

ARIZONA STATE TRANSPORTATION BOARD

STATE TRANSPORTATION BOARD

STUDY SESSION

REPORTER'S TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS

TELECONFERENCE STUDY SESSION

June 2, 2020

9:00 a.m.

REPORTED BY:

TERESA A. WATSON, RMR  
Certified Reporter  
Certificate No. 50876

Perfecta Reporting  
(602) 421-3602

PREPARED FOR:

ADOT - STATE TRANSPORTATION BOARD

(Certified Copy)

1                   REPORTER'S TRANSCRIPT OF EXCERPT OF ELECTRONIC  
2 PROCEEDINGS, ADOT - STATE TRANSPORTATION BOARD STUDY SESSION,  
3 was reported from electronic media by TERESA A. WATSON,  
4 Registered Merit Reporter and a Certified Reporter in and for  
5 the State of Arizona.

6

7 PARTICIPANTS:

8 Board Members:

9           Michael S. Hammond, Chairman  
10           Steven E. Stratton, Vice Chairman  
11           Jesse Thompson, Board Member  
12           Sam Elters, Board Member  
13           Gary Knight, Board Member  
14           Richard Searle, Board Member  
15           Jenn Daniels, Board Member

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

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:
Jeff Meilbeck, Executive Director, MetroPlan Flagstaff.....	5
Ana Olivares, Pima County Transportation Director.....	7
Charlie Odegaard, Flagstaff City Council, Metropolitan Vice Chair.....	10
Jodi Rooney.....	12

AGENDA ITEMS

Item 1 - FY 2021-2025 ADOT Tentative Five-Year .....	13
Transportation Facilities Construction Program, Greg Bryes, Division Director, Multimodal Planning Division and Kristine Ward, Chief Financial Officer	
Item 2 - Communication Protocol.....	44
Item 3 - Board Meeting Schedule.....	55

1 (Beginning of excerpt.)

2

3 CHAIRMAN HAMMOND: We're going to do the call to  
4 the audience now. I'm going to actually read these  
5 instructions, because they're fairly detailed, and as the  
6 technology, I think this particular specific technology we're  
7 using for the first time, listen carefully, and we do have four  
8 to five speakers. This is a teleconference website or Webex  
9 conference meeting. Everyone will be muted when they call in to  
10 the meeting. When your name is called to provide your comments,  
11 you will indicate your presence by virtually raising your hand,  
12 using your phone keypad, or through the Webex application. The  
13 Webex host will guide you through the unmuting and muting  
14 process following instructions included with the meeting agenda.

15 A reminder that a three-minute time limit will be  
16 imposed.

17 So let's go to the call to the audience.

18 MR. ROEHRICH: So Mr. Chair, this is Floyd. I  
19 will go ahead and call out the names. We have --

20 CHAIRMAN HAMMOND: Floyd, you can hear?

21 MR. ROEHRICH: Yes, sir. Yes, sir, Mr. Chair.  
22 This is Floyd.

23 So we have four requests. The order of requests  
24 will be Mr. Charlie Odegaard, Mr. Jeff Meilbeck, Ms. Ana  
25 Olivares, and Ms. Jodi Rooney. I would ask that all four of

1 those people use the raise their hand option based upon whether  
2 they logged in on a phone or Webex computer, internet browser or  
3 Webex iPhone application as outlined in the agenda, and once  
4 that happens, our meeting host, Ms. Hayley Estelle, will go  
5 ahead and unmute them so they can do their comments.

6 So first subpoena Mr. Charlie Odegaard,  
7 Councilman for the City of Flagstaff.

8 Please unmute Mr. Odegaard.

9 WEBEX HOST: Mr. Odegaard, this is Hayley  
10 Estelle, your host this morning. If you've joined us using  
11 (inaudible), please press star nine on your touch tone keypad to  
12 virtually raise your hand, and I'll unmute your line.

13 Floyd, I'm not seeing any feedback from  
14 Mr. Odegaard.

15 MR. ROEHRICH: Okay. How about Jeff Meilbeck?

16 Mr. Meilbeck, are you on the phone? Could you  
17 please raise your hand so we can unmute you?

18 WEBEX HOST: Jeff. Jeff, this is Hayley. I see  
19 your hand raised. I'm going to go ahead and unmute you. When I  
20 do that, you'll hear two tones.

21 MR. MEILBECK: Thank you.

22 Mr. Chairman, members of the Board, can you hear  
23 me?

24 MR. ROEHRICH: Yes, we can.

25 CHAIRMAN HAMMOND: Yes, we can.

1                   MR. MEILBECK: My name is Jeff Meilbeck. I'm the  
2 executive director of the Flagstaff Metropolitan Planning  
3 Organization, also known as Greater Flagstaff MetroPlan.

4                   I'm here today for three reasons. One, to  
5 acknowledge the fiscal challenges and economic uncertainty that  
6 you and we all face; two, to recognize the difficult choices  
7 that need to be made by this board and ADOT administration; and  
8 three, to underscore the criticality of the Rio de Flag Bridge  
9 replacement that's budgeted in fiscal year '20 on your five-year  
10 plan and recently deferred to fiscal year '21 in your draft  
11 plan.

12                   I know that everyone in this virtual room can  
13 make a strong case for the merits of any of their projects.  
14 There is clearly more that needs to be done and can be done.  
15 That said, the Rio de Flag Bridge replacement has a few other  
16 significant considerations. One, the project is part of a  
17 larger flood control project that has been in the works for  
18 decades. Two, the safety issues risked by delay could be  
19 severe, dare I say catastrophic, from an economic and public  
20 safety for perspective, and three, the City of Flagstaff not  
21 only has an IGA with ADOT to complete this project -- the City  
22 has already invested close to 2 million for their part -- and  
23 finally the project is heavily leveraged. In addition to City  
24 funding and State funding, the Army Corps of Engineers will be  
25 investing over \$60 million.

1           At all times, and particularly in a time of  
2 economic challenge, a project as heavily leveraged as this, a  
3 project that brings \$10 million to the table in the state  
4 economy is critical.

5           So I want to thank ADOT for continuing to program  
6 the Rio de Flag Bridge project in fiscal year '21. I will thank  
7 you, the Board and the ADOT team for keeping funding in fiscal  
8 year '21 as we move forward. So (inaudible) and be well.

9           CHAIRMAN HAMMOND: Thank you very much,  
10 Mr. Meilbeck.

11           Floyd.

12           MR. ROEHRICH: One more check. Mr. Odegaard,  
13 were you able to use your raise your hand function?

14           WEBEX HOST: Good morning, Floyd. This is  
15 Hayley. I still don't see feedback from Mr. Odegaard. I did  
16 send him a note to ask him to reach out to me directly to let me  
17 know how he's joined so we can give him the proper instructions  
18 for notifying us that he's in the room.

19           MR. ROEHRICH: Thank you.

20           Ana Olivares, are you there? Will you please  
21 raise your hand?

22           WEBEX HOST: Thank you. Ana, I see your hand  
23 raised. I'm going to go ahead and unmute you. When I do that,  
24 you'll hear two tones.

25           MS. OLIVARES: Good morning, Mr. Chair and

1 members of the Board. Can you hear me?

2 CHAIRMAN HAMMOND: We can.

3 MS. OLIVARES: Perfect. My name is Ana Olivares,  
4 and I'm the Transportation Director for Pima County. I thank  
5 you for the opportunity to speak today. I'm here to speak on  
6 the 2021 to 2025 Tentative Five-Year Program.

7 We take this opportunity to reiterate how  
8 important expanding transportation infrastructure is to our  
9 policy initiative to grow our local and regional economy. We  
10 continue to request your support in accelerating federal  
11 projects that are critical to the Pima County's economic growth.  
12 We understand these are unprecedented times, and managing  
13 reduced revenues is a challenge. However, we in Pima County  
14 have overcome some of our own challenges to initiate these  
15 critical projects, and we do not want to lose any momentum and  
16 will continue to advocate for their acceleration.

17 We request to make the following amendments to  
18 the tentative plan prior to approval: Program the funding for  
19 both the design and construction of the I-10 interchange at Pima  
20 Parkway and the interstate underpass along Forgeus Road. These  
21 improvements are necessary to support a major regional sports  
22 park completed and open to the public. In addition, we continue  
23 to pursue private public partnerships for additional  
24 entertainment venues at this location.

25 We request to program additional funding to



1 continue with a tier 2 study of the Saguaro Corridor in fiscal  
2 '21 of this five-year program. Completion of the tier 1 EIS is  
3 scheduled for fall of 2020, and identifying funding for an  
4 immediate continuation under tier 2 study is critical to  
5 continue the momentum that has been built with stakeholders  
6 during the tier 1 study. We have all seen how a new corridor  
7 can modify traffic patterns by providing alternate travel routes  
8 and stimulate commercial development. The Sonoran Corridor has  
9 the potential to bootstrap significant economic development in  
10 southern Arizona similar to the rapid growth experienced along  
11 the South Mountain Freeway extension.

12           And last, we request to program adequate funding  
13 for the I-10/Sunset interchange improvements within the I-10/Ina  
14 to Ruthrauff widening project. Pima County is continuing the  
15 design of the Sunset Innovation Campus in the southwest quadrant  
16 of the interchange and the connection from I-10 to River Road,  
17 including a railroad (inaudible) separation is necessary for  
18 this campus to be successful. We are working with the  
19 Southcentral District and PAG to make sure that permanent  
20 (inaudible) interchange improvements are completed with the ADOT  
21 widening project.

22           Thank you very much for your time today.

23           CHAIRMAN HAMMOND: Thank you, Ms. Olivares.

24           Floyd.

25           MR. ROEHRICH: Mr. Odegaard, I understand you now

1 are here. Could you please raise your hand?

