MINUTES

9:00 a.m., Friday, December 16, 2016 City of Surprise Council Chambers 16000 N. Civic Center Plaza Surprise, AZ 85374

Pledge

The Pledge of Allegiance was led by Board Chairman Joe La Rue.

Roll call by Board Secretary Mary Beckley

In attendance: Joe La Rue, Deanna Beaver, William Cuthbertson, Jack Sellers, Michael Hammond, Steve

Stratton and Arlando Teller (arrived at 9:10am)

Absent: None.

There were approximately 50 people in the audience.

Opening Remarks

Chairman La Rue thanked everyone for attending and acknowledged his last meeting as Chairman.

Call to the Audience:

The following members of the public addressed the Board:

- 1. Roland Winters, Jr., Surprise Councilman, re: welcomed board to Surprise; congratulated ADOT on the Bell Road/Grand bridge, great job on a good project, under budget and on time.
- 2. Christian Price, Maricopa Mayor, re: update board on process moving forward with RTA to raise money, working closely with AZ League of Cities and Town and GPEC ambassadors to educate legislators on transportation issues; hopes for successful RTA on ballot in the next 6-8 months; congratulated ADOT on Surprise bridge; requested ADOT to inform public and businesses on Maricopa overpass project/disruptions just as they worked with the Surprise community.
- 3. Glen Kephart, Navajo County Public Works Director, re: support of US 60 and Penrod Road project on consent agenda, important for County to increase traffic capacity and safety and opportunity for development, thank board and department to move project forward; requested one modification to request final design to accommodate bicycles in the intersection; thanked Board member Teller for service to state and Navajo County, Navajo Nation, Hope tribe, White Mountain Apache tribe appreciates his efforts.
- 4. Scott Sinclair, resident in area, asked that his comments be summarized into the record by Floyd Roehrich; comments attached in minutes on next page, re: closure of Post Ranch Road by private land developer.
- 5. Brad Hagen, AZ Airports Association President, re: appreciation to board for support of state aviation fund and working through the recent grant deferral process for airports; thank Mike Kies and Mike Klein on great job communicating and coordinating with all airports on this difficult issue; significant outreach; Gladys Wiggins, Yuma airport director, asked to express Yuma's appreciation/thrilled working through their deferral process and that's been resolved; events coming up Aviation Day at the Capitol on Jan 17 and spring conference May 20, welcomed board to attend these events.

Comments on 12/16/16 by Scott Sinclair summarized into record by Floyd Roehrich, ADOT Executive Officer:

Hon Board members and staff, my name is Scott Sinclair and I am a Cochise County resident in Saint David, AZ. at 1275 S Lee St (Hwy 80). I am here to ask for your help and assistance to address the illegal August 2016 gating and closure of Post Ranch Road inside the Benson City limits by a private land developer. It is a Common Law Public road which is established at law by State Statute ARS 28-7041 sec (C) and used by the public in an unrestricted manner for well over 65 years (County Hwy Dept Central Files Map B21-8 Sheet 4, General Hwy Map). The City of Benson, in Council Resolution 23-94 identifies the road as being used as a "public roadway" and also indemnifies the City for use thereof. This Resolution has never been amended, changed or rescinded per recent City of Benson certification. There are also many examples of AZ case law that support the reopening of this road, the most notable is at the AZ Supreme Court level in Pleak vs. Entrada. This historic, public roadway runs a length of approx 4.4 miles and connects State Hwy 80 to State Hwy 90. It is a "primitive" road that has seen County/City maintenance, agency signing and ADOT paved aprons, cattle guards and even a dedicated turnout off of Hwy 90, all at tax payers' expense. It also provides public access to 2000 acres of AZ State Trust Land (via State Rec permit or hunting license). This vital road is identified and mapped (see poster board) for improvement and paving as a medium priority project in the 2007 Benson Small Area Transportation Plan, partially funded by ADOT. It is also mapped and discussed in the 2014/2015 Update to the Benson General Plan. Furthermore it is identified as a connector road in the Cochise County General Development Plan as well as being mapped in the 1966 ADOT Cochise County Road Atlas. It is also identified in the Cochise County Hazard Mitigation Plan by map. Emergency routes and connectors are a public concern and a recent SV Herald opinion piece states just why this would tie in to having this vital connector returned and reopened to the public as a traversable roadway.

Because of the very limited number of routes in this local area transportation network (I-10, Hwy 80, Hwy 90 and Post Ranch Road) that tie the area together, we feel that it is time for the public to address the Transportation Board for support in the efforts to get the City of Benson to have the gates taken down. We have reached out to the developer, Mr. Reinbold of El Dorado Benson LLC, the Benson City Council and City Eng, Mr. Brad Hamilton as well as multiple County and State agencies (Cochise County Board of Supervisor, planning and transportation, SEAGO, Game and Fish, State Lands Dept, State Senator Gail Griffin, the State AG office and now the Transportation Board). This issue has been in at least 8 issues of the SV Herald and the San Pedro Valley Sun. We have collected over 1000 signatures from the public demanding that the gates be removed. THE GATES ARE STILL UP AND LOCKED. Who in AZ has the PUBLIC DUTY to respond when tax payer dollars are used for studies, plans and signing/maintenance of a public road that the public now cannot access. Thank you for your time and we, the public, look forward to your assistance.

Scott and Cyndi Sinclair

ITEM 1: DISTRICT ENGINEER'S REPORT (Julie Gadsby)
ITEM 2: DIRECTOR'S REPORT (John Halikowski)7
ITEM 3: CONSENT AGENDA
ACTION TAKEN
MOTION TO APPROVE CONSENT AGENDA13
ITEM 4: LEGISLATIVE REPORT (William Fathauer)
ITEM 5: FINANCIAL REPORT (Kristine Ward)22
ITEM 6: MULTIMODAL PLANNING DIVISION REPORT (Michael Kies)
ITEM 7: PRIORITY PLANNING ADVISORY COMMITTEE (PPAC) (Michael Kies)31
ACTION TAKEN
MOTION TO APPROVE PROJECT MODIFICATIONS ITEMS 7a through 7f32
MOTION TO APPROVE NEW PROJECT ITEMS 7g through 7j33
MOTION TO APPROVE AIRPORT PROJECTS 7k (rescission of 17 items)39
MOTION TO APPROVE AIRPORT PROJECTS ITEMS 7I through 7q42
ITEM 8: STATE ENGINEER'S REPORT (Dallas Hammit)
ITEM 9: CONSTRUCTION CONTRACTS (Dallas Hammit)
ACTION TAKEN
MOTION TO APPROVE ITEM 9a44
MOTION TO APPROVE ITEM 9b45
MOTION TO APPROVE ITEM 9c47
MOTION TO REJECT ALL BIDS ITEM 9d48
ITEM 10: PERFORMANCE AUDIT OF MAG REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION PLAN
ACTION TAKEN
MOTION TO APPROVE ADOT RESPONSES TO AUDIT75
ITEM 11: SUGGESTIONS
ITEM 12: TRANSPORTATION BOARD ORGANIZATION – CHAIR AND VICE CHAIR76
ACTION TAKEN
MOTION TO APPROVE DEANNA BEAVER AS CHAIRWOMAN77
MOTION TO APPROVE BILL CUTHBERTSON AS VICE CHAIRMAN77
ITEM 13: RECOGNITION OF BOARD MEMBER ARLANDO S. TELLER

(Beginning of excerpt.) 1 2 CHAIRMAN LA RUE: Move on to Item 1, which is the district engineer's report, and then we have Julie -- Julie here 3 4 this morning. Julie, give us an update. Tell us what's going 5 6 on. Fill us in. 7 MS. GADSBY: That's what I plan to do. Okay. Good morning, Mr. Chairman, members of the 8 Board. Julie Gadsby. I'm the assistant district engineer for 9 10 Central Construction, and we're just going to do a brief 11 overview of the projects. 12 (Inaudible.) 13 Okay. So first we want to thank Surprise for 14 inviting us down here. As you can see from the banner, we 15 recently just opened Bell Road, and I'll touch on that later in 16 my overview. 17 So currently, Central Construction has 27 projects under construction, 22 federally funded and five State 18 funded. As you know, we have the Loop 202 South Mountain 19 20 Freeway. Between overall construction cost this year 21 (inaudible) 1.19 billion. This is just a tracking of our monthly estimates. 22 We separate South Mountain from the rest of the district, 23 24 because the estimates are so large, it skews our averages.

So milestones that we reached this last year, we

25

had the SR-51, the Black Mountain Boulevard that we administered for City of Phoenix. Our first local government CMR went very well. The Loop 303 El Mirage TI. The U.S. 60, Loop 303 TI just down the road. Currently we're in the progress of completing the Loop 303 landscaping project.

We've had numerous FMS installation jobs on I-17 and I-10. We just completed eight miles of paving on the Red Mountain from Gilbert to Broadway. The I-10, we just completed paving from Loop 303 to SR-85. The 101 general purpose lanes, we just added a general purpose lane, ten miles, from the 202 to Shea. Completed that this summer. And then the US-60 Bell Road TI.

So Bell Road, even though we just made the interim opening, it's still ongoing. We're about 87 percent complete, and then there's just -- we've got a little bit of ramp construction left, asphalt paving, sidewalk, and this lane is concrete, and then to finish up with the landscaping and paving.

US-60 Thunderbird, 64 percent complete. Mostly just miscellaneous. A lot of the asphalt work has been done. We just have minor asphalt paving, all the electrical, lighting, traffic signals, and then wrap it up with the landscaping.

The Loop 303 I-10 Phase 2, about 54 percent complete. If you drove here today on I-10, you'd see the structure's ongoing. We're working on the Van Buren structure.

We're in the middle of the 303 doing our (inaudible), working on (inaudible) lane and the frontage lane construction. Then we'll wrap it up with the electrical FMS siding and the landscaping.

2.4

And then my baby is the South Mountain Freeway. So I-10, you've recently seen us out there. We've started stipend construction. Three of the stipends are in the way of the TI, so we're going to get those out of the way and then start working on the TI there.

We're also in the East Valley working on the HOV construction between the San Tan TI and 48th Street. We'll bring in drill shafts in the Salt River the third week of January. Off site, we're actually making all girders and the MSU panels fabrication, so we're also starting that mid-January. And then after the first of the year, you'll see a push on Pecos Road to start constructing the detour to allow us to build a freeway offline.

So this next year, upcoming year, we've got several projects. I-17, 19th Ave. to Dunlap pavement preservation, and then all the ADA improvements that go along with that project. I-10, I-17 to Dysart. It actually will surround -- it will be a coordination between the work that South Mountain will do. So you'll see portions of road are completed until South Mountain is done in 2019. The 347 UPR crossing will get underway. SR-88, the Apache Junction, so we'll be out there (inaudible). And then several landscape

restoration projects. FMS projects, and about 30 local agency projects.

CHAIRMAN LA RUE: Very nice. Questions of Board members?

Julie, I want to say thank you on behalf of the Board, and really on behalf -- this is my district in the West Valley. These projects here that you've mentioned are very important to us, very important to the region, very important to the State, and I -- you know, a lot of people think I'm kind of strange, but you know, on weekends I actually go out and drive some of these projects, and some of that pavement preservation things you've been doing, the roadway is driving really, really nice, so... I don't do it during the week because it's pretty congested, but on the weekend it's a little bit nicer. So, you know, thank you.

And the Bell Road one is one that -- you know, promises were made to get it underway in the off season from spring training and the shopping, to get Bell Road open before the shopping season, which ADOT did and fulfilled that promise, which was huge here in the West Valley. And then the other one was really to get out of the way of spring training, which starts here in a couple months. Looks like you're well on track for that.

So, you know, give our thanks to everybody, you know, in the field and the crews and everybody in the district,

```
because it's -- that's a lot of work that's going on and, you
1
     know, I don't think a lot of our motoring public realize the
2
     amount of work that's happening right in this busy time and, you
 3
     know, it's pretty seamless. I mean, I'm out here a lot, and
 4
     it's -- you know, there's a little disruption now and then, but
 5
     for the most part, we're not inconvenienced. So I appreciate
 6
 7
     that.
                    MS. GADSBY: Thanks. We try our best.
 8
                    CHAIRMAN LA RUE: Steve.
 9
                    MR. STRATTON: Mr. Chairman, I just wanted to --
10
     I couldn't help but notice that you're showing the projects
11
     that -- you're proving safety for the motoring public, but
12
     they're also very aesthetically pleasing. I wanted to commend
13
     the designers in the end product. It's very pleasing to the eye
14
     as well as safe. Thank you.
15
                    MS. GADSBY: Thank you.
16
                    CHAIRMAN LA RUE: Thank you, Julie.
17
                    Let's go on to -- we have a guest in the
18
     audience, so we'll go on to the next item. That's Director
19
     Halikowski. Welcome. Yeah.
20
                    MR. HALIKOWSKI: You know, Mr. Chairman, this
21
     time of the year is always a little bittersweet for me. I just
22
     get used to working with the chairman, and now it's time for you
23
```

CHAIRMAN LA RUE: So it's more sweet than bitter?

