

MINUTES
STATE TRANSPORTATION BOARD STUDY SESSION
9:00 a.m., Tuesday, May 30, 2017, 2017
Human Resource Development Center (HRDC)
Grand Canyon Room
1130 N. 22nd Avenue
Phoenix, AZ 85009

Pledge

The Pledge of Allegiance was led by Board member Jack Sellers.

Roll call by Floyd Roehrich

In attendance: Deanna Beaver, William Cuthbertson, Joe La Rue, Jack Sellers, Michael Hammond, Steve Stratton and Jesse Thompson.

Absent: None.

There were approximately 30 people in the audience.

Title VI of the Civil Rights Act

Floyd Roehrich reminded all attendees to sign in and fill in the survey cards to assist our Civil Rights Department. He added information regarding an evacuation plan for the HRDC building and provided instructions on how to proceed in the event of an emergency.

Call to the Audience:

The following members of the public addressed the Board:

1. John Moffat, Pima County Director, thanked the Board for the Sonoran Corridor SR410 Study. He asked the board to consider adding funding in the budget to help keep moving this project forward. He added on a local level, they are looking into federal funding.
2. Chris Bridges, CYMPO Administrator, discussed regional partnerships and what has been accomplished so far. He also asked the Board to consider adding the SR69 Safety and Capacity Improvement Project into the Five Year Plan.
3. Marcie Ellis, Traffic Matters Chair, reported on the recent traffic issues in Sedona and Oak Creek Canyon. She provided examples of why changes need to be made. She asked the Board to consider including
4. Mary Garland, Traffic Matters, echoed Ms. Ellis's comments and asked for legislative changes to find alternative funding sources. She also asked the Board to look into public/private partnerships and consider new strategies.

Item 1: Grand Canyon Airport Master Plan

Item 2: MAG'S Major Amendments to the Regional Transportation Plan

Item 3: 2018– 2022 Tentative Five-Year Transportation Facilities Construction Program Review

STATE TRANSPORTATION STUDY SESSION – May 30, 2017

I N D E X

PAGE

ITEM 1: Grand Canyon Airport Master Plan (Sonya Herrera).....3

ITEM 2: MAG'S Major Amendments to the Regional Transportation Plan (Bob Hazlett/MAG)..14

ITEM 3: 2018– 2022 Tentative Five-Year Transportation Facilities Construction Program Review
(Kristine Ward, Bret Anderson).....61

(Beginning of excerpt.)

MS. HERRERA: Madam Chair and members of the Board, thank you for the opportunity to share with you an update today on the Grand Canyon National Park Master Plan. The FAA recommends that airports update their long-term planning documents every seven to ten years. The Grand Canyon National Park's current master plan was completed in 2005. So, in late 2015, we began the process to update our master plan. Following the bid process, we contracted with Koffman Associates, a national aviation consulting firm who specializes in master planning and environmental studies to lead this effort.

MR. ROEHRICH: How about that so you don't have to juggle so many things?

MS. HERRERA: Thank you, Floyd.

The airport -- the airport master plan is an evaluation of current and forecasted airport activity, facility requirements and a review of various alternatives for the Grand Canyon National Park Airport. The master plan establishes short, immediate, as well as long-term planning goals for a 20-year period.

The primary objective of the airport master plan is to provide guidance for future development, which will satisfy aviation demand in a safe, environmentally and fiscally responsible manner, while adhering to appropriate Federal Aviation Administration safety design standards.

During extensive and proactive public involvement and community outreach process, alternative development scenarios will be devised with environmental stewardship being a prime consideration during all phases. The master plan then acts as a guide to aid local, state, and federal decision makers when considering airport improvements.

A key component of developing master plan, is the establishment of a planning advisory committee that features key stakeholders to provide guidance throughout the process. As you can see, we have quite a large pact with all key stakeholders being represented. Some of those include the FAA, several different areas within ADOT, the USDA, the Grand Canyon National Park, the Town of Tusayan -- and we have Mayor Dufy (phonetic) here today. So, thank you for being here, Mayor. As well as the Havasu tribe, the Sierra Club, and many of our other stakeholders from the area.

There are -- there are several phases in the master plan process that I am now going to walk you through.

The Planning Advisory Committee, or PAC, first met on October 29th, of 2015 in the town of Tusayan to educate participants on the process as well as to discuss next steps. The PAC met again on May 25th of 2016 to review the working papers on inventory, forecast, demand capacity, as well as facility requirements.

The first of eight public information workshops

1 was held in Tusayan on May 25th, and a second was held on July
2 20th of 2016 in Flagstaff.

3 The Planning Advisory Committee met again on
4 October 27th of 2016 to discuss development alternatives. In
5 addition, another public information workshop was held that same
6 day in the town of Tusayan, and an additional public information
7 workshop was held in Williams on February 15th of 2017.

8 The next Planning Advisory Committee meeting is
9 scheduled for June 26th, this summer, to review the working
10 papers on the master plan concept, to review the environmental
11 section of the plan, as well as the sustainability analysis. I
12 will tell you that something that we have spent a lot of time
13 and effort working on is really to include a really robust
14 sustainability plan as a part of this master plan going forward.

15 So I thought I'd share some of the forecast
16 summary that our consultant has developed. So, an enplanement
17 includes any revenue passengers that board an aircraft for a
18 fare at an airport. This statistic is what the FAA utilizes
19 to determine the annual level of entitlement funding dedicated
20 to an airport under the Airport Improvement Program, or AIP.

21 In reviewing the Grand Canyon National Park's
22 airport history, (inaudible) enplanements came in 1996 with
23 642,000 enplanements. Since 2011, the Grand Canyon Airport has
24 averaged about 334,000 annually. The enplanements consist
25 primary of air tours as well as charter flight passengers.

1 The consulting partnership with the Planning
2 Advisory Committee is working on a number of alternatives, many
3 of which are shown here: Enhancing the terminal facility to
4 better meet customer and operational needs, determining land
5 uses, both aviation as well as non-aviation, evaluating airfield
6 improvements necessary to comply with the FAA design, as well as
7 geometry standards.

