for I-17 from the split to Loop 101 of roughly \$1.1B. At the same time, the Central Phoenix Framework Study will also be done.

Smaller general purpose lane projects and TI improvements will also be ongoing throughout the proposed five year program.

JENNIFER TOTH: In terms of the Aviation Fund and 5-Year Program, this is a grant-funded program; the first line being federal, State, local grants; the second being State, local; and, the APMS is our Pavement Management System. There is also a loan program although no loans have been issued over the last two years due to the Aviation Fund sweeps. There is a planning study which equates to the economic impact study done statewide. The FAA utilizes that information and it needs to be updated; the last study done was in approximately 1992.

Amounts coming into the Aviation Fund were shown. Grants are not specifically programmed into the 5-Year Program. An amount is programmed with a list of grants applied for within the current fiscal year. The figures were proposed with an assumption there would be no further aviation sweeps, although there may have to be limits placed on the number of grants in fiscal year 2011.

The tentative program will be presented at the February 19, 2010 Board meeting for the Board's approval and then moving forward for public comment. Public hearings are scheduled for March 19 in Phoenix, April 16 in Oro Valley, and May 21 in Sedona. In June, there will be a study session to discuss any changes to the tentative program and then to seek adoption of the program of the June Board meeting.

ADJOURN

Upon motion duly made and seconded, the meeting was then concluded at 1:05 p.m.



Bob Montoya, Chairman
State Transportation Board



John McGee, Executive Director for Planning and Policy
Arizona Department of Transportation