

STATE TRANSPORTATION BOARD MEETING
9:00 a.m., Friday, September 21, 2018
City of Florence Council Chambers
775 N. Main Street
Florence, AZ 85132

Call to Order

Chairman Cuthbertson called the State Transportation Board meeting to order at 9:00 a.m.

Pledge

The Pledge of Allegiance was led by Board Member Stratton.

Roll Call by Board Secretary Linda Priano

A quorum of the State Transportation Board was present. **In attendance:** Bill Cuthbertson, Jack Sellers, Mike Hammond, Steve Stratton, Jesse Thompson, Sam Elters and Gary Knight. **Absent:** None. There were approximately 35 members of the public in the audience.

Opening Remarks

Chairman Cuthbertson thanked the Town of Florence and Pinal County for the activities they had arranged for the board members on Thursday, as well as the enjoyable evening reception. Chair Cuthbertson stated he was impressed with all the communities and planning organizations that participated in the events. Board Member Stratton commended Bret and his staff for the outstanding job they did in planning and hosting this board. Vice Chair Sellers also expressed his thanks and said he was really impressed with all the amenities Florence has to offer. Board Member Thompson added that the food was excellent and appreciated all the communities coming together.

Title VI of the Civil Rights Act

Floyd Roehrich, Jr., reminded all attendees to fill out the optional survey cards to assist our Civil Rights Department.

Call to the Audience

An opportunity was provided to members of the public to address the State Transportation Board. Members of the public were requested not to exceed a three minute time period for their comments.

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

REPORTER'S TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS

City of Florence Council Chambers
775 North Main Street
Florence, Arizona 85132

September 21, 2018

PREPARED FOR:
ADOT - STATE TRANSPORTATION BOARD
(Certified Copy)

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

CALL TO THE AUDIENCE

SPEAKER:	PAGE:
Brent Billingsley.....	5
Irene Higgs.....	7
Tom Rankin.....	8
Vincent Gallegos.....	9
Paul Ward.....	10
Eric Duthie.....	12
Andy Smith.....	14
Duane Eitel.....	14
Karen Benally.....	15
Sheila Runke (called but did not comment).....	16
Kara Harris.....	16
Peggy Judd.....	18
Jerry Williams.....	20
Mike Humphrey.....	22

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

AGENDA ITEMS

Item 1 - Director's Report, Floyd Roehrich, Junior, Deputy Director..... 27

Item 2 - District Engineer's Report, Rod Lane, Southcentral District Engineer Operations..... 27

Item 3 - Consent Agenda..... 33

Item 4 - Legislative Update, Floyd Roehrich, Junior..... 35

Item 5 - Financial Report, Floyd Roehrich, Junior..... 37

Item 6 - Multimodal Planning Division Report, Clemenc Ligocki..... 39

Item 7 - Priority Planning Advisory Committee (PPAC), Clemenc Ligocki..... 40

Item 8 - State Engineer's Report, Steve Boschen..... 54

Item 9 - Construction Projects, Steve Boschen..... 55

Item 10 - U.S. Route 80 Historic Route Designation..... 76

Item 11 - Proposed Major Amendment to MAG Regional Transportation Plan, Clemenc Ligocki..... 88

Item 12 - Suggestions..... 93

1 (Beginning of excerpt.)

2 CHAIRMAN CUTHBERTSON: We'll now move on to the
3 call to the audience. So to address the board during the call
4 to the audience, we'll ask that you fill out a public -- request
5 for public comment form and hand it to Linda or somebody up
6 there in the desk. And in the interest and fairness of time,
7 we'll ask that you limit your comments to three minutes so that
8 everybody has a chance to talk. So if you pass that three
9 minute limit, you'll hear a little audio sound that's tells you
10 your three minutes is up, and we'll remind you to wrap your
11 comments up. So...

12 With that, I'd like to invite Brent Billingsley,
13 the Town Manager of Florence, up.

14 MR. BILLINGSLEY: Good morning, Board. Thank you
15 very much for coming and visiting us. It was very nice to get
16 the very positive comments regarding the time spent with the
17 Town of Florence. Of course, we're very proud of the amenities
18 that we have. We're very proud of our people, and we cannot
19 continue to succeed and thrive in the way that -- that we have
20 traditionally without the help of ADOT.

21 We are a town on the exurban edge that's very
22 interested in economic development and development overall.
23 We're a town steeped in history, but moving forward very
24 quickly. Hopefully as, at the end of the meeting today, you'll
25 be able to go see not only the downtown, but some of our newer

1 areas to the north, including a partnership with Pulte in terms
2 of the Anthem development and the amenities that we provide if
3 you were unable to attend the golf tournament yesterday.

4 Some very key projects for Florence coming
5 forward. We have a project that I actually worked on over 20
6 years ago in the 79/287 intersection in front of the Burger King
7 here. It was a safety problem 20 years ago. We currently have
8 a design concept report under review. That will be an important
9 project for us going forward. The bridge replacement project on
10 the Gila. Hopefully you have an opportunity to go take a look
11 at that while you're in town today. But I would be remiss if I
12 didn't share with you the great partnerships that we have in
13 Rod, behind me here, our district engineer, in Todd, who I've
14 known for many years and is always a friend to Florence for the
15 successful projects that we've completed together.

16 Most recently, we've completed two very
17 successful projects with ADOT. One being the 79B/79
18 intersection, which was a safety project that was done last
19 year, and then secondarily, the diversion dam intersection and
20 signalization, which was a partnership project where the Town
21 came in and improved the intersection, and ADOT came back in and
22 installed the signal.

23 One thing that you'll find about Florence and
24 Pinal County, and I mentioned it last night, is we're here to
25 work with you. We're here to put money into the jobs. We're

1 here to put experience and technical knowledge into cooperative
2 projects. Our number one project going forward, and I think I
3 speak for a lot of folks, is the North/South Corridor. So don't
4 forget about Florence, and spend some money while you're here,
5 why don't you. Appreciate you. Thank you.

6 CHAIRMAN CUTHBERTSON: Thank you.

7 Next we have Irene Higgs, Executive Director of
8 the Sun Corridor MPO.

9 MS. HIGGS: Good morning, Mr. Chairman, board
10 members and ADOT staff. Welcome to Pinal County. My name is
11 Irene Higgs and I'm the executive director for the Sun Corridor
12 Metropolitan Planning Organization. We are one of the three
13 transportation planning agencies that the -- Pinal County has
14 the wonderful opportunity of getting to work with. My region is
15 1,155 square miles, and we provide transportation planning to
16 the cities of Casa Grande, Eloy, Coolidge and a portion of Pinal
17 County.

18 This morning I just wanted to take an opportunity
19 to thank you for the two I-10 widening projects that are
20 currently under construction. These two projects not only will
21 increase capacity and efficiency to I-10, but also the safety to
22 the traveling public. Partnerships that we have developed with
23 ADOT and Federal Highways have contributed to our success, and
24 we really do appreciate these partnerships. Again, thank you
25 for all that you do, and safe travels home.

1 CHAIRMAN CUTHBERTSON: Thank you.

2 Next, Tom Rankin, the former Mayor of Florence.

3 MR. RANKIN: Mr. Chair, members of the Board,
4 thank you much. Only a couple of you know me. Hopefully I
5 don't make you all mad again, but that's okay.

6 Thanks for coming to Florence. You know, there's
7 probably not too many people in here that remember John J. Bugg.
8 If John J. Bugg would have had his way back in -- before
9 Interstate 10 was built, we wouldn't be talking about
10 North/South Corridor at this time. Mr. Bugg wanted to take
11 it -- he was a highway commissioner, and he wanted to bring
12 Interstate 10 down Highway 79 at one time. But politics being
13 politics, it was taken where it is today.

14 The North/South Corridor, I completely -- I don't
15 know how many years that I've talked to the Transportation Board
16 about putting this North/South Corridor in. It's an economic
17 boost for Coolidge, Eloy, Florence, Pinal County, Queen Creek,
18 Apache Junction in the east valley, as well as the Globe/Miami
19 area, and all the way over to Safford, because it alleviates a
20 lot of traffic off Interstate 10, but it also puts a lot of
21 traffic going this way into the east valley where they don't
22 have to go through the congestion of Interstate 10, and I think
23 the North/South Corridor, now that it's on the plan, needs to be
24 taken a look at very strongly as far as getting what money we
25 can into it.

1 And I know there's not a lot of money for new
2 construction, but there is money for planning. Planning needs
3 to be done, but there's already corridors set. None has been
4 selected. The one that the Town of Florence sponsors, and also,
5 I believe, Coolidge is with us, would be the most beneficial
6 economically for this area.

7 So, you know, and I think you've heard me say
8 this before. Now, I'm talking to -- when I talk to ADOT and
9 they hear me talk, it's the same thing, and I always believe
10 that what I'm saying is true, that we have got the fifth oldest
11 town in -- Florence being the fifth oldest community in the
12 state, it needs economic development to continue on. We have to
13 job diversify. We have the opportunity to do it with the
14 North/South Corridor. Without that, we're kind of dead in the
15 water.

16 And I hope you did have a good time down here. I
17 wasn't able to come last night. I'm short a person (inaudible)
18 right now, but that's the way it goes in politics.

19 Folks, thank you very much. Be careful going
20 home tonight, and we'll probably be seeing you down the road.
21 Thank you.

22 CHAIRMAN CUTHBERTSON: Thank you.

23 Next, Vincent Gallegos, Director of the Lake
24 Havasu MPO.

25 MR. GALLEGOS: Good morning, Mr. Chairman,

1 members of the Board. I'm just here this morning to express my
2 gratitude to the Board, and really, traveling around the state,
3 it is such a great privilege to have these meetings every month
4 in a different community that we may not, you know, as staff
5 regularly get to.

6 With that said, I'm really looking forward to
7 having you coming to Lake Havasu next month as part of the 20th
8 Arizona Rural Transportation Summit. I've come up and spoken
9 about it before, but truly grateful to you, to ADOT's -- to ADOT
10 staff's support, federal highways, RTAC. It really is all the
11 MPOs and COGs coming together, all those staffs coming together
12 to have this one conference that focuses on Greater Arizona and
13 transportation.

14 I understand there's quite a bit of conference
15 activity that week. There's an ITS conference. There's an
16 engineers conference. So I know people will be attempting to be
17 in all places at once. But I just really want to express my
18 gratitude to you all committing your time coming out there and
19 having a State Transportation Board meeting next month. We look
20 forward to hosting you and spending some time with you. So
21 thank you very much.

22 CHAIRMAN CUTHBERTSON: Thank you.

23 Next is Paul Ward, the Executive Director of the
24 YMPO.

25 MR. WARD: Mr. Chairman, members of the State

1 Transportation Board, thank you for the opportunity. As you're
2 probably aware, YMPO is the planning agency, transportation
3 planning agency for Yuma County, as well as for the Yuma
4 metropolitan region.

5 From that point of view, I've been carrying out
6 some analysis going back for 20 years on state transportation,
7 the facilities programs that ADOT put out, and taking a look at
8 how much money has been coming to the Yuma region. I regret to
9 report specifically over that 20-year period that apparently
10 we're getting about one-quarter of the money that we're putting
11 into the state highway system, which I was kind of baffled to
12 take a look at.

13 Regardless of that, I've given that analysis to
14 senior ADOT transportation planning staff, primarily because the
15 fund or the information, the data I used was gathered from ADOT
16 information and ADOT data. Regardless, what I'd like the
17 opportunity to do, if it's appropriate to do so, of course, is
18 to make a presentation to the State Transportation Board at some
19 point in the future with regard to that analysis. Obviously I'd
20 be happy to work with State staff to ensure that the funds are
21 -- the data is correct.

22 Failing that, would definitely like to take the
23 opportunity of giving you that presentation if and when you
24 finally come back to the Yuma region again. I beg your pardon
25 when I say "if and when." You did so last year in February, and

1 we were very happy to host you. We'd like the opportunity again
2 this February.

3 Failing that, I'd definitely be willing to give
4 you the analysis that I've done again using ADOT as an
5 assistance to ensure that the funds we've got are correct, and
6 just forward them through the normal process so you can take a
7 look at.

8 Again, from that point of view, looking at the
9 most recent ADOT state facilities construction construction
10 program, based on the amount of money that we're getting -- that
11 the Yuma County region is providing to the State highway system
12 in gallons of gasoline and diesel, we're only receiving
13 one-fifth of the money back. Again, something tells me there's
14 a problem there somewhere, and I'd definitely appreciate the
15 opportunity to present to you what that problem is.

16 Looking forward, I'm definitely looking forward
17 to working with the Southwest District engineer and ADOT in
18 reprogramming and getting just a little bit more extra funds to
19 the Yuma region. Thank you, sir.

20 CHAIRMAN CUTHBERTSON: Thank you.

21 Next, Eric Duthie, the Tusayan County Manager.

22 MR. DUTHIE: Thank you, Mr. Chair, Board,
23 Mr. Thompson. It's good to see you again. I bring greetings
24 from the Grand Canyon this morning. It was a long drive, but
25 kind of interesting to get out of 40 degree weather into what we

1 are here.

2 Several -- a few months ago, we -- in a meeting
3 in Flagstaff, we had an opportunity to present to you some of
4 our concerns over the single two-lane highway that serves the
5 Grand Canyon at the South Rim. In -- following that, expressed
6 great appreciation for Director Halikowski and staff, for
7 District Engineer Audra Merrick and her staff. They've been
8 very responsive to our concerns. We are currently working with
9 them in research on a variety of issues. Our base issue is that
10 we have such a significant amount of international, non-English
11 reading drivers on our highway that it's a behavioral problem
12 for that. And so there is some out-of-the-box thinking going on
13 with pictorial signage, some lane striping opportunities, some
14 other traffic calming research that is going on.

15 We have no problem coming to you and complaining
16 about things. Absolutely not. You know that. But I also want
17 to be able to report to you that there is progress, and that we
18 are extremely appreciative of that. I would remind the Board
19 and staff that the Town of Tusayan is in a position to
20 financially assist with projects, and we are looking at that
21 cooperatively from that standpoint. And I just wanted to share
22 with you personally and on behalf of our town council the
23 appreciation that we have for the response and for your
24 interest. We -- we'll complain when we need to, but we'll also
25 keep you advised of the good things, and right now it's a good

1 thing. So thank you very much.