8 So here's a little bit more about the
9 Sustainability Management Plan goals. So the areas that are
10 being addressed are air quality, energy, natural resource
11 management, land use, plan development, construction methods,
12 resiliency and preparedness, waste management, as well as
13 water, which is a very precious resource in Northern Arizona.

14 So with regard to our public outreach, ADOT
15 prepared a public involvement plan at the very beginning of
16 the master plan -- planning process. So, typically, we have
17 in the past had about four public outreach meetings. In this
18 particular process, we are having twice that. We are having
19 eight, and they're in multiple regional areas.

20 So this is a recap. I mentioned these earlier,
21 ones that are upcoming is in the town of Tusayan again. That
22 will be on June 28th. We're meeting -- going down to meet with
23 the Havasupai tribe on the 29th, and then there will be an
24 additional meeting here in Phoenix, and that date has not yet
25 been determined.

1 We do have a website where members of the
2 public as well as the Board can go to find more information
3 and see the actual working papers and the draft documents that
4 are currently available.

5 So our next steps. We'll be developing the
6 master plan concept as well as the associated Capital
7 Improvement Program. We will be implementing the Sustainable
8 Management Plan based on recommendations, and then we will be
9 preparing a market rent study, as well as a rate and charges
10 analysis. The next step in that process will then be approval
11 and adoption by ADOT, and then the final step of that is the FAA
12 will review and approve our airport layout plan.

13 So I wanted to also update the Board. We had
14 shared a number of pictures and things with regard to the
15 airport, and Chairwoman Beaver came up and visited with us at
16 the airport. We really appreciate you coming up and spending
17 some time with us. So I wanted to share a little bit about
18 some of those things that we have done with regard to some
19 improvements at the facility since your visit. We've repaired
20 the retaining wall and steps, which I'll share some pictures
21 of those here in a moment.

22 We've enhanced security at the Grand Canyon
23 Airlines terminal by installing fencing that better controls
24 runway access. We've also updated the exterior of the
25 terminal. We've painted and done some repairs there. Our HVAC,

1 we have a new AC unit, as well as a new heating unit to support
2 the terminal. And then the lighting in our parking lots -- and
3 this is something we're really proud of -- has been converted to
4 LED lights at no cost to the State, and that includes shields
5 which are compliant with the Dark Sky Initiative. We've
6 installed and rehabilitated airfield lighting and added 20-foot
7 shoulders to our runway, and we've done some taxiway
8 preservation as well.

9 The current FBO and fuel farm lease does expire
10 on September 30th, and these are being put out for bid. ADA
11 improvements were also done on our main parking lot when it
12 was crack sealed. So we have better addressed ADA parking at
13 the terminal as a result of that project.

14 So some other things that have occurred. We
15 now have tandem skydiving. A vendor named Paragon is there on
16 site doing that. That has started back in April of 2016, and
17 it's the only operation of its kind in North America. Our
18 helicopter leases come up for renewal in 2018 and 2016. We've
19 also replaced the security system with fiber optic cabling to
20 repair automated gates and to make them more reliable and to
21 also enhance our security system.

22 I'm also happy to report that for the last
23 three years, the airport has been very close to being
24 completely self-sustaining. And our energy conservation
25 efforts are paying off. Our water consumption at the airport

1 has gone down significantly.

2 One other item to note is we no longer have
3 scheduled air at the Grand Canyon National Park Airport, as
4 Vision Airlines did not renew their lease.

5 So I'm going to some photos here. At the top,
6 this is the before, and the below is the after. Again, these
7 are updated photos. Both of these are from current. Just
8 made this week.

9 So we showed you the retaining wall and the
10 steps.

11 We were having some major deterioration issues
12 there. Those have now been repaired.

13 This retaining wall also was starting to break
14 down and degrade. That has also been repaired.

15 Those are our new HVAC and heating units.

16 And I am now willing to take any questions that
17 you might have.

18 CHAIRWOMAN BEAVER: (Inaudible.)

19 MR. HALIKOWSKI: Madam Chair, could you please
20 pull the microphone up?

21 CHAIRWOMAN BEAVER: Excuse me. Yes.

22 Does any of the board members have any
23 questions that they would like to ask Sonya?

24 MR. LA RUE: Madam Chair.

25 CHAIRWOMAN BEAVER: Board Member La Rue.

1 MR. LA RUE: Sonya, it's not so much a question,
2 but just as you're working on the master plan, you know, every
3 -- I think is an area that's got a little bit of controversy
4 (inaudible). We look at this (inaudible). So when I think
5 about that, I always think, what is the purpose of the airport?
6 You know, what is its mission and why? And then are there
7 guiding principles to get it there? And then how do you wrap
8 all of the, you know, recommended capital projects that are
9 going to come from that through the mission and the guiding
10 principles. So I don't know if this committee's working on that
11 or thought of that, but -- I'm assuming you have, but that would
12 be nice to bring back to this board (inaudible).

13 MS. HERRERA: Member La Rue, you're absolutely
14 correct. It's stating that it is an area that there's a lot
15 public interest with regard to the environment, and I think
16 through the public outreach and the public information
17 workshops, we are giving a lot opportunity for the citizens as
18 well as the groups in the area that may have concerns to
19 provide some input with regard to that.

20 I also believe that as a part of the master plan,
21 it is that group's charter to really look at what is the purpose
22 of the airport going forward and what is the vision for the
23 future for that particular area.

24 MR. LA RUE: Okay. Thank you.

25 CHAIRWOMAN BEAVER: I know on my visit up there,

1 I think it was a couple of years ago, but on that visit, as far
 2 as the main building, there was -- I know that you're working on
 3 the outside as far as the ADA compliance, but the TSA was
 4 totally out of compliance, and then the bathrooms up there were
 5 not ADA compliant. Has anything been happening on those, or are
 6 those still in need of...