24

to go.

MR. HALIKOWSKI: That last remark (inaudible).

Really I just wanted to give you a few remarks, Mr. Chairman, because I think that it's a good time of year to assess what we've done and where we're going and, you know, I wanted to just thank you for your service. You were appointed to represent Maricopa County in March 2012, but you haven't been just focused solely on the Maricopa County region. You've put emphasis really on the statewide transportation system, and you've been dedicated to building and maintaining that system for the future. And this is very personal, I believe, to all Arizonans, but especially to folks like me in the department who have dedicated our lives to furthering transportation and transportation safety. So you've been a steady hand at the helm, Mr. Chairman.

CHAIRMAN LA RUE: Thank you.

MR. HALIKOWSKI: And you've encouraged consensus and collaboration, worked to acknowledge the plans and goals of Arizona's local planning organizations and community leaders.

And under your leadership, the Board has committed to preserving the existing state highway system with \$260 million per year dedicated to preservation.

You focused on driving projects to improve the key commerce corridors that connect Arizona to Mexico and other international markets and national markets, and those are trillion dollar markets that you're connecting us to. Several

notable accomplishments by the Board this year.

State Route 189 improvements in Nogales. I was just there with the governor this week at a Fresh Produce Association luncheon, and we met with four different groups throughout the day. And the enthusiasm and interest by the folks in Nogales for our commitment to trade with not only the State of Sonora, but the rest of Mexico, was felt very keenly by the governor. And they are very appreciative of the Board's attention to the area, and especially SR-189.

So the improvements will be two years ahead of schedule because of this board. Starting in 2019, the roadway and interchange improvements to move this ever-increasing international commerce through Nogales between Mariposa port of entry and State Route 19.

The mayor of Maricopa was just up here. The State Route 347 overpass. Long sought after Ray Road overpass on State Route 347 in Maricopa. It's going to move forward thanks to a 15 million federal TIGER grant and 15 million local contribution, in addition to this Board and ADOT's \$19 million commitment.

Quicker time line on our key commerce corridor projects. Two stretches of US-93 between Wickenburg and Interstate 40. Widening Interstate 10 in Pinal County from State Route 87 from Picacho and from Earley Road to Interstate 8. And once the I-10 projects are completed, ADOT will have

reached its goal of widening the entire stretch of I-10 between Casa Grande and Tucson to a six-lane divided highway. As you know, there will still be challenges in the future as we look to working with our partners on the Gila River Indian Community to widen I-10 to its ultimate through that area.

2.0

Five I-10 interchanges, interchange projects in Tucson. Projects continue to improve the flow of traffic through the I-10 corridor in Tucson, including safe separation of vehicles and trains. In the Phoenix region, Loop 202, South Mountain Freeway, as Julie just mentioned. Preliminary work has started, with \$973 million allocated in fiscal -- from fiscal year 2017 to fiscal year 2019. On Interstate 10, 324 million allocated from fiscal '19 to '21 for widening and other improvements from near Phoenix Sky Harbor Airport to the Loop 202 San Tan in Chandler, including the congested Broadway Curve. And Interstate 10 just south of Phoenix, 74 million allocated for FY 2019 to FY 2021 for the construction of a general purpose lane and HOV lane in each direction.

So I just want to say thank you, Mr. Chairman. You have served this board with distinction. We look forward to your service as a board member for another year, but I'd like to thank all of the Board for your commitment and dedication. I think that as you look at the magnitude of what you're moving, in especially fiscally constrained times, we really are a model for the nation in many ways in the way that we work together to

keep moving Arizona forward. There's still lots of work to be done, so I look forward to working with all of you as we continue to make Arizona the place to work, play and do business in the future. So thank you, Mr. Chairman, for your year with us.

CHAIRMAN LA RUE: Thank you. Thank you, John.

And, you know, I think I said a little bit last night, but it's amazing this board transforms each and every one of us, because you know, I kind of call myself -- you know, I'm from the cotton patch, and if -- and I've been out here forever, and this was all cotton, you know, many years ago. And you know, once you get on this board, you actually travel around the state, and you really get a full statewide perspective, and so it's truly amazing. And so not only are we helping to transform the state. We're really transforming each and every one of us to be broader thinkers. And so I'm very appreciative of that opportunity that's been provided to me.

So Board Member Hammond.

MR. HAMMOND: Just a comment. As one of the newer Board members -- by the way, that event was fabulous last night, Joe -- the cooperation among all components of -- from the Board, through the senior staff to the ADOT staff and (inaudible), I -- just in two years of seeing the cooperative engagement that ADOT does when they put a project together. I'm still waiting -- and it will happen, I'm sure -- for someone to

come up in a call to the audience to really beat us up on what we've done, but in two years, I haven't seen it. Not that everybody's happy with it, but they appreciate the effort to accommodate, and when -- when not accommodated, they understand the result that may not have been their particularly desired result.

And I -- Mr. Halikowski, you are so spot on when it talks about how the leadership through Joe has -- and from the Board level -- continued that process of cooperation, engagement, listening and respect for the process. I'm a person that has very little process bones in me, but it's so important in this endeavor. And the district engineers, everyone seems to work overtime to make sure that everybody's listened to, and it's a very, very functional organization, which in this era of dysfunction is very refreshing. It's -- I really enjoy this board, and it's for reasons because of Mr. Halikowski, Mr. La Rue and the rest of the Board and your staff. So this is the time of year to say that.

MR. HAMMOND: Thank you.

CHAIRMAN LA RUE: Thank you.

Any other comments from Board members? Director, wraps up your report?

MR. HALIKOWSKI: That's it, Mr. Chair.

CHAIRMAN LA RUE: Thank you. Let's move on to the consent agenda. That's been distributed in your packet.

```
Does any member wish to pull any item from the consent agenda?
 1
                    While you're thinking about it, we did hear a
 2
     little bit about 3A, I think, in the call to the public and
 3
     about cooperation there. I don't necessarily think we need to
 4
     pull it, but I'm assuming staff took note of that and will
 5
     extend that cooperation to -- I believe it was Navajo County.
 6
 7
                    Having said that, the Board would entertain a
     motion for approval of the consent agenda as presented.
8
 9
                    MR. HAMMOND: I make a motion.
                    MR. SELLERS: Motion for approval.
10
                    CHAIRMAN LA RUE: We have a motion from Board
11
     Member Hammond, a second by Board Member Sellers. Any further
12
13
     discussion?
                    Hearing none, all those in favor signify by
14
15
     saying aye.
16
                    BOARD MEMBERS: Aye.
                    CHAIRMAN LA RUE: Any opposed? The ayes have it.
17
18
     Consent agenda is approved.
                    We will move on to Item No. 4, the legislative
19
20
     report, and Mr. Fathauer.
                    Floyd, you looked like you wanted to jump up and
21
22
     say something.
                    MR. ROEHRICH: Well, I didn't see -- oh, there he
23
     is. He didn't say anything. I was ready to start, Mr. Chair.
24
                    CHAIRMAN LA RUE: Yeah. I didn't want to say,
25
```

```
but Bill kind of strolled in a little late, so I -- I think it
 1
     was the rain. There's was the slick highways. He was driving a
 2
 3
     lot slower.
                    MR. ROEHRICH: Thank you. His evaluation is
 4
 5
     coming up.
                    CHAIRMAN LA RUE: Well, I think he was checking
 6
7
     his -- checking his iPhone on any last-minute legislative
8
     updates.
9
                    MR. FATHAUER: Exactly.
10
                    MR. ROEHRICH: You don't know what's coming out
     of Washington at any time of the day.
11
12
                    CHAIRMAN LA RUE: That's right.
13
                    MR. ROEHRICH: (Inaudible.)
                    CHAIRMAN LA RUE: He was checking Trump's tweets.
14
                    MR. FATHAUER: Chairman La Rue, members of the
15
     Board, my name's Bill Fathauer. I'm the legislative liaison for
16
17
     the Department of Transportation. I appreciate you -- I
     appreciate you allowing me to speak today. But I just want to
18
     give you a guick update on federal issues concerning our State
19
20
     Department of Transportation.
                    Since our last -- since the last meeting in
21
     Safford, we found out who the new -- who the new Secretary of
22
     Transportation in the Trump administration is going to be.
2.3
     going to be former Secretary of Labor Elaine Chao, who served as
24
     Deputy Secretary of Transportation under the first Bush
25
```

administration from 1989 to 1991. Her appointment was generally viewed positively bipartisanly in Washington and in Arizona as well.

As I mentioned last time, the Trump administration continue -- or the incoming Trump administration continues to express interest in investing over a trillion dollars into overall infrastructure spending during his term in office. Lawmakers on both sides of the aisle in Washington, I think, want to see more detail as to what that will look like. I think there's elements of Washington that want to see that be public investment through federal spending, and others who would like to see it be more private sector oriented through public/private partnerships or tax incentives to spur investment.

In addition, he's proposed a tax reform policy.

It's going to give transportation advocates an opportunity to address funding issues concerning the Highway Trust Fund, either through a change in the current revenue sources or be it some type of repatriation tax. Those are both the options.

The American Trucking Association has recently named 11 logistic executives to a committee which will brainstorm different potential sources of new funding for highway and other infrastructure projects nationwide, and they're expected to help the incoming administration come up with sustainable future options for infrastructure project

funding going forward.

2.4

Just before the -- before their adjournment for the year, the House and Senate approved a continuing resolution to continue to fund federal obligations, including transportation programs, at the fiscal year 2016 levels until April 28th of next year, which -- upon which time they will have to either continue it again or figure out a more permanent funding solution.

Additionally, the NHTSA recently, I believe on the 12th, earlier this week, held their second public meeting on guidances for autonomous vehicle technology or for the autonomous vehicle technology guidelines that it issued in September that I mentioned at our last meeting. The first meeting was held on November 10th and dealt with their 15-point safety assessment, and the meeting this week covered the model state policy and advanced — discussed available regulatory tools to allow that technology to be used on highways and roads safely and effectively.

I wanted to give you a quick update as well on state legislation. We have had our legislative (inaudible) group by the governor, and I'll be passing copies of the draft Omnibus bill that we'll be running this year. It has four individual sections.

The first one is an element of a bill that we ran two years ago that did not make it through the process, but it

effectively would allow the director broader authority to privatize certain administrative and delivery of program functions that the department does. We've done that in the past with traffic survival schools, and hopefully by the next board meeting, we'll have some specific examples of how the department would use that broader authority in the future. It will make for an -- a more effective partnership with the private sector in delivering ADOT programs.

The second section deals with -- currently in statute, when a person's license is suspended for whatever reason, and they go to the court and make themselves right under the law with the courts, their license is actually still indefinitely suspended until they actually come in to an MVD office and pay the \$10 re-instatement fee. That was a change in the law in the early '90s to encourage greater compliance with the reinstatement fee. It wasn't getting paid. But the problem that changed the law created was that it effectively made it more likely that people were going to be driving around on a suspended license, because once they get done with their court obligations, then most people naturally think that they're good to go.

And now that that -- that driving on a suspended license is class one misdemeanor, they're actually at risk of substantial penalties, and in certain situations, could even have their car impounded if they have other mitigating factors.

So given that we can, as we did in the past, collect that fee at a -- at the time of registration or whenever they come in for their next transaction at an MVD office, we felt like going back to the way it was before the rule change -- or the law change in the early '90s would prevent people from being put in that precarious situation.

The third section deals with a section of statute called HURF Maintenance of Effort. When the Highway User Revenue Fund was created, one of the things that I think the department noticed was that municipalities were taking that new influx of State funding that they got from the drawdown from HURF and were moving their own municipal revenue that they normally spent on transportation purposes to General Fund revenue or other purposes, and the state legislature did not want them to use the new influx of state funding as an excuse to not spend their own money on transportation purposes.

would require them to maintain a certain level of effort, and that level of effort was the average amount of spending from about five -- a five-year period in the early to mid 1980s. And as a lot of our cities and towns are increasing in population and becoming -- meeting the requirements for having to report to ADOT about their maintenance of effort, you're seeing a lot of cities that weren't even -- some of them weren't even incorporated when the -- in the early '80s when that span of

time they're required to maintain an effort, an average effort.

So you're seeing a lot of people having to report effectively

for spending more than zero dollars or spending more than this

infinitesimal amount of money. It's just a burden on cities and

counties to report something that's really an archaic

requirement.

And I'll wrap up real quick. I'll give you a copy of the legislation.

Also, I'll give you a kind of brief overview of what was presented to the State -- Surface Transportation

Funding Task Force. They were -- the department was asked to provide different scenarios for different increases in transportation funding sources. 50 percent increases of various sources, and this will kind of give you a breakdown of what that would mean in a year, a one-year increase in transportation funding, as well as what it would mean over a 20-year estimate for some, like, key commerce corridors purpose. And since I'll provide you with copies of that, I won't take up any more of your time, but I'm happy to answer any questions that you have.