2 CHAIRMAN CUTHBERTSON: Thank you.

3 Next is Andy Smith, the Planning Supervisor from
4 Pinal County.

5 MR. SMITH: Good morning. My name is Andy Smith.
6 I'm planning supervisor for Pinal County. I'm here to submit a
7 resolution of support to the board -- ADOT board for -- from the
8 Pinal County Board of Supervisors regarding the -- trying to
9 come up with some safety mitigation measures for I-10, and so I
10 can submit it or however you'd like me to...

11 CHAIRMAN CUTHBERTSON: Yeah. If you'll just give
12 it to Linda, she'll make it part of the record. Yeah.

13 MR. SMITH: Thank you, and thank you for last
14 night.

15 CHAIRMAN CUTHBERTSON: Yeah. Thank you.

16 Next is Duane Eitel, the City Transportation
17 Engineer for Casa Grande.

18 Duane, I hope I pronounced your name okay.
19 Probably not.

20 MR. EITEL: Thank you, Chair. You got my last
21 name right, which is unusual.

22 CHAIRMAN CUTHBERTSON: Okay.

23 MR. EITEL: Chair, board members, good morning.
24 Great news for this region is Lucid, the electric car
25 manufacturer, is coming to Casa Grande. I know you'd all talked

1 about that a little bit last night. Ultimately, Lucid will have
2 2,300 employees or more and is just one of many developments
3 coming to the area, such as the electric truck manufacturer in
4 Coolidge.

5 Employees of these developments will be coming
6 not only from Casa Grande, but all the surrounding cities.
7 Robust connectivity is vital to the region in these
8 developments. The I-10 and Kortsen Road TI is a critical
9 missing link in the interconnectivity in the Sun Corridor MPO
10 region. Therefore, we strongly urge the Board to include this
11 project in ADOT's statewide transportation improvement program.
12 Thank you.

13 I'm kind of going for the award for the shortest
14 presentation.

15 CHAIRMAN CUTHBERTSON: Thank you. Yeah. It's
16 always something to strive for.

17 MR. EITEL: Thank you.

18 CHAIRMAN CUTHBERTSON: That's good.

19 Next is Karen Benally, Department Manager for the
20 Navajo Division of Transportation, Apache County.

21 MS. BENALLY: Good morning, honorable board
22 members. My name is Karen Benally. I am the department manager
23 with Navajo Division of Transportation. I come before you today
24 to -- in the hopes of partnerships in projects that are a part
25 of the Navajo Nation Reservation. We do have several state

1 highways that go across Navajo Nation, and we are very
2 interested in partnering with the State of Arizona to fund
3 and -- to fund and share resources and safety improvements for
4 routes throughout the Navajo Nation.

5 We do have a document here before you. We'd like
6 to submit this for the record. I'm not sure -- the deadline has
7 passed, but we'd like to propose several projects onto the TIP,
8 the State Transportation Improvement Program. We are interested
9 in, again, the partnership as far as funding is concerned. We
10 have several communities that are identified through this sheet
11 here for the proposed project listing. We have Saint Michaels,
12 Arizona; Ganado, Arizona; Tuba City, Arizona; Kayenta, Arizona;
13 and Chinle, Arizona. These routes are -- we are looking for
14 safety improvements is US-264, 191, 160, 163, 161 and 191.
15 These are corridors that are the main populated areas throughout
16 the Navajo Nation, and we do have a lot of safety issues that
17 occur along these routes. Thank you.

18 CHAIRMAN CUTHBERTSON: Okay. Thank you.

19 Next is Sheila Runke, the -- a citizen from the
20 city of Clarkdale. Sheila -- Sheila Runke?

21 Okay. Kara Harris, a taxpayer from Huachuca
22 City.

23 MS. HARRIS: I'm back. It was nice to see you in
24 Show Low, and it's nice to be back. Today I brought my
25 infrastructure. I brought Ms. Peggy Judd, who will hopefully

1 talk after I do. I'm back again to talk about State Route 82,
2 but before I do, I again want to thank you for the bypass and
3 Highway 90. Boy, is it awesome. I have to drive that way every
4 day to take my child to school, and so it's a wonderful thing
5 you've done down in Sierra Vista.

6 I would like to again point out, and I handed out
7 a flier that I made of the traffic increase on Highway 82,
8 especially the 18-wheel traffic. The guardrail that you see
9 that was taken out was not taken out by a wide load. It was
10 taken out by an 18-wheel truck.

11 When I ride my bicycle the mile and a half from
12 my house to Highway 90, I am passed by at least two plus
13 18-wheel trucks, and on that two-lane highway, if I get two
14 going at once, on my bike it's dangerous. I would like to
15 encourage you to consider widening that length of road, and
16 somebody since I was here last month has suggested even if it's
17 from entering Whetstone to the highway, because it's
18 particularly dangerous for those residents that have to turn
19 right off there or turn left off of that highway.

20 We've seen an increase of traffic to Patagonia
21 Lake, which has made it busier on that road. And also, I was
22 informed it is a -- billed as a tourist attraction for other
23 bicyclists to ride from Sonoyta to Whetstone, something I've
24 never done and will never do -- and I ride 21 miles, I rode 21
25 miles yesterday on my bicycle -- because it's extremely

1 dangerous. We have about 18 inches to ride on if you ride on
2 the inside of that white strip, and I personally don't want to
3 meet my maker currently, so I'm really nervous when I'm riding
4 that. But the only way to get to the highway is to trailer my
5 bike or to ride on that strip. So I'd like to ask that you look
6 at the increased traffic on 82, especially since NAFTA and the
7 18-wheel trucks coming between Nogales and Highway 90 and the
8 wide loads.

9 But one thing I learned in Show Low in reading
10 your packet is that SEAGO was involved in a funding in Nogales.
11 So when I talked to Mrs. Judd and asked her to come with me, she
12 informed me she was on the SEAGO board. So I'm hoping SEAGO
13 will be willing to partner in this effort, because it's in their
14 interest in the county, and as tourism is real strong for us and
15 a major generator of revenue, we'd like to see that road widened
16 for our safety. And I just thank you. It's nice to see you
17 again. I'll see you in Havasu City.

18 CHAIRMAN CUTHBERTSON: Thank you.

19 Next is Peggy Judd, the Cochise County
20 Supervisor.

21 MS. JUDD: I don't have to say a whole bunch
22 about myself, but I am a new supervisor in Cochise County just
23 this last term. So it's been two years, nearly, and I just
24 wanted to come today. I have reached out to the directors over
25 my two districts, because Cochise County is divided. I have

1 heard back from Rod. That was wonderful to hear right back from
2 him and his input. And then Kara covered that part of the
3 county pretty well.

4 I do have some concerns, one right now, and thank
5 goodness for the rain, and we have a lot of weeds at -- the
6 highways are building up with weeds, and we do see some mowing
7 -- some mowers on the side of the road on your ADOT roads, but
8 we're not seeing any mowing. So we have little herds of deer
9 that come down in the valley where the -- and they're out on the
10 roads, and it's getting a little bit -- a little bit more
11 dangerous than it normally is with our desert. So the weeds are
12 a concern.

13 Just to bring before the Board, and I hope this
14 will come out and be resolved soon, we've -- our sheriff's
15 department in the San Simon area -- area has asked a few times
16 now if they could have a school crossing in the little town of
17 San Simon, and I hear from my highway -- or not my highway
18 department -- my floodplain that that has been discussed in the
19 past, and it's just something that the Board has to approve and
20 work out. So that may come across. It's not a giant project,
21 but it is a business loop situation, and that is another
22 concern.

23 And then now I'm going to get to the thank yous.
24 We -- you've done some great projects. I do work on the SEAGO
25 board, so I see your assistance and the way you play in, and I

1 just want to thank Chairman Cuthbertson and the board at ADOT
2 for -- for your attention to our area. We feel like we're way
3 down there in the southeast corner, and we have a lot of issues,
4 and just knowing that there's someone at the State looking out
5 for us and keeping us safe is good, taking care of some of our
6 -- our issues. So thank you very much. And by way of
7 introduction, here I am. And I will also be coming back, happy
8 to support people in my district who wish to come out and speak
9 to the Board. So thank you very much.

10 CHAIRMAN CUTHBERTSON: Thank you.

11 Next, Jerry Williams of the Le Chee Chapter in
12 Coconino County.

13 MR. WILLIAMS: Good morning. Thank you Board
14 Chair and the rest of the Board. My name's Jerry Williams. I'm
15 with the Le Chee Chapter, part of the Navajo Nation. We're
16 situated up close to Page, and I gave a brief report on your
17 meeting over in Globe on two areas that the -- we're hoping that
18 something can be done with Highway 89 at Horseshoe Bend.

19 And I've noticed I went by there a few times, and
20 I think ADOT put in some pegs alongside the highway to have the
21 public not park alongside the 89, which is good. But then
22 they're starting to park at the end of the pegs, where the pegs
23 are, and they're starting to park there and wander over to
24 Horseshoe Bend. So that's one of the things that I wanted to
25 let you guys know.

1 And also, over on Highway 98, and also N22, too,
2 which is the turnoff to Antelope Point Marina, and we'd like to
3 see, you know, we can be considered for some kind of a -- some
4 actions that is really needed, because it's real -- the traffic
5 there is real heavy, and going from there east to Milepost 302,
6 there's another business that they started up on the hill, and
7 the same thing with that turnoff is just a two-lane, but there's
8 no turnoff lane. So we're try to see if that -- we wanted to
9 make you guys aware of that.

10 And we're also in discussion with Navajo DOT.
11 Navajo DOT, and we're beginning to have quarterly meetings with
12 them to address some of these areas and let them know. Also,
13 we're scheduling some meetings with the City of Page, because
14 Horseshoe Bend is within the city limits of Page, and the Navajo
15 Nation bound -- boundaries right south of Horseshoe Bend. So
16 we're putting a little -- we're putting some effort into some of
17 these items to where we can get some of the local entities and
18 Navajo Nation and maybe Coconino County just to let them be
19 aware of what we have out there.

20 So -- and then again, I thank you for giving me
21 some time to give you guys a little update, and one of things
22 that we want to do is we want to be here. We want to be at
23 these meetings and be visible so that we can have these ongoing
24 discussions. Thank you very much.

25 CHAIRMAN CUTHBERTSON: Thank you.

1 Next is Mike Humphrey from Tucson.

2 MR. HUMPHREY: Chairman Cuthbertson and the
3 Board, thank you for allowing me to speak to you today. My name
4 is Mike Humphrey. I live at 3760 North Camino Sinuoso in
5 Tucson, Arizona. My wife, Pam, and sister, Ann, were killed in
6 a cross-median crash at Milepost 171.4 on I-10 between Tucson
7 and Phoenix. If there had been a median barrier cable in that
8 median, they would not have perished that day.

9 I come to you again today to request your
10 assistance in addressing this serious public safety hazard on
11 I-10. Too many people are dying and being injured in
12 cross-median crashes, and something needs to be done to make the
13 highway safer, and I've come to you to ask for your support.

14 I have a proposed resolution I would like to read
15 to you. Before I do that, though, I'd like to tip my hat to the
16 Pinal County Board of Supervisors who share my concern about the
17 safety of this roadway, and they passed a resolution in support
18 of making that roadway safer. So thank you very much.

19 Okay. A resolution by Arizona State
20 Transportation Board in support of installation of median cable
21 barriers on I-10 between Tucson and Phoenix.

22 Whereas, traveling on I-10 between Tucson and
23 Phoenix is very dangerous both for our residents as well as
24 visitors going between the two cities.

25 Whereas, this danger is reflected in the large

1 number of cross-median crashes, fatalities and injuries on this
2 roadway.

3 Whereas, cross-median crashes and their aftermath
4 pose significant negative health, economic and environmental
5 impacts for motorists, first responders, local communities and
6 the State of Arizona.

7 Whereas, the 2013 Arizona Roadway Departure
8 Safety Implementation Plan, which was produced by ADOT,
9 identifies the need for additional median cable barriers at
10 Mileposts 170 to 190, 210 to 220, and 230 to 240 between Tucson
11 and Phoenix.

12 Let me repeat. The Arizona Roadway Departure
13 Safety Implementation Plan, which was published in 2013, calls
14 for those cables to go into those sections that I just -- that I
15 just stated.

16 Whereas, median cable barriers have been
17 installed in other crash-prone areas of the state.

18 Whereas, extensive federal and state research has
19 shown that the installation of median cable barriers can reduce
20 cross-median crashes by up to 97 percent, demonstrating
21 consistent success in saving lives every year.

22 Whereas, extensive state research has shown every
23 dollar spent on median cable barriers results in significant
24 savings from serious injury and fatal crash avoidance.

25 Whereas, installing median cable barriers in

1 sections of I-10 between Tucson and Phoenix will protect the
2 health, safety, economic welfare and environmental quality of
3 motorists, first responders, local communities and the State of
4 Arizona.

5 Whereas, the Arizona State Transportation Board
6 has both policy powers and advisory capacity.

7 Be it resolved that the Arizona State
8 Transportation Board strongly supports the immediate
9 installation of median cable barriers on I-10 between Tucson and
10 Phoenix.

11 Thank you.

12 CHAIRMAN CUTHBERTSON: Thank you.

13 Okay. I'm going to return to Sheila Runke. Is
14 Sheila -- is Sheila here? She submitted a card, and she said
15 she wishes to address a stretch of roadway between uptown Sedona
16 and Flagstaff that is currently Highway 89A. "Please enter my
17 previous communications and concerns sent to ADOT."

18 I'm not sure if we have a communication from
19 Ms. -- Mrs. -- Ms. Runke or not. I guess if we have that, we
20 could include it in the call to the audience comments for the
21 record, so...

22 Okay. With that, that concludes the call to the
23 audience. We'd like to move on to the director's report. Item
24 No. 1 on the agenda.

25 MR. THOMPSON: Chairman.

1 CHAIRMAN CUTHBERTSON: Yes.

2 MR. THOMPSON: I'd like to ask the staff I know
3 that many of the comments that are made here, we can't discuss
4 at all, but is it okay to do it outside the chambers?

5 CHAIRMAN CUTHBERTSON: You know, I think -- I'm
6 not sure. We'll have staff weigh in. I think, Board Member
7 Thompson, we -- if there's things -- if there's things that are
8 brought up in the call to the audience if we would to agendize
9 for, like, the next meeting --

10 MR. THOMPSON: Yes.

11 CHAIRMAN CUTHBERTSON: -- or we want to put on,
12 then we can certainly do that.

13 MR. THOMPSON: I guess what I was thinking about
14 is, you know, give them an idea as to the process. Give them
15 direction as how these new projects, you know, to move up to be
16 moved up. So that's all I wanted to do.