7 MS. HERRERA: Madam Chair, those are still in
 8 need of modernization, and those are things that we are
 9 working on and looking at. Ultimately, I know that one of the
 10 things that the PAC committee is also going to be recommending
 11 is a new terminal. In updating the siding on the terminal, we
 12 found that there is no insulation in the walls of the terminal
 13 at all. There's only insulation in the ceiling. So clearly
 14 that's something that we need to take into account as we go
 15 forward in the future.

16 CHAIRWOMAN BEAVER: And I noticed that you had
 17 one of your public meetings -- it seems that Flagstaff is also
 18 one of the neighbors that -- from past has had some concern
 19 about the airport up there, and I did notice that you did have
 20 one of your meetings there. And was it well attended?

21 MS. HERRERA: Madam Chair, we had about 20
 22 members of the public attend that meeting. So it was well
 23 attended.

24 CHAIRWOMAN BEAVER: Mr. Thompson.

25 MR. THOMPSON: Just one comment. I think that

1 (inaudible) is that I am happy that you are able to talk about
 2 the concerns. I know there's probably a lot issues as well as
 3 interests in that (inaudible). I like that you're able to
 4 address those concerns. (Inaudible.)

5 MS. HERRERA: Thank you.

6 CHAIRWOMAN BEAVER: Mr. Hammond.

7 MR. HAMMOND: I don't (inaudible), but I'm
 8 curious as to Board Member La Rue's question. You had a very
 9 good, very large group of constituents in the process. We've
 10 had the -- for example, the Sierra Club before us in the past
 11 voicing their objection. I'm curious. How much consensus is
 12 there within your constituency, and could (inaudible)
 13 appropriate for you to talk a little bit about that as far as
 14 those in that constituency that are absolutely against versus
 15 those -- it's not that I'm (inaudible), but I think that the
 16 Board, some of the balance of the (inaudible), if that's the
 17 right word, (inaudible) your stakeholders would be appropriate
 18 to at least (inaudible).

19 MS. HERRERA: I think --

20 MR. HALIKOWSKI: Before you answer that, and
 21 Madam Chairman, to that point, I'd ask you just to speak in
 22 generalities and not point out any specific groups, but
 23 generally what the issues are.

24 MS. HERRERA: Member Hammond, I was going to
 25 respond. This is probably premature at this point. The next

1 meeting is going to discuss further some of the development
 2 alternatives. So I think at this point it would be premature to
 3 say who sits where on the fence with regard to the
 4 recommendations of our consultant. That will be something at
 5 the June 28th meeting that will be discussed in greater detail.

6 MR. HAMMOND: And I would just say to that point,
 7 Madam Chair, obviously there are a number of issues surrounding
 8 the airport. The point is well taken, what's the airport's
 9 mission and what its future would be.

10 As you know, we've had issues of whether or not
 11 the airport would draw business away from other tourist
 12 centers, whether improvements to the airport would impact
 13 water usage in the national park, whether, you know, the
 14 flights over the Canyon -- what impact those have.

15 So as we've looked at, you know, improving the
 16 airport, as Sonya has said, to try and at least make it break
 17 even, there are lots of concerns on both sides about whether
 18 expansion of the airport in Tusayan in general is a good thing
 19 and what impact the airport would have on any of that
 20 potential expansion.

21 So I think it's imperative that we continue to
 22 outreach to the stakeholders and the tribes to discuss this,
 23 because then sooner or later you've got to make some decisions
 24 about the airport's mission and its future, and do you at some
 25 point turn that into an enterprise that breaks even or makes

1 enough money that it could be leased out and run by a private
 2 entity instead of ADOT. So there are lots of questions on
 3 both sides of this particular issue.

4 Thank you, Madam Chair.

5 CHAIRWOMAN BEAVER: Thank you. Thank you.

6 Okay. Now we'll move on to Item 2, MAG's Major
 7 Amendments to the Regional Transportation Plan.

8 Hi. If you could just state your name for the
 9 record.

10 MR. HAZLETT: Certainly. Is this water?

11 MR. HALIKOWSKI: You can't have water until
 12 you're done.

13 MR. HAZLETT: I can't have water until I'm
 14 done? Thank you, Mr. Halikowski. I certainly appreciate it.

15 MR. ROEHRICH: You have to -- the microphones
 16 are not the best. You kind of -- you've got to get kind of
 17 close.

18 MR. HAZLETT: Okay. How about if I -- hopefully
 19 I'm right there, and hopefully --

20 MR. HALIKOWSKI: Just like when you were on
 21 American Idol.

22 MR. HAZLETT: You saw that episode.

23 My name is Bob Hazlett. I'm the senior
 24 engineering manager for the Maricopa Association of Governments.
 25 Madam Chair and members of the State Transportation Board,

1 Mr. Director, I really appreciate the opportunity to be here.

2 When we brought up this item -- and there's going
3 to be some action, I think, that we're going to be seeking from the
4 Board at your -- at your regular business meeting coming up here
5 in June. It became very apparent to us that there have been a
6 lot of activities that have happened at MAG, and we wanted to
7 bring the Board up to date on some of these activities. Some of
8 them are some major initiatives that we've had for I-10 and
9 I-17, and then another big one was what we call rebalancing, and
10 I'll get into that as I get into the presentation here.

11 To start off, and I'm going to go a little out of
12 order from your Board agenda just to -- just because of flow,
13 but I want to talk first about a project that we've recently
14 completed, and the final recommendations were just accepted by
15 the MAG Regional Council last week, and that is for the
16 Interstate 10/Interstate 17 Corridor Master Plan.

17 This project was a study that started and was an
18 outgrowth of a number of workshops that were held back in 2012,
19 about five years ago. Then Director Halikowski and also Karla
20 Petty with the Federal Highway Administration, we all had met on
21 Halloween to talk about the continuing planning and the
22 continuing expansion of Interstate 10 and Interstate 17.

23 We had a couple of member agencies, elected
24 leadership that were kind of concerned about some really large
25 expansion plans. And so we kind of stepped back to -- because

1 of what was brought up by the elected officials and said, "What
2 are we doing with this corridor, and where are we going to go
3 with this?" And so, again, back in 2012, we identified that
4 will be some near-term improvements that would be conducted, and
5 then we would also -- MAG would also complete this corridor
6 master plan so that we could have the long-term vision for the
7 corridor.