CHAIRMAN LA RUE: Any questions?

VICE CHAIR BEAVER: Yes.

CHAIRMAN LA RUE: Vice Chair.

VICE CHAIR BEAVER: Chairman La Rue,

Mr. Fathauer, I had a question with regard to you talking about legislation, and I know you were talking more state related as

1 opposed to federal related, but I'm getting back to the 2 privatization of rest areas. And I know we've talked about this 3 before, and there's federal law that says the eastern part of 4 the United States, evidently they were grandfathered in, but the 5 western side of the United States -- not necessarily that we 6 would do it, but for me, I would like it to be optional for us 7 to do it, and I don't know what the process is to get it --8 evidently it's a Congressional-type action that's going to need 9 to be taken place in order to make that a reality, but I just 10 want to put that out there on the table that, you know, I 11 haven't totally given up on that idea, privatizing or at least 12 making it an option for us to consider at some point in time. 13 Thank you.

MR. HALIKOWSKI: Thank you. And if I could, Mr. Chairman.

CHAIRMAN LA RUE: Yes.

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

2.4

25

MR. HALIKOWSKI: Thank you, Board Member Beaver.

This is something we've been, as you know, at the forefront of for some years now. We tried to work with Chairman Mica when they were talking about a transportation re-authorization about privatizing rest areas, and they chose at the time not to put that into the re-authorization. It's a contentious issue with our truck stop operators. But the governor has asked us to put a list of things together to share with our delegation and the new administration of changes that

we would like to see. So this is one thing that we will include, is this privatization of rest areas, because we felt it's -- it's an unfair playing field when the east is allowed or has been allowed to privatize and we have not. So it's something we're going to be looking more into.

CHAIRMAN LA RUE: Any other questions of Board members?

Thank you, Mr. Fathauer.

And I would -- remind Board members if there's some legislative issues that you want deeper depth, reach out to Floyd and things, because there's a lot going on there, and we're covering it pretty briefly here. So feel free to reach out to Floyd, and he can direct the appropriate staff member to get the information.

One of the things you heard Mr. Fathauer mention is the committee that's out there that's reporting this month, I've asked Floyd and then when they do so to update us on that. From what I'm picking up on in some of the articles, it's come down to saying, "Wow, there's a lot of need out there. Big mess, not enough funds." You know, kind of like we're not certain what to do. So it's -- will be interesting to see what actually comes out of that committee.

MR. ROEHRICH: Mr. Chairman, members of the Board, absolutely. As soon as the Board -- as soon as that task force comes out with the final report, we'll make sure to get

copies distributed to everybody. So you'll be able to see 1 what -- again, what the recommendation is. And then as it rolls 2 into the legislative session, as Mr. Fathauer had said, I'm sure 3 there will be some discussion going on, and whether the Board 4 chooses to participate or not, that will be up to your 5 6 discretion. 7 CHAIRMAN LA RUE: Thank you. Anything else on that agenda item? If not, next 8 Agenda Item No. 5, financial report, Kristine Ward. 9 10 MS. WARD: Good morning. CHAIRMAN LA RUE: Good morning. 11 MS. WARD: Mr. Chair, Board members. 12 So HURF, we are right on forecast. I am happy to 13 report that when this year is completed, we remain on forecast, 14 we will finally exceed 2007's revenues. Not everyone get happy 15 at once. So overall, we expect about 1.4 billion, a little over 16 1.4 billion for the year when all is said and done. 17 Gas and diesel were a little below forecast, and 18 diesel actually had negative growth in November. We're going to 19 check into that. We haven't got our port numbers yet for the --20 you know, for the port activity, but that's something we're 21 22 going to be looking into. November was a strong month for VLT. We had 11 23 percent growth in VLT in November. 2.4 Moving on to RARF, a little above forecast, but 25

within target. Moderate growth pretty much in all of our 1 primary revenue categories. 2 With regards to the federal legislation, we're 3 very happy to see that Congress chose to continue funding 4 through April 2017 and took us right up to the last minute 5 there. It expired on the 4th, and I think we got it a couple of 6 days -- got signed a couple of days later; however, they did 7 delay the funding increases that were built into FAST, but we 8 expect those increases to be -- to come in when they deal with 9 it before the April expiration. That's about \$15 million worth 10 of federal funds that are -- that we are not going to have 11 access to until towards the end of the year. 12 And my final comments, the Aviation Fund, with 13 regards to the Aviation Fund and those deferred payments, we are 14 estimating that we will have all the deferrals caught up, those 15 payments caught up by about mid-March. 16 CHAIRMAN LA RUE: Very nice. 17 MS. WARD: So we should get back on track. 18 CHAIRMAN LA RUE: Very nice. 19 MS. WARD: That concludes my presentation. I'll 20 be happy to take any questions. 21 CHAIRMAN LA RUE: Questions of Board members? 22 MR. HALIKOWSKI: Mr. Chairman, if I could. 23 CHAIRMAN LA RUE: Yeah. 24

25

MR. HALIKOWSKI: Sorry to spring this on you, but

```
1
     we've gotten a few letters from some of our transportation
 2
     partners about HURF swap.
                    MS. WARD: Uh-huh.
 3
                    MR. HALIKOWSKI: Could you just briefly mention
 4
 5
     our efforts there?
 6
                    MS. WARD: Yeah. Yes. We are in the midst of
 7
     reconstructing that program and developing the policies
 8
     associated with it. We've been meeting with -- internally quite
 9
     a bit to vet that policy out. And so what we are estimating now
10
     and what we discussed at our most recent resource allocation
11
     meeting is implementing that starting in the next fiscal year.
12
     Assuming all the revenues stay on track, we would estimate the
13
     first projects in this next federal fiscal year. So that would
14
     be October 1 of 2017.
15
                    MR. HALIKOWSKI: So we're working with the
16
     governor's budget staff, Mr. Chairman, to ensure that we've got
17
     stability of funds to make sure we can bring this program back
18
     successfully and sustainability.
19
                    CHAIRMAN LA RUE: Excellent. Very nice.
20
                    Board Member Teller.
21
                    MR. TELLER: Thank you, Chairman La Rue.
22
                    On the Aviation Fund payments made -- will be
23
     made by mid-March, how many payments will that be, and how many
24
     airports will be receiving their reimbursements?
25
                    MS. WARD: Mr. Chair, Board Member Teller, I do
```

```
not have the specific numbers of how many payments that is, but
1
     I will get that for you promptly.
2
                    MR. TELLER: Okay. Thank you. I appreciate it.
 3
                    MS. WARD: And the amounts. I believe we're
 4
     talking about -- in terms of dollar figures, we're talking
 5
     another couple of million dollars of deferred.
 6
                    MR. HALIKOWSKI: We could bring either Mr. Kies
 7
8
     or Mr. --
9
                    MR. KIES: Mr. Klein.
                    MR. HALIKOWSKI: -- Mike Klein up.
10
                    CHAIRMAN LA RUE: Your choice.
11
                    MS. WARD: (Inaudible.)
12
                    MR. KIES: The total aviation grant deferrals was
13
     added up to 5.7 million. So what Kristine is reporting is that
14
     we anticipate that all of those payments will be made by the end
15
16
     of March.
                    MR. TELLER: I have a follow-up question.
17
                    CHAIRMAN LA RUE: Yes.
18
                    MR. TELLER: Thank you, Chairman.
19
                    Are those processed by first come, first served
20
21
     or --
                    MR. KIES: Yes. We've been -- do you want to
22
23
     take that one?
                    MS. WARD: Yeah. Excuse me. All of the
24
     payments, the very first ones that we've received requests for
25
```

reimbursements are the very first ones that are being mailed 1 out. So we are taking them in a first in, first out. The Yuma 2 payment that is the one that was referenced earlier, that is 3 actually going out today, and I believe that was in the 4 one-and-a-half million dollar range. 5 MR. TELLER: Thank you very much. 6 CHAIRMAN LA RUE: I think that's good news. 7 remember some discussion before on the first in, first out. Do 8 we try to do a percentage? But I think staff said, "We're going 9 to catch this up fairly quickly, and with this next cycle of 10 revenue coming. Let's just do it under what we've been doing 11 and get it cleaned up." So I view all that as very positive. 12 13 So thank you. 14 MS. WARD: Thank you. CHAIRMAN LA RUE: Excellent. Any other questions 15 on the financial report? 16 If not, let's move on to the Multi-Planning 17 Division report, Item 6. Michael Kies. 18 MR. KIES: Thank you, Mr. Chair. 19 I do have one item to report to you on the 20

I do have one item to report to you on the Multi-Modal report. As you recall, last year we took the effort to submit a FASTLANE grant submittal to the federal government looking to request additional federal funds, and were awarded that grant for \$54 million that this board worked to look to accelerate it to widening projects on Interstate 10.

21

22

23

24

25

27 The federal government has opened up applications 1 yet again for another FASTLANE grant submittal. Yesterday we 2 did submit a second request for FASTLANE grant. This time it's 3 an ask for \$40 million of additional federal aid. That would 4 support widening Interstate 10 between Verrado Way and State 5 Route 85, west of the Phoenix metro area. 6 And also I couple that with what we're calling "smart truck parking," which is from California to New Mexico, 8 we would implement a ITS, or intelligence transportation system, 9 that notifies truckers as they're traveling across our state how 10 many parking spaces are currently available in our rest areas 11 and what the approximate travel time would be to get to that 12 rest area, so they can plan their trip according to federal time 13

So with that, I would ask for any other -- any questions on my report.

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

constraints.

CHAIRMAN LA RUE: Very nice. Any questions on the Multi-Modal?

VICE CHAIR BEAVER: Chairman La Rue, I would just like to ask, with regard to this, it sounds interesting. Are they going to be adapting it to where there's an app on the, you know, individual truck driver's phones and, you know, where anyone can download an app and --

MR. KIES: Yes. Yes.

MR. HALIKOWSKI: Let me -- because I've had some

communication Mike may not be aware of.

As we're looking at this, there are other states that already put up digital signs, if you will, to estimate time to travel to the next rest area. Some will go so far as to report spaces available. But in communication I've had with our Arizona Trucking Association, there is concern that actually what we need, perhaps before the technology, is additional parking spaces. So we're looking at that. However, as you know, Board members, there is a cost to purchase the land and construct those. So we need to see if that is something we'll bring back to you in the future.

The other thing is that they stated pretty clearly that their policy is they don't want their drivers looking at cell phones while they're operating the vehicle. So there may be other technologies that we would employ in order to be able to do that, but whether or not we do an app at this point, we'd have to take those safety considerations into account as to whether we put it on the cell phone.

CHAIRMAN LA RUE: Board Member Hammond.

MR. HAMMOND: Just a question. I know the discussion of autonomous vehicles is out there. But they say this industry, the trucking industry, may be the first affected, which would affect truck stops, you know, freeway services, on so many things. And how do we input that in so we don't put infrastructure out there that becomes somewhat obsolete in four

or five years.

MR. HALIKOWSKI: So Mr. Chairman, Board Member, what you'll, I think, see is more of an evolution of assist devices, whether those are lane changing warning devices, braking assist, tire inflation devices, brake devices that tell you whether your brakes are working or not. And we've done surveys in the past with various private companies, and what we've found is that probably 90 to 95 percent of the trucking companies out there own five trucks or less. So there's a real cost break point as to what technology they'll want to put onto, say, small fleets versus very large ones. So I think your early adopters will probably be larger fleets.

But as we look at technology, we need to work closely with the industry, because we want this to be, I would think, somewhat seamless from state to state so that you are using the same things between states that are familiar to the industry. And to that end, we formed what we call the I-10 Corridor Coalition with Texas, New Mexico and California. And our goal is to look at the I-10 corridor -- we've got our charter done already with the four states -- and work together to determine what technology we put in on the I-10 corridor with the states working together.