17 CHAIRMAN CUTHBERTSON: Okay. Okay. Yeah. So
18 that is a good point. I think sometimes folks that come up to
19 the call to the audience might -- for us, since they're not
20 agendize items, we really can't discuss or communicate them.
21 But what it is is an opportunity for us to take concerns from
22 the public and consider them for agendizing maybe on a future
23 meeting.

24 Mr. Roehrich, would you like to weigh in on that,
25 please?

1 MR. ROEHRICH: Mr. Chair and board members, I
2 would. Just real quickly, part of having these meetings here
3 and the staff here as well is the ability to interact with the
4 locals. So a lot of times you'll see a topic will be brought
5 up, and either the director or the state engineer or even the
6 district engineer will go up to that person afterwards,
7 introduce them self and say, "Let's follow up on the topic."

8 Local governments that have been up here and
9 said, "We'd like the partner with ADOT and spend time with
10 them," we -- please go through your district engineer's office
11 or the state engineer's office. We are always happy to come out
12 and meet. Just like Mr. Duthie from the City of Tucson said.
13 After they came to the Board and made these comments, the
14 director scheduled -- worked with his office and took some
15 people up there, the district engineer and the state engineer to
16 meet and start talking about that. We're very happy to meet and
17 explain that.

18 In addition, if there's comments or concerns or
19 interest in learning how we go through the programming process,
20 our website has a lot of detailed information on how we develop
21 the five-year program, how ADOT conducts its business, how the
22 Board conducts its business. So there's a lot of opportunities
23 to find that, and we're always open to meeting and having those
24 discussions.

25 MR. THOMPSON: Thank you, Chair.

1 CHAIRMAN CUTHBERTSON: Yeah. Thanks. Thanks for
2 the comments and the question.

3 Any comments?

4 Okay. Let's go ahead and move on to Item 1,
5 director's report. I don't see Director Halikowski here.
6 Floyd, are you --

7 MR. ROEHRICH: Mr. Chair and board members, on
8 behalf of the director, he sends his apologies. He got called
9 off to some meetings, and he got a conflict, couldn't be here.
10 He did not have any last minute items to discuss, but he does
11 want to remind the Board if you've got something he definitely
12 -- you would like him to address, even as a follow up from this
13 meeting to future meetings, please let myself or him know and
14 we'll make sure to get it agendaed. With that, there's nothing
15 else to report.

16 CHAIRMAN CUTHBERTSON: Okay. Thank you.

17 So we'll move on to Item 2 on the agenda. Rod
18 Lane, the Southcentral District Engineer, will provide an update
19 of the issues of regional significance. For information and
20 discussion only.

21 MR. LANE: Good morning Mr. Chair, members of the
22 Board. I'm going to keep my report brief. Not as brief as
23 Mr. Eitel's, unfortunately, but certainly...

24 I'd like to thank you or welcome you to the
25 Southcentral District. Apparently I'm still loading. So give

1 it a moment here and we will continue on. There we go.

2 So welcome to the Southcentral District. I'm
3 going to talk about some of the construction projects we've got
4 going on down here that are significant to the area, and also
5 some of the -- briefly touch on some development projects that
6 are significant to the area.

7 So the first one I want to talk about and give
8 you a status check is the I-10 at SR-87 in Picacho. That
9 project is being administered by our Southcentral District -- or
10 excuse me -- by the Central District, but it is within the
11 boundaries of the Southcentral District, and it's going along
12 well. The contractor is Coffman Specialties. It's got a value
13 of about 58 and a half million dollars. It's a mainline
14 widening and a new traffic interchange project. We're about 43
15 percent complete on that project, and we expect to have it done
16 in about a year or so.

17 The other project that's of big significance down
18 here is I-10 widening at I-8. Again, this project is being
19 administered by the Central District, but it is within the
20 bounds of the Southcentral District. So we'll take up the
21 maintenance aspect of it. And that one is being -- the
22 contractor for that project is a joint venture between Combs and
23 Ames Construction. It's got a contract value of 36.6 million.
24 Again, it's a mainline widening of that area. So we're
25 increasing the capacity from the two lanes to the three lanes.

1 We're about 23 percent complete, and we expect to have that one
2 done right around middle of the summer of next summer.

3 Another large project of significance to the
4 district is the Ina Road traffic interchange project, being done
5 down in the north side of Tucson down there. This is being done
6 by a joint venture, again, of Sundt and Kiewit. It's got a
7 value of \$124 million for the project. We're about two-thirds
8 of the way complete, and we're expecting final acceptance to be
9 around the end of June. You'll start to see ramps opening up in
10 about six months or so down there. But -- so we'll have some --
11 we'll open the ramps as much as we can.

12 This is a photo of kind of the work that's going
13 on out there. It's just a -- kind of a transportation geek
14 photo, because it's got everything. It's got a train going,
15 bridge construction, a highway being built. It's really just --
16 I kind of like it, so I threw it in there.

17 Another one that's very important to the Tucson
18 area is the I-19/Ajo TI. This is kind of a two-phase project
19 going on. Phase one was completed at the beginning of the
20 summer, and that was done by Ames Construction with a 30 --
21 about a \$40 million project, and that was the construction of
22 the single point urban interchange, the SPUI, TI.

23 And the phase two has now just started, and that
24 contractor is FNF Construction, with \$32 million. And that
25 project is going to consist of a new bridge over the Santa Cruz

1 River. So it's west of -- just west of I-19. It's also going
2 to put a large ramp -- just about a mile-long exit ramp that
3 goes underneath the Ajo TI and loops around for the Irvington
4 Road exit, which is the next exit south. Some noise walls, a
5 pedestrian bridge going over I-19 as well are all part of this
6 phase. And we've just started that one at the end of the summer
7 here. We expect to have that one done in January of 2020.

8 So another vital project for the community down
9 there is the SR-86 Valencia to Kinney, and we're pretty much
10 done with that. The only thing left we have on that one is the
11 final course of asphalt, which we call the asphalt rubber
12 friction course. So everything else is done. We'll put that
13 last course down, and then we'll come back and do the striping
14 and we'll finish that up. That was done by Ashton Construction,
15 a value of \$40.9 million. So again, we're just wrapping that
16 one up.

17 Another one down vital to the region is the I-10
18 over the Wilmot project. This was kind of unique, because we
19 used a temporary bridge structure on this project. You can kind
20 of see that up on the right there where we hauled it in and we
21 put a bridge -- a temporary structure on the median, and then we
22 swapped the traffic to the median for both phases. So, for
23 example, the eastbound traffic went to the median. Then we
24 replaced the eastbound bridge. Then the westbound traffic went
25 to the median. Then we replaced the westbound bridge. So this

1 was the second time we actually did that. It was very
2 successful on the first one. The contractor is Pulice
3 Construction. Got a value of about \$4 million dollars. We're
4 about 40 percent complete on that. We expect to be done
5 December 2018.

6 Got some signals putting in on the south side of
7 Tucson. The contract has just started. Wilmot, Kolb, Rita.
8 It's not a high value contract, but it's significantly important
9 to the region. We've got quite a bit of traffic backup down in
10 that area, and these will hopefully help curb that when --
11 they'll curb some of that issue quite a bit. So we've just
12 started that one. We're only 12 percent in. We'll have that --
13 those done in about a year. Again, there's three signals on
14 there.

15 So this is kind of what we've got going on.
16 Those are the major ones we've talked to you about. A couple of
17 the other ones I want to mention. A pavement pres. project out
18 on I-19. That's about 70 percent done. We've got the Pima Mine
19 Road Bridge. We expect to have that one done in about a month
20 on so. And we've also got two projects wrapping up down in
21 Sierra Vista area, one on SR-92 -- 90 and 92, and one on the
22 Buffalo Soldiers Trail. And they're moving along nicely.

23 So some of the upcoming major design projects
24 we've got. I didn't put all of them. I just put kind of the
25 major ones that we're just kind of moving into.

1 Route 189 in Nogales, we're starting to process
2 that one. That's supposed to be moving out in fiscal year '19
3 as a design build project, and we're just kind in the process of
4 picking the designers for that and the teams for that. So that
5 one's moving forward.

6 The Pinal Air Park TI, it's actually on the
7 program, I believe, to be approved -- we've got an apparent low
8 bidder on that one. So that one's actually going to move into
9 the construction phase.

10 Another one that's pretty important to this
11 region specifically, Coolidge, is a traffic signal at Ruins
12 Drive. That's going to be advertised in about a month, and we
13 should have that one starting construction this year.

14 The Ruthrauff TI is a very important project for
15 the Tucson area, and that's going to be -- we expect to have
16 that one in this year, advertised this year, probably around
17 February-ish, we'll have that one advertised and a complete set
18 of plans, and that's a full TI placement at the Ruthrauff area.

19 Houghton Road is another project, vital. That
20 one -- the design is just getting kicked off on that one. So we
21 expect of to have that one delivered in fiscal year '20. Kind
22 of the south side of town, right where we're putting on -- in
23 those signals at Kolb, Rita and Wilmot. Houghten Road TI is
24 going, and that's a unique project, because it's going to be the
25 first diverging diamond in the district.

1 So -- and another project that's very important
2 to this specific region is the Gila River Bridge on SR-79. That
3 ones going to be a unique project when that one starts. We're
4 just kidding -- just kicking off the design, just selecting the
5 designers and the engineering consultants to move that job
6 forward. It's scheduled for fiscal year '22, and it's going to
7 be unique, because we're going to try some accelerated bridge
8 construction methods on that one. That one's got -- it's pretty
9 narrow. It's a vital route. So how we maintain traffic and
10 reconstruct that bridge is going to be a pretty challenging
11 effort, and that's why we've chosen to kind of go for an
12 accelerated bridge concept on that. So hopefully you'll see
13 more as you move through the design process on that.

14 So with that, that's my presentation. Are there
15 any questions?

16 Thank you very much.

17 CHAIRMAN CUTHBERTSON: Yeah. Thank you. Lots of
18 work going on in the district, it looks like. So thanks.

19 We'll move on to Item 3 on the agenda. The Board
20 will consider items included in the consent agenda. For
21 information and possible action. Board members have had a
22 chance to review their packets. Are there any items in the
23 consent agenda that you would like pulled for individual
24 discussion?

25 Board Member Stratton.

1 MR. STRATTON: I'd like to pull Item 7C to
2 discuss, please.

3 CHAIRMAN CUTHBERTSON: Okay. Okay. So let's --
4 let's table that until we get down to -- is that in the PPAC
5 package, or is that in the consent agenda? Is that in the
6 consent agenda?

7 MR. ROEHRICH: Mr. Chair, that is in the PPAC
8 item. That's not in Item 3. We're only dealing, Item 3, with
9 the consent agenda right now.

10 CHAIRMAN CUTHBERTSON: Okay. So we'll pull it
11 when we get to Item 7C.

12 MR. STRATTON: Okay.

13 CHAIRMAN CUTHBERTSON: We'll hold that thought.

14 MR. ROEHRICH: And Mr. Chair, as part of Item 3,
15 I want to remind the Board there was an addendum on that to
16 correct a wrong project location map that was included in the
17 consent agent, but it's administrative. It doesn't require, in
18 our opinion, any need to take it outside of the consent agenda.
19 It still can be acted on.

20 CHAIRMAN CUTHBERTSON: Okay. Everybody clear on
21 that correction?

22 Okay. Do I have a motion to approve the consent
23 agenda as presented?

24 MR. THOMPSON: I would so move.

25 CHAIRMAN CUTHBERTSON: Okay.

1 MR. KNIGHT: Second.

2 CHAIRMAN CUTHBERTSON: Moved by Board Member
3 Thompson, seconded by Board Member Knight. Any discussion?

4 Hearing none, all in favor signify by saying aye.

5 BOARD MEMBERS: Aye.

6 CHAIRMAN CUTHBERTSON: Any opposed, say nay.
7 Ayes have it. Motion passes.

8 We'll -- Item 4 on the agenda, Mr. Roehrich will
9 provide the legislative report. For information and discussion
10 only.

11 MR. ROEHRICH: Thank you, Mr. Chair.

12 We're in that lull period here at the end of
13 summer where there isn't very much going on either locally or
14 nationally, in Congress, as far as legislative issues, but there
15 are a couple things that we're working on. Right now staff is
16 working on putting together our legislative recommendations that
17 we want to address in the next section -- next session. Those
18 are due the middle of the month.

19 We're in the process now of waiting to hear back
20 from the governor's office, that they analyzed that, and then we
21 meet with them to determine how to align our legislative actions
22 with what the governor intends to put forward this next session.
23 We should have an understanding of that later this year, and as
24 soon as we have consensus and agreement, Kevin said that he will
25 provide a more extensive discussion as we reach the beginning of

1 next year and we start to do legislative session. So more will
2 be coming up as far as what we intend to look at or what the
3 governor wants to prioritize next session.

4 Nationally, the House and Senate have reached
5 agreement on fiscal year 2019 spending for most of the federal
6 departments and agencies, but there's still policy disputes that
7 are holding up agreement on the FY '19 spending levels for
8 Department of Transportation, Interior, Agriculture and Housing.

9 So as they work through a continuing resolution
10 on those four departments, which goes until September 30th,
11 which is basically the end of the federal fiscal year, if they
12 come to agreement before then, either they shut down those parts
13 of the government or they continue to provide a continuing
14 resolution. Right now, the best feeling, our legislative people
15 feels are they're not going to come to agreement, but they will
16 come to an agreement for continuing resolution to keep those
17 parts of the federal government running, at least until the
18 beginning of December, around December 7th. So it's likelihood
19 that those will be a continuing resolution and not a full budget
20 item for the year.

21 Let's see. And that does center around the
22 continued threats by the administration to shut down government
23 if they don't get their support for a border wall and some of
24 the other actions that the administration is looking for. And
25 according to our legislative folks and what they're hearing out

1 of Congress, and if they do do a continuing resolution to expand
2 those areas, that there might have to be some consideration of
3 the administration's requests, and that's all being discussed on
4 right now. No idea where that might end up.

5 So at this time we're continuing to monitor the
6 federal situation and determine if there will be any impact to
7 us. That's all he had for a legislative report, board chair and
8 members.

9 CHAIRMAN CUTHBERTSON: Okay. Questions?

10 Thank you, Floyd.

11 Item 5, financial report. I don't see Kristine
12 Ward here today. So I'm assuming that maybe you're filling in
13 for...