8 The corridor itself is up here. As you can see,
9 it's 31 miles long. It begins down at the Loop 202/Pecos Stack,
10 extends up along Interstate 10 to the split interchange, and
11 then from the split interchange, it continues along Interstate
12 17 up to the North Stack at Loop 101.

13 And the reason that we -- that -- the nickname
14 that has been given to this project is called "the Spine." And
15 the reason we call it "the Spine" is because when we take a look
16 at all of our traffic that happens on the regional freeways,
17 roughly 40 percent of all daily travel finds its way on to some
18 part of I-10 and I-17. So it is an extremely important corridor
19 to the region, but we also know it's a very important corridor
20 to the state of Arizona and our continuing activities as the
21 economic development continues to happen throughout the entire
22 state.

23 The project was led by this group of management
24 partners you see up there. We had some great representation
25 from Multi-Modal Planning Division inside of ADOT. Mike Kies,

1 when he was the director of the Multi-Modal Planning Division,
 2 was there at every meeting, and we really appreciate all the
 3 assistance that was given. We had some great representation
 4 from Federal Highway Administration, and then you can see,
 5 also, too, that we had a number of representatives from the
 6 Maricopa Association of Governments that helped lead this
 7 project.

8 The project itself, through purchasing and
 9 procurement and everything, we went from Halloween of 2012 to
 10 about the beginning of 2014 to go ahead and get started with the
 11 particular project, and it was about a three-and-a-half effort
 12 that we -- that led us through a number of different options and
 13 different ideas for the corridor.

14 But the best way to kind of settle everything
 15 down is to really talk about some of the six key issues that
 16 we had when we started developing this Corridor Master Plan.
 17 The very first one was trying to tackle the whole notion of
 18 the aging infrastructure that we have.

19 As many of you around this table probably know,
 20 and I know there's been ADOT (inaudible) that probably know
 21 their history better than me, but this is -- if I'm not
 22 mistaken, I-17, the I-17 part of it was Arizona's first freeway.
 23 It goes all way back to the '50s. In fact, it was, I believe,
 24 designated as Arizona State Route 69 before the interstate
 25 system even came into existence here in Arizona. And so there

1 are some parts of that infrastructure that are aging. We have
 2 flooding issues that you can see here, whenever we get a good
 3 monsoon storm that comes through. And so all those kind of
 4 issues kind of came to the forefront and really demonstrated to
 5 us that the facility, both 10 and 17, need to be modernized to
 6 today's design standards.

7 The next thing that was important to us was that
 8 we have four Light Rail crossings of I-17. Light Rail is
 9 extremely popular here in the Valley, continues to be so, and we
 10 have now four different places where it is going to cross. One
 11 down to the south on Central Avenue, another up by Van Buren
 12 Street, and then one up in kind of the Camelback corridor,
 13 although that hasn't been completely determined yet. And then
 14 the last one is up by Metro Center. So we have those four
 15 crossings.

16 And the one thing that was important was, is that
 17 as these improvements take hold, we wanted to make certain that
 18 they were scheduled at a time such that we don't have
 19 construction happening on top of construction to the point that
 20 it prolongs the construction season or causes a lot of delays
 21 for our partners.

22 The other part of that, too, is that the
 23 Federal Transit Administration works with full funding grants,
 24 and we wanted to try and make certain that we met all those
 25 windows as we're working with these four Light Rail crossings.

1 The other thing that was also very important, we
 2 had a round of public meetings, was planning for bicycle and
 3 pedestrians, and a lot of folks came to us and said that --
 4 during the public meetings that they felt like getting back and
 5 forth across the freeways -- and we see that not just on 10 and
 6 17, but across our entire freeway system, that planning for
 7 bikes and pedestrians -- they see it as a Great Wall. It's kind
 8 of tough to get back and forth across the freeways. And so as
 9 we did some of our planning, we really started to focus on this
 10 and look at the bicycle master plans that our member agencies
 11 such as Phoenix and Tempe and Chandler were doing so that we
 12 could make certain that we could appropriately plan for those
 13 types of facilities.

14 Technology was certainly a part of our
 15 discussion. The connected vehicle, autonomous vehicle future
 16 was always something that we -- that we kind of kept tabs on.
 17 Quite admittedly, it's very difficult to really have a true bold
 18 technology plan inside here, because a lot of that's still
 19 starting to evolve, and as we start working with our -- with
 20 folks like Google and Apple and even Ford and Chrysler, we're
 21 not aware of all their plans, but I think the one thing that we
 22 did was is we tried to make certain that any recommendations
 23 that we had of this Corridor Master Plan, that we would make
 24 certain that it wouldn't preclude the ability to be able to
 25 include technology and that we could enhance technology.

1 Certainly ADOT has a very big push and initiative on it through
 2 the TSMO division, and we wanted to support that as best as we
 3 possibly could with this Corridor Master Plan.

4 The other issue that we had is that it is a
 5 constrained corridor. We knew that any significant expansion,
 6 particularly along Interstate 17, was going to be difficult at
 7 best. It was going to affect a number of businesses, a number
 8 of residences, and we wanted to try to make certain that any
 9 expansion that we had, that it would not only be the best bang
 10 for the buck, but that it would also be one that wouldn't take
 11 as many businesses or homes as possible. And so we looked at
 12 a lot of different ideas and concepts to try and keep it
 13 within the existing corridor.

14 The issue is, though, is that parts of I-17,
 15 the rights-of-way were purchased back in the '50s, and again,
 16 it's kind of difficult to not -- to not impact somebody just
 17 simply because the corridor is extremely tight. And when you
 18 add to that the increasing demand for the corridor -- as I
 19 stated, it's roughly 40 percent today. We only see traffic
 20 continuing to increase on both Interstate 10 and Interstate 17
 21 as the Valley continues to grow. We were the fastest growing
 22 county and the fastest growing city in the nation last year, and
 23 so as a result, that means that there is going to be more
 24 activity. And that's always important. It's always good,
 25 because that means that it is a sign of a good economy.