2 WEBEX HOST: Hi, Charlie. This is Hayley. Thank  
3 you for your patience this morning. I'm going to go ahead and  
4 unmute you. When I do that, you'll hear two tones on your end.

5 MR. ODEGAARD: Okay. Can you hear me now?

6 WEBEX HOST: Yes, sir.

7 MR. ODEGAARD: Okay. Thank you very much. Thank  
8 you for your patience. I'm not very computer literate, so thank  
9 you, board members.

10 Good morning, Chairman Hammond and Vice Chair  
11 Stratton and the board members. Thank you for the opportunity  
12 to address you this morning.

13 And to introduce myself, I'm Charlie Odegaard  
14 from the City of Flagstaff. We understand the State  
15 Transportation Board reached a decision to defer the funding for  
16 the Rio de Flag Bridge replacement by City Hall (inaudible) was  
17 postponed to the next fiscal year, and it's my understanding  
18 that that happened with the proposed five-year plan, and I want  
19 to thank you for that.

20 ADOT bridge replacement projects has been  
21 integrated with the Rio de Flag Flood Control Project that's  
22 being delivered by the Army Corps of Engineers in partnership  
23 with the City of Flagstaff. The City of Flagstaff entered into  
24 an IGA with ADOT to provide the necessary (inaudible) required  
25 by ADOT's bridge replacement projects and has paid \$670,000 for

1 rock excavation beneath the new bridge to ensure the new bridge  
2 is not damaged when the Army Corps completes the flood control  
3 improvements. And the City has recently completed \$1.3 million  
4 of necessary utility relocation work in the vicinity of the new  
5 bridge at ADOT's request.

6 This new bridge will provide a 100-year flood  
7 conveyance capacity that will protect property, the traveling  
8 public and associated infrastructure, enhance our economy,  
9 ensure the safety of our residents who reside in the floodplain.  
10 The Army Corps has estimated that nearly \$1 billion worth of  
11 damage would be suffered if a major flood event would occur, and  
12 that number was generated during the recession of 2008.

13 The \$120 million Rio de Flag Flood Control  
14 Project is the most significant capital undertaken by our  
15 community, and it's urgently needed to address flood mitigation  
16 in the (inaudible). We respectfully ask that ADOT be mindful  
17 upon the safety component of our Rio de Flag Flood Control  
18 Project and ensure that a critical and integrated bridge  
19 replacement project on Route 66 is not deferred beyond the  
20 fiscal year '20 to '21.

21 And again, it's my understanding that will happen  
22 in the next fiscal year, and I appreciate the cooperation that  
23 ADOT -- that has done with the partner of the City of Flagstaff.  
24 So thank you very much this morning.

25 CHAIRMAN HAMMOND: Thank you, Mr. Odegaard.

1 Floyd.

2 MR. ROEHRICH: And last is Ms. Jodi Rooney.

3 Ms. Rooney, have you accessed the web event?

4 WEBEX HOST: Yes. Good morning, Floyd. This is  
5 Hayley. I see Ms. Rooney has raised her hand.

6 Ms. Rooney, you've raised your hand for the  
7 teleconference. I'm going to go ahead and unmute your line.  
8 When I do that, you'll hear two tones, and you'll be unmuted.

9 MS. ROONEY: Chairman Hammond, board members,  
10 Director Halikowski and staff, thank you so much for your good  
11 work here for the citizens of Arizona.

12 Good morning. This is Jodi Rooney, and I'm  
13 participating from Yavapai County today. Well, it has been a  
14 long time. This is not the first time I've addressed the State  
15 Transportation Board.

16 ADOT has been a good partner. You have helped us  
17 with many projects over the years, and it is our intention to  
18 continue to be innovative and follow through.

19 We also appreciate Board Member Gary Knight  
20 representing us.

21 I-17 by its very nature requires multiple  
22 improvements and maintenance. ADOT, FHWA and regional partners  
23 have always stepped up. Our current national economic situation  
24 has required us all to sacrifice. We are seeing this with the  
25 tentative five-year program. While we understand this, I would

1 like to speak to and ask that I-17 continue to remain a  
2 priority, and we're speaking directly (inaudible) the project  
3 868000. That's I-17 from Anthem Way TI to Cordes Junction.  
4 It's a study, roadway and widening design and construction.  
5 It's a huge project, and we don't take that lightly.

6 I also would like a consideration of not just  
7 I-17 to remain a priority, but also I know Supervisor Thurman  
8 from Yavapai County was in the (inaudible) had sent a letter  
9 regarding the McGuireville TI. Certainly this has not been on  
10 the program for a long time. However, we would like for it to  
11 remain on the radar, please.

12 So I respectfully ask this of our board, and we  
13 thank you for your leadership.

14 CHAIRMAN HAMMOND: Thank you very much,  
15 Ms. Rooney.

16 Floyd, is that the last speaker we have on the  
17 agenda?

18 MR. ROEHRICH: Mr. Chair, that is the last call  
19 to the audience. We can close that function and move on to Item  
20 1 if you so choose.

21 CHAIRMAN HAMMOND: Okay. Let's end the call to  
22 the audience and move on now to Item 1. This is the review of  
23 the fiscal year 2021 to 2025 ADOT Tentative Five-Year  
24 Transportation Facilities Construction Program. That  
25 presentation will be Greg Byres, the Division Director,

1 Multimodal Planning, and with Kristine Ward, our Chief Financial  
2 Officer. It's for information and (inaudible) discussion only.

3 MR. ROEHRICH: So Mr. Chair, this is Floyd. I  
4 would ask if Kristine is here if she wanted to start. She had  
5 comments I think she wanted to make, and then Greg Byres does  
6 have a presentation that we will call up and share that. But to  
7 start with, I'd ask Kristine --

8 CHAIRMAN HAMMOND: (Inaudible.)

9 MR. ROEHRICH: -- if she has her comments.

10 MS. WARD: Very good. Thank you, Floyd. Good  
11 morning, Mr. Chair. Good morning, board members.

12 Since we met two weeks ago, we do not have  
13 additional data. We will be getting in our next HURF numbers on  
14 the 9th. I expect we'll get those numbers out to you per Board  
15 Member Daniels' request, and then those numbers will comprise  
16 April's activity. So you will see the first full month of COVID  
17 activity in those figures.

18 Until that time, we'll be following up with  
19 (inaudible) continue to look at the (inaudible) for the grant.  
20 We'll be updating cash flows and, of course, following the  
21 information that flows in from the market and other sources.

22 With that, that completes my report, and I'd be  
23 happy to take any questions.

24 CHAIRMAN HAMMOND: Board members, would you like  
25 any questions of Ms. Ward? Anybody want an update of what she

1 presented last meeting or are we good to go?

2                   Okay. Hearing no questions, I guess, Greg,  
3 you're up.

4                   Thank you, Ms. Ward.

5                   MR. BYRES: Thank you, Mr. Chairman, board  
6 members. Good morning. We'll get the presentation up here in  
7 just a second.

8                   So I have just a quick presentation to go  
9 through. Next slide.

10                   This -- we're just going to kind of go through  
11 pretty much the same information that we went through last time  
12 with a little bit of an update. We will be going through the  
13 background, the tentative five-year delivery program, as well as  
14 MAG and PAG's programs and aeronautics.

15                   So as far as the background goes, again, the  
16 tentative five-year program was presented to the State  
17 Transportation Board on February 21st. That was our initial  
18 tentative recommendation. We went through, were supposed to  
19 have planned public hearings for March and April, which were  
20 canceled. Then, of course, we had the revenue future  
21 projections that were changed. So we have put together the  
22 revisions to the tentative five-year program, which you should  
23 have received a copy of that we're going through, and that is  
24 what our recommendations are still today.

25                   The five-year program must be approved by the

1 State Transportation Board on June 30th. That's by statute.  
2 The fiscal year starts on July 1, and we must be fiscally  
3 constrained.

4           So as of today, we have received 41 website  
5 respondents, 3 email comments, 3 phone comments, and public  
6 hearing comments. The major themes that were included in those  
7 comments was the widening of I-10 from Casa Grande to the 202,  
8 widening of I-17 from Anthem to Sunset Point, widening of SR-260  
9 at Lion Springs, the widening of US-93, repaving of various  
10 highways statewide, repair pavement on I-17 within the Phoenix  
11 area, pavement preservation of US-60 and SR-260 in the White  
12 Mountains, reconstruct the I-10 Gila River Bridge, start  
13 construction of I-11, place the West Kingman TI back into the  
14 current program, and construct new port of entry/modernize  
15 existing port of entry and build a new corridor road in the city  
16 of Douglas. We've received those as well as the comments that  
17 were presented earlier in this meeting.

18           CHAIRMAN HAMMOND: And Greg, are these -- are  
19 those comments in any order of numbers or are they just randomly  
20 in any order?

21           MR. BYRES: Those are just randomly gone through.  
22 We -- the majority of the comments we received were all single  
23 comments, but we did receive some that had multiples on those.  
24 I believe you've received copies of all of our comments  
25 previously. I believe Floyd sent those out to you. So if any



1 other ones come through, we will certainly get those to you.

2 CHAIRMAN HAMMOND: Okay. Thank you.

3 Board members, if you have questions through  
4 Mr. Byres' presentation, don't hesitate to interrupt.

5 MR. BYRES: So as we go through, again, we break  
6 down all of our investment categories into three different  
7 categories: Preservation, modernization and expansion. Again,  
8 this is just a quick review of what those entail. Preservation,  
9 again, is investment to keep pavement smooth and maintain  
10 bridges. Modernization is non-capacity investment that improves  
11 safety and operations. And expansion is investment that adds  
12 capacity to the highway system.