14 MR. ROEHRICH: Mr. Chair, members of the Board, I
15 guess I'm filling in for her.

16 CHAIRMAN CUTHBERTSON: Okay. Thank you.

17 MR. ROEHRICH: So with that, I did have a chance
18 for her executive assistant to send me down a presentation just
19 in case. So I did want to point out a couple of things that I
20 noticed as I looked over her presentation.

21 You can see that for the HURF revenues, we
22 continue to fall under the -- under her forecasted for the year,
23 at least the first two -- couple months of the year. Although
24 we've seen some modest increase in growth in the valley or in
25 the state as well, with continued fuel consumption going up, the

1 revenues themselves have not kept pace with the expected growth.

2 We're -- she's not concerned at this time if this
3 trend continues, but obviously the issue would be is if the
4 revenues keep declining from forecast, what that would mean in
5 the available funds when we head into the next programming
6 session, which will kick off at the beginning of the year. So
7 she's monitoring that, and she'll have quite a bit more emphasis
8 to talk about.

9 I did notice in her report there's some things
10 that we think are contributing to that. Since 2017, between
11 last year and this year, we've seen the average price of a
12 gallon of gasoline go from 200 -- \$2.23 last summer to 2.92 this
13 year. So it's already up 59 -- 59 cents year over year. So
14 that might be contributing to some aspect of it. So she'll keep
15 monitoring that, and then hopefully we'll see, if the trend
16 continues, what impact it may have on available HURF funds.

17 The RARF, RARF's doing just moderately better.
18 It's just above her forecast level, about seven-tenths of a
19 percent. Again, you're seeing moderate growth. And this is the
20 thing that was a little surprising, I think, in talking -- in
21 looking at the information here. We keep hearing that Arizona
22 is -- and Maricopa County is one of the fastest growing regions
23 in the state, but what we're not seeing is increase in revenues
24 associated with that, at least at this time. So hopefully as we
25 kind of normalize those trends, we'll see our revenues continue

1 to move forward. But RARF is right on -- right on the -- her
2 forecast, at least at this time, at the beginning of the
3 fiscal year.

4 And then from the federal aid program, as I
5 stated in the legislative report, we'll see where the discussion
6 goes with the transportation funding. She did want to remind
7 the Board that last month you had approved the -- her to go out
8 and do the bond issuance. She's in the middle of doing that,
9 and hopefully by next month she'll be able to come back and
10 report at least the results of that bond issue and bond funding,
11 which will again roll into next -- hopefully availability of
12 funds as we go through the next programming cycle.

13 With that, that's what I have for a financial
14 report. Obviously when Kristine's back, she'll be able to give
15 you a more comprehensive discussion. Thank you.

16 CHAIRMAN CUTHBERTSON: Okay. Questions from
17 board members?

18 Okay. Move on to Item 6 on the agenda. Clem
19 Ligocki, the Planning and Programming Manager from Multimodal
20 Planning Division, will present an update on the current
21 planning activities pursuant to A.R.S. §28-506. For information
22 and discussion only.

23 MR. LIGOCKI: Good morning, Mr. Chairman, members
24 of the Board. It is indeed a good day to be filling in for
25 other people today. So I'm here for Greg Byres. And we talk

1 about one ADOT. We all work here together as a team, I'm happy
2 to be here for Greg.

3 So first, the director's -- excuse me -- the MPD
4 report. I don't have much today. I just wanted to continue, as
5 we have been, updating you on where we are as we start to look
6 toward next year's program, and we are now currently evaluating
7 and rating the projects that have been proposed, and we'll
8 continue working on that for another month on so, and we'll be
9 happy to update you in the future on where we're going with
10 that. We'll see you in a study session sometime soon, as you
11 know.

12 Just to echo what -- and support what Floyd said
13 earlier on, too, if there are ever any questions about the
14 planning and programming process for anyone, we're here. We're
15 available at any time, and any time happy to meet with people
16 and talk about that process. So that's really all I have for
17 the MPD report.

18 CHAIRMAN CUTHBERTSON: Okay. Thank you.
19 Questions?

20 Okay. So we'll move on to Item 7, the Priority
21 Planning Advisory Committee. So continuing on, Clem will
22 present recommended PPAC actions, including consideration of
23 changes to the 2019-2023 Statewide Transportation Program -- did
24 you already do that, Clem, or did --

25 MR. LIGOCKI: Absolutely.

1 CHAIRMAN CUTHBERTSON: Did that already. Okay.
2 Sorry.

3 MR. LIGOCKI: So Mr. Chairman, board members, I
4 recognize that there may be some questions. I'll go ahead and
5 present my information. So we have six items today for PPAC,
6 Items 7A through 7F. 7A through 7C are project modifications,
7 and then 7D through 7F are new projects.

8 There's one project, 7A, the State Route 86
9 project, that's contingent on approval by the Pima Association
10 of Governments. So as you go move to direct -- to approve that
11 at some point, we -- make sure we note that is contingent on PAG
12 approval, and we're expecting that on October 4th, we hope.

13 That's really all I have as far as that goes. So
14 we would be asking for your approval of Items 7A through 7F when
15 appropriate.

16 CHAIRMAN CUTHBERTSON: Okay. So -- so board
17 members, you've had a chance to look at new items, or projects
18 7A through 7F. Are there any items you would like pulled for
19 separate discussion?

20 MR. STRATTON: I would like to discuss 7C.

21 CHAIRMAN CUTHBERTSON: Okay. Okay. So we'll --
22 what we'll do is we'll pull that one for separate discussion.

23 And do I have a motion then on new projects 7A
24 through 7D?

25 MR. ELTERS: Mr. Chairman.

1 CHAIRMAN CUTHBERTSON: Yes. Yes.

2 MR. ELTERS: I would also like to pull 7B and 7F.

3 CHAIRMAN CUTHBERTSON: Okay. So we've got 7B, 7C
4 and 7F that we're considering for individual discussion. Any
5 others?

6 MR. KNIGHT: Mr. Chair.

7 CHAIRMAN CUTHBERTSON: Yes.

8 MR. KNIGHT: Right here. I've just got one
9 question, and we don't have to pull any of them, but the three
10 that are new projects, the D, E and F, does that mean that they
11 were not in the five-year plan and now they are, or they're
12 moved -- being moved up in the five-year plan?

13 MR. LIGOCKI: Mr. Chairman, Mr. Knight, the funds
14 are there, but these are projects that may not have been
15 identified at that time. So it could be subprogram funds that
16 could be used. And so they're new projects being added in to
17 the first year.

18 MR. ROEHRICH: Mr. Chairman, sorry. Yeah. I
19 want to make sure that we're clear on that, because that is what
20 it is. If you remember when we developed the five-year program,
21 we have specific projects in there, but then we have lump sum
22 subprograms, like a bridge program, a safety program, pavement
23 preservation program, bridge scour program. We haven't fully
24 defined what projects are coming out of those subprograms, but
25 they're money that at the time that we asked the Board to

1 approve. We set aside for that reason.

2 Then what we do is as we develop the specific
3 projects to be funded out of those sources, when they're ready
4 to go, we bring them forward, which is why they weren't acted on
5 originally when the five-year program was, because we hadn't
6 completely fleshed out the final scope and the final budget, but
7 we knew it was going to be funded out of that subcategory of
8 funds. Once we've identified that, then we bring them to the
9 Board to identify this is the specific area so the Board knows
10 that those funds that they said we put aside for preservation or
11 for bridge or for safety actually went to that type of a
12 project.

13 MR. KNIGHT: Thank you.

14 MR. ROEHRICH: And Mr. Chair, if I could, given
15 that there's 7A through F, and that at least three of the
16 projects are taken out, Clem, why don't we take each project
17 individually? Approve the ones you want. Then we get to the
18 ones that were asked to discuss. We can have a conversation
19 about that specific project. I know it's going to go a little
20 bit longer, but I think there -- it's not like there's 27
21 projects to go through.

22 CHAIRMAN CUTHBERTSON: Yeah.

23 MR. ROEHRICH: But I think if we go one at a time
24 -- let's just do them one at a time, and then we can address
25 each project as we get to it.

1 CHAIRMAN CUTHBERTSON: Yeah. I think that's a
2 good idea. It will certainly make the motions easier.

3 MR. LIGOCKI: Okay. So Mr. Chairman, I think
4 that first then is 7A, the SR-86 project, which would be
5 contingent on PAG approval.

6 CHAIRMAN CUTHBERTSON: Okay. Any questions on
7 Item 7A, new project 7A?

8 Do I hear a motion to approve Item 7A as
9 presented?

10 MR. KNIGHT: So moved.

11 MR. HAMMOND: Second.

12 CHAIRMAN CUTHBERTSON: Moved by Board Member
13 Knight, seconded by Board -- oh, no. Board Member Hammond.

14 MR. HAMMOND: (Inaudible.)

15 CHAIRMAN CUTHBERTSON: Moved by Board Member
16 Knight, seconded by Board Member Hammond. Any discussion?

17 All in favor indicate by saying aye.

18 BOARD MEMBERS: Aye.

19 CHAIRMAN CUTHBERTSON: Opposed, nay. Ayes have
20 it. The motion passes.

21 Item 7B.

22 MR. LIGOCKI: Okay. Mr. Chairman, I believe 7B
23 is one of the ones that was pulled for discussion.

24 MR. ELTERS: Mr. Chairman, my question related to
25 7B just -- I understand the program. This is related to

1 processing projects with the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers
2 related to permits. It's necessary. The increase that is being
3 requested puts the annual amounts over \$1 million. So my
4 question is how many -- has the program grown to this point, and
5 how many individual and/or (inaudible) are being supported that
6 would require over a million dollars a year to sustain it?

7 MR. LIGOCKI: Mr. Chairman, Mr. Elters, I don't
8 have the answer to that question. I'm looking to see if others
9 do. Okay.

10 (Inaudible conversation.)

11 MR. LIGOCKI: Okay. Lynn is informing me that
12 there have been incremental increases each year over the last
13 several years. I think it's reflect -- it's reflective of the
14 amount of activity anticipated for this year, 404 permit
15 activity and such. There may be others here who can expound on
16 that.

17 That's okay.

18 MR. ELTERS: So is it --

19 MR. ROEHRICH: Mr. Chair, I just want to look --
20 is all of this funding, a million dollars in one fiscal --
21 because it looks like it increased 172,000 per year over the
22 five years. I guess I'm not understanding this now that I look
23 at it as well.

24 (Inaudible conversation.)

25 MR. LIGOCKI: Excuse me. Mr. Boschen's just

1 informed me it's a cumulative number.

2 MR. ROEHRICH: So then could you clarify -- so
3 then are you saying it's -- what you're asking for is a budget
4 instead of five years of 862,000, the five years of 1 million 34
5 thousand?

6 MR. BOSCHEN: Mr. Chair, Mr. Elters, the request
7 is for a yearly amount. So I think if the request is 172, that
8 is what we're paying the Corps of Engineers to expedite our 404
9 permit. So it's a yearly budget. So we're tracking it as how
10 much we've paid them. It's one contract, so it's like a
11 five-year contract, if that's makes more sense.

12 MR. ELTERS: Okay. So it's not an annual one
13 million dollars? It's an annual 172- --.

14 MR. BOSCHEN: Absolutely not. That would scare
15 me, also.

16 MR. ELTERS: Okay. That -- that addresses my
17 question.

18 CHAIRMAN CUTHBERTSON: Okay. Good clarification.
19 Thank you.

20 Okay. Any other discussion on Item 7B? Do I
21 have a motion to approve Item 7B as presented?

22 VICE CHAIR SELLERS: So moved.

23 CHAIRMAN CUTHBERTSON: Moved by Board Member
24 Sellers.

25 MR. ELTERS: Second.

1 CHAIRMAN CUTHBERTSON: Seconded by Board Member
2 Elters. Discussion further?

3 All in favor, aye.

4 BOARD MEMBERS: Aye.

5 CHAIRMAN CUTHBERTSON: Opposed, nay? Ayes have
6 it. Motion passes.

7 Item 7C.

8 MR. LIGOCKI: Mr. Chairman, I believe this one
9 was also pulled for discussion.

10 CHAIRMAN CUTHBERTSON: Yes. Comments?

11 MR. STRATTON: Mr. Chair.

12 CHAIRMAN CUTHBERTSON: Comments on Item 7C.

13 Board Member Sellers -- Board Member Stratton.

14 MR. STRATTON: I have a couple questions on this
15 item. First of all, the increase in the budget amount, where's
16 the money coming from?

17 MR. ROEHRICH: Mr. Chair, Mr. Stratton, it looks
18 as if it's asking for the money from the bridge rehabilitation
19 program, \$1 million, and the rest of it from contingency fund.

20 MR. STRATTON: Follow up on that question then.
21 Is that statewide money or is that Greater Arizona money?

22 MR. ROEHRICH: Mr. Chair Mr. Stratton, it's out
23 of the lump sum, which can be used statewide.

24 MR. STRATTON: Okay. Thank you.

25 One more question. I see that you want to change

1 to silica fume concrete. I have pretty extensive experience of
2 that. Usually it's used in high acid areas and for high
3 strength areas. Is there a particular reason -- is there -- not
4 being any acid in that area, to my knowledge, is there a
5 particular reason silica fume concrete is being used? It's
6 quite expensive, and it's very hard to work with.

7 MR. ROEHRICH: Mr. Chairman, Mr. Stratton, the
8 only thing I'm going to point to is it does talk about that they
9 do a lot of de-icing up there and a lot of pavement maintenance
10 in order to keep that stretch open when it's needed, and I think
11 that has been -- we've seen very corrosive in those northern --
12 northern regions, especially with the bridges. Other than that,
13 I would either ask if Mr. Boschen or somebody technically could
14 come up. My first reaction is, is given the area of the road --
15 the surrounding earth may not be as acidic, but we're doing
16 acidic work on there through the de-icing and some other
17 activities to keep that road open.

18 MR. STRATTON: A follow-up question to that then,
19 and if it extends the life and it's good for maintenance, that's
20 great. However, if we're trying to reach a high PSI, is it
21 because of the triples that are pulled on that particular route
22 or any other reason?

23 MR. LIGOCKI: Mr. Chair, Mr. Stratton, I think
24 Floyd nailed it in terms of why we're using the silica fume. In
25 the terms of PSI of the concrete, we're doing it for the bridge

1 loading that is up there. There are triples, but triples do a
2 good job of spreading their load out. So although I-15 is one
3 of the few routes that we allow triples because of our
4 neighboring states, it still meets the bridge formula. But the
5 silica fume, as Floyd correctly described, does help us preserve
6 this in a very high corrosive environment. And we are also
7 using epoxy for the rebar out there.