So these are issues we're facing as to what will the industry purchase first based on its cost. Will they be more self-assist devices? What will they want us to put on

```
electrically, whether that's in the form of an transponder or an
1
     app, and those are things we continue to work out.
 2
                    So the purpose of having the four states together
 3
     is to ensure that we're not shooting off in one direction, and
 4
     maybe California and Texas are adopting different technologies.
 5
     In the future, we've had interest and hope to expand that to the
 6
     states of Mississippi, Alabama and Florida. We want to mimic
     the I-95 Corridor Coalition in the east, and basically provide a
 8
     seamless ride, if we can, for our trucking industry.
 9
10
                    CHAIRMAN LA RUE: Any other -- Board Member
11
     Teller.
                    MR. TELLER: So is this smart truck and ITS going
12
13
     to be I-10 or I-40?
                    MR. HALIKOWSKI: I believe you have I-10 and
14
15
     I - 40.
                    MR. KIES: This FAST grant submittal is only for
16
17
     I-10.
                    MR. HALIKOWSKI: I thought I saw I-40.
18
                    MR. KIES: But it is a concept that's catching on
19
     nationwide, and there could be that day that, you know, all the
20
21
     corridors have -- as the director said, have a similar system
22
     that truckers can get information uniformly on all the
23
     interstate routes.
                    MR. TELLER: So for our corridor in northern
24
     Arizona, I-40, is there a schedule on an anticipation for a
25
```

```
testing up there to include into this I-10 corridor ITS?
1
                    MR. KIES: Not at this time. We're taking
 2
     advantage of this opportunity to submit for a FASTLANE grant.
 3
     The primary project is the widening of I-10, and we felt it was
 4
     -- it coupled well together to put the truck parking scheme with
 5
     the I-10 project so that the federal government would see that
 6
     we're focusing some attention on one key freight corridor. But,
 7
     you know, if this is successful, then it would be a model to
8
 9
     expand to other corridors.
10
                    MR. TELLER: As a common user of I-40 as of late,
     from Window Rock to Flagstaff for this morning, I find that the
11
     billboard's very helpful. It is informative. So I anticipate
12
     the warning signs and the -- issues up ahead. So, you know, it
13
     is -- it is helpful for a traveler on that corridor, like myself
14
15
     (inaudible).
16
                    MR. KIES: Right.
                    MR. TELLER: So yeah, it is useful. Thank you.
17
18
     Appreciate it. Appreciate it.
                    CHAIRMAN LA RUE: Any other final questions?
19
20
     Hearing none, Mike, take us on into PPAC.
                    MR. KIES: All right. Thank you, Mr. Chair.
21
                    There are seven project modifications today on
22
     the PPAC agenda. They're Items 7A through 7F, and unless the
23
     Board has questions or comments on these six items, I'd ask the
24
25
     Board for a motion to approve Items 7A through 7F.
```

CHAIRMAN LA RUE: These PPAC items were 1 distributed to you. Are there any Board members wishing to pull 2 any particular item? Seeing none, I would -- the Board would 3 entertain a motion to accept and approve project modification 4 Items 7A through 7F as presented. 5 MR. STRATTON: So moved. 6 CHAIRMAN LA RUE: I have a motion by Board Member 7 Stratton, a second by Board Member Teller. Any further 8 9 discussion? Hearing none, all those in favor signify by 10 11 saying aye. BOARD MEMBERS: Aye. 12 CHAIRMAN LA RUE: Any opposed? Hearing none, the 13 14 aves have it. 15 Next item. MR. KIES: Thank you, Mr. Chair. 16 The -- there are four new projects on the PPAC 17 agenda. They're Items 7G through 7J. Unless there are any 18 questions or comments from the Board, I'd ask the Board to 19 approve the motion for Items 7G to 7J. 20 CHAIRMAN LA RUE: So these items were previously 21 distributed to you in your packet. Does any Board member wish 22 to pull any particular item? Hearing none, the Board would 23 entertain a motion to accept and approve new project Items 7G 24 25 through 7I as presented.

1 MR. KIES: G through J. CHAIRMAN LA RUE: Oh, did I misspeak? I'm sorry. 2 3 7G through 7J. Yes. VICE CHAIR BEAVER: I make --4 CHAIRMAN LA RUE: We have a motion by the vice 5 6 chair. VICE CHAIR BEAVER: Yes, for Items 7G through 7J. 7 CHAIRMAN LA RUE: A second by Board Member 8 Teller. Any further discussion? 9 10 Hearing none, all those in favor signify by 11 saying aye. 12 BOARD MEMBERS: Aye. CHAIRMAN LA RUE: Any opposed? The ayes have it. 13 MR. KIES: Mr. Chair, Item 7K relates to the 14 Aviation Fund. There is a memo on page 111 of the Board agenda 15 that highlights 17 grants that staff proposes to be rescinded 16 regarding the aviation grant program. These actions are part of 17 mitigation to affect the low balances in the State Aviation 18 Fund. These 17 projects were approved by this board in June of 19 '16; however, since that time, six grants were issued with -- no 20 progress has occurred since that time. And 11 of the 17 21 projects have not currently been issued a grant, and it is an 22 23 opportune time to rescind those grants. All airport sponsors have been contacted and 24 agree that these projects can be rescinded. They understand the 25

circumstances regarding the rescinding -- of rescinding of the projects.

These projects add up to \$5.5 million of commitments that would be -- the Aviation Fund would be relieved of, which helps the cash flow of the fund.

With that said, I do have some other additional statistics on the progress that we've been making with the Aviation Fund and the grant deferrals. We did receive 2.6 -- approximately \$2.6 million of new revenue in the Aviation Fund during the month of December. And as Kristine highlighted, we have aggressively started paying those deferral payments. And since the last board meeting in Safford, 51 grant payments are in process to the airport sponsors, including that large one of concern to the Yuma Airport Authority. And that -- those grant deferrals payments are adding up to approximately \$2.7 million worth of referrals. So the rescinding of these 17 grants is part of that plan to get us out of the hole that we are with the Aviation Fund.

So with that, Mr. Chair, if there aren't any questions or concerns, I would ask the Board to approve Item 7K.

CHAIRMAN LA RUE: All right. Does -- Board Member Stratton.

MR. STRATTON: Mr. Chairman, Mike, since all of these sponsors have agreed to rescind the grants and help alleviate our problem, will they be given any priority when

moneys become available to re-apply?

MR. KIES: I don't know if that has been discussed yet. I know that Mike Klein, our aviation grant manager, is organizing a meeting this spring to talk about how to maybe better improve the process of the grant program, selection of grants, management of the cash flow of the Aviation Fund.

I'm sure that that would be something that could come up in that meeting. And if -- and then I would ask Mike if there's any other conversation that's happened to the sponsors about what happens after the rescind -- their grants are rescinded.

MR. KLEIN: In the normal course of our policy, this would not happen. They would re-compete each year. The way our policy is written right now is that each year, all airports re-apply if they didn't get funding in the prior year. We don't always fund every project. There's not always enough money.

happen. But we are having discussions with the Arizona Airports Association. We're going to do a nationwide/statewide forum at the AZA (phonetic) conference in May to discuss some of these policies. So it's possible, but it does rise to a lot of complications about fairness, because there are other people who were all set up for '18 and '19, and we're not doing anything in

'18. So it's a complicated structure. We're talking about it, and we can bring that back to you, probably, when we finish the May conference.

MR. STRATTON: Mr. Chairman, I would appreciate at least the conversation about that since these sponsors are cooperating with us and helping us through this particular (inaudible). I think it's worthy of a conversation (inaudible) --

MR. KLEIN: I think it's a little more formal than that, because we are going to formally ask for these suggestions. We're not going to just have a conversation. We are going to formally examine our policies and bring those back to the Board for their consideration.

CHAIRMAN LA RUE: All right. Good question.
Board Member Teller.

MR. TELLER: Thank you very much.

I understand the situation. Actually, Mr. Klein has been reporting to the Arizona Airport Association at the most recent conference in Phoenix, and also at the fall conference, sharing with the members of the state organization that we're in dire straits. We need to work together to cooperate, which I really do appreciate the message. So the message has been clear to these sponsors, including myself, understanding that we have to approach this fiscally-constrained atmosphere.

And I support this effort to look at which of the 1 airports that are -- that we can rescind, you know, the grants 2 to pay -- you know, to continue keeping this program afloat. 3 So at the same time, I also concur with Board 4 Stratton's concern on, you know, a formal -- a formal 5 conversation with the sponsors. Though he's been -- Mr. Klein's 6 been at the, you know, AZA and also meeting with individual 7 sponsors, because your door is always open, letting them know 8 that this is what's going on. This is a potential effect of the 9 situation at hand. We understand that. 10 So I appreciate Mr. Klein's efforts in 11 communicating individually to the sponsors of the current 12 situation. At the same time, I see and hear an item, 70, you 13 know, Sedona there is an SL grant, and --14 CHAIRMAN LA RUE: Mr. Teller, we're on Item 7K. 15 16 MR. TELLER: Yeah. Right. CHAIRMAN LA RUE: So is this tied to Item 7K 17 18 or --19 MR. TELLER: Right. It is. CHAIRMAN LA RUE: Okay. All right. Thank you. 20 21 MR. TELLER: Because from the last meeting, I understand that there are going to be concerns on state, local 22 grants, and they're going to continue with federal, state, local 23 grants, but I see a grant in here that's state and local. So is 24 there a change? Is there -- I mean, I have a concern about, you 25

```
know, the discussion from previous meetings to this. Again, I
 1
     support this item, but I just wanted a clarification of that.
 2
                    CHAIRMAN LA RUE: So let me repeat what I think
 3
     the question back to the full Board is. Does our -- does the
 4
     action that's being proposed on 7K have impacts on 70 or other
 5
     grants that -- or other actions that we could take later in the
 6
 7
     agenda.
                    MR. TELLER: Thank you.
 8
                    CHAIRMAN LA RUE: I think that's your question.
 9
                    MR. TELLER: Yeah. Thank you.
10
                    MR. KIES: The action of 7K to rescind these
11
     grants does relieve the Aviation Fund of these commitments, and
12
     then based on cash flow analysis, that allows Item 70 to be
13
14
     funded.
                    CHAIRMAN LA RUE: But I think the question was
15
     deeper in that it was something to do with 70 is a mix of a
16
     federal and state grant.
17
                    MR. KIES: And I can address that, Mr. Chair, if
18
     you want to address 70 at this time. I'm -- I can --
19
                    CHAIRMAN LA RUE: I think we can only address the
20
21
     linkage.
                    MR. KIES: Yeah.
22
                    CHAIRMAN LA RUE: Not so much 70. We'll take 70
23
     up when it comes up on the agenda.
24
25
                    MR. KIES: Okay.
```

```
CHAIRMAN LA RUE: I think the question was about
 1
 2
     the linkage.
                    MR. KIES: Yes.
 3
                    CHAIRMAN LA RUE: But you've -- I think you've
 4
 5
     answered that.
                    MR. TELLER: Yes. Thank you.
 6
                    CHAIRMAN LA RUE: Any other Board questions on
 7
     this? Then I would -- I think -- Mr. Teller, was that a motion
 8
 9
     to approve 7K as presented?
                    MR. TELLER: Yes.
10
                    CHAIRMAN LA RUE: I have a motion from
11
     Mr. Teller. I have a second from Mr. Stratton. Any further
12
13
     discussion?
14
                    All those in favor say aye.
15
                    BOARD MEMBERS: Aye.
                    CHAIRMAN LA RUE: Any opposed? The ayes have it.
16
17
     Now --
                    MR. KIES: Thank you, Mr. Chair.
18
                    So Items 7L through 7Q are new airport project
19
     grants to be approved by the Board, and since there already was
20
     discussions about 70, I'll make some comments before I ask for a
21
22
     motion.
                    So yes, five of these airport projects are
23
     federally -- are federally-funded projects, and this action
2.4
     would be providing State funds to partially match those federal
25
```

funds, which is something we talked about last month as part of 1 the program that we would continue fully funding those matches 2 towards federal funds. 3 As Board Member Teller mentioned, Item 70 is a 4 grant for a project for the Sedona airport, which is a 5 State-only funded project, which is an exception from what we've 6 talked about last month as the plan going forward through fiscal 7 year '18 for the Aviation Fund. However, this project is 8 described to me as an emergency situation. It's a marker of 9 some sort, and I could ask Mike to up come if we need some 10 technical explanation, that there was a recent weather issue or 11 weather storm that washed out part of the area around the 12 airfield, and it disrupted with some of the markers that pilots 13 use to land safely on the airport. And we feel it's important 14 that we fund this project immediately so that that repair work 15 16 can go on. CHAIRMAN LA RUE: And as an exception to our 17 policy, is that what we're hearing? 18 MR. KIES: An exception to the plan that we 19 20 described. CHAIRMAN LA RUE: We've described, not a --21 (Speaking simultaneously). 22 CHAIRMAN LA RUE: An exception to the plan that 23 you presented last month. 2.4 25 MR. KIES: Correct.

CHAIRMAN LA RUE: Mr. Teller, you're our resident 1 expert on the Board. I think we all look to you to, you know... 2 MR. TELLER: It's actually an excellent 3 exception, because safety is number one for the air users and 4 the airport users. So I see that, and in speaking with the 5 Sedona sponsor, as she mentioned that this was a concern for the 6 community and the airport users. And right across the hill (inaudible) is Embry-Riddle Aeronautical University, and they 8 fly to this airport very, very frequently. So it's an 9 10 exception. CHAIRMAN LA RUE: Thank you. And I also look to 11 Board Member Stratton, because he understands this stuff. Any 12 13 thoughts, comments, questions? MR. STRATTON: Mr. Chairman, I do agree with 14 Board Member Teller that it is a good exception. However, I 15 would ask as a Board member, if the rest of the Board agrees, 16 that if there are any further exceptions, that they be presented 17 individually rather than in groups so that we can discuss that 18 19 (inaudible). 20 MR. KIES: That's a great recommendation. 21 CHAIRMAN LA RUE: That's an excellent 22 recommendation. I would just say just implement that. 23 Any other questions by Board members on 7L 24 through 70? And if not, anything else from staff on those 25 items?