13 So this is the same slide that you saw at the  
14 board meeting previously. This goes through and shows each of  
15 the five years in the program. Green being preservation, red  
16 being modernization, the purple being project development,  
17 yellow being planning, and the blue being expansion. We really  
18 don't have any blue with the exception of the hashed marks on  
19 2021, which is at 26.25 million, and that 26.25 million includes  
20 25 million for US-95 and 1.25 million for SR-69. That 25  
21 million for 95 was a State appropriation.

22 So a lot of the comments that we had received  
23 earlier were for specific projects. Several of those projects  
24 are in this program, and we can kind of go through and detail  
25 those out with more detailed comment and comment resolution

1 summary, and we can -- we'll pass that on to -- we'll just plan  
2 on passing that on to you either later on today or tomorrow so  
3 that you'll have that information.

4           As far as the program itself, as we go through  
5 it, looking at the big pie chart, this includes MAG and PAG  
6 funding, along with all of our Greater Arizona funding, and you  
7 can see that we've got 42 percent in expansion, 12 percent in  
8 modernization, and 46 percent in preservation. Compared to last  
9 year's program, which had 26 percent expansion, which did not  
10 include the 3 percent that we had for legislative  
11 appropriations, 10 percent modernization, and 41 percent in  
12 preservation.

13           When we look at the Greater Arizona area isolated  
14 by itself, what you see here is that we only have 1 percent  
15 expansion, which was that 26 million that we just discussed, 23  
16 percent is in modernization, and 76 percent is in preservation.

17           Just as a note of reference, in the Long Range  
18 Transportation Plan, the recommendations that we had for Greater  
19 Arizona was 25 percent modernization and 75 percent  
20 preservation.

21           As we go into the development years, we're  
22 staying consistent with the information that we currently have.  
23 Trying to maintain roughly about 290 million in preservation,  
24 and again, no expansion.

25           In the MAG region, MAG does its own planning with

1 the exception of some preservation projects on state routes.  
2 This is the information -- the latest information that we have  
3 from MAG, which was a rebalancing that was done in September  
4 with all the projects listed.

5 In the PAG region, it's the same thing. PAG does  
6 their own planning with the exception of some preservation on  
7 state routes, and this is a list of the projects that they have  
8 within their region. Mostly on I-10, with projects also on  
9 SR-77 and I-19.

10 We also have the aeronautics or the airport  
11 improvement program. With it we have the different programs  
12 that we run for grants. We have the FSL, which is the  
13 federal/state local. We currently have it at \$5 million  
14 dollars. The state/local, which is SL, at \$10 million. The  
15 APMS at \$7 million. Grand Canyon Airport is currently at  
16 \$15 million. State planning services for aeronautics at  
17 1.1 million, for a total of 38.15 million.

18 And with that I will take whatever questions you  
19 may have.

20 CHAIRMAN HAMMOND: Greg, I have one question, and  
21 then I'll turn it over to the others. This is, I think, the  
22 third presentation of the tentative plan. I know we've been  
23 constrained by a lot of things, but has there been any material  
24 changes from the first presentation to this presentation in the  
25 five-year plan active plan, or is it just basically the same

1 one?

2 MR. BYRES: We have gone through and made sure  
3 that we had everything balanced. We roughly have about 140  
4 projects currently programmed through the five years. Most of  
5 those are in the first two years of the program. We don't  
6 normally program all the way out to the fifth year. Those are  
7 maintained within -- those funds are maintained within the  
8 subprograms. But we have gone through and made sure that's we  
9 have addressed some of the comments that have come in to date.

10 CHAIRMAN HAMMOND: Okay. Other board members?

11 VICE CHAIR STRATTON: Mr. Chairman.

12 CHAIRMAN HAMMOND: Board Member Stratton.

13 VICE CHAIR STRATTON: Greg, this may be a  
14 question for you. It may be for John. At the last meeting, I  
15 requested to see if we could delay the June 30th deadline. Have  
16 we got an answer to that yet?

17 MR. BYRES: So there is a state statute that says  
18 that the five-year program does have to be completed by June  
19 30th. We would have to get some kind of a variance away from  
20 that state statute. I know Michelle, the attorney for the  
21 Board, had chimed in with comments stating that that should be  
22 met.

23 VICE CHAIR STRATTON: I understand the statute,  
24 Greg. I believe the Director was going to speak to the Governor  
25 about that issue. The IRS delayed taxes for two months. I

1 don't see why we can't delay a five-year plan and get some good  
2 data. I know we have April coming in like Kristine said, but  
3 there's quite a difference in what I have seen between what was  
4 happening in April and what's happening now.

5 I do own commercial property. Can I tell you the  
6 activity has been -- in the past few months wasn't much, but my  
7 phone is ringing quite a bit the past couple weeks, people  
8 interested in different buildings. So the fuel stations, I've  
9 had to stay in line every time I got fuel. The traffic that was  
10 on on Memorial Day weekend was reminiscent what was several  
11 years ago. I had believed that we can't set a trend off of one  
12 month. It takes two or three months, and I think we need to  
13 have more data before we try and adopt a five-year plan.

14 CHAIRMAN HAMMOND: Well, I think that Board  
15 Member Stratton has a valid point, because it needs to be asked  
16 maybe a little more strongly. (Inaudible) of my question. We  
17 don't -- we really don't have -- I think Ms. Ward, she said two  
18 weeks of real data (inaudible). If we can't expand it, that's  
19 fine, but I would think -- I would think (inaudible) question  
20 ought to be asked of someone (inaudible) the Governor on whether  
21 we could delay 30 days (inaudible) data.

22 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: (Inaudible.)

23 DIRECTOR HALIKOWSKI: Hello. So this is the  
24 Director. In answer to Mr. Stratton's question, I don't have an  
25 answer to whether we can ignore the statute, but I think what

1 we're talking about is, kind of in a semantics way, what does it  
2 mean that, you know, we approve a five-year plan by June 30th,  
3 when as we've seen in the past, we amend that plan throughout  
4 the year. So I want to reiterate it's not final and done and we  
5 can never touch it again if revenues improve.

6 On the revenue side, Mr. Stratton is correct, I  
7 think, that there are categories of the economy that are  
8 probably picking up and showing some strength, and as he said or  
9 Mr. Hammond said, one week or one month does not a trend make.

10 And so what we're asking the Board to do is  
11 really to approve what I call more of a tentative program by  
12 June 30th, because if Kristine will join me in this discussion,  
13 we're watching the numbers right now to establish a trend of two  
14 or three months, because her fuel numbers come in at least a  
15 month behind, if I recall, or not more. So we're trying to  
16 track the revenues to see that if we can start including  
17 projects back based on the go forward ideas she has.

18 So it's not like I-17 is out. It's not like  
19 we're saying no more money will come in for the rest of the year  
20 other than what we've projected, and she's been working with  
21 other economists, and we've been working with the Governor's  
22 budget staff to provide another set of eyes on our logic. But I  
23 think what we're asking you for here is a little bit of patience  
24 and time to establish a better trend, because our data doesn't  
25 come in the same way the transaction privilege tax data does on

1 a monthly basis. We're usually running a little behind.

2 So Kristine, I don't know if you want to join in  
3 this discussion, but Mr. Chairman, the bottom line is is that  
4 the program is dynamic. Even though we sign off on one by the  
5 end of June, there's nothing that prohibits the Board, if  
6 revenues are stronger, to adding things back in. So I don't  
7 know if we really need to say we need an executive order or  
8 delay it to the 30th day. I think we just need to recognize  
9 that we have a dynamic and changing program, but we need a  
10 little bit of time here to see what the revenues look like,  
11 because we do have to be fiscally constrained.

12 Kristine, I'd ask you to comment, and I know  
13 we've been working on this and discussing it intensively for the  
14 past two weeks with various people. Is there anything you want  
15 to add?

16 MS. WARD: Director, you're absolutely correct.  
17 The program is set up in such a way that we are able to  
18 (inaudible) and change the program throughout the year if new  
19 revenues become available, and naturally that was intention when  
20 we originally did the reforecast of the revenues with COVID  
21 coming into the picture.

22 The reason that (inaudible) reforecast 2021 and  
23 '22 as opposed to (inaudible) forecast a much longer period is  
24 because we were in such unknown territory and because what we  
25 needed, those two just what you said, sir, buy ourselves some

1 time. So we forecasted a short period knowing that we would --  
2 we have the ability to come in and change the program, but we  
3 need -- we just made, and I think Mr. Stratton hit upon the  
4 point, as well as you, Director, that we need to just get some  
5 data in to see just what the impacts are going to be in what is  
6 an unprecedented situation.

7 DIRECTOR HALIKOWSKI: Kristine, could you talk a  
8 little bit about how your fuel revenues come in for that?  
9 Please understand it's not (inaudible) and we know how much tax  
10 is coming in.

11 MS. WARD: Well, certainly, sir.

12 So when the next (inaudible) that's going to be  
13 coming in will be April's activities, and we will get April's  
14 fuel tax activity -- fuel tax (inaudible) send us those fuel tax  
15 reports. They're required to report by the 27th of every month,  
16 following the month of activity. So April's activity, they  
17 report by May 27th, and then it takes a few days to get the  
18 reports processed, and then I report, and then we close HURF,  
19 meaning that's when we have the final distribution numbers that  
20 we send over to the treasurer to do the distribution, and then  
21 we have the numbers that I report out to the Board the third  
22 week of that month.

23 So we're looking at about a three-month delay  
24 from the activity being the date of the actual activity, the  
25 fuel tax activity, people going and purchasing fuel, to the time



1 that we actually know the figures.

2 Did that help you, sir?

3 CHAIRMAN HAMMOND: Yes. Director, I don't push  
4 back very often, but I think that this discussion even --  
5 essentially, it's the point that we're improving something that  
6 we're -- with data is very sketchy, and even if it's symbolic,  
7 we would have much better data (inaudible), for example, by the  
8 July board meeting, if it just has to be approved the end of  
9 June, and I think we (inaudible) we put out a (inaudible) plan.  
10 It's a plan. Even though we amend it, I know that, but I'd kind  
11 of come down on the side of Director Stratton and -- but  
12 (inaudible) symbolic, we shouldn't approve a plan (inaudible)  
13 that we're using.