8 MR. STRATTON: Okay. Thank you.

9 CHAIRMAN CUTHBERTSON: Any other questions or
10 discussion?

11 Do I have a proposal or a motion to approve Item
12 7C as presented?

13 MR. STRATTON: So moved.

14 MR. THOMPSON: Second.

15 CHAIRMAN CUTHBERTSON: Moved by Board Member
16 Stratton, seconded by Board Member Thompson.

17 All in favor, indicate by saying aye.

18 BOARD MEMBERS: Aye.

19 CHAIRMAN CUTHBERTSON: Opposed, nay. Ayes have
20 it. Motion passes.

21 Moving on to Item 7D. I don't think this was one
22 that was pulled for discussion. Any comments?

23 Do I have a motion to accept 7 -- Item 7D as
24 presented?

25 MR. KNIGHT: So moved.

1 MR. STRATTON: Second.

2 CHAIRMAN CUTHBERTSON: Motioned by Board Member
3 Knight, seconded by Board Member Stratton.

4 All in favor indicate by saying aye.

5 BOARD MEMBERS: Aye.

6 MR. STRATTON: Opposed, nay? Ayes have it.
7 Motion passes.

8 Item 7E. I don't believe this one was pulled for
9 discussion either.

10 MR. LIGOCKI: That's correct, Mr. Chairman.

11 CHAIRMAN CUTHBERTSON: Okay.

12 MR. STRATTON: Move for approval.

13 MR. KNIGHT: Second.

14 CHAIRMAN CUTHBERTSON: Motion to approve by -- as
15 proposed by Vice Chair Stratton, seconded by Board Member
16 Knight.

17 All in favor indicate by saying aye.

18 BOARD MEMBERS: Aye.

19 CHAIRMAN CUTHBERTSON: Opposed, nay? Ayes have
20 it. Motion passes.

21 And finally, Item 7F. This one was pulled for
22 discussion. Was it Board Member Elters?

23 MR. ELTERS: Yes. I had a question on 7F.

24 Just reading this item, it seems to indicate that
25 a water line will be placed in the I-40 right-of-way coming into

1 the City of Flagstaff, and to my understanding, that is not
2 consistent with the policies of the past. So my question to
3 staff is is it consistent, and if not, what is the thought
4 process behind it?

5 MR. ROEHRICH: Mr. Chair, Mr. Elters, we have a
6 long history of working with the City of Flagstaff on this
7 specific request. It has actually been denied multiple times by
8 various state engineers as part of our coordination, but it
9 continues to come back as an item for further evaluation. The
10 specific item is to continue to evaluate options where we could
11 potentially come to some type of eventual solution that would
12 allow an exception to policy to put this in.

13 The City of Flagstaff and the department have
14 worked very closely on how we can get to a yes with no guarantee
15 by the department we will get to a yes. But because of the
16 political nature and some of the questions raised as far as what
17 this means to the City, what this means to that northern region,
18 could we as a department still work on -- with the City to
19 ultimately come up to something we can agree with. We're not
20 there yet, but it's a continuing subject.

21 This allows us to fund, to consult and to come
22 in, to help us review some of the work that the City is
23 proposing in order to further the discussion about eventually
24 getting an encroachment permit.

25 There's no agreement at this point where the

1 department wouldn't ensure they're getting an encroachment
2 permit. We're just working to see if we can eventually get to
3 one. And as you said, that would be an exception to policy, as
4 we've been very tough about what goes into the right-of-way upon
5 the interstate system, but at the same time, we also need to be
6 open to looking at is there a possibility we could ever get to a
7 yes. And that's what this is furthering, that discussion.

8 MR. ELTERS: Mr. Chairman, just a quick follow-
9 up. Mr. Roehrich, thank you for the response. I asked the
10 question not to imply that I'm opposed to it. I was just trying
11 to get some insight. Things do change over time, and if there
12 is a need for this or any other applications where something
13 similar would be accommodated in the future, I was just trying
14 to get some insight as to the consistency related to the policy.

15 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Absolutely.

16 MR. ROEHRICH: Mr. Chair, Mr. Boschen would like
17 to make a comment.

18 MR. BOSCHEN: Mr. Chair, Mr. Elters, we are
19 trying to look at flexibility when we look at our corridors. As
20 you're all aware, broadband is a very, very big push across the
21 nation, and we're being pushed by industry to look at broadband.
22 We actually will need that with automated vehicles in the future
23 to have that type of connection. So in addition to a water
24 line, broadband is another thing that we need to look at from a
25 guideline perspective, not necessarily a policy.

1 But Mr. Roehrich again nailed it. Historically,
2 we have not wanted to have longitudinal facilities to protect
3 our infrastructure, but we need to look at this from a
4 risk-based perspective, and that's what we're doing right now.
5 And again, like Floyd said, we are continuing our dialogue with
6 the City of Flagstaff on how we can move forward from an
7 encroachment permit perspective. I hope that answers your
8 question.

9 MR. ELTERS: Mr. Chair, Mr. Boschen and
10 Mr. Roehrich, thank you. That does answer my question, and
11 unless other board members have other questions, I will move
12 this item.

13 CHAIRMAN CUTHBERTSON: Okay. Thank you.

14 Do I have a motion then to approve Item 7F as
15 presented?

16 MR. KNIGHT: So moved.

17 VICE CHAIR SELLERS: Second.

18 CHAIRMAN CUTHBERTSON: Moved by Board Member
19 Knight, seconded Vice Chair Sellers.

20 All in favor indicate by saying aye.

21 BOARD MEMBERS: Aye.

22 CHAIRMAN CUTHBERTSON: Opposed, nay? Ayes have
23 it. Motion passes.

24 MR. LIGOCKI: Thank you, Mr. Chairman, board
25 members. Let me just add that engineers are good.

1 CHAIRMAN CUTHBERTSON: Okay. Thank you, Clem.

2 MR. ROEHRICH: (Inaudible.) Thank you.

3 CHAIRMAN CUTHBERTSON: Okay. So we'll move on to
4 Item 8, the state engineer's report.

5 MR. BOSCHEN: Chairman Cuthbertson and board
6 members, I have the same challenge that Rod did. So I am
7 loading. This is what happens when you load a 20 meg. file.
8 Lynn, you're getting really tricky with this, all your links.

9 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: (Inaudible.)

10 MR. BOSCHEN: Okay.

11 MR. ROEHRICH: Put him on the clock. Put him on
12 the clock.

13 MR. BOSCHEN: There we go. All right.

14 I'm Steve Boschen. I'm here to do the state
15 engineer's report. First on the agenda is Item 8, and that's a
16 summary of active and finalized projects. We do have 104
17 projects under construction at 1.649 million. We did finalize
18 six projects in August, and fiscal year to date, we have
19 finalized 13. Obviously we're only two months into our fiscal
20 year.

21 This is a different look at the active projects
22 that we have going on. You'll see that South Mountain is a big
23 book of our business right now. That's 916. Southcentral, Rod
24 has quite a bit of work, and he already described some of that.
25 Central has quite a bit of work, and the North Central is our

1 other leading one, and you can see the rest of the distribution
2 for statewide. With that, that concludes Item 8 on the agenda,
3 Mr. Chair.

4 CHAIRMAN CUTHBERTSON: Okay. Any questions for
5 Mr. Boschen?

6 All right. Thank you.

7 MR. BOSCHEN: Next up we have Item 9, new
8 construction contracts. Thank you for approving the five that
9 were on the consent agenda. I have the privilege to talk about
10 nine. So three of them we are going to recommend award, three
11 of them we're going to postpone, and three of them we're going
12 to reject all bids.

13 So I will start with 9A. This project's a bridge
14 rehab project in Clifton. It's on Zorrilla Street. Our low bid
15 was 1.2 million. Our estimate was 7. Big difference there.
16 It's a bridge deck that's made out of timber. One of our big
17 costs was the work enclosure containment. That means we didn't
18 want anything falling down into the creek. We only had one
19 bidder on this. We'd like to postpone it and analyze what we
20 need to do, either restructure the contract and look at the work
21 enclosure containment and see if we can get any money out of the
22 local. So at this point we're recommending postponement.

23 CHAIRMAN CUTHBERTSON: Okay. Any questions on
24 Item 9A?

25 Yes. Vice Chair Sellers.

1 MR. SELLERS: So when would we expect, then, to
2 rebid this?

3 MR. BOSCHEN: Mr. Chair, Mr. Sellers, we'll look
4 at this next month, and we'll have a recommendation either to
5 rebid it or to restructure it and look at it. So I would say
6 within a month.

7 MR. SELLERS: Okay. Thank you.

8 CHAIRMAN CUTHBERTSON: Other questions?

9 Do I have a motion to accept and approve staff's
10 recommendation to postpone the contract for Item 9A as
11 presented?

12 MR. HAMMOND: So moved.

13 VICE CHAIR SELLERS: Second.

14 CHAIRMAN CUTHBERTSON: I'm going to say moved by
15 Board Member Hammond, seconded by Vice Chair Sellers. And do I
16 have any questions?

17 All in favor indicate by saying aye.

18 BOARD MEMBERS: Aye.

19 CHAIRMAN CUTHBERTSON: Opposed, nay? Ayes have
20 it. Motion passes.

21 Item 9B.

22 MR. BOSCHEN: Next up is Item 9B. This is in
23 District 1. It's in Fountain Hills. It's a widening and a
24 drainage project on Fountain Hills Boulevard from Pinto to
25 Segundo. Again, we did have a very large difference, 47.9

1 percent. Roadway excavation was a major component. In Fountain
2 Hills, it was surprising to us we only had one bidder. So at
3 this point, we're going to circle the wagons and talk to
4 Fountain Hills and see if we can get more interest in this
5 project. We are recommending postponing at this point.

6 CHAIRMAN CUTHBERTSON: Questions?

7 Do I have a motion to accept and approve staff's
8 recommendation to postpone the contract for Item 9B as
9 presented?

10 MR. KNIGHT: So moved.

11 MR. ELTERS: Second.

12 CHAIRMAN CUTHBERTSON: Moved by Board Member
13 Knight, seconded by Board Member Elters. Comments? Questions?

14 All in favor indicate by saying aye.

15 BOARD MEMBERS: Aye.

16 CHAIRMAN CUTHBERTSON: Opposed, nay? Ayes have
17 it. Motion passes.

18 MR. BOSCHEN: All right. Finally, one that we
19 award. Item No. 9C, this is in District 1. It's in Glendale.
20 It's a shared use pathway along New River, between Patrick Lane
21 and Hillcrest Road. Low bid was 703. State estimate was 615,
22 or 14 percent over. The decomposed granite ran more than we
23 thought, and the concrete pathway ran a little bit more than we
24 thought, but we do feel this is a responsive and responsible
25 bid, and we recommend award of this project.

1 CHAIRMAN CUTHBERTSON: Questions by board
2 members?

3 Do I have a motion to accept and approve staff's
4 recommendation to award the contract for Item 9C to Visus
5 Engineering Construction, Inc. as presented?

6 MR. ELTERS: Mr. Chairman.

7 CHAIRMAN CUTHBERTSON: Yes.

8 MR. ELTERS: I move this item.

9 CHAIRMAN CUTHBERTSON: Okay.

10 MR. STRATTON: Second.

11 CHAIRMAN CUTHBERTSON: Moved by Board Member
12 Elters, seconded by Board Member Stratton. All in favor
13 indicate by saying aye.

14 BOARD MEMBERS: Aye.

15 CHAIRMAN CUTHBERTSON: Opposed, nay. Ayes have
16 it. Motion passes.

17 MR. BOSCHEN: Item 9D is down here in District 2,
18 in Rod's district. It's two pathway projects on the San Javier
19 District of Tohono O'Odham Nation. Again, we did have some
20 decorative pavement and landscape establishment, and only two
21 bidders on this project. So not a real positive bid
22 environment. At this point we recommend postponement. Again,
23 we'll look at repackaging or seeing if the locals can contribute
24 additional funds when we look at rebidding this in the future.
25 Recommendation by staff is postponing.

1 CHAIRMAN CUTHBERTSON: Okay. Any comments or
2 questions?

3 MR. THOMPSON: Again, Chairman, a time for
4 getting it back before the Board?

5 MR. BOSCHEN: Mr. Chair, Mr. Thompson, we usually
6 deal with the locals to see if they have -- if they want to move
7 forward with something like this. If they want to contribute
8 more money to make them match, but within 30 days by the next
9 board meeting, we'll have a decision for you.

10 MR. THOMPSON: Thank you.

11 CHAIRMAN CUTHBERTSON: Okay. Yes, Board Member
12 Hammond.

13 MR. HAMMOND: Just as a general question. I
14 can't recall three postponements due to low bid -- low number of
15 bidders, this kind of thing. Can you just say a few words on
16 trends here? This seems like it's going to get worse before it
17 gets better.

18 MR. BOSCHEN: Mr. Chair, Mr. Hammond, there were,
19 I think, three or four that we only had one bidder on, and I can
20 tell you that the Phoenix area and the Tucson area do have a lot
21 of local projects going on. A lot of the labor pool is wanting
22 to go out of state. There's two stadiums being built right
23 right now. One's in Vegas. One's over in L.A. So any concrete
24 workers, they want to go work there, because they have two years
25 of work that they're going to have. Labor is a shortage right

1 now. So I hope we don't see this. We really need to -- and
2 maybe it's the fact that we put too much on the street at the
3 same time. This was 9, 5, 14, but that's not a lot. Again,
4 hopefully some other contractors come in and compete, but right
5 now, having just one bidder on almost three projects, that's
6 scary.

7 MR. ELTERS: Mr. Chairman, just a -- just a
8 thought as well related to Mr. Hammond's question, and maybe to
9 help Steve answer it. It appears to be cyclic. I remember
10 vividly going through a similar situation between 2005 and 2008
11 where we had identical issues. Fewer bidders, higher than
12 estimates where it required a lot of follow-ups and discussions
13 to assess what conditions are causing it and opportunities for
14 additional funding either local or otherwise. So I think the
15 cycle is just repeating itself.