1 And so as we started getting into the Corridor
 2 Master Plan, we looked at about 349 different ideas of how to --
 3 how to develop this plan. We threw everything into the -- into
 4 the mix here. We even looked at one -- one section even looked
 5 at, as the suggestion was, to maybe move 17 around if we
 6 couldn't have all the right-of-way that we needed. And that was
 7 a very tricky one to work with, but we talked with our partners
 8 on the management team, as well as our friends in Phoenix and
 9 Chandler and Mesa and Guadalupe, and we tried to keep everything
 10 down the existing center lines as it stands right now. But I
 11 just used that as an example to illustrate the 349 different
 12 ideas that we had of trying to develop it.

13 We went through a different -- a number of --
 14 about four different screen levels, where we worked different
 15 alternatives, and then we went through a whole host of very
 16 rigorous evaluation criteria to develop the Corridor Master Plan
 17 recommendations. And these are these recommendations that we
 18 had identified.

19 The very first thing is I identified some of
 20 the issues was, again, improving the safety by modernizing
 21 both interstates to current design standards. As I'd stated
 22 before, on I-17, being some of the oldest construction, we
 23 recognized, also, too, that there is going to be a point in time
 24 where some of that construction's going to be resulting in
 25 reconstruction, just simply because some of the pavement's

1 getting to the end of its service life, and we want to make
 2 certain that -- that if that happens to go ahead and make
 3 certain that there is the ability to modernize the interstates.

4 The other recommendation that we have is that
 5 minimum of adding one lane throughout the entire corridor.
 6 But when we started looking at that, adding that one lane, and
 7 in particularly in areas on I-17 where we have such a tightly-
 8 constrained corridor, what became very important to us was to
 9 try and manage that capacity as best as possible. As it
 10 stands right now, I-17 is recommended to have another lane
 11 added in each direction, but that it be another HOV lane,
 12 because that's where we kind of get our biggest bang for the
 13 buck in terms of people movement. It also provides our best
 14 reliable transportation time, and then, also, too, as
 15 technology starts to unfold, we feel that that extra lane
 16 coupled with the existing HOV lane would be -- would be good
 17 candidates to be able to work through that.

18 The next thing that was very important to us, and
 19 one of the things we found when we were doing our studies, we
 20 found that we found more people crossing I-17 and crossing I-10
 21 that actually using I-17 and I-10. And so what became very
 22 important to us there was to recommend improving or
 23 reconstructing 24 of the 31 traffic interchanges. Again, those
 24 are -- a lot of folks talked to us about that. And it's not
 25 only the bicycle and pedestrians that couldn't figure out how to

1 get back and forth across, but even some people that travel
2 across the corridor on a day-to-day basis. They wanted to make
3 certain that the interchanges would be able to facilitate that.

4 And then the other thing that was also given to
5 us, we call them "direct HOV ramps" or the "DHOVs." These are
6 ramps that you see a lot of times in some of the system
7 interchanges here in the Valley. They're also meant for
8 carpools to be able to exit, as well as public transportation
9 and shared rides. We recognize that when you have those --
10 when you don't have the HOVs, you have a lot of that traffic
11 trying to weave all our way across the general purpose traffic
12 to try and get in the HOV lane. We kind of felt that if we
13 could identify five new direct HOV ramps throughout the
14 corridor, that by doing that, we would be able to help cut down
15 on that weaving movement and be able to help improve the
16 reliability of those trips.

17 And then last but certainly not least, we
18 were -- the recommendations, the plan and enhanced bicycle
19 pedestrian connects across the corridor at 20 locations, and a
20 lot of these all match up with locations that have been
21 identified by the City of Phoenix, the City of Chandler, the
22 City of Tempe, and also the Town of Guadalupe, and also included
23 in that are nine new structures to -- to be able to facilitate
24 bicycle/pedestrian movement. So we -- we felt like we covered
25 the gamut on a lot of the stuff as we make recommendations.

1 And just to kind of give you an idea of what some
2 of those recommendations were, the biggest area that we wanted
3 to try to figure out how to import was I-10 at State Route
4 143/Broadway and the US-60 interchange complex. That was a
5 near-term improvement study that's still moving forward, and we
6 wanted to make certain that we could get those improvements
7 targeted so that we could look at improving some of the
8 connections there.

9 And then another thing that we've also recommend
10 along I-17 is the introduction of -- now again, this is -- still
11 has to go through a lot of study through ADOT's interchange
12 selection process, but we developed these recommendations with a
13 lot of folks, with ADOT staff, and that is, is what we call the
14 "platform diamond." It adds a third deck to a lot of these
15 diamond interchanges that we have along Interstate 17, and the
16 idea there is, is to be able to provide better ways for people
17 to get back and forth across, and also, too, to minimize, the
18 potential for traffic to start to back out onto the I-17 main
19 line. And so these were some of the big recommendations that
20 we -- that we saw throughout the project.

21 Again, as I talk about technology improvements,
22 trying to provide better connectivity for vehicles, especially
23 as these systems start to evolve. I talked about the direct HOV
24 ramps and being able to provide those. This is in the Pecos
25 stack right here at Loop 202 and I-10. We see the -- a lot of

1 value to that. The issue with a lot of these interchanges,
2 though, is that they can be quite pricey because they're all one
3 structure. But ADOT has done a magnificent job of building
4 these, and so we've recommended that more of these be considered
5 in the future.

6 Dealing, again, with the Light Rail crossings, as
7 I've stated before, there's about four different areas that
8 we're trying to work through.

9 And then finally, the bicycle/pedestrian
10 crossings. A lot of folks really like this bridge, 63rd Avenue
11 and Loop 101 in Glendale. Like to see types of structures
12 added, and working with ADOT staff on that.

13 So how did this all plan out? A lot it responded
14 to the priorities that the public told us. Improves commutes,
15 particularly by modernizing the interstate alone. We'll be able
16 to provide better safety and ability for traffic. You'll be
17 able to move to the left and to the right during different
18 times. And adding more HOV lanes. Adding more travel choices
19 was another big priority that the public had told us. Wanted to
20 make certain that we could have more managed capacity. And, of
21 course, the bike/ped crossings added to that.