14 MR. ELTERS: Mr. Chairman. Mr. Chairman.

15 CHAIRMAN HAMMOND: Yes.

16 MR. ELTERS: This is Board Member Elters. I'd  
17 like to jump in and weigh in on a couple of thoughts to -- I  
18 think we're saying the same thing, that the staff is in -- we  
19 need some patience, because we have little data, and the Board  
20 (inaudible) let's be patient (inaudible) a little data. That's  
21 occurred (inaudible) board meeting presentation where Ms. Ward  
22 made it clear that we had very (inaudible) and we have a lot of  
23 uncertainty. So it seems to me we have taken the path of, okay,  
24 even though we have limited data and a lot of uncertainty, we  
25 assume the worst case scenario. We change the program or revise

1 it to reflect the worst case scenario, and the Board (inaudible)  
2 to go along with the worst case scenario (inaudible) five-year  
3 program because the five-year program is dynamic.

4 (Inaudible) that we don't have enough data. We  
5 have a lot of uncertainty. Let's leave it alone, be patient,  
6 and if we must, adopt the five-year program in June. Let's  
7 adopt the five-year program that we started with in hand, and  
8 then recognizing that it's dynamic and we can change it. We  
9 will revise it and change it once we have more data to rely on.

10 I'm really not sure that I can support the  
11 approach of let's (inaudible) program in -- under the  
12 presumption that funding is going to be severely impacted.  
13 Hence I would -- you know, I would think (inaudible) what we  
14 heard from Board Member Stratton, that is, you know, (inaudible)  
15 federal agency such (inaudible) in delay, the deadline for  
16 filing tax (inaudible), I think there should be an opportunity  
17 given these very unusual conditions to (inaudible) before we  
18 adopt the five-year program.

19 But having said that, if we must adopt it by June  
20 30th and there's no way to get beyond the hurdle of the statutes  
21 calling for an adoption in June, I would recommend we adopt the  
22 five-year program we had originally and wait for the data as  
23 opposed to (inaudible) worst case scenario (inaudible). Thank  
24 you, Mr. Chairman.

25 CHAIRMAN HAMMOND: Well, board member, I don't

1 certainly want to go to jail over this issue, so --

2           DIRECTOR HALIKOWSKI: So Mr. Chairman and  
3 Mr. Elters, your points are well taken, but I did not mean to  
4 imply that the program we're asking you to adopt, the revised  
5 program is not fiscally constrained, and based on the data we  
6 have, and that's why we're asking you to adopt the recast or  
7 revised program, because we're certain that one's fiscally  
8 constrained. Perhaps it's too fiscally constrained, but that's  
9 where we need some trend data to make that decision probably by  
10 September (inaudible) some of the strategies we're deploying to  
11 add money back into the program.

12           As to whether or not anybody's going to go to  
13 jail for adopting -- or for not adopting the program by June  
14 30th, you know, your board attorney should be on the line, and  
15 she can advise you of that. So I really don't have an answer  
16 for you as far as the legal ramifications if you don't adopt a  
17 program by June 30th, but what I can tell you is the program  
18 we're presenting to you, we believe it's fiscally constrained,  
19 and even if it is adopted and money comes in, it can be amended.  
20 So I'll leave it at that.

21           VICE CHAIR STRATTON: Mr. Chairman.

22           CHAIRMAN HAMMOND: Go ahead, Board Member  
23 Stratton.

24           VICE CHAIR STRATTON: I appreciate all the  
25 comments that have been made, and Kristine, I appreciate your

1 forecast, but having been city/county manager and having  
2 financial directors work for me, it is their job to really look  
3 at the negative side, if you will, and make sure that everything  
4 is there. While I'm an optimist, I've always -- I believe that  
5 things will be clearer than what most financial people forecast.  
6 I agree with Sam that -- Board Members Elters that if we adopt a  
7 plan, it would be the one that was originally given to us. As  
8 far as the (inaudible) it will be.

9 I know that the Director's (inaudible), but  
10 having been on this board now for five years, I have tried to  
11 amend that plan previously two or three different times, and  
12 it's not quite as easy as it's made to be believed here. So I  
13 would be -- I cannot support the plan that was presented today  
14 and will not. I believe that we should (inaudible) money and  
15 adopt the plan that was originally given to us. Thank you.

16 CHAIRMAN HAMMOND: I think on the (inaudible) the  
17 issue of delay there; am I correct, Board Member Stratton?

18 VICE CHAIR STRATTON: Pardon me.

19 CHAIRMAN HAMMOND: (Inaudible) on the issue of  
20 delay there, you were talking about a previous plan that  
21 contains projects that are not out of the plan, correct?

22 VICE CHAIR STRATTON: That is correct, and I did  
23 (inaudible) the delay. I mean, I was hopeful we would have an  
24 answer to that question about the delay today, which we don't.  
25 So I felt like I had (inaudible) address it and it didn't.

1 Thank you.

2 CHAIRMAN HAMMOND: Yeah. I am a little  
3 disappointed, Director, that the question wasn't even asked on  
4 the delay. So I don't know -- you know, I'm not the kind that  
5 would vote no just because I'm angry, but (inaudible) board  
6 members, but --

7 MR. ELTERS: Mr. (Inaudible) --

8 CHAIRMAN HAMMOND: -- (inaudible) we will have  
9 better data for the June Meeting (inaudible) into the discussion  
10 if not the plan by then so we can at least have that information  
11 (inaudible) --

12 MR. ELTERS: Mr. Chairman.

13 CHAIRMAN HAMMOND: Yes. Go ahead.

14 MR. ELTERS: This is Board Member Elters.

15 I would say in fairness to the Director, as far  
16 as the question of whether the adoption of the five-year program  
17 can be delayed beyond June 30th, I -- what I'm hearing him say  
18 and (inaudible) so is that is a legal question we should be  
19 perhaps asking the Board attorney to weigh in on, and to that  
20 end, is the Board attorney, Michelle, on the call today? I'd  
21 like to hear from her.

22 MR. ROEHRICH: So this is Floyd Roehrich.

23 CHAIRMAN HAMMOND: Floyd, I'm guessing Michelle  
24 is not on the call?

25 MR. ROEHRICH: This is Floyd. No, Michelle was

1 on earlier.

2 DIRECTOR HALIKOWSKI: She's showing on the phone,  
3 Mr. Chairman.

4 MR. ROEHRICH: She may --

5 MS. KUNZMAN: This is Michelle. Can you hear me?

6 MR. ROEHRICH: Yes, Michelle. Yes.

7 MS. KUNZMAN: So I think in order to respond to  
8 the question about whether or not you have the ability to not  
9 vote on the plan by June 30th, that is -- you know, that is a  
10 statutory requirement. You know, I could certainly look into  
11 from a legal perspective what would happen or what the  
12 ramifications to the Board (inaudible) and the consequences  
13 (inaudible) requirement (inaudible) research on my end.

14 Just echoing what has been said by the Director,  
15 you know, I understand the Chair's point and some of the board  
16 members that there's a feeling that, you know, (inaudible)  
17 symbolic to make sure that we're actually making a decision  
18 based on good numbers, and what I hear the Department say is  
19 that it is fiscally constrained, and so, you know, the legal  
20 requirement would be to make a decision based on what you have,  
21 based on the data before June 30th, and pursuant to statute  
22 28-304, that does give the Board the authority to make changes.

23 To Board Member Stratton's point (inaudible)  
24 changes, we can certainly talk through that, and that could be  
25 the (inaudible) there is a pretty extensive outline what -- you

1 know, what can be done in terms of the changes throughout  
2 (inaudible).

3 But in order to answer the question of what would  
4 the consequence would be not (inaudible), I would need to do a  
5 little bit of research on that. The only other option that I  
6 can see is as I mentioned earlier, you would have to have some  
7 kind of amendment to the statute.

8 CHAIRMAN HAMMOND: If that's the case, we  
9 probably would. Nobody's trying to be rebellious here. We're  
10 just trying to put a plan out there that has, you know, a little  
11 bit better than two weeks of data on a significant generational  
12 event going on. I think our heart's in the right part -- right  
13 place on that discussion.

14 John, I'll give you kind of the last word on  
15 this, and maybe we can figure out a way to just move on here.

16 DIRECTOR HALIKOWSKI: Yeah. I (inaudible)  
17 Chairman, that I don't have a more definitive answer on the  
18 statutory question. I think your attorney's giving you good  
19 legal advice.

20 My goal in this was to meet the statutory data  
21 with a physically constrained plan with the idea that if  
22 revenues improve, projects that were already in the plan can  
23 come back, and that's a little different perhaps from amending  
24 the plan by adding a new project into it.

25 So we're trying to save the projects that we got

1 online. The Board is going to have priority choices to bring  
2 those back in. So, you know, I'm not trying to say that the  
3 amendment process is not something that we're going to have to  
4 engage in, but I think we're going to have to work together on  
5 this. So I'm trying to keep you statutorily sound by meeting  
6 your date with the go forward plan.

7 So that's all I have, Mr. Chairman.

8 CHAIRMAN HAMMOND: Okay. Thank you, Director.  
9 Any other Board member comments?

10 MR. KNIGHT: Yes. Chairman, this is Board Member  
11 Knight.

12 CHAIRMAN HAMMOND: Go ahead, Board Member Knight.

13 MR. KNIGHT: One question that I would like to  
14 address is, okay, if we were to be able to delay start approving  
15 the program for one or two months, what's the collateral --  
16 what's going to happen with the programs that were supposed to  
17 start July 1st, and on our NEPA program that we were supposed to  
18 have approved and didn't, and because we delayed for a month or  
19 two, what's going to happen to those programs that were supposed  
20 to be started during that time frame? Just a question.