16 MR. HAMMOND: So we should sell our stock
17 portfolios is what I heard. We're going to be in for a big
18 crash.

19 CHAIRMAN CUTHBERTSON: You heard it here.

20 MR. HAMMOND: (Inaudible.)

21 CHAIRMAN CUTHBERTSON: Okay. Other comments?

22 Do I have a motion to accept and approve staff's
23 recommendation to postpone Item 9D as presented?

24 MR. HAMMOND: So moved.

25 CHAIRMAN CUTHBERTSON: Moved by Board Member

1 Hammond.

2 MR. THOMPSON: Second.

3 CHAIRMAN CUTHBERTSON: Seconded by Board Member
4 Thompson. All in favor indicate by saying aye.

5 BOARD MEMBERS: Aye.

6 CHAIRMAN CUTHBERTSON: Opposed, nay? Ayes have
7 it. Motion passes.

8 MR. BOSCHEN: Next up we have 9E, Winchester
9 Road. It's in the District 4 in Apache Junction. We have
10 talked to the City of Apache Junction, and at this point they
11 would like to reject all bids, because roadway ex. and
12 reinforced concrete pipe was higher. They don't think they can
13 come up with the money. They are reevaluating whether or not we
14 would bring this project back to a shorter scope, maybe half of
15 the length or three-quarters of the length. So at this point we
16 feel it's responsible to release the bidders so that they can
17 pursue other work. We're recommending rejecting all bids.

18 MR. STRATTON: So moved.

19 CHAIRMAN CUTHBERTSON: Okay.

20 MR. KNIGHT: Second.

21 CHAIRMAN CUTHBERTSON: I have a motion to accept
22 and approve staff's recommendation to reject all bids for Item
23 9E made by Board Member Stratton, seconded by Board Member
24 Knight.

25 All in favor indicate by saying aye.

1 BOARD MEMBERS: Aye.

2 CHAIRMAN CUTHBERTSON: Opposed, nay? Ayes have
3 it. Motion passes.

4 MR. BOSCHEN: Item 9F, again, in District 4.
5 It's almost in two. So it's on the dividing line. It's a new
6 bridge deck on Pinal PI. It includes straightening the girders.
7 We looked at a little bit higher price for reinforced steel and
8 structural concrete. I'm used to seeing steel around buck a
9 pound. This was a buck fifty. The structural concrete, I
10 think, was a thousand bucks a cubic yard. Again, my history
11 says about 700 to 800 per cubic yard, so we are seeing some
12 escalation on that. And then lead-based paint removal was
13 higher than we anticipated. However, based on what we analyze,
14 we do feel that this is a responsive and responsible bid. We
15 recommend award of this contract.

16 VICE CHAIR SELLERS: Move to award.

17 MR. ELTERS: Second.

18 CHAIRMAN CUTHBERTSON: Okay. I've got a motion
19 to accept and approve staff's recommendation to award the
20 contract for Item 9F to FNF Construction, Inc. by Board Member
21 Sellers, seconded by Board Member Elters.

22 All those in favor indicate by saying aye.

23 BOARD MEMBERS: Aye.

24 CHAIRMAN CUTHBERTSON: Opposed, nay? Ayes have
25 it. Motion passes.

1 MR. BOSCHEN: Next up is Item 9G. This is Pinto
2 Creek Bridge on US-60. This is my route to go see my mother-in-
3 law, so it's very important for me.

4 CHAIRMAN CUTHBERTSON: In which way? Yeah.

5 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: (Inaudible.)

6 MR. BOSCHEN: This was in the addendum, and I
7 apologize for, I think, having two addendums on this one.

8 We received a low bid of 24 million and change.
9 Our State's estimate was 18 million. Quite a large difference,
10 6 million. 34 percent difference. The drilled shafts creating
11 the substructure and the access were things that all three of
12 the top bidders really had challenges with. I have not seen a
13 14,000 lineal foot drilled shaft in my life, and that's what was
14 quoted on the number one bid. Reenforcing steel, again, is
15 higher than we anticipated. And then structural concrete.

16 At this point, we had multiple meetings this week
17 with the team, and we're looking at a different substructure at
18 least option to rebid. At -- so at this point, the staff's
19 recommendation is to reject all bids, and we will be looking at
20 spread footings or another substructure to make this more
21 competitive.

22 MR. STRATTON: Mr. Chairman.

23 CHAIRMAN CUTHBERTSON: Yes. Board Member
24 Stratton.

25 MR. STRATTON: How long will this take, this

1 process?

2 MR. BOSCHEN: So Mr. Chair, Mr. Stratton, we are
3 shooting for a month to two to restructure it so that we can
4 have a bid alternate in the plans. We'll still have a drilled
5 shaft as one of the options for the plans for the structure.
6 However, we're going to put a spread shaft alternative in, and
7 that shouldn't take more than a month or two so that we can
8 evaluate putting that on the street. I will be honest with you.
9 Our bridge group thought about some upcoming federal grants of
10 potentially -- what do I call those, Karla?

11 MS. PETTY: Bundling.

12 MR. BOSCHEN: Bundling. That's it. I couldn't
13 think of the word.

14 We're going to apply for bundling of projects
15 that are bridge related, so if we put two or three bridges
16 together, we could apply for a grant and receive that. That
17 happens December 4th. So we want to have that opportunity,
18 because we also have Queen Creek, which is a similar bridge on
19 the same corridor. We might bundle these two, along with some
20 bridges on I-40, to apply for a federal grant. We'll know that
21 within two months, though.

22 MR. STRATTON: Thank you on that.

23 Another question is early on in the design, I
24 talked to the state engineer about suicide fencing on this
25 particular project, and it was reported back to me, yes, there

1 would be suicide fencing on this. And then approximately a
2 month or two months ago, I was informed that The Forest Service
3 would not allow that; is that correct?

4 MR. BOSCHEN: Mr. Chair, Mr. Stratton, I'm not
5 familiar that The Forest Service would not allow it. What we
6 have done is put provisions in that we could add it later, but
7 you're -- you are correct, this does not have suicide fencing on
8 it.

9 MR. STRATTON: My understanding is that, again,
10 if it was The Forest Service or whomever, they said there had
11 not been enough attempts or enough suicides. In speaking with
12 the county attorney this week and two behavioral health
13 agencies, in the past six years there have been three people
14 jump and one person drive off the edge. The one, obviously,
15 with the new bridge will eliminate the drive off, because it's
16 going to fill up that space. However, I want to make sure the
17 information's correct, and I would like to know for the record
18 who took the suicide fencing out after I was told it was going
19 to be in. Was it The Forest Service or was it ADOT?

20 MR. BOSCHEN: So Mr. Chair, Mr. Stratton, I will
21 check with Dallas on that, but in terms of what we proceeded
22 with design all long was to make sure we had accommodation for a
23 future suicide fence should the need be there. I'm not aware of
24 whether or not The Forest Service said no to that potential.

25 MR. STRATTON: My understanding is now that

1 hardware will be installed so that fencing may be installed at a
2 later date. If it is The Forest Service that is not allowing
3 this for aesthetic reasons is what I'm understanding, possibly,
4 then are they going to foot the bill for the difference in
5 installing it later if there are more lives -- if they decide
6 it's warranted? And how many lives does it take for them to say
7 it's warranted? One's too many for me.

8 MR. ROEHRICH: Mr. Chair, Mr. Stratton, I think I
9 need to make sure we're -- to answer one of your questions. If
10 the decision is made to take that, you know, safety fence off,
11 it's the department's decision. We may have made it because of
12 the concerns that were (inaudible) by The Forest Service or
13 because of their non-support for it, and they probably told us,
14 hey, you're -- if you want us to concur, you've got to take it
15 off.

16 How much we argue that out or push it out, that's
17 an agency's decision. So I don't think we'd take it off just
18 because they said we had to. But I do think in order to get a
19 lot of these projects complete, especially on Forest Service and
20 other areas, because of the sensitivity of it, we do have to
21 sometimes compromise. I don't believe we're compromising safety
22 here. I've not heard that The Forest Service didn't support
23 that, which is why. And we need to follow up on that. And
24 Steve, I would ask that we definitely, definitely do that.

25 One life or any life is of value, and we don't

1 want to give the impression that, you know, there's a number out
2 there of deaths before we do something. That's unacceptable,
3 and that's not the department's stand. We do look at what we
4 think is the acceptable measure of ensuring the general public
5 safety to the degree that we can. I do not know of any decision
6 to take it off without having further discussion. We need to
7 clarify that.

8 But I do want to be clear. If the decision is
9 we're not putting it on there, it's our decision. We own it.
10 We don't go to court if we're sued and say, well, we did it
11 because of somebody else. No. It's our decision. We have to
12 own it, and therefore, we have to stand up when that happens.
13 But we don't let that happen just weakly, without really going
14 in there and defending whatever we feel is the final position we
15 need to take.

16 MR. STRATTON: That being said, if it's an ADOT
17 decision, then I am willing to go along and make a motion to
18 reject all bids, but in the redesign, I request that the suicide
19 fencing be reinstalled in the design. So I will make the motion
20 of rejecting all bids, and in the redesign that the safety
21 fencing be in that design.

22 MR. ELTERS: Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask a
23 couple of questions before we act on the motion.

24 CHAIRMAN CUTHBERTSON: Yes. Go ahead. Go ahead,
25 Mr. Elters.

1 MR. ELTERS: It's just a follow-up on the price,
2 Mr. Boschen.

3 As I looked at this, and understanding it is 34
4 percent over and \$6 million, I also look at those sort of bids,
5 and they -- they appear to be closely spaced as far as photos.
6 You know, understanding what the industry goes through as far as
7 bidding these projects, I wonder if there is a step in between
8 rejecting and awarding, such as postponing and doing some
9 follow-up to try to figure out a way to address those potential
10 key items that have escalated the cost. And I'm mindful of what
11 we just said, and that is the trend is heading in the opposite
12 direction from where we want it. You know, costs are going up.
13 We've seen that in months after months since the beginning of
14 the year. So I'm not sure that the cost will hold the same, and
15 it may even go up on some items from what it is today.

16 So was that contemplated? Is there an
17 opportunity here to postpone and negotiate? I -- you know, it's
18 not one bid. It's not two bid. It's four bids. And I think
19 that begs that question. So I'm not implying anything by my
20 question of you other than to look at it from that point of view
21 and keeping the industry in mind as we consider options.

22 MR. BOSCHEN: So Mr. Chair, Mr. Elters, we have
23 done exactly what you just asked, meaning we have gone, drilled
24 down to the four bidders. We did know that they were very
25 tight. Every one of them told us they were very concerned about

1 the access and getting a 10-foot diameter shaft down into that
2 canyon and the access road necessary to do that. They
3 questioned why we didn't look at doing spread footing. So
4 that's why we're pursuing that avenue. We do know the costs
5 that bidders have to take to put bids like this together.

6 One unfortunate fact I didn't bring up before was
7 Happy Valley Road and Pinnacle Peak TI, bid on the exact same
8 day. We lost two bidders because of that, and we found that out
9 later. So there could have been additional competition on this,
10 but they wanted to go for the larger one, and Happy
11 Valley/Pinnacle Peak was more around 50 million. So you've got
12 to figure out which basket do you want to put in. So we do
13 think that we're going to have better competition with bid
14 alternates. We have done that due diligence.

15 And to Mr. Hammond's thought before, which I
16 thought was excellent, I don't want to be up here saying
17 postpone, postpone, postpone, because that doesn't do any good
18 to the industry, because they want to go out and chase other
19 work. Now they know that we're going to be repackaging. So
20 that's why we're recommending rejecting all bids.

21 I do want to follow up, Mr. Chair and
22 Mr. Stratton. This week we did have on I-40 and 303 two
23 jumpers. So we're very concerned about what our infrastructure
24 is in terms of an attractive nuisance. It's a behavioral
25 challenge. We try to work with our behavioral specialists. I

1 don't know if I'm a fan of putting suicide fence up on every one
2 of our bridges, though. That's one of the department's
3 challenges, and I think that's where Floyd is saying we have to
4 own that. That's all I have.

5 CHAIRMAN CUTHBERTSON: Okay. Questions? Other
6 questions.

7 Go ahead, Mr. Stratton.

8 MR. STRATTON: Back to the grants that you
9 believe you may apply for. Is that pretty well set? If we
10 reject this, you will apply for those grant -- that grant.

11 MR. BOSCHEN: Mr. Chair, Mr. Stratton, we're
12 still evaluating that. That was one thing the team brought up
13 this week. We had thought we were going to chase grants for
14 I-40, because those are usually about 50 or 60 years old, but so
15 are these bridges. So we thought these would be excellent ones.
16 It's not a definite. We would know by -- I'm going to put Karla
17 on the spot -- by February if we won the grant, Karla?

18 MS. PETTY: (Inaudible.)

19 MR. BOSCHEN: I do know the grant application's
20 go in December 4th.

21 MR. STRATTON: Knowing that all of those bridges
22 that you just mentioned that would be in that application come
23 out of the Greater Arizona bridge fund, or the bridge fund, and
24 they're all in Greater Arizona, with the other explanations you
25 have given me on the reason for the overage in the bid, I would

1 be willing to roll the dice, so to speak, and see if we could
2 get a grant for those bridges and do the redesign. Just to
3 justify my reasoning to the staff and to the audience.

4 So again, I will make the motion to reject all
5 bids. I do ask the staff to look again at the safety fencing on
6 this, and I would like to be part of that discussion as well as
7 necessary. The behavioral health agencies in the area, the
8 county attorney, all these people have come to me over this
9 issue. So I think it's significant enough that we at least
10 discuss that before a decision is made on that portion of it.
11 Again, I make the motion to reject all bids.

12 MR. KNIGHT: Second.

13 CHAIRMAN CUTHBERTSON: Okay. I have a motion to
14 reject all bids -- to -- I guess it's to accept and approve
15 staff's recommendation to reject all bids for Item 9G. And I
16 guess I note that -- to consider suicide fencing in the re- --
17 any rebid or redesign of the project, so... And the motion made
18 by Board Member Stratton, second by Board Member Knight. Any
19 further discussion?

20 All in favor indicate by saying aye.

21 BOARD MEMBERS: Aye.

22 CHAIRMAN CUTHBERTSON: Opposed, nay. Ayes have
23 it. Motion passes.

24 MR. BOSCHEN: Item 9H is in District 4. It's on
25 State Route 95, Kiowa Boulevard, right turn lanes and median.

1 Again, that is in your amendment package, and I apologize for
2 our dyslexia and going back and forth on this. Our low bid was
3 12 -- a million two. The State estimate was 917. The
4 difference was 317. Pretty high overage, 34 percent. Drainage
5 ex., reinforced concrete pipe.