22 We feel that it protects the environment as best
23 as possible, because we were doing our best to keep within the
24 existing right-of-way footprints wherever possible. And also,
25 addressing some of the flooding issues on I-17. Increasing

1 connection and promoting neighborhoods. I-17 in particular goes
2 through a number of neighborhoods in North Phoenix, and so we
3 wanted to try to protect those as best as possible.

4 And then last, but certainly not least, we think
5 that all this will help improve commerce. It will also minimize
6 the cost of what was, I think, originally being identified, and
7 it also emphasizes jobs. And when we had a set of public
8 meetings. We -- the last set of public meetings, we asked
9 people about this recommendation. And as you can see here with
10 thoughts about the strategy, we had more than half of the folks
11 seemed to agree with us and -- but about a third -- or about 26
12 percent, about a quarter of the people not agreeing with us.

13 And then we also had questions about right-of-way
14 acquisition. That's always kind of a fundamental question, and
15 as you can see there, we still have pretty good support for
16 right-of-way acquisition, and about a quarter of the folks not
17 terribly excited about it.

18 All the information for this particular
19 project -- and I'm sorry it didn't appear on the slide -- is
20 spine.azmag.gov. If you just go to that website, you can get
21 all of the information related to this.

22 Now, the entire Corridor Master Plan in and of
23 itself probably has about a three-and-a-half billion dollar
24 price tag. And so the question that kind of comes up is, is how
25 do you -- how are we going to work through that? And the

1 rebalancing that was recently accomplished for the Regional
2 Freeway and Highway Program certainly figures into that as some
3 of the projects from this Corridor Master Plan have kind of been
4 moved forward.

5 The biggest thing about the Regional Freeway
6 and Highway Program is is that we have to keep everything in
7 balance. We cannot -- we have to keep things fiscally
8 constrained. We cannot program projects unless the money is
9 clearly identified in that. That's part of the legislation,
10 the enabling legislation for Proposition 400. We like to try
11 to keep -- make certain that everything is in balance. And
12 when we take a look at our cash flow balances, you see the red
13 line there below. That was where we had identified the cash
14 flow back in 2012.

15 And now, you can see up above in blue with a lot
16 of work that's been done by a lot of folks where the cash flow
17 balance is. We have about a \$1.8 billion improvement, or
18 roughly now in the program, almost a \$1.4 billion surplus. And
19 there's a lot of folks that really helped lead us to that -- to
20 that -- to this great finding that we have. It's not every day
21 that you find that you have extra money to -- to do some things
22 with.

23 The folks at ADOT that have helped us out,
24 besides the leadership of John Halikowski, Kristine Ward, and
25 Elise Maza, Patrick Stone have all been great with FMS. Kwi

1 Kahn -- Kang, excuse me, Clem Ligocki, Mike Kies, when he was
2 NPD Director, Steve Boschen, Annette Reilly. And then, of
3 course, we've had a lot of help from folks from Federal Highway,
4 Karla Petty. And then, of course, the staff at MAG that have
5 helped us to have such a positive balance in the program.

6 And the first question you might say is, "How did
7 that happen? How did you go from being \$300 million in the hole
8 to being \$1.4 billion ahead?" And this is why -- this is
9 where -- where it all happens. Tax revenues have gone up
10 considerably, and that has really helped out the Regional Area
11 Roadway Fund, which is the half-cent sales tax that's
12 collected here in Maricopa County.

13 But there has been a whole host of other
14 activities that have happened. South Mountain has come in at a
15 much better price than I think a lot of us have figured on. And
16 then you see that purple wedge there called "Other Project
17 Expenses." One of the things that we've been very, very excited
18 about, and this has been a joint effort between ADOT and MAG,
19 and that has been our whole cost/risk analysis process where we
20 have gone through each individual project, and we cost out the
21 risk instead of just doing a blanket contingency. And a lot of
22 that has freed up a lot of money that has allowed us to figure
23 out how to program and be able to bring more projects to the
24 table.

25 And so, what that translates into here in 2017,

1 with the projects that are under construction, and that includes
2 Loop 202, South Mountain, and also Loop 303 out in Goodyear, at
3 roughly about \$1.8 billion.

4 We also had another host of projects that were
5 still programmed at about \$2 billion. With the rebalance
6 projects we've safely identified roughly about 1.25 billion.
7 We left a little bit in reserve in case project costs get away
8 from us again or we have to add something in the future. But
9 when you put it all together, we've got roughly about a
10 \$5 billion program over the next 12 years, and we couldn't be
11 more excited about that and what that has done for the region.

12 Now, what does 5 billion buy you? That. Those
13 41 projects that you see listed up -- or you see I colored up
14 here on the map. I'm going to talk a little bit about some of
15 these projects that were brought back in that we thought we
16 couldn't bring back in. I'm going to start in the West Valley,
17 and you see some of the highlighted projects you see there. See
18 identified there in -- I think that's orange. The Agua Fria
19 Freeway/Loop 101, that was balanced out. We weren't going to be
20 able to provide an additional general purpose lane on that
21 particular facility, but now we can.

22 And then also, too, a direct HOV ramp at I-10 and
23 Loop 101. We have a lot issues right now with the HOV traffic
24 merging into the GP traffic and trying to go across the I-10
25 traffic. All that was in there.

1 And then the project number 34 you see
2 highlighted right there. That's Arizona State Route 30. It's
3 also the subject of a major amendment that I'll talk about
4 towards the end of my presentation, but we went ahead
5 identified a way to at least acquire the right-of-way between
6 Loop 303 and Loop 202, and to go ahead and put in what we call
7 a phase one facility in that particular part of the Valley.

8 The next big part was I-17, as I just went
9 through the Corridor Master Plan. What we've been -- what
10 we've been able to identify is out of that \$3 billion, roughly
11 half of it's going to be funded now. And you see a lot of the
12 projects are really tackling the interchanges along Interstate
13 17.