1	MR. KIES: No. With that, I would ask the Board
2	to approve a motion to approve Items 7L through 7Q.
3	CHAIRMAN LA RUE: All right. I have a motion by
4	Board Member Teller. I have a second by Board Member
5	Cuthbertson. He's been, you know, trying to chime in here. So
6	this time I'm just going to go ahead and say he chimed in.
7	VICE CHAIR BEAVER: Okay.
8	CHAIRMAN LA RUE: I'm sorry.
9	VICE CHAIR BEAVER: Mr. Chairman, I just have one
10	question. This does include 70, right?
11	CHAIRMAN LA RUE: Yes.
12	MR. KIES: Correct.
13	VICE CHAIR BEAVER: Okay.
14	CHAIRMAN LA RUE: Thank you for that
15	clarification.
16	Do we have any further discussion? Hearing none,
17	all those in favor signify by saying aye.
18	BOARD MEMBERS: Aye.
19	CHAIRMAN LA RUE: Any opposed? The ayes have it.
20	MR. KIES: Thank you, Mr. Chair.
21	CHAIRMAN LA RUE: Thank you.
22	Item No. 8, State Engineer's report.
23	MR. HAMMIT: Good morning, Mr. Chairman, members
24	of the Board.
25	Currently, ADOT has 124 projects under

construction totaling \$1.629 billion. In November we finaled 1 five projects totaling 35.4 million, and year to date, we have 2 finalized 43 projects. 3 Are there any questions under the State 4 Engineer's report? 5 CHAIRMAN LA RUE: Any questions by Board members? 6 Doesn't seem to be, Dallas. Pull us on to Item No. 9. 7 MR. HAMMIT: So on our contracts, thank you for 8 approving the three projects in the consent agenda. We have 9 four to have a little more discussion. Year to date, we have 10 contracted 197 million -- excuse me -- \$197,922,000 worth of 11 projects. The estimate was one-hundred ninety-nine six fifteen 12 [sic]. Basically, we're within eight-tenths of a percent of our 13 estimate to where the contracts are coming in if you average it 14 out. So we're coming in fairly close. There's some outliers 15 here and there, but we're doing fairly well in our estimating 16 17 overall. CHAIRMAN LA RUE: That's pretty phenomenal when 18 you look at that spread. I mean, that's amazing work, so... 19 20 MR. HAMMIT: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. CHAIRMAN LA RUE: (Inaudible) congratulated for 21 that. And do I recall some discussion about the -- these excess 22 funds here is a discretionary fund for the outgoing board chair? 23 MR. HAMMIT: I think Ms. Ward will address that. 24 CHAIRMAN LA RUE: Address that. And probably a 25

lot of input from Floyd as well. 1 MR. ROEHRICH: That's under item ZZZ. 2 MR. HAMMIT: Mr. Chairman, the first project that 3 needs justification is Item 9A. There's a local project in 4 Mohave County. The low bid was \$434,208.85. The State's 5 estimate was 388,864.52. It was over the State's estimate by 6 7 \$45,344.33, or 11.7 percent. As we looked at this project, we saw 8 higher-than-expected prices in our asphalt. Basically, these 9 small quantities, it had to be trucked in, and then they were 10 constructing a concrete poured wall, and we had -- we saw a 11 little higher prices on that. We have reviewed the bid, believe 12 it is a reasonable and responsive bid, and would recommend award 13 to Show Low Construction, Inc. 14 CHAIRMAN LA RUE: Do we have any questions by 15 Board members on this item? If not, the Chair would entertain a 16 motion to accept and approve staff's recommendation to award the 17 contract for Item 9A to Show Low Construction, Inc. 18 I have a motion by the Vice Chair. 19 20 VICE CHAIR BEAVER: So moved. CHAIRMAN LA RUE: So moved. Do I have a second? 21 Second by Board Member Teller. Or I'm sorry. Board Member 22 23 Stratton. Any further discussion? All those in favor signify by saying aye. 24 25 BOARD MEMBERS: Aye.

CHAIRMAN LA RUE: Any opposed. The ayes have it. 1 MR. HAMMIT: Thank you, Mr. Chair. 2 The next item, 9B, is a bridge project out on 3 I-40. The low bid was \$4,353,978.45. The State's estimate was 4 3,938,514.70. It was over the State's estimate by \$415,463.75, 5 or 10.5 percent. 6 Where we a saw the higher-than-expected prices was in the steel girders, not only in the price of the steel, 8 but also mobilizing it out to the project. We did see some 9 higher-than-expected pricing in the concrete -- or excuse me --10 the asphalt pavement coming in to the bridge. We have reviewed 11 the bids. We do believe the bids are reasonable and responsive, 12 and would recommend award to Pulice Construction, Inc. 13 CHAIRMAN LA RUE: Are there any questions or 14 further discussion by Board members? Hearing none, the Board 15 would entertain a motion to accept and approve staff's 16 recommendation to award the contract for Item 9B to Pulice 17 Construction, Inc. I have a motion by Board Member -- Vice 18 19 Chair Beaver? 20 VICE CHAIR BEAVER: So moved. CHAIRMAN LA RUE: And a second by Board Member 21 Cuthbertson. And if --22 VICE CHAIR BEAVER: I did just have one question. 23 24 CHAIRMAN LA RUE: Sure. VICE CHAIR BEAVER: I mean, this -- are those 25

expenses, the girders and things that you described as being the 1 overestimate, I mean, is that within reason? It just seems like 2 3 it's a bit high. MR. HAMMIT: Mr. Chairman, Board Member Beaver, 4 as we estimate the project, we're talking with different vendors 5 on -- at a point in time where steel pricing is. Where we -- at 6 the time, I think it was a little higher, and then we 7 underestimated what it would cost to mobilize those girders out 8 to the project. So we do believe it is a good bid. 9 VICE CHAIR BEAVER: Okay. 10 MR. HAMMIT: And comparing that to the other 11 bidders on the project, it was not out of line. 12 CHAIRMAN LA RUE: Any further questions? 13 So we have a motion and a second to approve and 14 award pursuant -- as presented. Any further discussion? 15 All those in favor signify by saying aye. 16 17 BOARD MEMBERS: Aye. CHAIRMAN LA RUE: Any opposed? The ayes have it. 18 MR. HAMMIT: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. 19 The next item, 9C, is a pavement preservation 20 project on State Route 86 in Yuma County. The low bid -- or 21 excuse -- the low bid was \$4,254,452. The State's estimate was 22 \$5,116,831.25. The -- it was under the State's estimate by 23 24 \$862,379.25, or 16.9 percent. Where we saw the biggest differences was in the 25

1	asphalt oil and the asphalt mix. The mix is a product of
2	placing it in trucking it and manufacturing, putting the
3	aggregates together. Their site was right next to the project
4	the low bid had access to. So we have reviewed the bids and
5	believe it is reasonable and responsive and would recommend
6	award to Granite Construction Company.
7	CHAIRMAN LA RUE: Any questions or discussions by
8	Board members? If not, the Board would entertain a motion to
9	accept and approve staff's recommendation to award the contract
10	for Item 9C to Granite Construction Company. I have a motion by
11	Board Member Hammond. Do we have a second? Second by Board
12	Member Cuthbertson. Any further discussion?
13	All those in favor signify by saying aye.
14	BOARD MEMBERS: Aye.
15	CHAIRMAN LA RUE: Any opposed? The ayes have it.
16	MR. HAMMIT: Thank you, Mr. Chair.
17	Item 9D, this project is a project to repair some
18	storm damage from one of our tropical storms that came
19	through
20	CHAIRMAN LA RUE: Tropical?
21	MR. HAMMIT: on a number of the landscape
22	areas on the freeway system here by Maricopa County. The low
23	bid was \$4,041,415. The State's estimate was \$3,007,739. It
24	was over the estimate by \$1,033,676, or 34.7 percent.
25	When we reviewed these bids, we saw one item in

1	particular. It was a discovery item. We labeled it as
2	preconstruction documentation. Basically, we had asked the
3	bidders to give us a price on going through the system, doing a
4	check on the electrical, the boxes. We didn't describe it very
5	well. They did a much more in-depth review that we wanted. We
6	believe well, they gave us a different product than we had
7	asked for. Let me take that back. We asked them to give us a
8	different product than we wanted. We need to clarify the bid
9	and put it back out. So with that, I would recommend that the
10	department go back, clarify the specification and rebid it.
11	With that, we'd recommend to reject all bids.
12	CHAIRMAN LA RUE: Any discussions by staff?
13	MR. SELLERS: Mr. Chairman
14	CHAIRMAN LA RUE: By staff by the Board.
15	MR. SELLERS: I make a motion to reject all
16	bids.
17	CHAIRMAN LA RUE: We have a motion by Board
18	Member Sellers to accept and approve staff's recommendation to
19	reject all bids in connection with Item 9D. Do we have a
20	second by Board Member Teller. Any further discussion?
21	VICE CHAIR BEAVER: Chairman.
22	CHAIRMAN LA RUE: Yes.
23	VICE CHAIR BEAVER: I did have one question. I
24	just wanted to inquire with regard to those that did bid on

this, they will have some kind of notification with explanation,

1 | right, separate from when it goes out to bid again?

needed repair within the next month or so.

MR. HAMMIT: Mr. Chairman, Board Member Beaver, yes. In fact, they are notified by a letter. As soon as we, as staff, we're prepared to make recommendation to the Board, we let them know. There were two bidders on the project. We had phone conversations and written conversations of our actions. They understood what we were doing, and so they know to look for this project, but we can make sure they know when it's coming out again. We do anticipate putting it out, because it is a

CHAIRMAN LA RUE: And I would just share with the Board, having been in construction a little bit, this is not uncommon where you put out a set of plans and specifications, and get the bids back and say, "Uh-oh, what did we interpret differently?" You work with the bidders. You realize that they interpreted it one way. We intended to write it another way. You rewrite it. You send it out to the same folks in many occasions and end up rebidding it and getting what you're actually going for. So I don't see this -- anything that's not out of the ordinary, unless I'm missing something.

MR. HAMMIT: Thank you, Mr. Chair.

CHAIRMAN LA RUE: We have a motion and a second pending to reject all bids. Any further discussion? Hearing none, all those in favor signify by saying aye.

BOARD MEMBERS: Aye.

1 CHAIRMAN LA RUE: Any opposed? The ayes have it. 2 We are going now to Item No. 10, performance 3 audit. Floyd. 4 MR. ROEHRICH: Thank you, Mr. Chair, members of 5 the Board. 6 When Prop 400 was passed by the voters for the 7 Regional Transportation Plan of Maricopa County, there's a 8 condition in there that it has a performance audit that is reviewed and conducted on that program every five years. This 9 year, in 2016, was the most recent audit that was performed on 10 11 the program. 12 I know that Mr. Mike Kies does have a presentation that gives you a little bit more in depth about the 13 audit, about some of the conditions of that, and then after he 14 finishes up with his overview, we have a couple more discussion 15 16 points to make regarding the next steps within the audit itself. 17 The audit was provided to each of you, as well as 18 responses by Maricopa Association of Government, Valley Metro and ADOT, and we'll talk about that after Mike's overview. 19 20 MR. KIES: Thank you. Thank you, Floyd. 21 Mr. Chair, yes, I have an overview of the 22 performance audit related to the MAG RTP. These -- this slide 23 just shows you a couple of the State revised statutes that are in effect where, as Floyd mentioned, beginning in 2010, every 24

five years, this audit needs to take place. The main revised

25

statute that we're talking about today is the second one there, which says within 45 days after the release of the audit, the Regional Public Transit Authority, the Citizens Transportation Oversight Committee, the State Transportation Board and the Maricopa County Board of Supervisors, by a majority vote of each entity, shall submit written recommendations to the Transportation Policy Committee, and that is the subject that we are talking about today. And Floyd will clarify the action that would be asked for after my presentation.

So here are some of the facts that relate to the audit and set that 45-day calendar. You can see the name of the audit firm, but the more important thing is that the audit was -- release date was November 23rd, 2016, which was the day before Thanksgiving. So that 45 days expires on January 7th of 2017.

The objectives of the audit, you can see here, was to essentially review the effectiveness and the performance of MAG's Regional Transportation Plan, which relates to the MAG Freeway Program that -- it is funded by Prop 400 and the half cent sales tax in Maricopa County.

With that, the audit has 12 recommendations to the agencies that are affected by the Regional Transportation Plan, and as you can see here, one of those 12 recommendations applies to MAG only. There's one that applies to Valley Metro only. There -- and then there are seven to ADOT, one to MAG and

ADOT, one that applies to MAG and Valley Metro only, and then one for all three agencies.

So our recommendation is that the Board consider nine total responses and only provide responses to the nine recommendations that are -- that were directed to ADOT in some way. And I'll go through each of those nine with you, and with the Chair's permission, after each one of those recommendations, I would pause for any questions or comments to get concurrence if the recommendation is to the Board's pleasure.