21 CHAIRMAN HAMMOND: Good question. Go ahead,  
22 John.

23 DIRECTOR HALIKOWSKI: Well, Mr. Chairman, I would  
24 ask Dallas to step in here, because he and Greg have a much more  
25 detailed analysis of what's coming up, and this is a joint



1 effort between the money side, Kristine, and Dallas. So I would  
2 want them to address what happens if you don't have something  
3 adopted to the existing program to take its place.

4 MR. HAMMIT: Mr. Chairman, Director, this is  
5 Dallas Hammit.

6 DIRECTOR HALIKOWSKI: So Dallas or Kristine.

7 MS. WARD: So Mr. Chair, Mr. Knight, to the  
8 Director's point, Dallas and I have been working very closely  
9 together on what the process would be in terms of bringing  
10 things back on this program -- in this program, and we get more  
11 data (inaudible). The data that I will have at the next board  
12 meeting, June meeting, will only be one and a half months of  
13 data.

14 But to Mr. Knight's point, what (inaudible). You  
15 know, my conversation with Dallas about (inaudible) is the I-17  
16 project that's in the middle of procurement. It is estimated to  
17 (inaudible) that procurement isn't going to happen until  
18 December. So we actually have time. That was the whole point  
19 in this, how we buy ourself time in order to (inaudible). If we  
20 can (inaudible) and let our (inaudible) some of our existing  
21 forecasting processes take place, what I would envision is  
22 coming back to this board (inaudible) in between of what the  
23 actuals have been, but that would also allow us to go through  
24 our (inaudible) revenue estimating process that involves  
25 economists, outside economists, outside transportation

1 (inaudible), and then we get to bring those -- bring those  
2 projects that have been taken out of the (inaudible), they would  
3 be prioritized and be available to (inaudible) program  
4 (inaudible) three and a half months of data (inaudible) to get  
5 additional (inaudible).

6 CHAIRMAN HAMMOND: So if I understand correctly  
7 Ms. Ward, then you would envision if we approve this at the end  
8 of June, it would probably be in the September time frame where  
9 we would have sufficient data to make amendments based on the  
10 financial data; is that correct?

11 MS. WARD: Mr. Chairman, that is correct. That  
12 is what I had envisioned happening, because what occurred in  
13 August, when we have our local risk analysis process, that is  
14 where we go through our normal forecasting process. You have  
15 (inaudible) we'll have two and a half months of data and  
16 (inaudible), and we will then be able to come back to the Board  
17 in September (inaudible) conversations with the financial  
18 advisors (inaudible) that we can increase our (inaudible)  
19 general forecasting bonding, we will (inaudible) back into the  
20 program (inaudible) will come back and present these to the  
21 Board. So yes, sir, (Inaudible.)

22 CHAIRMAN HAMMOND: Board Member Knight, does that  
23 answer your question?

24 MR. KNIGHT: Yes. Thank you.

25 CHAIRMAN HAMMOND: Other comments (inaudible)?

1 MS. DANIELS: Yes. Chairman Hammond, this is  
2 Jenn Daniels.

3 CHAIRMAN HAMMOND: Go ahead, Board Member  
4 Daniels.

5 MS. DANIELS: Thank you.

6 I think my concern probably falls along the same  
7 lines as Board Member Searle and Elters, and that is that as we  
8 take programs out of this -- or excuse me -- the projects out of  
9 this program, we may be causing some unnecessary angst, because  
10 we don't know yet, and the fact of the matter is trying to  
11 re-add projects, obviously different people in different corners  
12 of our state (inaudible) about some of the projects that are  
13 being removed, and the fact of the matter is we don't know if  
14 that's necessary or unnecessary at this time. (Inaudible) make  
15 adjustments as needed along the way, strategically and both  
16 understanding the financial position that we're in.

17 I also hope that we are able to hopefully take  
18 advantage of a more favorable living environment as we move  
19 forward, and we don't know that yet either. And so we may be  
20 able to still accomplish our purposes, but I think we are  
21 causing some unnecessary or at least at this point unwarranted  
22 angst.

23 What we're seeing from a local level is our  
24 revenues are down about 10 to 13 percent. That's a significant  
25 (inaudible), it is, but it's not unmanageable, and so I don't

1 want to see us cause a lot of unnecessary concerns around the  
2 state by removing projects if it's not necessary. And so I  
3 don't doubt we need to make some tough decisions in the next  
4 several months, but I would prefer to leave the projects in the  
5 plan. Thank you.

6 DIRECTOR HALIKOWSKI: So Mr. Chairman, to that  
7 point, I respect your opinions on leaving projects in, but the  
8 problem is that most of the state money that we were forecasting  
9 as coming in is not there at this point, and so, you know, you  
10 can go ahead and think about approving projects in a  
11 non-fiscally constrained plan against the Department's  
12 recommendation, but you may be suffering angst down the road if  
13 those have to come out and we rebalance for those revenues not  
14 being there.

15 MS. DANIELS: And I appreciate that, but at that  
16 point we have hard data and information to be able to point to  
17 to say why this is why is we have to make this decision right  
18 this moment.

19 And I'm a proactive individual, so I get what you  
20 guys are attempting to do, but I think there are just too many  
21 unknowns, and I get that I'm the new one here. So I do see an  
22 opportunity for us to create some stability within the state,  
23 but also make some hard decisions as time allows.

24 DIRECTOR HALIKOWSKI: Well, I can assure you,  
25 Board Member, we have been making some very hard decisions as we

1     come to you, because it is not our pleasure to come to you with  
2     a recast plan and taking out projects, but it is our  
3     responsibility to come to you with what we believe is a fiscally  
4     constrained plan. And when we talk about hard data, I just want  
5     to be very careful that, as I watch what's going on out in the  
6     world, some of the data is indicating we better be conservative  
7     if there is a second wave of economic downturn due to virus. So  
8     I just want the Board to be aware of these things as we're  
9     moving forward. We take no pleasure in coming to you --

10                     MS. DANIELS: (Inaudible.)

11                     CHAIRMAN HAMMOND: Well, I agree with the  
12     Director. We have more than a responsibility for fiscal  
13     constraint. We have an obligation. You know, hence my thought  
14     process and Board Member Stratton's to at least try to delay  
15     (inaudible) in the plan. And so, you know, again, Board Member  
16     Stratton asked that question a month ago, and we probably should  
17     have had a better answer for him at this board meeting, but to  
18     put out a fiscally -- a plan that's not fiscally constrained, I  
19     don't think is a good idea. I'm not even sure we can. I think  
20     if we had legal ramifications, it is in the area of being  
21     fiscally constrained in any recommendation we make for the use  
22     of revenues, so --

23                     MR. THOMPSON: Chairman.

24                     CHAIRMAN HAMMOND: (Inaudible) in a better place  
25     now than we were a half an hour ago, but it's been a good

1 discussion. (Inaudible) --

2 MR. THOMPSON: Chairman.

3 CHAIRMAN HAMMOND: Other board members? Go  
4 ahead.

5 MR. THOMPSON: Chairman. Chairman Hammond.

6 CHAIRMAN HAMMOND: (Inaudible.) Yes.

7 MR. THOMPSON: Yes. I do feel -- I would feel  
8 better if there was better data, better information that we  
9 could go by, and right now it's just a lot of things that we're  
10 anticipating, like come about in the next two, three months, and  
11 I'm just looking at all these projects. Some of them are going  
12 to be painful to the community that's got these projects up to  
13 this point, and these are some programs that are being  
14 recommended to go away, and those have been very helpful to the  
15 smaller communities, and I do feel that we need to have our  
16 attorney to look a little bit deeper into this. What is it that  
17 we can do without having to break the law, but again, be able to  
18 move forward with the information that we have, and then make a  
19 good judgment based on the information that's going to be given  
20 to us sometime between here and June.

21 So again, thank you very much, Chairman.

22 CHAIRMAN HAMMOND: Okay. Any other board members  
23 want to (inaudible)?

24 MR. ELTERS: Mr. Chairman, one last thought, just  
25 at least in my own mind to wrap up and summarizing, and that is

1 I think we're all on board with adopting a fiscally constrained  
2 program. We understand it's an obligation and it's a must. I  
3 think what defines as fiscally constrained and the basis on  
4 which if we determine whether we're fiscally constrained or not  
5 is at the heart of the debate. We've made an assumption that  
6 the impact is going to disappear. We've (inaudible) the program  
7 to that degree, and now we're saying we can adopt a fiscally  
8 constrained program.

9 I think what many of the board members, including  
10 myself, are suggesting that (inaudible) fiscally constrained  
11 program, but it's the basis on which we build that are not as  
12 severe as we started with (inaudible). We ought to approach it  
13 with more caution.

14 As Board Member Daniels indicates, we do -- we  
15 can (inaudible) always do (inaudible) proactive. It's perhaps  
16 (inaudible) or maybe even easier to (inaudible) a sense of let's  
17 wait for the (inaudible) and build on it, and (inaudible) then  
18 delete -- let me rephrase that -- or postpone projects  
19 (inaudible) at the right time (inaudible) challenge or impact to  
20 those projects. Thank you.

21 CHAIRMAN HAMMOND: So Board Member, you're  
22 suggesting we go ahead and approve it at the end of June and  
23 then look for adjustments as we go on? Is that what I'm hearing  
24 or not?

25 MR. ROEHRICH: So Mr. Chair, this is Floyd.

1 MR. ELTERS: Chairman Hammond and board members,  
2 fellow board members, I'm suggesting if we must adopt the  
3 five-year program in -- by June 30th, that it not (inaudible)  
4 program that is based on the worst case scenario. That  
5 (inaudible). So what we have to do together may take some  
6 effort. We may have to have two plans in front of us. One is  
7 the original, you know, based on the different financial  
8 forecasts, and then the -- then the (inaudible) in front of us  
9 today, and we have an opportunity to perhaps vote on both of  
10 them.