6 One of the challenges we had on this was the DBE
7 documentation really resulted in us only receiving one bidder.
8 So how this works is the low bidder is asked to submit their DBE
9 information within five days of the bid opening. The other
10 bidders voluntarily submit their DBE information. We received
11 three. There was five bidders on this. Two chose not to. It
12 looked like three really didn't meet the DBE requirements. In
13 the end, we saw that because of the way our form was structured,
14 it wasn't as clear for a prime DBE to fill it out. So we felt
15 that they were in compliance. However, that resulted in one
16 bidder. We do think that when we rebid this, it will be more
17 competitive. We knew we had five bids. So the department is
18 recommending rejecting all bids and rebidding this.

19 CHAIRMAN CUTHBERTSON: Questions by board
20 members?

21 Do I have a motion to accept and approve staff's
22 recommendation to reject all bids for Item 9H as presented?

23 MR. THOMPSON: I would so move.

24 CHAIRMAN CUTHBERTSON: Moved by Board Member
25 Thompson. Do I have a second?

1 MR. ELTERS: I'll second it. I have a question.

2 CHAIRMAN CUTHBERTSON: Okay.

3 MR. ELTERS: Mr. Chairman, I'll second it. I
4 have a follow-up question.

5 CHAIRMAN CUTHBERTSON: Okay. Seconded by Board
6 Member Elters. Board Member Elters, go ahead and proceed with
7 your question.

8 MR. ELTERS: It's similar to my comment earlier.
9 Five bids here. Understanding it's 35 percent over, but these
10 numbers are now published, and thinking of rebidding it,
11 historically industry pays attention to these numbers, and how
12 -- how would you -- how would you change this project to ensure
13 that there's a level playing field for the industry to rebid it
14 and, you know, ensuring that the cost associated with bidding
15 and rebidding is not becoming so excessive for those folks that
16 we want to be interested in this project, understanding that we
17 have now fewer and fewer contractors, given the work environment
18 and the workload that is out there? And I'm sorry to keep
19 harping on that, Mr. Boschen, but I just want help myself.

20 MR. BOSCHEN: Mr. Chair, Mr. Elters, one of our
21 struggles, we did work with industry about a year and a half
22 ago, and when I say "industry," it's the AGC. We're one of the
23 few states that don't require the DBE information to be filed at
24 the time of the bid. So we work with our partners. We're now
25 seeing that maybe we should have been like the rest of the U.S.

1 instead. So we're going to be working on our DBE documentation
2 with AGC, with our DBE office to make it easier so that we can't
3 have these anomalies filed by the contractors.

4 We did talk to some of them, and they said, quite
5 frankly, you know, this is -- low thing on the totem pole. We
6 don't think it's very important. It is important, obviously,
7 for DBE reporting for us. So we could streamline, and we're
8 going to work with industry to do that. We do recognize this
9 costs money for contractors to bid, just like it costs money for
10 consultants to put proposals together. We're very aware of
11 this.

12 In terms of restructuring the bid, we're not
13 going to. I personally think it's great that the information's
14 out there. I think the taxpayers or the Highway User Revenue
15 Fee pairs are going to get a good bang for the buck up in this
16 area once we rebid it.

17 MR. ELTERS: Thank you.

18 CHAIRMAN CUTHBERTSON: Okay. Any further
19 discussion?

20 That -- we have an open motion to accept and
21 approve staff's recommendation to reject all bids. All in favor
22 indicate by saying aye.

23 BOARD MEMBERS: Aye. Opposed, nay? Ayes have
24 it. The motion passes.

25 All right.

1 MR. BOSCHEN: All right. Last project. Item 9I.
2 This is a statewide to put UPSs in, and that's not a UPS truck.
3 That's uninterrupted power supplies for our traffic signals.
4 The low bid was a million. Our estimate was 872. We had a
5 couple of challenges. The load center cabinets meeting a little
6 bit higher price, and I think it was more because they're all
7 remote locations, and the mobilization because they were remote
8 locations. The difference was 18.7 percent. We feel it's a
9 responsive and responsible bid. We recommend award.

10 CHAIRMAN CUTHBERTSON: Questions?

11 Yes. Vice Chair Sellers.

12 MR. SELLERS: Again, it shows we have only one
13 bidder on this project. Is that -- is there an explanation for
14 that?

15 MR. BOSCHEN: So Mr. Chair, Mr. Sellers, again,
16 it's a very competitive market right now, and the explanation is
17 that they are chasing work in other locations. We are conscious
18 it was only one bid. We did feel that this was still responsive
19 and responsible.

20 CHAIRMAN CUTHBERTSON: Okay. Others?

21 Do I have a motion to accept and approve staff's
22 recommendation to award the contract for Item 9A [sic] to
23 Roadway Electric, LLC, as presented?

24 MR. KNIGHT: So moved.

25 MR. ELTERS: Second.

1 CHAIRMAN CUTHBERTSON: Okay. Move by Board
2 Member Knight, seconded by Board Member Elters.

3 All in favor indicate by saying aye.

4 BOARD MEMBERS: Aye.

5 CHAIRMAN CUTHBERTSON: Opposed, nay. The ayes
6 have it. Motions passes.

7 MR. BOSCHEN: Thank you.

8 CHAIRMAN CUTHBERTSON: Okay. Thank you,
9 Mr. Boschen.

10 Okay. So we've got Item 10 on the agenda. And
11 for Item 10, I think Todd Emery, the Deputy State Director -- or
12 Deputy State Engineer of Development will present the final
13 evaluation and request to designate former U.S. Highway 80 as a
14 state historic route, along with a proposed recommendation for
15 the Board's consideration.

16 Representatives from the Tucson Historic
17 Preservation Foundation may be present and available to answer
18 questions from board members. Mr. Clinco, I see in the
19 audience.

20 So Mr. Emery, please proceed.

21 MR. ROEHRICH: Mr. Chair, just real quick.
22 Todd's going to start here in a second. Two quick issues. I
23 know he'd love to be the deputy director, but -- I'm going to go
24 back and tell John he's got a new -- this is my last board
25 meeting, by the way, because Todd will be taking over now for

1 me. So congratulations on your promotion.

2 So the second thing is obviously this issue's
3 been around for a while. It's been in front of the Board a
4 couple different times in discussions, and I think what we're
5 going to go through is a real good discussion on kind of where
6 we're at today, and we're going to lay the groundwork for kind
7 of the rules and the process that's been followed. But I want
8 to remind the Board, if you remember back in January when we
9 started this, the PHSRAC, the subcommittee that was making the
10 recommendation, actually had met and kind of got out -- a little
11 bit out of sequence and had made a recommendation to approve the
12 full alignment before we had completed the steps within the rule
13 process.

14 So at the time the Board had gone ahead and
15 approved designating the former U.S. Route 80 in the local
16 jurisdictions where the local -- where the route is now more a
17 local road. It's off the state highway system. And since
18 January, staff has been working with our self, stakeholders and
19 others to evaluate what was former U.S. Route 80, which is not
20 on the state highway system, and then looking at what's eligible
21 or at least what we feel is appropriate to sign, evaluating the
22 criteria, the -- kind of the eligibility, and then also kind of
23 looking at what's reasonable to go out there and sign and make
24 sure that we have some agreement on that so that we can come
25 back to the Board. The report was done.

1 There's also a requirement to consult with the
2 Arizona -- what -- Historical Advisory Council --

3 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Commission.

4 MR. ROEHRICH: -- Commission, thank you,
5 Commission as part of the state library. That has been done,
6 and they've given us some minor comments for clarifying. But
7 they agreed with the recommendations of the segments that we
8 view are appropriate to go out and designate as former U.S.
9 Route 80.

10 And then there's also a step in the process to
11 have PHSRAC evaluate that and make a final recommendation. What
12 you're going to hear Todd go through is how we did everything up
13 to that with the exception of that last, if you will,
14 coordination by PHSRAC, because that committee basically is not
15 meeting anymore, and the Legislature had disbanded that
16 committee and is going to move the function of these historic
17 roadways over to the state library. Effective date, though, is
18 not until next summer. Because of that, the members of PHSRAC
19 have basically, well, stopped communicating with us.

20 The attempts -- and Todd can go over the attempts
21 to try to get a meeting to try to follow that step in the
22 process -- we weren't successful. But we view -- understand
23 it's a legal regulation that's defined in rule as part of the
24 process. So that process is a rule, and it's legal to follow
25 that, and we're going to go through and discuss it. But I think

1 what we're trying to say is we made every attempt that we feel
2 is reasonable to follow that process. We haven't completely
3 done it. Todd's going to take you through the process with the
4 final recommendation. We think we're at a point where our
5 recommendation is for this transportation board to go ahead and
6 adopt these segments.

7 So Todd, why don't you go through that, and then
8 we'll have a discussion, and we can talk more about that as the
9 Board debates it.

10 CHAIRMAN CUTHBERTSON: Okay. Thank you, Floyd.

11 MR. EMERY: Good morning, Mr. Chair.

12 CHAIRMAN CUTHBERTSON: Good morning.

13 MR. EMERY: Members of the Board. Happy to be
14 here today, and I will make this as brief as I possibly can.
15 Let's see here. Just to kind of recap, where we've been and
16 where we're at now in regards to this designation of former U.S.
17 Highway 80, as Floyd mentioned, and I'll just restate, the Board
18 took action in January of -- January 19th of 2018, and at that
19 board meeting designated the non-state highway portions of old
20 US-80 as a historic road.

21 Part of that process, just to give you an update,
22 ADOT has contacted the local governments to begin the process of
23 initiating the intergovernmental agreements, which is necessary
24 to formalize that, that designation. From that time forward, we
25 have been working diligently and have completed the ADOT report,

1 which evaluated the segments on the state highway system, and
2 have come up with recommendations based on our evaluation.

3 ADOT submitted the reports and the
4 recommendations to the Arizona Historical Advisory Commission,
5 and we did receive a response from that commission by letter
6 dated September 7th, 2018, and they concurred with the
7 recommendations that we'll be presenting here today.

8 In addition, the ADOT report, the recommendations
9 and the Arizona Historical Advisory Commission letter were
10 submitted to the members of the PHSRAC, and a response was
11 received that stated they were happy to see the recommendations
12 moving forward.

13 As Floyd mentioned, we have made several
14 attempts, one attempt to actually convene a meeting with the
15 PHSRAC. We've submitted the report and recommendations and the
16 letter to the PHSRAC for their review and comment. Again, the
17 comment that we received back, that they were happy to receive
18 -- or happy to see that moving forward. And we did also give
19 them another opportunity yesterday to voice any objections to
20 these recommendations, and at that time, no comments were
21 received back from any member of the PHSRAC. So based on that,
22 I thought I'd just kind of go over quickly what we're going to
23 be recommending.

24 The map you see there basically shows the route
25 of old U.S. 80 as it goes from the New Mexico/Arizona state line

1 to the California/Arizona state line over in Yuma. The segments
2 that we will be recommending are those segments shown in red.
3 So going from the New Mexico/Arizona border, along State Route
4 80, and then segments on State Route 79. We'll actually get to
5 that in just a sec. The segments in blue are the segments on
6 the local road system that the Board has already designated.
7 Oh.

8 MR. ROEHRICH: Did you -- do I need to reboot
9 you?

10 MR. EMERY: No. I though Board Member Elters
11 want to say something, so...

12 CHAIRMAN CUTHBERTSON: Well, then maybe you got
13 stuck like the computer and --

14 MR. EMERY: I don't know.

15 MR. ROEHRICH: Reboot time.

16 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: (Inaudible.)

17 MR. EMERY: No. I'm okay.

18 So again, the segments that you see in blue on
19 that map are the segments on the local road system that the
20 Board has already designated back in January. The segments that
21 aren't red or blue, what you see in yellow are primarily I-10
22 and I-8 in the section of State Route 85 that we are not
23 recommending for designation.

24 So based on that, to get right to what the staff
25 is recommending, the staff recommends the Board take the

1 following action: To designate 217.8 miles of state highways as
2 a state historic road. Those state highways include portions of
3 State Route 80, State Route 77, State Route 79, State Route 79B,
4 US-60, State Route 85, and State Route B8. The specific
5 locations to be designated are shown on the letter to Director
6 Halikowski dated September 18th, 2018 as presented to the Board.

7 So with that I'm prepared to go into more detail
8 of what we've done and what we're recommending or would
9 certainly be happy to entertain any questions from the Board.

10 CHAIRMAN CUTHBERTSON: Board members, any
11 questions?

12 MR. KNIGHT: Mr. Chair.

13 CHAIRMAN CUTHBERTSON: Yes. Board Member Knight.

14 MR. KNIGHT: Thank you.

15 For clarification, Highway 80 comes into the city
16 of Yuma from California, goes right through the center of the
17 city, and then through -- as it leaves the city limits, through
18 the county, through Yuma County, on its way to the Gila Bend.
19 How would this designation or would this designation impact what
20 the local jurisdictions, both city and county, are able to do
21 along that route since it is a central route? It no longer has
22 any -- even -- it no longer even resembles old Highway 80 at
23 this point. It hasn't for a lot of years. So will there be any
24 impact to those jurisdictions on that section of the -- where
25 the old Highway 80 was?

1 MR. EMERY: Mr. Chair, Board Member Knight, we
2 actually did talk to our environmental planning group, as an
3 example, to see would this designation impact not only the state
4 but our local partners if they want to do projects on the road.
5 And the response we got back was no, that the process would be
6 no different after the designation as it was before, as far as
7 going through the environmental process to do road improvements.

8 There are some requirements that are placed on
9 the local jurisdictions and the State. One of those
10 requirements is to put up signs that designate the route, that
11 show the route as being a historic road. The other is
12 maintaining the route, maintaining the road in essentially the
13 condition it is -- when it was designated. Roads that are
14 designated can lose their designation if there are significant
15 changes that would warrant that. But as far as making the
16 improvements to the road, it's my understanding there would be
17 no -- there would be no impact to that.

18 MR. ROEHRICH: Mr. Chair, Mr. Knight, I also
19 think, Todd, isn't it true, that the cities are not required to
20 accept that designation or adoption? What they can do is,
21 through agreement with the State, enter an agreement with us,
22 and then they can sign it. Then they can advertise it, market
23 and say, you know, if you're interested in, you know, this
24 historic route, come here and you can get a sense of what it is.
25 They're not required to do that. It's actually up to them to

1 decide to do that. They enter an agreement, and then as Todd
2 said, they agree they'll put up signs. And they'll agree to
3 make sure if they're marketing it and they're acknowledging it
4 as former U.S. Route 80, that it has that designation and
5 configuration. But if they develop it over time and they no
6 longer either meet those characteristics or no longer want that
7 designation, they can agree, then, to remove it and then do what
8 they want. It's still their facility. They're responsible for
9 it.