CHAIRMAN LA RUE: I think that's a reasonable way to handle it.

MR. KIES: The Joint Legislative Audit Committee made this very simple for us. They're asking us to respond to each recommendation in one of four ways. I guess they realize that planners and engineers tend to go into the weeds, and they just want one -- a one-sentence reply to each recommendation. And you can see them there, that either the agency agrees to the recommendation and it will be implemented, or the agency agrees but a different method will be implemented than what the audit describes, or the agency does not agree with the recommendation but still will implement the recommendation, and then the final one is that the agency does not agree with the recommendation and will not implement the recommendation. And you can see staff recommendations of how many of the responses we feel apply to each of those categories. With that, now I'll go through the

1 | nine one at a time.

Recommendation No. 1 is that MAG should work with ADOT and the local jurisdictions to enhance freeway and arterial project cards by including baseline budgets and baseline schedules to allow comparisons against actual.

As you can see, ADOT staff recommends that we agree and that we implement this. If Board members are not familiar with the project cards, they're a one-page document that's available on the web -- MAG website that describes the project, a conceptual schedule and shows the cost that is predicted for the project. This recommendation then asks that there should be a baseline budget so the public could see if over the course of time that budget for the project has gone up or down based on the original estimate.

So with that, I'll ask if there's any questions or comments on this recommendation.

CHAIRMAN LA RUE: Question or comments by Board members?

I do have a question. So the baseline budget, what time frame is that created that gets then put on to a project card? Is that in the design phase? Is that in the conceptual phase? What phase of the project is that baseline created that actually gets memorialized.

MR. KIES: Mr. Chair, I'm not sure that's been completely worked out, but the assumption is that at the time

that Prop 400 was passed, there were assumptions to what those 1 project costs would be. 2 CHAIRMAN LA RUE: So you use the Prop 400 3 assumption as the baseline. So that's probably not going to 4 have any reality to what the project actually comes in at, I 5 think, because so much time has transpired. I don't know. I'm 6 just trying to get at the -- the effectiveness of this 7 information that you put it out there may lead to more confusion 8 than assistance. I mean, I get the concept on putting it out 9 there, but we all know with projects, the numbers change from 10 concept to contract, so ... 11 MR. HALIKOWSKI: So Mike, I think what we're 12 trying -- or I think what the auditors are trying to get at here 13 is that if this was your baseline in 2003 when you put this 14 together, can you give a walk through to the public on what has 15 changed? Is it the cost of asphalt? The cost of concrete? 16 Steel? You know, have we (inaudible). 17 CHAIRMAN LA RUE: The scope of the project. 18 MR. HALIKOWSKI: Right. 19 CHAIRMAN LA RUE: Okay. 20 MR. HALIKOWSKI: All these different things. 21 22 They could happen. So at least there's, you know, some sort of way 23 of walking through and say, "Okay. I see what the differences 24 25 are."

1 | CHAIRMAN LA RUE: Okay.

2.1

2.3

2.4

MR. HALIKOWSKI: Because you're right, Mr. Chair. It's pretty hard in 2003 to project what something's going to cost you and what it might look like given all the variables in 15 years.

CHAIRMAN LA RUE: Well, and most of the time when you do that, I don't think we have really -- you've got concepts or ideas. You don't have designs and --

MR. HALIKOWSKI: Right.

CHAIRMAN LA RUE: -- (inaudible) of the right-of-way, utility infrastructure and all of that. So -- but if that's the purpose of doing this, and there's a lot of narrative that says, "Here's how we got from what was in the prop to what's" -- you know, the asphalt that's in the roadway, then it work's. But somebody's doing a lot of work describing --

MR. ROEHRICH: Mr. Chair and members of the Board, and that's what this is, is a comparison, because when they -- voters approved Prop 400 back in 2004, they had an expectation these projects were going to be delivered for this, and as we all know with the revenue dropoff and with everything else, projects have been moved and things have been shifted, and what we've been doing is we have been updating those cards based upon the current.

So what they're saying is somebody wants to go back and look at how did it evolve from 2004, when we voted to

now, they didn't have that, because they only had what was 1 current. This says to put in what was originally done so people 2 could start seeing some progression over time of what has 3 happened to these projects. So there's a better history --4 CHAIRMAN LA RUE: Yeah. 5 MR. ROEHRICH: -- documented as opposed to a 6 point in time. 7 CHAIRMAN LA RUE: Yeah. No, I -- so I think the 8 key there is that documentation of that history, not just say 9 here's our start, here's our finish, and people go wow. It's 10 somebody documenting the history that got us through, so... 11 MR. ROEHRICH: Yes, sir. 12 CHAIRMAN LA RUE: All right. That's all I got. 13 So it sounds like unless there's -- I'm not hearing any 14 heartburn. It looks like an acceptable recommendation. 15 MR. KIES: Recommendation No. 4 is that the RTP 16 partners -- and when the recommendations refer to "RTP 17 partners," that's MAG, ADOT and Valley Metro -- should fully 18 employ best practices and established performance targets and 19 key indicators for freeway, arterial streets and transit 20 performance. Again, the recommendation is to agree and 21 implement this recommendation. In fact, on the highway side, a 22 federal law is actually starting to kick in with federal -- with 23 final rule making that does have ADOT establish those 24 performance targets and key indicators.

25

CHAIRMAN LA RUE: Any -- Board Member Hammond.

2.2

2.3

2.4

MR. HAMMOND: Just a quick question. It implies that we weren't using best practices. What's the -- what's the -- kind of the root cause of this one?

MR. HALIKOWSKI: Well, if I could, since I was at the legislature and wrote some of these sanctions, performance and key indicators, I think, tend to evolve, because back at that point, we had certain things in statute about the regional freeway system, where that were supposed to be met. But let's just say that since 2003, we've learned a lot, and statutes and rules have changed over time.

And so I think what you're seeing here is an evolution of saying, "What are we really trying to measure that makes sense on these key performance targets?" Because during that time in '03 when we were putting this together, we struggled to try and figure out what would the key performance indicators be. And to just be quite honest with you, we put together what we thought were the best practices at that time.

So experience may be the best teacher. I think it's a good time to sit down with the partners and say, "Okay. Are we measuring the right things that make sense in 2017 and beyond? And what program or practice will we have in place to adjust those as necessary given changing conditions?"

So I think this is a good thing, Mr. Chairman, Board Member Hammond, that we -- we really do measure the

correct things and that we track whether or not we're hitting 1 those targets, because if we're not, then we should be putting 2 countermeasures or making other adjustments to hit targets. 3 CHAIRMAN LA RUE: Any other -- follow-up? Board 4 Member Hammond or any other comments? 5 It sounds like a good to go there, too, Michael. 6 MR. KIES: Great. Thank you, Mr. Chair. 7 Recommendation No. 5 is that ADOT should work 8 with the Citizens Transportation Oversight Committee, or CTOC, 9 to ensure responsibilities such as annual reporting are 10 fulfilled and methods of committee operations are changed to be 11 more effective in meeting statutory requirements. 12 This is another recommendation that ADOT would 13 agree and implement this recommendation, and there's been a lot 14 of discussion since this recommendation has come out about 15 re-energizing, for a lack of better words, the CTOC committee 16 and getting more regular meetings happening and paying more 17 attention to the statutory requirements of that committee. 18 CHAIRMAN LA RUE: Questions by --19 MR. SELLERS: Mr. Chair. 20 CHAIRMAN LA RUE: Mr. Sellers. 21 MR. SELLERS: Yeah. And this may be more comment 22 than question, but, you know, I'm know why the CTOC committee 23 was formed originally. I know that it's required by statute, so 24 that's why this is probably more comment than question. But, 25

you know, I've attended some of those meetings, and typically, I was the only person in the audience, and I'm just wondering why we put so much effort into something that really doesn't appear to be doing very much right now.

MR. HALIKOWSKI: So if I could, again, answer that question, because we did have a lot of discussion about this. As you know, Board Member Sellers, the CTOC was put in at a time where Prop 300 expenses -- because, again, of an another economic downturn, were not sufficient to build out 300. Had a lot of upset people in paradise, as you recall, and other issues where citizens felt they weren't being heard, and the CTOC was established as a countermeasure, if you will, to that.

But again, over time, as Prop 400 and MAG has evolved with the Transportation Policy Committee and other administrative committees in the MAG process, really a lot of the issues that were originally brought up about CTOC are now handled, we believe, through that MAG process. Unfortunately, or fortunately, depending on where you're sitting, we have a statutory responsibility still to fulfill, and as long as we have that responsibility, we've agreed to the audit recommendation that will fulfill that responsibility.

We've met with the CTOC chairman. We've talked about the agenda, you know, coming up in January, and we're working with the staff at MAG to ensure that the agenda items we're going to be considering on CTOC also are in line with what

the TPC will be seeing since the CTOC chair is to take those 1 issues to the TPC and the Regional Council. So essentially, as 2 long as we have the duty, we feel that we have a responsibility 3 to fulfill it. If something were to change in this coming 4 legislative session, then obviously we'd go with that, too. 5 MR. SELLERS: Well, in fact, I think we had a 6 discussion in the last year at MAG on whether or not the present 7 committee should be continued. 8 MR. ROEHRICH: Right. I think often there's a 9 reluctance to discontinue something with the word "citizen" in 10 it. But as I said, based on my experience, there are lots of --11 and the life cycle programs MAG has put in, for example, really 12 address a lot of the issues that CTOC was designed to counter. 13 MR. SELLERS: Maybe if we just make Barack a 14 permanent member of TPC (inaudible). 15 MR. ROEHRICH: Leave that up to the folks at TPC. 16 CHAIRMAN LA RUE: Yeah. 17 MR. SELLERS: (Inaudible.) 18 CHAIRMAN LA RUE: Yeah. I think I -- let that 19 20 one go. Well, I think, you know, there was a lot of 21 discussion for other board members here, a lot of discussion 22 last year that this committee probably should be sunsetted. 23 That did not happen in the Legislature. So I think we have a 24 statutory duty to comply with the statute, and so I think the 25

recommendation is right on. So thank you.

MR. KIES: Thank you, Mr. Chair.

The next item is that ADOT, as the Citizens

Transportation Oversight Committee's administrative support,

should encourage the County Board of Supervisors and the

governor's office to fulfill vacancies on CTOC and encourage the

committee to meet on a regular basis as statutorily required.

In this recommendation, ADOT agrees with the recommendation but proposes a different method of dealing with the findings to be implemented, and it's just a very minor change in the method is that -- and it's currently underway where it's -- the governor's office is directly encouraging the County Board of Supervisors to nominate and fill the vacancies on CTOC.

CHAIRMAN LA RUE: Questions by Board members? I think you're good there.

MR. KIES: Great. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

The next item is that ADOT should report freeway, bridge and pavement condition at the Maricopa County or Phoenix Mesa urbanized area level, in addition to current statewide data already available.

Staff's recommendation here is not to agree with the recommendation, but implement the recommendation. The background there is that we currently look at our pavement and bridge condition on a statewide level and believe that the most

effective way to manage our infrastructure is to look at the 1 entire state and put the resources as appropriate. We don't see 2 a big need to separate out the Maricopa County area or the 3 Phoenix metro area. However, we have the data. It's easy to 4 separate out. We'll -- we're happy to do it. 5 CHAIRMAN LA RUE: Comments? Questions? 6 Objections? I think you're good. 7 MR. KIES: All right. Thank you, Mr. Chair. 8 Recommendation No. 8 is ADOT should track and 9 report internal project delivery performance metrics at the 10 Maricopa County or Phoenix Mesa urbanized area level. 11 Again, ADOT staff's recommendation is not to 12 agree, and the audit recommendation will not be implemented, and 13 on this item, staff's concern is that there is no significant 14 value in separating out Maricopa County from a system 15 performance perspective. 16 CHAIRMAN LA RUE: Comments? Questions? 17 I guess the question I've got, so we're saying we 18 do not agree to the finding, and we're not going to implement. 19 So then what happens? We send that back, report back. 20 MR. ROEHRICH: Mr. Chair, members of the Board, 21 in the past, it really has -- again, the audit being their 22 findings and recommendations. If it's not agreed to and we 23 don't have any issue with the director in regarding that, or 24 with the our local partners regarding that issue, it just --

25

it's not complied with. 1 CHAIRMAN LA RUE: It just dies. 2 MR. ROEHRICH: And then in the next audit, they 3 can review again and decide if that is a continued issue. If 4 somehow something comes up that shows it's important we have 5 this information -- we view that because we work so closely and 6 cooperatively with our COGs and NPOs that these -- we know the 7 status of our projects. Breaking them out separate is just 8 extra administrative work that, that as Mike has said the team 9 looks at, what value does that give to tell the specifics of 10 these -- the continued project issues that are going on. 11 you really need to know, what's the status of the project, and 12 is it being delivered on time, under budget and within the 13 scope? And those are the things that we measure, so... 14 MR. HALIKOWSKI: I would say, Mr. Chairman, what 15 this does, since this audit is given to the Legislature and the 16 public, if someone felt very strongly, obviously, they could try 17 and work with the Legislature to take action, and perhaps 18 require the agency by statute to do this, but --19 CHAIRMAN LA RUE: But --20 (Speaking simultaneously.) 21 CHAIRMAN LA RUE: Okay. 22 MR. HALIKOWSKI: It's a recommendation and we 23 just -- we disagree that it has any value. 24 CHAIRMAN LA RUE: Okay. All right. Next one. 25