11 CHAIRMAN HAMMOND: Okay. Thank you. You'd make  
12 a good county manager somewhere.

13 DIRECTOR HALIKOWSKI: Mr. Chairman --

14 CHAIRMAN HAMMOND: (Inaudible.)

15 DIRECTOR HALIKOWSKI: Mr. Chairman, Kristine is  
16 trying to raise her hand and would like to comment.

17 CHAIRMAN HAMMOND: All right. Kristine, go for  
18 it.

19 MS. WARD: Mr. Chairman, I was (inaudible)  
20 referencing (inaudible) I was (inaudible) the revised tentative  
21 plan, but adding to that plan (inaudible) illustrative project,  
22 and illustrative is probably a poor choice of words (inaudible)  
23 identified the prioritized projects that has (inaudible)  
24 available (inaudible) projects would be added back into the  
25 program (inaudible) to the (inaudible) associated to those



1 projects (inaudible) the constrained program in that the funding  
2 (inaudible) you could (inaudible) that were originally taken  
3 out. I wanted to provide that as a possibility.

4 CHAIRMAN HAMMOND: That might be a good idea. I  
5 mean, I recognize even that list might be revised. The language  
6 (inaudible) top ten projects that point wise come up as the  
7 (inaudible) money becomes available as we could, we have  
8 prioritized those projects, it would be nice to know that what  
9 the ten projects are, I guess. Is that a problem with you, John  
10 or Floyd or any of the Board or Greg? Is that something we  
11 could look through?

12 DIRECTOR HALIKOWSKI: So Mr. Chairman, I think  
13 that's something we can develop to give you assurances that if  
14 revenues come up, that these are the projects that cascade back  
15 in.

16 So, you know, again, I want to caution folks,  
17 because they'll come to me and say, Director, we gave you more  
18 money. What did you do with it? Well, how much money? When is  
19 it coming? What form does it take or restrictions on it? So  
20 you know, people say I'm going to give you some money  
21 (inaudible). Well, it depends on whether it's ready or not to  
22 build and how that money's going to come in.

23 So I think we can deliver the list with the  
24 caveat for what has to happen for that project to come back.  
25 Here's the amount of state money needed. Here's the (inaudible)

1 need to be done, et cetera. So we have talked about that  
2 internally to say what would that look like (inaudible) give you  
3 assurances if you say (inaudible) the I-17. Here are the steps  
4 that have to happen to put it back into the program.

5 CHAIRMAN HAMMOND: I think that's fair enough,  
6 Director. Any other board members comments?

7 MR. ROEHRICH: We agree with him? Do we have any  
8 issue with that?

9 MR. KNIGHT: Chairman, this is Board Member  
10 Knight.

11 CHAIRMAN HAMMOND: Go ahead.

12 MR. KNIGHT: I think at this point we already  
13 know we have lost a considerable amount of revenue. It's gone.  
14 It's not coming back. Even if the economy comes back quickly,  
15 the money that we lost is lost. Our best hope is for it to come  
16 back to the level that it was prior to COVID. I don't think we  
17 can look for it to come back to the point where it's going to --  
18 where we're going to get back the revenue that we have already  
19 lost during this two, three-month period of time. That money is  
20 gone.

21 So the original program as it was presented to us  
22 is not fiscally responsible anymore. Even -- even if the  
23 economy does come back quickly, it -- and for us -- and I agree  
24 with Chairman Hammond, I don't think we can approve a program  
25 that's not fiscally responsible. I think it's (inaudible) to

1 try to make sure that we do.

2 As long as we have a plan that is (inaudible) and  
3 brings programs back, it's my understanding I guess we're not  
4 going to run right out and give the two grants back, the BUILD  
5 grant or the TIGER grand or the -- and the INFRA grant,  
6 amounting to, what, \$150 million. We're not going to run out  
7 and give that money back. We've got time before that would have  
8 to happen, so -- and I don't know how much time, but I think  
9 we've got quite a lot of time on such as the INFRA grant. I  
10 think I did hear it was 2022 or something like that before we  
11 would have to make that decision, but nevertheless, as long as  
12 we're not going to run right out and give back \$150 million in  
13 grants, and we have some time on those, we're good there, and I  
14 think we're -- that gives us time to work with our Congressional  
15 delegation, senators and representatives to make sure that they  
16 are aware and can eliminate those matching fund requirements  
17 that are -- seem like (inaudible).

18 That seems to me for the feds to be a no brainer,  
19 because it's not going to cost us any money. The grant's been  
20 awarded. The grant we would still get. They just have to cut  
21 the red tape and the strings, the matching fund strings so that  
22 we can use those funds for what they were intended, whether we  
23 have all of the matching funds right at that time or not.  
24 Anyway, that's where I stand on it.

25 CHAIRMAN HAMMOND: (Inaudible) infrastructure

1 bill at the federal level at some point. That seems to have  
2 some momentum. See whether it goes anywhere.

3 Any other comments?

4 Okay. All the discussions of staff, I appreciate  
5 your patience. Board members, also. Very good input. Very  
6 respectful, and let's try to get through this (inaudible) the  
7 best we can. Is anybody else on the conference call this  
8 (inaudible) discussion?

9 Okay. Hearing none, I'll move on to Item 2, kind  
10 of along the same subject, communication protocols, and this was  
11 an item that came up as a -- a subject for the study session,  
12 and (inaudible) Floyd lead off the conversation.

13 MR. ROEHRICH: So thank you, Mr. Chair.

14 This has been a topic that's come up for --  
15 multiple times. It's come up by different board members, but it  
16 became apparent last board meeting that there was a number of  
17 issues or concerns, and when we discussed putting together this  
18 agenda, Mr. Chair, you did think -- or you did say let's agenda  
19 it. Let's let the board members bring their issues, concerns  
20 and ideas or thoughts on how they want to better improve our  
21 communications between staff, board members, and even board  
22 members themselves. And so we're here to listen, take  
23 recommendations, and then go back and see what we can do as  
24 staff to make sure we're meeting the needs that you, Mr. Chair,  
25 and the other board members have. So I really am opening up now

1 to the board members to share with us the thoughts, concerns and  
2 any thoughts on how to improve it.

3 CHAIRMAN HAMMOND: Who wants to lead us with  
4 their first comments on this issue?

5 MR. KNIGHT: Mr. Chair, this is Board Member  
6 Knight.

7 CHAIRMAN HAMMOND: Go ahead, Board Member Knight.

8 MR. KNIGHT: And I was one of the ones when I  
9 first got on the Board that suggested -- what I would like to  
10 see is on the PowerPoints and information that was brought to us  
11 during the meeting, it would be so helpful if we could get those  
12 electronically at the same time we get the agenda. So when we  
13 study the agenda and we look at what's on the agenda and we --  
14 then we can go to those PowerPoints and have a -- we can look at  
15 them, be informed, have -- if we have questions when they're  
16 presented at the board meeting, we'll already have the questions  
17 ready. We won't be seeing that PowerPoint for the first time.  
18 I would certainly like to have it at the same time  
19 electronically. I don't need it to come paper. I mean,  
20 electronically, send to us so that we'll have it at the same  
21 time that we have the agenda at least.

22 And I realize when I asked for it a year or two  
23 ago, I -- it worked for the first month or two, and I was -- and  
24 I got them, and then after that they went away, and I -- the  
25 only explanation I had, well, the PowerPoints, a lot of those

1 were not ready until the day of the meeting or the day before  
2 the meeting.

3 But, you know, the agenda -- you have the agenda  
4 ready on the Friday or whatever, beginning of the week when the  
5 meeting's on Friday. It seems reasonable to be able to expect  
6 to get the PowerPoint presentations in a little more timely  
7 manner so that we can look them over prior to the meeting.

8 And that's all I have, Mr. Chairman. Thank you.

9 CHAIRMAN HAMMOND: I mean, I will concur with  
10 that. Even the day before. I would take the time to review  
11 them and you could formulate questions, but what's the notice  
12 time for the board meeting? Is it a week prior we have to go  
13 public with it or what's that time frame?

14 MR. ROEHRICH: So Mr. Chair, this is Floyd. The  
15 agenda only has to be posted 24 hours before. Previously --

16 CHAIRMAN HAMMOND: Okay.

17 MR. ROEHRICH: Previously, we've had board  
18 members ask for it early as much as possible so they can review,  
19 because there is a lot of background data in there, whether it's  
20 the PPAC actions, the construction contracts, previous meeting  
21 minutes, the items that are in there. So we've always pushed to  
22 send it out the week before, that Friday before.

23 And yeah, I'll go back and talk with staff about  
24 how quickly -- you know, if we can still get the agenda out, how  
25 quickly we can have those presentations ready and the

1 information. You know, some of it is dynamic. There's no doubt  
2 about it. You know, we're going through that right now with the  
3 financial situation. Want to make decisions on dynamic  
4 information that is either so minimal amount of data or it's  
5 constantly changing.

6 So we can work at how quickly we can pull  
7 together the staff's information and presentations and get those  
8 out as well, whether it could be at the same time as the agenda  
9 or definitely before the meetings. So we'll discuss that.

10 CHAIRMAN HAMMOND: Okay. Go ahead, Board Member  
11 Stratton.

12 VICE CHAIR STRATTON: First off, I'd like to  
13 thank the staff. Over the past few years, I have asked for  
14 several reports be generated, specifically on projects for  
15 Dallas, and those reports have been most helpful, and I  
16 appreciate them. I do think that what Mr. Knight is asking for  
17 is reasonable and would be beneficial to us, also.