14 There is a large widening -- or pardon me --
15 reconstruction of 17 between the I-10 split and 19th Avenue or
16 Durango Curve. And then up north, north of Anthem Way, the MAG
17 program has added \$50 million for the widening of Interstate 17,
18 up to the county line, Black Canyon City. So, again, good
19 things to come there with I-17.

20 In the East Valley, some of the biggest projects
21 that we were working with, again, were the -- was I-10 itself,
22 identifying a way to get the reconstruction of the State Route
23 143 interchange in there, but then at the same time, too, we're
24 ready to go on widening the Price Freeway, which is project
25 number 27, and the recommendation there is to go ahead and move

1 that ahead of I-10 just because it's ready to go and I-10 is not
2 yet.

3 And then also, too, when we do the widening of
4 the Price, the recommendations that extend what we call the
5 run-outs from the system interchange there at 101 and 202 over
6 to Arizona Avenue. A phase one facility for State Route 24 is
7 also identified from Ellsworth over to Ironwood, particularly
8 to help out the San Tan Valley residents. And then last but
9 certainly not least, widening of the Superstition Freeway/US-
10 60 between Crismon Road, out to Ironwood Drive, has also been
11 identified in the Regional Freeway and Highway Programs.

12 So it does buy us a lot of stuff, as you can see
13 here. That's the -- in addition to the projects that are under
14 construction, which also, again, as I'd stated before is the
15 South Mountain, which is identified in number 29 up there,
16 that's mainly for the continuing maintenance. That's part of
17 the design/build contract. And then also, too, the -- just
18 finishing out the south half of the I-10/Loop 303 traffic
19 interchange.

20 And so, this was adopted by the MAG Regional
21 Council on March 29th. We've had a number of meetings
22 internally between MAG and ADOT to try and get the scheduling
23 down, and also, too, to make certain we've got the right program
24 in (inaudible). And so where we're going to go with that is, is
25 that there's going to be some program amendments that'll be

1 developed this fall. Some of that is -- will then -- would
2 then, I guess, roll up into the -- into the ADOT program, but
3 right now we're just moving through that and moving through our
4 conformity.

5 We're going to always do cost to cash flow
6 modeling, and I can't say enough how terrific the staff is at
7 FMS here and ADOT, that they've been giving us the data that we
8 need in a timely manner. They've been keeping the spreadsheets,
9 keeping everything up to date. And then also, to our friends at
10 Federal Highway have certainly contributed.

11 And the other thing that we've also decided to
12 do, too, is to go ahead and do quarterly reporting of the
13 Regional Freeway and Highway Program to the Transportation
14 Policy Committee, and what we've done is we've started with this
15 large matrix that you can see here, but it kind of identifies
16 the four big phases of a project: Pre-design, design, right-of-
17 way, and utility and construction.

18 You can see the projects up top there that are
19 already in the pipeline, and then you can see the other projects
20 that are getting underway. You can see what's completed and --
21 and so we want to be able to report this out to the
22 Transportation Policy Committee on a timely manner. Their next
23 update will be here in June, because we gave them the first
24 update in March. So that will be three months. And we're
25 pretty excited about staying on track with that so that folks

1 can get the information that they need on the Regional Freeway
2 and Highway Program.

3 So before I go to the major amendments, Madam
4 Chair, are there any questions about these two items?

5 CHAIRWOMAN BEAVER: Does -- any questions at this
6 time? Okay. Board Member Hammond.

7 MR. HAMMOND: (Inaudible) I don't have a right
8 to ask a question. Do you have any sense of the percentage of
9 traffic coming from -- to L.A. or Flagstaff that goes through
10 to points southeast, Casa Grande and Tucson? What percentage
11 of that traffic goes right through?

12 MR. HAZLETT: That's a good question, Madam
13 Chair and Board Member Hammond. It is -- right now when we see
14 the amount of traffic that goes through the region, it actually
15 goes, like, from, say, Los Angeles down to Tucson or Los Angeles
16 down to El Paso or Los Angeles to Flagstaff, it's really a very
17 low number. It's -- we have what we call on our travel demand
18 models external stations, and we do these surveys on a pretty
19 regular basis, and we try to figure out how much is going
20 through and how much is actually ending here in the Valley. And
21 at most of the external stations, it's not more than 10 percent
22 of the volume. Most people that are coming into the Valley are
23 coming to the Valley for a destination.

24 MR. HAMMOND: My sense is that you could get 10
25 percent (inaudible) off that corridor, and that would be

1 significant, and I know that South Mountain is trying to do just
2 that but there was something that -- this is anecdotal. I was
3 coming back from L.A., and it was four o'clock, and I hit the
4 Buckeye area, and I knew I was in for a treat going through
5 Phoenix. So I (inaudible) Gila Bend, and the time to get to the
6 intersection of I-10 and I-8 was, I think, two minutes different
7 than going through Phoenix and going through traffic, and I
8 don't know that that message is getting out. You might be able
9 to -- with just some signage or some -- an electronic billboard
10 get some of that traffic out of central Phoenix. That's my
11 thought.

12 MR. HAZLETT: Thank you.

13 CHAIRWOMAN BEAVER: Board Member Stratton.

14 MR. ROEHRICH: I don't know if you could pull
15 that, Madam Chair, so maybe...

16 MR. STRATTON: Thank you.

17 Kind of tag on to Board Member Hammond's
18 question. Take it the other direction. How much traffic is
19 coming from eastern states, Texas, New Mexico and others and
20 passing through Tucson/Phoenix points beyond into California.

21 MR. HAZLETT: Madam Chair, Board Member Stratton,
22 it's the -- about that 10 percent volume is about the same at
23 just about all of our -- all of our external stations. I know
24 there's -- it might seem like we see a lot of license plates
25 from Texas and California on our Valley freeways, but based on

1 surveys, a lot of folks that are coming in from the south or
 2 coming in from the east, they are coming to Phoenix. They --
 3 there's a few that makes its way through. But the one thing to
 4 kind of look at is, is the volumes are high, and, you know,
 5 again, it's around 50,000 cars a day on some parts of these
 6 external stations. 10 percent is about 5,000 cars going
 7 through, and it's kind of easy to see that 5,000 cars on a daily
 8 basis.