MR. KIES: Thank you, Mr. Chair. 1 ADOT should consider using additional project 2 delivery metrics including project administrative costs as a 3 percent of the budget. As similar to the previous ones, ADOT 4 does not agree with this recommendation, but the recommendation 5 will be implemented. Starting in fiscal year '17, ADOT will 6 track project development costs as a percentage of the 7 construction costs. Again, we don't see the burning need to 8 separate that out, but we have the data. It's easy to screen, 9 and so ADOT, in fiscal year '17, will be tracking that. 10 CHAIRMAN LA RUE: Okay. Questions by the Board 11 12 members? All right. Thank you. 13 MR. KIES: Recommendation No. 10, with many 14 innovative project management practices employed on the South 15 Mountain Freeway Project, ADOT should consider applying 16 techniques and tools from this project to other ADOT freeway 17 projects as appropriate. And this is a recommendation that ADOT 18 agrees to and is happy to implement this recommendation. 19 CHAIRMAN LA RUE: Comments? Questions from the 20 21 Board? Sounds good. 22 MR. KIES: The last one, ADOT should continue its 23 efforts currently underway to scientifically explore, evaluate 24 and implement active traffic management techniques where

25

practical or feasible, including continued efforts to work with the RTP partners on considering and prioritizing the maintenance of the communication infrastructure to remain functional and current. Again, ADOT agrees with this and is happy to implement this recommendation. CHAIRMAN LA RUE: Was there a corresponding recommendation in the report to say the Legislature should fund this effort? You know --

 $$\operatorname{MR.}$$ ROEHRICH: Actually (inaudible) the audit was somewhat silent on the funding requirement.

CHAIRMAN LA RUE: You know, because I think we all -- this one is like a no brainer, but then, you know, where are the funds to implement the audit recommendation.

MR. KIES: Correct. Yeah.

CHAIRMAN LA RUE: Question on Recommendation 12 or something else?

think your comment on this being a no brainer kind of reflects back on my comment on how we're using best practices. It seems like the common theme is more coordination between these three agencies rather than criticizing, you know, the methods we're currently using, and then maybe some more delivery of information, too, but it's more the coordination of the entities that they saw room for improvement is what I kind of read when I looked at the document when I received it, and I still see it in

these recommendations. So I don't know. Is that an accurate statement?

MR. KIES: Mr. Chair and Mr. Hammond, I do agree, and I think it reflects back to the director's statements of this is a great time for us to all coordinate on what are the best practices, where is the technology today, what do we each know as different organizations about where technology is going, and it's a great call to action, I think.

MR. ROEHRICH: And Mr. Chair -- I'm sorry.

CHAIRMAN LA RUE: I was going to say, that was a great, a great question. Thank you, Board Member Hammond.

MR. ROEHRICH: So Mr. Chair, members of the Board, I want to wrap up a couple things here.

In general, I think it's important to remember the outlook was very positive, and that's what -- in the outbriefing it was the same. You see kind of the issues here seem a little nitpicky and very generalized like use best practices. Well, we know we do that.

Where I think it points to is the success that we have had as a region by working cooperatively between the State Transportation Board, the Regional Council, MAG staff, ADOT staff, all the local governments within that area to deliver what is probably one of the most aggressive and well-built transportation systems in that region. And I think the audit did point to a lot of great successes as well.

1 So the general theme of this seems to be relatively getting down to some nuanced items and some very 2 generalized items. Nothing in there was of significant concern 3 or pointed to anything that needed glaring attention or changes. 4 Mike, unless you feel differently, I think the 5 general theme in the outbrief from the audit was you guys are 6 7 doing good. 8 CHAIRMAN LA RUE: And I think that's an important point, and I see the slide popped up. Any time an auditor says 9 10 there are no significant findings or changes, it's very positive. And I don't want to offend any auditors in the crowd, 11 12 but we know auditors have to find something, you know, to report on to justify the amount -- because they spend a lot of energy 13 14 and a lot of time looking at this stuff. So I'm not surprised 15 that they came up with things, but I think your point's a great 16 one. There is no significant material change or issue or 17 deficiency, so ... MR. ROEHRICH: And so then now I want to talk --18 Mike, I'm ready to go to the next step unless you've got 19 20 something. MR. KIES: Sure. The last thing was just that 21 you have been provided the link for the -- to the entire audit, 22 and there's a lot more detail in the audit than what I 23 24 presented.

CHAIRMAN LA RUE: Yeah. I thank you for that.

25

sent the Board members home early last night. I know they all got on the internet, got on the link and read it word by word, so...

MR. KIES: With that, I'll turn it back to Floyd.

Thank you.

MR. ROEHRICH: So a couple more points to move forward. So in the past how we handled this, at least the most recent audit five years ago, after this discussion, if the Board felt there were no further comments that were -- the Board wished to amend, you move that you accepted ADOT's recommendations. I sent a letter to the Auditor General of the State of Arizona expressing that, outlining that the Board has reviewed on their action, and therefore they concur with the previous recommendations, and we will move forward as identified.

If you choose to modify any of these recommendations or add, then I would need the Board to tell me that, and then we can craft up a response that would include any additional language. Again, I signed it in the past. If this is something, Board Chair, you'd rather you sign, we're fine with that. We would just need to know, you know, one, do you agree with these recommendations, or do you want to add recommendations, and Floyd, then go ahead and send that response back or prepare something for your signature.

CHAIRMAN LA RUE: Yeah. So let's take it kind of

one at a time. Board members, are there any changes, adjustments that you would have to the recommendations?

Board Member Hammond.

MR. HAMMOND: It's just a question. I did go online, because I think the link was sent a week or two ago to this audit and looked at it, and I agree with everything, you know, that's been said. But normally when the final audit, kind of the exit interview where all of these are presented, usually a board member, chair or somebody is invited to be there. Is that -- did that happen or should it happen? And -- that's been my experience, and at some point they actually get staff out of the room and then say -- ask the board are there any questions.

MR. ROEHRICH: Mr. Chair, members of the Board, we do not do that. I think that's an excellent suggestion and consideration probably for the next audit, but we did not bring the Transportation Board into this. The auditors hadn't asked for that, and I guess I'll take the hit. I didn't think to say, "Well, we would want to invite our board to this," feeling that we would present it like we've done it in the past where it really came from us without that.

I'm more than happy to see will the Auditor

General like to have a meeting where we invite the Board so you can maybe hear that, or to ensure that in the future when we have this to make sure to invite the Board to sit through that.

I'm very happy either way. It's my failure now to not have

addressed that, Mr. Hammond, inviting Board members to our exit audit.

CHAIRMAN LA RUE: Board Member Hammond, let me follow up on that. Are you suggesting we do that before we take any action on this one, or as a suggestion to the audit -- and this is done, what, every five years?

MR. ROEHRICH: Every five years.

MR. HAMMOND: I really don't know. It was more of a comment, and we're a different board than a board that hires and fires the director. So I'm not sure it was even appropriate that we be invited. I'm just saying it is normal and it's part of the transparency that ADOT is so good at. It would seem an easy thing to do, and we could choose not to show up, I guess.

MR. ROEHRICH: And then Mr. Chair, Mr. Hammond, and that's -- I don't think there's anything precluding it happening. We just had never really thought to invite the Board or the Board's expressed interest before at previous audits or follow-up from that that says, "Hey, in the future we would like to do that." We're willing to accommodate the Board. I don't see any reason why not.

MR. HAMMOND: Well, I mean, if I'm the only one on the Board that feels that way, then that's fine. I just made that comment. Maybe some other Board members needed to chime in real quick, and if you don't think it's a good idea, I have

1 broad shoulders. CHAIRMAN LA RUE: Right. So a couple things. 2 One is we need to take action within 45 days. So if we delay 3 action today and want to sit with the Auditor General, we'll 4 have to do so pretty quickly so that we can take action --5 (Speaking simultaneously.) 6 7 MR. HAMMOND: Well, I don't think this would change the -- you know, the recommendation to accept. 8 CHAIRMAN LA RUE: Okay. 9 MR. HAMMOND: Or would it? I mean, I'm not 10 trying to throw a wrench --11 CHAIRMAN LA RUE: No. I just want to explain to 12 Board members that if that's something --13 14 MR. ROEHRICH: (Inaudible.) CHAIRMAN LA RUE: -- we want to do, then we need 15 to hold on this and schedule that right away or take action on 16 this today, but then pass along the recommendation that -- and 17 then there's two prongs to that. One is did we want to meet 18 with the auditor post our action in this audit cycle, or just 19 pass on the recommendation for the next audit? 20 Any -- Board Member Stratton. 21 MR. STRATTON: Mr. Chairman, having been through 22 several of these audits in past positions, it's very common for 23 staff to meet with the Auditor General and the Senate Finance 24 Committee or whatever, and the boards or councils that I've 25

worked for previously can attend if they wish, but it's not mandatory. My only suggestion would be that the invitation to the Board be extended during the next audit, but I don't believe this one should be held up. For the amount of money that has been handled through this audit, if you look at the multi-million dollars, the findings are very minimal, and I commend the staff for what they've done.

CHAIRMAN LA RUE: Board Member Beaver, any comments on that?

VICE CHAIR BEAVER: Well, my comment would kind of echo what Board Member Stratton had said. I just think especially when you read that final line that you'd commented on, that there was no significant findings, that in itself was saying that the -- you know, the Auditor General didn't find anything of significance. And I do think, though, for future, it might just be noted that the Board could be invited. Whether or not they show up or not is another thing.

CHAIRMAN LA RUE: Anybody? Any comments?

So I do agree with Mr. Hammond that best practice is to make sure we're invited, but I don't think we need to hold up this vote. But there is a meeting in early January. Is the Auditor General at that meeting, or is that just a public meeting?

MR. ROEHRICH: Mr. Chairman and Board members, that's the second part I wanted to talk about.

Also in the past, the region has held a public hearing that will allow the public, who's had now time to look at this, because it's been posted through your website, through MAG's website, through the Auditor General's website, through Valley Metro's website, that the public should have a chance to review it.

In the past they've held a joint public hearing at MAG's office, between MAG, Board members who have wanted to attend, as well as Valley Metro members who wanted to attend. I do not remember if the Auditor General was there. But what was presented were the findings as well as the draft responses, very similar to kind of how Mike had addressed here that has been presented by ADOT -- MAG, ADOT and Valley Metro staff. And it was presented so the public could see it and then provide any public comment back that these agencies, the Valley Metros or Regional Council and State Transportation Board could hear. That was on your agenda today, so you had a chance to public hear it as well as for your input.

So from the perspective, we feel you've held your public meeting or hearing on this. But in the past, Board members -- and usually they've been the ones from Maricopa County -- have attended the joint meeting. All Board members are invited, by the way, but in the past it has probably been more traditionally represented by the Maricopa County regional board members.

1 So that public hearing, the Board doesn't really have a role in that, because you don't have to speak or -- you 2 3 can ask questions or you can be part of that process. It has been there for the public to respond. Right now, we're 4 tentatively looking at coordinating with MAG and Valley Metro to 5 hold that on the afternoon of January 4th. About 3:00 p.m. 6 would be the start date. A notice will go out once its finalized, all the coordination, as well as a notice to all the 8 9 Board members. We will post it through the Board site as a 10 hearing, where Board members will -- may be present, but again, 11 no action's required at that, nor is it required to attend. But 12 it is there so the public has a chance to view and express any issues which then would be shared with, as we said, the regional 13 bodies and the State Board and MAG and Valley Metro. 14 15 VICE CHAIR BEAVER: Chairman. 16 CHAIRMAN LA RUE: Yes. 17 VICE CHAIR BEAVER: I do have one additional

vice CHAIR BEAVER: I do have one additional question. When our agenda was posted to the website, how many days -- has it been posted more than two days? I mean, has it been on the website for a significant number of days?

MR. ROEHRICH: Mr. Chair, Mrs. Beaver, it's been up there for a week.

(Speaking simultaneously.)