18 CHAIRMAN HAMMOND: One of the things you -- staff  
19 has done, Floyd, I haven't seen it recently, was we were invited  
20 to enter into the P2P conversations at the engineering level,  
21 and I know I did go into a couple of meetings. I didn't  
22 comment, but it was very interesting to hear the conversation  
23 back and forth as projects were discussed. I don't know if any  
24 other board members took the time to enter those and found them  
25 helpful. I'd ask --

1 MR. THOMPSON: Chairman.

2 CHAIRMAN HAMMOND: (Inaudible.) Yes. Go ahead.

3 MR. THOMPSON: Chairman, this is Member -- Board  
4 Member Thompson. Let me read to you what I have forwarded to  
5 staff, the Director, but I did have a conversation with  
6 Mr. Roehrich prior to my sending this letter out.

7 It says that regarding ADOT staff recommendation,  
8 the deferred Rio de Flag Bridge project until 2021 discussed at  
9 the April 28th telephonic meeting, I'm concerned about the way  
10 the information was conveyed to the team project leaders and the  
11 City of Flagstaff, MetroPlan and to me. I don't feel there was  
12 adequate notification prior to the meeting of ADOT's  
13 recommendations to defer the project.

14 I have discussed this concern with Mr. Roehrich  
15 and appreciated his response, but I am confident that you and  
16 your team will look to strengthen the process on notifying  
17 (inaudible) to alert the board members of these later project  
18 changes well in advance of a meeting.

19 So my -- I guess my concern is to make sure that  
20 those people that initiate a project are notified of these  
21 changes, and it's kind of late to have a healthy discussion on  
22 that when these kinds of changes are given to us during the  
23 board meeting. So again, that's my comment on it. So I think  
24 there could be an improvement made to how the information is  
25 disseminated by the project leaders.



1                   CHAIRMAN HAMMOND: Thank you, Board Member  
2 Thompson.

3                   Any comments from staff on Board Member  
4 Thompson's request?

5                   MR. ROEHRICH: So Mr. Chair, this is Floyd. Yes.  
6 You know, as we're developing projects, we're obviously in  
7 contact with a lot of stakeholders. And on the Rio de Flag,  
8 specifically, I was told by our development folks they had been  
9 talking with the City staff that was assigned to that project.  
10 How that information gets disseminated within the City when the  
11 mayor and the city council said we were surprised by that, you  
12 know, I don't know -- we -- I guess we feel how far do we go,  
13 and when we're coordinating with our staff members, from our  
14 stakeholders who are part of the project, and then how that  
15 gets -- is disseminated through their organization.

16                   I don't want to be defensive. We can go back,  
17 and I've asked Dallas' team to look at that in the future as we  
18 develop these projects, but we do reach out to stakeholders. We  
19 have a lot of stakeholders and staff from cities, counties and  
20 other jurisdictions involved in the project development process.  
21 We have team meetings. We share information. It's just a  
22 question of how is that information disseminated to the breadth  
23 that maybe people are looking at.

24                   And so obviously we can do better at that, and  
25 we're going to continue to look for that. I don't know. Dallas

1 is here. He may want to comment specifically to that or  
2 procedurally what he and his team have been working on, but that  
3 is how we responded to Mr. Thompson, and that's how we  
4 approached the Rio de Flag.

5 MR. HAMMIT: Mr. Chairman, this is Dallas. On  
6 that specifically, we were responding to an emergency need on  
7 Interstate 40. There were trucks parking on the ramps, backing  
8 up on the interstate, and we needed to make action as soon as  
9 possible. We couldn't just add a program -- a project to the  
10 program without removing something so that we stayed fiscally  
11 constrained. We looked at the projects that were ready to go  
12 and one that worked.

13 In this case, there were some utility work that  
14 needed to be done. We've looked at moving, and that action  
15 moved it basically one month. We've moved it from June of 2020  
16 into the next fiscal year, but it was planned as it was stated  
17 at that time to be awarded in -- or to advertise in July of  
18 2020. Definitely we moved very fast to meet that need. We can  
19 do better in communicating and we will in the future, but that  
20 was the purpose of that -- that group of projects, to address an  
21 emergency need on Interstate 40.

22 MR. THOMPSON: Chairman.

23 CHAIRMAN HAMMOND: Go ahead, Board Member.

24 MR. THOMPSON: Again, I do appreciate -- I do  
25 believe that there is some kind of maybe some things that were

1 composed that you will be doing to improve my concern, and I  
2 certainly do appreciate that, and then I certainly do appreciate  
3 everything the staff is doing. So again, I think this is a  
4 healthy discussion, because we need to (inaudible) need to come  
5 back (inaudible) people up here, up north. So again, thank you  
6 very much.

7 MR. KNIGHT: Mr. Chair, this is Board Member  
8 Knight.

9 CHAIRMAN HAMMOND: Go ahead, Board Member Knight.

10 MR. KNIGHT: To Board Member Thompson's issue, I  
11 think what he's really getting at is if I'm representing four  
12 counties or three counties or what -- whatever area that --  
13 whatever district each one of us represents, when you have --  
14 when ADOT has a conversation with the stakeholders, it doesn't  
15 make us look too good if the stakeholders come to us and say,  
16 hey, look, what's going on with this project, you know, and we  
17 don't know anything about it.

18 So I think we need to be in the loop with the  
19 stakeholders so that we're up-to-date with what's going on when  
20 you do have a conversation about a project within our district.  
21 We're including in the stakeholders so that we get the  
22 information and know what's going on so when they come to us, we  
23 don't just give them a blank stare. That's just not, for me,  
24 acceptable, and I think that goes to Board Member Thompson's  
25 concerns as well. Thank you, Mr. Chair.

1                   CHAIRMAN HAMMOND: Yeah. I think you bring up a  
2 good point. I mean, (inaudible) the definition of what  
3 significant means is the question, but -- but I think staff  
4 knows when they're dealing with something that might be  
5 controversial with a particular city, either putting something  
6 in on a positive note, taking something on a negative note, and  
7 I don't know how you would kind of notice the board member of  
8 the district, but -- and again, what's significant? We don't  
9 want to -- but I would suspect it's not -- one or two of those a  
10 year for any one district. So maybe there's a better  
11 communication process of identifying what a board member might  
12 get pinged on, pinged by on one of his constituents, and at  
13 least have him say I'm aware of that.

14                   Anything there, Floyd, you think might be  
15 possible to do?

16                   MR. ROEHRICH: So Mr. Chair, this is Floyd.

17                   Yeah. Yes. We have tried in the past when we  
18 know something has been controversial to make the board members  
19 aware. When we were holding board meetings out at the  
20 communities -- remember we used to get those community profile  
21 updates prior to each meeting, and usually it would list the  
22 issues that are going on in that community. Now, obviously with  
23 140 projects under development at any one time and a -- 90 in  
24 construction or whatever it is, keeping board members involved  
25 in every communication on the project is obviously -- that's

1 going to probably be just untenable.

2           But I do think sitting down with staff, we can  
3 look for those areas if we see that it's causing an issue with  
4 local government staff, and we know that it looks like it's  
5 probably going to be escalated to their leadership, we need to  
6 make sure that you board members are aware of that. And so we  
7 can go back and talk about how we can identify, as you said,  
8 those few issues each year that look like they're going to be  
9 controversial with a local government or another agency and look  
10 to give board members heads up.

11           So we might -- we'll see what's about developing  
12 an issues board or issues roster that we can have for each of  
13 the board districts. We'll look at something like that.

14           CHAIRMAN HAMMOND: Well, something that kind of  
15 formalizes it so we don't do it for a month and then have it go  
16 away. Maybe there's just a reminder, I don't know, checklist or  
17 something that, you know, allows this kind of discussion not to  
18 get lost over time, because I do think the identification of  
19 significant issues for a board member in their district is an  
20 important component that ought to be (inaudible).

21           Other comments? Input?

22           MR. ROEHRICH: So Mr. Chair, this is Floyd again.  
23 Just one more point to that.

24           I think you'd also have to be a little realistic  
25 here in that as we're doing day-to-day business with some of the

1 local governments or stakeholders, yes, they're probably going  
2 to have information that we're dealing with at that time ahead  
3 of the board members. So I can't control how they react to it  
4 and if they reach out to board members.

5 I don't think there's any -- to me, I don't think  
6 there would be an issue if the board member would say, you know,  
7 I have not been fully brought up on that. I will get the  
8 information. I'll make sure to get you a response, and then  
9 follow up with staff, because there are going to be things going  
10 on in real time that maybe are ahead of us that local government  
11 might feel is important to them that we didn't -- you know,  
12 either been told to us that that's going to be an issue or that  
13 they're really upset with that issue. You know, we're just  
14 communicating with them, and they take it to a board member.

15 We need to be responsive when we also are asked  
16 those questions. So please remember to contact us when you have  
17 those issues, and we will get the response for you so you can  
18 respond back to your constituent stakeholders.

19 CHAIRMAN HAMMOND: A lot of good points, Floyd.  
20 I do have a responsibility. I hesitate to ask questions  
21 sometimes, because we overkill the response, and I hate to  
22 (inaudible) staff do so much work. So I've always appreciated  
23 the response.

24 And another point you made earlier, it wouldn't  
25 be the first time politicians don't read their pile of

1 (inaudible) on their desk, and staff knows everything that's  
2 going on, and the politician claims they didn't know, and then  
3 they call a -- you know, call a board member and complain. So  
4 that happens, I think, a lot where staff is just (inaudible) via  
5 memos and stuff, but the politicians (inaudible) with the amount  
6 of materials that they get to read hasn't noticed until somebody  
7 calls to complain, and then they blame lack of communication.  
8 So there's a lot of that that goes on, too.

9 Other board members, this is a good conversation.  
10 I think if you have thoughts, now is the time to weigh in on it.  
11 (Inaudible.)