10 MR. KNIGHT: Thank you. But it won't keep us
11 from widening the road or making improvements to -- in other
12 words, you don't have to maintain it as close to what it was
13 when it was US-80. We just have to -- I mean --

14 MR. EMERY: Mr. Chairman, Mr. -- yeah. Go ahead,
15 Floyd.

16 MR. ROEHRICH: Mr. Chair, Mr. Knight, absolutely.
17 But if they want to keep the designation, then they should keep
18 it like that. But if they choose to modernize it, expand it, to
19 commercialize it, to do whatever, then they can agree that's
20 their local planning for that, and then the designation can be
21 taken away.

22 MR. KNIGHT: Okay. Thank you.

23 MR. EMERY: Mr. Chair, Board Member Knight, I'll
24 just re-emphasize what Mr. Roehrich said. The designation
25 really doesn't become finalized until that intergovernmental

1 agreement is executed between ADOT and the local jurisdiction,
2 and that's their choice, whether they want to enter to that
3 agreement or not. They don't have to.

4 CHAIRMAN CUTHBERTSON: Okay. Thank you.

5 Other questions?

6 MR. ELTERS: Mr. Chairman.

7 CHAIRMAN CUTHBERTSON: Yes. Board Member Elters.

8 MR. ELTERS: Quick comment. I'm -- I believe the
9 process that the department has followed has been really
10 thorough, exhaustive, included consultation with all the locals.
11 They've been working on it since January. The recommendations
12 appear to have the support of the locals, and with that said, I
13 make a motion to proceed with the staff recommendation.

14 CHAIRMAN CUTHBERTSON: Okay.

15 MR. STRATTON: I'd like to second that, but I
16 would like to make a comment, Mr. Chairman. I'd like to
17 compliment the staff on how far they have gone in this, in
18 working with the people. That's one of the things that the
19 Board had requested back in January or February, and I think
20 you've done an excellent job.

21 MR. EMERY: Thank you.

22 CHAIRMAN CUTHBERTSON: Okay. I've got a motion
23 to accept and approve staff's recommendation to designate former
24 U.S. Route 80 as a state historic route, as identified in the
25 ADOT report dated June 2018 and summarized in the letter to ADOT

1 director dated September 18th, 2018. Moved by Board Member
2 Elters, seconded by Board Member Stratton.

3 Any other comments or discussion?

4 MR. ROEHRICH: Mr. Chair, I just wanted to make
5 sure that as we close this out, because this has been a
6 significant enough issue, if there is any question in the
7 Board's mind about the -- not just that process, but what's in
8 law and required, which is defined in law through our rules,
9 that we have that brought forward. I don't want the Board to
10 get the -- any feeling that maybe the department or staff has
11 not vetted through as best we can to meet those requirements
12 that are in law or in rule. If there's any question in any
13 board member's mind, I do want to have the opportunity to make
14 sure that we've answered that to the degree that you're
15 comfortable with it.

16 CHAIRMAN CUTHBERTSON: Board members, are you all
17 comfortable?

18 Board Member Hammond.

19 MR. HAMMOND: I didn't have a question until I
20 listened to all the conversation, but the -- you know, my sense
21 is that as a board, we're just -- want to make sure we don't
22 impede our ability to expand our system because of this
23 designation, and I've heard no. Is that correct?

24 MR. ROEHRICH: Mr. Chair, Mr. Hammond, that is
25 correct. This designation gives it no other criteria or no

1 other characteristics on the roadway beyond what we have the
2 ability to control. It's still our roadway, and the Board
3 prioritizes the improvements.

4 MR. KNIGHT: Mr. Chair.

5 CHAIRMAN CUTHBERTSON: Yeah. Board Member
6 Knight.

7 MR. KNIGHT: And I didn't really mean -- I didn't
8 mean to sound like I was not for this. I just wanted to make
9 sure that what was going to be required of local jurisdictions
10 was clarified so that we knew where we were going moving
11 forward.

12 MR. ROEHRICH: Mr. Chair, Mr. Knight, absolutely.
13 That's why we brought this here. That's why we're open, to make
14 sure that we've answered those questions, because it's all
15 important that we understand that. If there's confusion, we
16 will try to disconfuse it.

17 CHAIRMAN CUTHBERTSON: Is everybody thoroughly
18 disconfused?

19 Okay. I have a motion on the table and a second.
20 All in favor indicate by saying aye.

21 BOARD MEMBERS: Aye.

22 CHAIRMAN CUTHBERTSON: Opposed, nay? The ayes
23 have it. The motion passes.

24 Okay. Thank you very much. I just would like to
25 comment. I know it's been a very long process. I would --

1 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: (Inaudible.)

2 CHAIRMAN CUTHBERTSON: Give Mr. Emery our
3 congratulations for -- and really, it was kind of a testimony to
4 perseverance for not only -- well, really for Mr. Clinco and the
5 Historic Preservation Foundation. I think in the end there was
6 a lot of support for it from the Board, but I know that I -- we
7 really appreciate the ADOT staff for making sure that it was
8 done very thoroughly, and I think we're all comfortable with the
9 process at the end. So thank you.

10 Okay. Move on to Item 11. Clem Ligocki will
11 present a proposed major amendment to the MAG Regional
12 Transportation Plan to remove the Central Glendale lightrail
13 extension originally included in the 20- -- 2003 adopted
14 Regional Transportation Plan. For discussion and possible
15 action.

16 MR. LIGOCKI: Thank you, Mr. Chairman, members of
17 the Board. First I'd like to thank the Maricopa Association of
18 Governments and the City of Glendale for the information they've
19 provided to use in this presentation. MAG is here if there are
20 any other questions that they can help with later on, and thank
21 them for being here also to follow through.

22 Since the last time -- previous times that the
23 Board has taken actions regarding MAG Regional Transportation
24 Plan major amendments, there have been others that -- some of
25 you who have come onto the Board and maybe haven't been through

1 this process with the State Transportation Board.

2 So the question might be why is this before the
3 State Transportation Board? And that's because when the
4 Legislature put this together, they put various quality controls
5 into the -- into the statute, and one of those was this review
6 process, and the statute requires that the MAG Transportation
7 Policy Committee consult with the State Transportation Board,
8 the Maricopa County Board of Supervisors and Valley Metro each
9 time one of these major amendments comes forward. So that's the
10 reasons.

11 And then it also -- the Board is then -- each of
12 these entities is required to communicate back to the MAG TPC a
13 recommendation either to approve or to disapprove or to modify.
14 So that's why it's here and that's what's requested.

15 So this figure then shows the location of the
16 extension. You see that light brown area there where the red
17 arrow was pointing. That's the location. It's just a two mile
18 segment in length.

19 I'd also just point out note -- the note on the
20 left of the slide there that the \$51 million that was dedicated
21 in regional funding for the project goes back into the transit
22 life cycle balance. So it can be used potentially for other
23 projects in that pot later on.

24 Also point out, importantly, that if MAG does
25 ultimately approve this major amendment, the action is still

1 going to be contingent on conformity or quality conformity
2 analysis.

3 Just a little bit of background. The extension
4 that is the subject of the amendment was included in some plans
5 that were supported by voter-approved taxes, and that --
6 approved taxes, and that goes back to 2001 with Glendale's
7 Proposition 402, and then, of course, Prop 400 in MAG back in
8 2003, with the tax coming in 2004.

9 It was back in December of 2017 that Glendale
10 City Council took their action where they vetted to discontinue
11 their participation in this project, this extension. In
12 essence, it was a financial decision. And so then that
13 deletion, that triggers a major amendment process, because it's
14 deletion of a corridor, and that qualifies as a major amendment,
15 and so the process is then started.

16 And then so the process so far, at MAG, on August
17 15th, the TPC approved the beginning of the consultation process
18 that we're now in, and then August 29th, the MAG Regional
19 Council followed suit with that, and the deadline was set as
20 September 28th, which is approaching, and again, that's why we
21 have it here today.

22 And here's the timeline. You can see where we're
23 at now in the consultation, and the remaining activities then
24 play out through December, where the conformity would come
25 through. So that's the remaining timeline. And all I have

1 left, then, is some language for a possible motion. It is a
2 little bit long, and we did that intentionally to make sure that
3 we mimicked the language that has been coming all along with MAG
4 so that we're consistent and correct, and also to adhere to the
5 statute.

6 And so the motion, I'll read it, is the State
7 Transportation Board recommends to the Maricopa Association of
8 Governments Transportation Policy Committee that the proposed
9 major amendment to the MAG Regional Transportation Plan to
10 delete the Glendale lightrail extension from the 2040 Regional
11 Transportation Plan contingent on the finding of air quality
12 conformity be approved, if you choose to recommend approval.

13 That's all I have, Mr. Chairman.

14 CHAIRMAN CUTHBERTSON: Board Member Hammond, do
15 you have a question?

16 MR. HAMMOND: Just a question on how
17 controversial this removal has been. Is everybody in agreement
18 it needs to come out?

19 CHAIRMAN CUTHBERTSON: Mr. Chairman, Mr. Hammond,
20 the agreement was pretty clear in the MAG committees where there
21 was virtually no discussion. It moved very quickly through
22 that, and I think it's agreed.

23 MR. ELTERS: Mr. Chairman, Mr. Hammond, this item
24 is basically fiscal constraint for the City of Glendale. There
25 were some issues within the City and residents and -- with

1 different views and perspective. However, as it sailed through
2 the MAG committees, both including the TPC and the regional
3 council, there was recognition that this is after all fiscal
4 constraint and funding limitation, and the City made what they
5 consider to be in their best interest, and the region went
6 along. So there was really not a whole lot of discussion during
7 those committee meetings, and it's from that point of view that
8 I would make a motion that the Board approves the staff request
9 and the recommendation as stated.

10 MR. KNIGHT: Second.

11 CHAIRMAN CUTHBERTSON: Okay. So the State
12 Transportation Board recommends to the Maricopa Association of
13 Governments Transportation Policy Committee that the proposed
14 major amendment to the MAG Regional Transportation Plan to
15 delete the Glendale lightrail extension from the 2040 Regional
16 Transportation Plan, contingent on the finding of air quality
17 conformity, be approved as presented. Made by Board Member
18 Elters, seconded by Board Member Knight. Any further
19 discussion?

20 All in favor indicate by saying aye.

21 BOARD MEMBERS: Aye.

22 CHAIRMAN CUTHBERTSON: Opposed, nay? Ayes have
23 it. Motion passes.

24 MR. LIGOCKI: Thank you Mr. Chairman.

25 CHAIRMAN CUTHBERTSON: Thank you, Mr. Ligocki.

1 Okay. Item 12, suggestions by board members for
2 upcoming board member -- board meeting agendas.

3 MR. ROEHRICH: Mr. Chair, just a reminder to the
4 board members that our next meeting in October is actually the
5 fourth Friday of the month, if you remember, October 26th, in
6 conjunction with the Rural Transportation Summit, and it will be
7 in Lake Havasu City. Hopefully you've all had a chance to get
8 registered if you're going to attend the full summit. If not,
9 we will meet that Friday. So next month, it will be the fourth
10 Friday of the month.

11 CHAIRMAN CUTHBERTSON: Okay. Thank you.

12 MR. ELTERS: Chairman, I have an item.

13 CHAIRMAN CUTHBERTSON: Yes. Board Member --

14 MR. ELTERS: Following up on my discussion back
15 in July in Show Low --

16 CHAIRMAN CUTHBERTSON: Uh-huh.

17 MR. ELTERS: -- related to a platform or an
18 opportunity for the Board to -- study session or a retreat or
19 something of that sort. And after further discussion with
20 Mr. Roehrich and Michelle Kunzman, our board attorney, I have a
21 request, and the request is to have an agenda item for the board
22 study session in November, and the purpose for that would be to
23 discuss transportation funding in Arizona, both current levels
24 as well as potential future revenue increases.

25 The goal would be for the board members to have

1 an opportunity for dialogue, to have a platform where we can
2 exchange ideas, express thoughts, concerns, support,
3 preferences, and the desired outcome would be for the board
4 members to come to an agreement on a strategy, a position paper,
5 per se, similar to what we did with the long range plan where we
6 stated that the Board have concerns or supports certain
7 activities.

8 That position paper then would be perhaps voted
9 on by the Board, similar to what we did for the long range plan,
10 and that would be in time for after the November election is
11 complete and in preparation for the Legislative session to start
12 in January. So we as board members can be active, can reach out
13 to our elected officials, the decision makers, governor's team,
14 Legislature and so on, and communities, the groups, you name it.
15 If we're going to be active in driving that process and speak
16 from a -- informed, agreed to position or point of view as
17 opposed to being on a tangent. So with that said, that would be
18 -- that is my request for an agenda item --

19 CHAIRMAN CUTHBERTSON: Yeah.

20 MR. ELTERS: -- for the November study session.

21 CHAIRMAN CUTHBERTSON: Yeah. Sounds -- it sounds
22 like something that would fit well into the study session. Is
23 that something we can agendize for the study session?

24 MR. ROEHRICH: Mr. Chair, absolutely. You set
25 the agenda. I'm going to put on there whatever you want.

1 CHAIRMAN CUTHBERTSON: Board Member Stratton.

2 MR. STRATTON: Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask
3 for an additional item on the work session agenda, that it be
4 concerning our policy and procedure, a call to the public, a
5 discussion about it.

6 CHAIRMAN CUTHBERTSON: Yes. Okay. Okay. Policy
7 and procedure for call to the public. Okay.

8 Others?

9 Board Member Thompson.

10 MR. THOMPSON: I'd just like to appreciate the
11 staff and also continue the practice of keeping the records of
12 all the projects that are being opposed by the people and get a
13 list back to us at the end of the program period. I believe
14 that's what they did last year, and that was a good thing to do.

15 CHAIRMAN CUTHBERTSON: Yeah. Comments, comments
16 back. (Inaudible.)

17 Okay. Others? Okay.

18 (End of recording.)

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Adjournment

A motion to adjourn the September 21, 2018, State Transportation Board meeting was made by Board Member Sellers and seconded by Board Member Thompson. In a voice vote, the motion carried.

Meeting adjourned at 11:17 a.m. MST.



William F. Cuthbertson, Chairman
State Transportation Board



Floyd Roehrich, Jr., Executive Officer
Arizona Department of Transportation