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

VICE CHAIR BEAVER: Okay. So in that week have we had anyone through any kind of communication indicate that

1 they were concerned about this audit? MR. ROEHRICH: Mr. Chair, Mrs. Beaver, no. We 2 received no comments back on -- specific to the link to the 3 4 audit. VICE CHAIR BEAVER: Okay. Thank you. 5 6 CHAIRMAN LA RUE: Move us along, what I would 7 suggest, I would entertain a motion to accept and concur with ADOT's responses to the Maricopa Associated Government's 8 9 Regional Transportation Plan Performance Audit as presented and 10 discussed, along with a recommendation for the next cycle to 11 build in maybe a board review with the auditing team, 12 independent of executive staff, which is -- in certain circles is a best practice. I would entertain that kind of motion if 13 14 somebody would so move it. 15 VICE CHAIR BEAVER: So moved. 16 CHAIRMAN LA RUE: We have a motion by Board 17 Member Beaver, a second by Board Member Hammond. Any further 18 discussion? 19 All those in favor signify by saying aye. 20 BOARD MEMBERS: Aye. 21 CHAIRMAN LA RUE: Any opposed? 22 Thank you. The ayes have it. MR. ROEHRICH: Mr. Chair, the finding is agreed 23 24 to and the finding will be implemented. I'm trying to use Mike's (inaudible) here. I think it's a great suggestion about 25

the Board. Just something we had not really had Board members 1 bring up before, but I think it does speak about the involvement 2 and the interaction between us, so (inaudible). 3 CHAIRMAN LA RUE: Perfect. Thank you. 4 That takes care of that item. We'll move on the 5 Agenda Item No. 11, which is suggestions for feature agendas. 6 Any suggestions? Board Member Stratton. 8 MR. STRATTON: Mr. Chairman, I would like for --9 at a board session, just for discussion purposes, to discuss the 10 wrong-way driving incidents that are occurring and what we're 11 doing and what we may possibly do in the future to help that. 12 MR. HALIKOWSKI: Certainly. Certainly. 13 CHAIRMAN LA RUE: That's an excellent suggestion, 14 because we're hearing that more and more and more. Yeah. Thank 15 16 you for that. 17 Any other agenda items? Suggestions? Let's go on to No. 12, for liberation. It's 18 designation of Board Chair and Vice Chair, and I fail to 19 encourage somebody here to make motions and seconds. So I'm 20 just going to throw it out there to let you guys figure this one 21 22 out on your own. So we've -- now is the time to hold -- or 23 actually nominate, but I would entertain a motion to designate 24 the Vice Chair Deanna Beaver as the State Transportation Board 25

1	Chairwoman to be effective as soon as I gavel this meeting down.
2	MR. HAMMOND: So moved.
3	CHAIRMAN LA RUE: We have Board Member Hammond
4	moving. Do I have a second?
5	MR. CUTHBERTSON: Second.
6	CHAIRMAN LA RUE: Second by Board Member
7	Cuthbertson. Any further discussion?
8	We sure we don't want to go back and revisit the
9	last agenda? Because we could hold you know, have to have
10	another board meeting and keep me on for a week. No? Okay.
11	Great.
12	All those in favor signify by saying aye.
13	BOARD MEMBERS: Aye.
14	CHAIRMAN LA RUE: Any opposed?
15	Congratulations, Deanna.
16	VICE CHAIR BEAVER: Thank you.
17	CHAIRMAN LA RUE: You are the incoming chair.
18	I would entertain a motion to designate William
19	Cuthbertson as the State Transportation Board Vice Chair to be
20	effective immediately following the end of this meeting. Do I
21	have a motion?
22	VICE CHAIR BEAVER: So moved.
23	CHAIRMAN LA RUE: I have a motion by the vice
24	chair, the pending transition chair, and a second by Board
25	Member Stratton. Any further discussion?

Hearing none, all those in favor signify by 1 2 saying aye. 3 BOARD MEMBERS: Aye. 4 CHAIRMAN LA RUE: Any opposed? 5 Congratulations. Let's go on to Item No. 13, which is a little 6 sadness, but -- you know, I've got some remarks, but I think 7 I'll hold those, and I think, Floyd, you guys wanted to... 8 MR. ROEHRICH: Absolutely, Mr. Chair, and members 9 of the Board. I think it's -- it's fair to say that when 10 Mr. Rogers decided to leave the State and resign from the Board, 11 it's the first time that in anybody's memory we had a Board 12 member that resigned in the middle of -- not sure what to 13 14 expect. So there was a lot of what's going to happen, 15 16 what's going on, and it took a while to finally -- I guess the 17 governor's office to find the professional they wanted to put on 18 here. And then all of a sudden we hear you're going to get a representative from the northeast, Mr. Arlando Teller. 19 20 And immediately, you know, wondering, well, he's 21 coming here. He's got basically about a year left. So not sure 22 what's going to happen in that year, how effective it's going to 23 be. I tell you I think we were all surprised to realize the

energy he brought, the experience he brought, the intelligence

he brought from his experience through the aviation program,

24

25

through working with Navajo DOT and that.

He immediately jumped in, and there was no delay period, and so you're here saying, "Wow, thank you for your year." You probably, you know, don't know how active you've been, but I think he surprised all of us by how active he was, what his contributions were, and what he was able to bring as a balance to the Transportation Board and our coordinations we do with them and staff. So we're very pleased to have had this opportunity. And a couple mixed emotions. What -- where in the hell was he the whole six years?

CHAIRMAN LA RUE: Exactly.

MR. ROEHRICH: The second thing, why can't we get it extended into the next -- you know, let's give him a full term if we could. Unfortunately, I realize there are statutes or kind of rules about that. So maybe the next time it comes around, Mr. Teller, and back to Apache County's time to bring someone forward, maybe you can get a full term in. I mean, I think it would be great for us.

The experience and knowledge really was, I thought, a big benefit to us. The fact -- the questions and the way you interacted with staff were really something that I think furthered our ability to work together between staff and the Board, and I think it really complimented where the Board was going with its approach to this year. And there are a lot of significant issues we had to deal with, as we continued to climb

out of the financial downturn that we had.

We saw positive results, and because of that, you know, the Board took positive action, and Mr. Teller was a strong component of that. He got a lot done in a year. So his time is very well recognized, very well appreciated, and it really means we're going to miss his time on the Board between staff and individually from Board members. So I'm sure you'll have your own feelings about that.

So from us, we want to thank you, Mr. Teller, for your time here, tell you our appreciation for really what you did to help us transition into this, and in the short period of time, your contributions are significant. We feel that from staff, we can't say enough to say our appreciation. We have a few little gifts that we would like to present in recognition of your time here.

MR. TELLER: Thank you.

MR. ROEHRICH: First we would like to present a certificate signed by all the Board members and our director, again, expressing the sincere appreciation for your contribution and your dedication to public service, your contribution and your labors on this board for -- on behalf of all of Arizona. So thank you so much for that time.

VICE CHAIR BEAVER: (Inaudible.)

CHAIRMAN LA RUE: (Inaudible.)

(Inaudible conversation.)

MR. ROEHRICH: There are a couple more 1 personalized gifts, but Mr. Teller, I don't necessarily know 2 that that -- they are gifts you can show the public, by the way. 3 I don't want people to think the wrong thing. But at the same 4 5 time, these are, again, personal gifts from the department to you, things that we traditionally give to Board members. 6 There's a personalized license plate as well as a gift from the Arizona Highways, MAG and things, things that we hope do 8 acknowledge the great appreciation we have, and we really wish 9 10 you the best in all your endeavors to move forward. 11 And I know you will not be a stranger to transportation or to the department or to this board. We're 12 looking to continuing to work with you at the DOT of Navajo 13 Nation, as well as our aviation and then the rest of our 14 15 transportation issues. So thank you so much, sir. It's been a 16 real pleasure. MR. HALIKOWSKI: I'd like to note this is a 17 souvenir license plate. It's a not a real license plate, so... 18 19 CHAIRMAN LA RUE: I thought it was a lifetime, you know, ADOT. 20 2.1 MR. HALIKOWSKI: No. Unfortunately, no, but --22 CHAIRMAN LA RUE: Gold pass. 23 MR. TELLER: (Inaudible) HOV lane. 24 CHAIRMAN LA RUE: Right. MR. ROEHRICH: Thank you, though, Mr. Teller, for 25

1 bringing strength and honor to this board. It's much 2 appreciated. CHAIRMAN LA RUE: Comments? Other comments by 3 4 Board members? VICE CHAIR BEAVER: I would just like to make one 5 comment, that next year we look forward to being up in your 6 7 neighborhood, and we hope that you make that Board meeting. MR. TELLER: I make that --8 9 VICE CHAIR BEAVER: We're going to be up there 10 because you requested it. 11 MR. TELLER: Yes, definitely. 12 VICE CHAIR BEAVER: Hopefully no snow. CHAIRMAN LA RUE: You know, Mr. Teller, I just --13 you know, Floyd couldn't have said it any better. I mean, all 14 15 of the thoughts, I think, that the Board has had, and our time 16 that we've spent together has been absolutely, you know, 17 rewarding for all of us, and I can kind of speak from the -- you 18 know, the Board's perspective a little bit. 19 I was here with Hank Rogers for a number of years. He was a, you know, very impactful board member for a 20 21 few years there, but then you could tell that Hank, you know, 22 was distracted and was -- had other things that he had to go off 23 and do, and then there was just kind of this void left up there 24 in northern Arizona with Hank moving on, and it was quite awhile 25 before, you know, there was somebody selected there. And it

would show as we traveled around the state. You could tell that the -- you know, the constituents up there were looking for that leader, and then we ended up having a little misstep there before you joined us.

And so actually, when you joined, we were -- you know, at least I was sitting there saying, "Man, I -- how is this going to go?" But, you know, you stepped in here. You have a thirst for knowledge. You know, you represented those constituents up there very well. Not only did you represent them. You've actually mobilized them. You know, they're now coming to the meetings. They're getting engaged. They're speaking. That's just phenomenal. Absolutely phenomenal efforts on your behalf.

And so while I know that you're stepping off, what I hope happens is that you continue all of that energy up there. Keep the northeast part of that state engaged with us, because that's a very important piece of the State of Arizona, and I truly am going to miss not having you on this Board, the Board next year.

On behalf of the Board we wanted to just, you know, provide you something to -- let me make sure I brought it -- provide you something that you can just, you know, go and have a little time with somebody and enjoy. We've got some -- from one of your favorite places, we understand. You can go and just have, you know, time to eat and relax and think about what

1 you're going to do in the future. MR. TELLER: It is, actually. Thank you very 2 3 much. 4 CHAIRMAN LA RUE: Yeah. But thank you. MR. TELLER: Thank you as well. 5 CHAIRMAN LA RUE: Anything else? Wow. 6 With that, I would accept a motion to adjourn this Transportation meeting December 16th and get on about 8 9 business. VICE CHAIR BEAVER: Can I have a second? 10 CHAIRMAN LA RUE: I'm sorry. You know what? I 11 12 wasn't thinking. Thank you. MR. TELLER: Yeah. Thank you very much. 13 (Inaudible) or the support of the Board, as well as for the 14 15 legislator, the body who suggested me and to the governor who 16 appointed me. I sincerely appreciate this humbling experience 17 to progress Arizona State Transportation systems, and it has been a phenomenal experience working with a wonderful board. It 18 19 really has been. This is a new experience for me. You've made it 20 easy. You've made it understandable to me to jump right in with 21 22 both feet. I took this opportunity wholeheartedly, because I 23 feel that there's a lot more to do in the northeast area of 24 Arizona, and that progress is constant, and that we can work 25 together progressing towards improvement for the people of

Arizona, and that's what I took to mind.

When I was offered this opportunity, I had to go to my counsel. Who's your counsel, Arlando? My mother, my mother's brother and my aunt. My elders. And they sat me down and -- I come from a very traditional Navajo family, and they -- first they scolded me. This is how you need to react. This is how you need to respond. This is -- you know, so it was -- as a leader, this is what you need to do. And then they encouraged me. Speak for your people, speak for the people up here, not just Navajo people, but the people in the County, and also fight for the State, because you have other states that are fighting for the same resources that Arizona is going to be fighting for.

And with that, I really had in mind that this is something that I need to really wholeheartedly put my heart into it, my effort into it. The first meeting, I was a bit lost, because this was a new meeting for me, but Mr. La Rue,

Ms. Beaver, the rest of the team here really made it easy for me to understand the process. That was hard for me to understand the State process on, you know, the meeting.

But I sincerely appreciate this opportunity, and appreciate your leadership, Mr. La Rue, Ms. Beaver, all the Board members. (Speaking Navajo.) In Navajo that means "thank you." (Speaking Navajo.) "Thank you from here." Thank you.

CHAIRMAN LA RUE: Any final parting words or

25 | comments?

VICE CHAIR BEAVER: Well, my comment is it's been a pleasure working with you, and I would like us to be able to have a group picture maybe after. MR. TELLER: Absolutely. VICE CHAIR BEAVER: Don't go anywhere. (End of excerpt.)

Adjournment

A motion to adjourn the December 16, 2016 Board meeting was made by Arlando Teller and seconded by Deanna Beaver. In a voice vote, the motion carries.

Meeting adjourned at 11:09 a.m. MST.

Joseph E. La Rue, Chairman State Transportation Board

John S. Halikowski, Director

Arizona Department of Transportation