12 Okay. Hearing none, we'll close Item 2 and  
13 hopefully (inaudible) discussion will go on to Item 3, which is  
14 the board meeting schedule. Floyd.

15 MR. ROEHRICH: So -- and real quick, and if any  
16 board member wants to contact me after this meeting to talk  
17 about communication issues, things that they maybe thought of  
18 outside of this, please let me know. Staff is here to work and  
19 develop and take care of the agency's mission, but support the  
20 Board in its mission as well, and that's what we want to do.

21 So on Item 3, talking with the board chair, we  
22 are looking at kind of this slowly opening of our society and  
23 our government. We've been given guidance from the Governor's  
24 office. We're following the Center For Disease Control, CDC  
25 guidance.

1                   Somebody's making a lot of noise. Could they  
2 please, if you can, mute your phone for now? There's a lot of  
3 background noise. Thank you.

4                   So one of the things talking with the board chair  
5 is through this summer, we are looking at using Webex events.  
6 So that means on the June 19th meeting, that will be a Webex  
7 instead of going to Payson. On the July 17th meeting, that will  
8 be a Webex instead of going to Chinle. And August 21st was  
9 going to be a telephonic meeting, Webex meeting anyway, and that  
10 really was to deal with either high priority programming issues  
11 or award construction contracts. There was not a plan to meet  
12 then.

13                   So we would be looking later this fall as we see  
14 the opening of government, we see how any issues with either the  
15 continued COVID-19 concerns or we starting to -- with all the  
16 measurements we take in health and safety wise, we can start  
17 moving into a meeting. We would be looking to hold meeting  
18 later this fall, and then working out whatever guidance is at  
19 the time for social distancing, managing large groups of people,  
20 manage the safety element of us getting back together.

21                   In addition, I wanted to update everybody that I  
22 was contacted by the MPO director who was going to be hosting  
23 the rural summit in October. That was canceled this year. It  
24 is still looking to be in the Casa Grande area, but not until  
25 2021. So in October we would look at whether there's a venue



1 available or if we would maybe do a remote for that process.

2           So I guess I wanted to -- and Mr. Chair, I wanted  
3 to hear, obviously, input on this or suggestions as well, but as  
4 we talk, we basically were intending to go through the summer,  
5 use Webex events, the distance and remote meeting until such  
6 time as we can start safely going out to other venues.

7           In addition, the one thing we are able to do here  
8 is in our conference room, we think we got the ability to bring  
9 board members who want to get together, bring them into ADOT's  
10 admin. building in the conference room we're in right now and  
11 accommodate the board members and keep the guidance for social  
12 distancing, using face covers -- we're using face covers here --  
13 using the recommended guidelines to start bringing groups  
14 together, but keeping them to about ten people or so at any one  
15 event or at any one activity.

16           This way the board members could meet and  
17 possibly start interacting together over the next few months as  
18 we look to go back out and start meeting with the public. The  
19 public would still be remote access. There would be no public  
20 allowed in our facilities in these meetings, because we don't  
21 have the ability to handle crowds that large and keep our social  
22 distancing guidelines, but at least for the next three months,  
23 June, July and August, there would be Webex remote activities  
24 with the option of bringing board members here into ADOT's  
25 conference room, where we're at now, and hold them as a Webex

1 event and meeting our social distance guidelines.

2 So that's what we talked about. That was what we  
3 wanted to share with the board members, and then obviously,  
4 Mr. Chair, any comments you have referencing that as well, and  
5 then any guidance that you feel that we need to take as we move  
6 forward.

7 CHAIRMAN HAMMOND: Well, sure. I would want  
8 to -- in fact, I planned on doing the meeting today (inaudible).  
9 You know, subject to, you know, safety protocols, I want to try  
10 meeting. If it has to be in Phoenix, I'll be there, and if the  
11 other board members are comfortable and want to travel, it would  
12 be nice to get them there. Ultimately, we need to get back into  
13 the communities. I know it's a lot of time, but (inaudible)  
14 going into these communities and how much they appreciated us  
15 being there. So overwhelmingly positive. We need to get back.

16 I'm really going to miss the visit to Chinle,  
17 Jesse. I really enjoyed visiting up into your neck of the woods  
18 last time, but it isn't going to happen this time.

19 So yeah. Sooner rather than later. Obviously,  
20 safety protocols and board member (inaudible). Webex is fine.  
21 We seem to -- I think this meeting went better than the last  
22 one, and (inaudible) was the one before that, (inaudible) it's  
23 hard to believe we're only a little over 90 days into this.  
24 Think about that. May, June, July -- or March, April, May. A  
25 lot has happened, and a lot will happen in the next 90 days. So

1 it's frightening, and (inaudible) getting together rather than  
2 not, again subject to safety protocol.

3 Any other board members want to have some  
4 comments there? (Inaudible.)

5 Okay. I guess everybody agrees with that  
6 strategy.

7 MR. ROEHRICH: So Mr. Chair, this is Floyd again.  
8 So that's how we will move forward. We will start planning for  
9 those, and we will start planning for board members to be here.  
10 And like, for instance, Mr. Thompson, he -- since he's had some  
11 issues with his internet connection at -- in his home, he  
12 actually traveled to Flagstaff, but he's up at the district  
13 office there. We could also look at some type of accommodation  
14 as well.

15 So we will look at the options that we have  
16 available to us to make these meetings effective, efficient, get  
17 the board members together so they can collaborate and work on  
18 their items, but do it in the safe, responsible way based upon  
19 the guidance we are given.

20 So we'll continue to coordinate that. I will  
21 work with board members as we address their needs and move  
22 forward, and I agree with you as we have a host facilitator that  
23 has really done a super job of getting us informed. We have our  
24 IT group here at ADOT that is also helping us -- keep us move  
25 forward, and as staff, we're continuing to learn all along that

1 we do.

2 So collaboratively, all of us working together  
3 are finding a better way to social distance and get the work  
4 done that we can. So technology's finally helping us.

5 I resisted iPhone. I resisted a computer access.  
6 I resisted all that stuff, because I like leaving the house,  
7 because that's where my wife's at. So I like coming to work.  
8 But we're all making it work, and I appreciate the Board's  
9 patience in working with us.

10 MR. KNIGHT: Mr. Chairman, this is Board Member  
11 Knight.

12 CHAIRMAN HAMMOND: Go ahead.

13 MR. KNIGHT: I would just like to thank staff and  
14 Floyd and the rest of the staff, the Director, for all the work  
15 they've put in to making this happen. This one -- this Webex  
16 wet very, very smoothly, in my opinion. It's the best one so  
17 far. Very -- getting very comfortable with this, but I too  
18 would like to see us, if we can in June, the June 19th meeting,  
19 I would like to be -- I will travel to Phoenix and be there in  
20 person and do the social distancing and the mask and all that.

21 But I still want to thank staff for all their --  
22 all the work that they went into to put this on and to continue  
23 to do that and to be available. Whenever I had questions and  
24 concerns, I've been able to email Floyd, and he's right on it.  
25 He gets back with me, whatever answer to whatever question I've

1 asked, and I think thank him for that. It has been very  
2 helpful. Thank you, Mr. Chair.

3 CHAIRMAN HAMMOND: (Inaudible.)

4 MR. THOMPSON: Mr. Chairman.

5 CHAIRMAN HAMMOND: Yes. Go ahead. Board Member  
6 Thompson, was it? I'm not hearing somebody.

7 MR. THOMPSON: Can you hear me now?

8 CHAIRMAN HAMMOND: Yes.

9 MR. THOMPSON: Okay. Again, I just certainly  
10 would like to say thank you to the administration, the staff for  
11 everything they're doing. Certainly it is a little difficult  
12 being way out there, as I call it, in the remote area. Even my  
13 teleconference or my Zoom meetings aren't too good. So I have  
14 to come up (inaudible) community in order to be part of this  
15 meeting. So maybe (inaudible), but anything that Floyd, the  
16 staff can do that make (inaudible) a little bit better. I don't  
17 know that would be. I have no recommendation.

18 Again (inaudible) in this type of situation as  
19 far as technology is concerned. So I certainly do appreciate  
20 he's wanting to do what he can to make sure that communication  
21 happens between the (inaudible). So thank you very much.

22 CHAIRMAN HAMMOND: Thank you, Board Member  
23 Thompson.

24 All right. Any other comments? If not, I'll  
25 entertain a motion for adjournment.

1 MR. THOMPSON: I would so move.

2 MR. ELTERS: Second.

3 CHAIRMAN HAMMOND: Okay. A motion by Board  
4 Member Thompson, second by Board Member Elters.

5 All in favor?

6 BOARD MEMBERS: Aye.

7 CHAIRMAN HAMMOND: All right. Thank you,  
8 everyone. Thank you, staff. Thank you, John, Floyd, Kristine.

9 (Meeting adjourned.)

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

1 STATE OF ARIZONA )  
 ) ss.  
 2 COUNTY OF MARICOPA )  
 3

4 BE IT KNOWN that the foregoing proceedings were reported by  
 5 me, TERESA A. WATSON, Registered Merit Reporter, Certified  
 6 Reporter, Certificate No. 50876, State of Arizona, from an  
 7 electronic recording and were reduced to written form under my  
 8 direction; that the foregoing 62 pages constitute a true and  
 9 accurate transcript of said electronic recording, all done to  
 10 the best of my skill and ability.

11 I FURTHER CERTIFY that I am in no way related to any of the  
 12 parties hereto, nor am I in any way interested in the outcome  
 13 hereof.

14 DATED at Phoenix, Arizona, this 7th day of July 2020.  
 15  
 16

17 Teresa A. Watson  
 18 TERESA A. WATSON, RMR  
 19 Certified Reporter  
 Certificate No. 50876  
 20  
 21  
 22  
 23  
 24  
 25