9 MR. STRATTON: To continue on, Madam Chair, the
 10 proposed I-11 and the partnering we're doing at the Nogales
 11 border now and the -- increasing the inspection time -- or
 12 decreasing the time to 20 minutes, what's the impact on that
 13 traffic coming through?

14 MR. HAZLETT: Again, Madam Chair, Board Member
 15 Stratton, it's still significant, and I think it would still
 16 help out. I mean, we -- you know, these connections -- I mean,
 17 Phoenix is not an island, and it has to be connected. It has to
 18 have these connections. And again, work down at the border at
 19 -- on I-19 and State Route 189, and then, of course, the
 20 proposed Interstate 11, all of those enhance those connections
 21 to the Valley and helps us out with not only making better
 22 connections to neighboring metropolitan areas as well as to the
 23 country of Mexico, but it also helps out our economic growth and
 24 development.

25 MR. STRATTON: Thank you.

1 CHAIRWOMAN BEAVER: I have a question. If you
 2 could -- it's more for informational variety where I have a
 3 better understanding. I don't know. Maybe the other board
 4 members already have an understanding of it. If not, it will
 5 help. But when you were talking about the -- when making the
 6 improvements with regard to safety, as they relate to the
 7 current design standards --

8 MR. HAZLETT: Uh-huh.

9 CHAIRWOMAN BEAVER: -- that you follow, is
 10 there any kind of a requirement -- because I know this even
 11 takes into account statewide. Can that be done incrementally,
 12 or once you start on something, is it like you're kind of stuck
 13 where you have to do the entire thing to get it up to standard?

14 MR. HAZLETT: Madam Chair, I think the best way
 15 to kind of put that is is that yes, it can be done incrementally
 16 and over time, and there's a lot of times, too, that on just
 17 about every one of our projects, if we know we're widening it --
 18 I know that in working with ADOT staff, they'll always go to
 19 look at the current design standards and do their best to work
 20 some of these things out.

21 And so, you know, from our perspective at MAG, we
 22 just wait to continue to be able to promote that, to provide
 23 that, because we know that a lot of these design standards over
 24 time have been meant to help improve the safety of the facility,
 25 and if we can improve the safety of the facility, then we cut

1 down on crashes, and then we're able to have a much more
2 reliable trip for people to be able to make.

3 And so, again, that has always been our way of
4 looking at it at MAG. Safety is an extremely important
5 priority. And a lot of these -- all these design standards that
6 have been put into place are meant to help promote that.

7 MR. ROEHRICH: And Madam Chair, if I could --

8 CHAIRWOMAN BEAVER: Mr. Roehrich.

9 MR. ROEHRICH: -- maybe add on to that.

10 Bob, that was well said. I think the thing to
11 remember is our freeways are designed and built safe. But as
12 time -- and again, as was pointed out -- they're various ages,
13 and there's various evolutions of transportation technology that
14 happen. So as that happens, we then go through a period of as
15 we're modifying them, modernizing them, expanding them or making
16 major adjustments, we address those new trends or new safety
17 issues as part of the overall life cycle management, if you
18 will, of a system. Unless we find a direct safety correlation
19 by some of analysis or some engineering judgement that we go out
20 and correct specifically.

21 We're updating and modernizing as it goes, but at
22 no time do we leave unsafe conditions out there on purpose
23 without having to address them to the best of our ability. So
24 the question of safety is really not so much a question of "Is
25 it safe or unsafe," as, what is the standard that it was

1 designed and constructed under, what's the standard today, and
2 what is our plan moving forward to modernize it and then to
3 address those situations? Do we expand it or reconstruct it
4 or -- or as we plan for the system of the future.

5 CHAIRWOMAN BEAVER: I think part of my question
6 had to do with -- again, with liability. You know, if you tap
7 into one of those areas, are you -- you know, can you do it
8 incrementally? Like, if there's funds for a particular area,
9 it's not just here in the MAG region, but even statewide. Can
10 -- by law, whether it's statute or federal regulations, can you
11 do it incrementally, or once you find there's a deficiency as
12 far as the design, do you have to do the continuum?

13 MR. ROEHRICH: Well, Madam Chair, I think you
14 really get into a very legal discussion more significant than
15 what we're attempting to do here. But again, it's always
16 argumentative no matter in what court you get into or if you
17 have a specific situation that you have to defend.

18 All I can say is every road that we build, every
19 road that we design at the time is built to the standard of the
20 industry and to the engineering associated with it. When we do
21 see that there is a deficiency or something that is out of
22 standard for a reason, we develop projects to go in there and
23 correct it. I don't -- you know, it's not so definitive black
24 and white. There's always some gray element of it, and within
25 the legal system, it's obviously why there are lawsuits and why

1 we defend them or challenge them based upon whatever the
2 incident is.

3 But if we're modernizing the roadway and we go in
4 to modernize it, within that stretch of roadway we're working
5 on, we'll modernize all the elements of that stretch. And then
6 when we go to the next stretch and we program that project,
7 we'll modernize all of the elements of that project. So it's
8 not like we defined that we got a problem with guardrail, so all
9 28,000 miles of roadway have to have guardrail improved
10 immediately. No. We go out and improve it as we program
11 projects incrementally, as we address them through our life
12 cycle, freeway management/highway management program.

13 CHAIRWOMAN BEAVER: Thank you.

14 MR. ROEHRICH: I don't know if I've answered --
15 the way you're looking at me, I'm not sure if I've answered you,
16 but I don't think your question is easily answered, or I'm not
17 sure exactly what --

18 CHAIRWOMAN BEAVER: No, you did. My question had
19 to do with is that something once that you find that there's a
20 deficiency or something, and once you start -- you know, sort of
21 like when you have a problem with your house, and you start to
22 do remodeling, and the next thing you know, you've got a whole
23 bunch of other projects that you've got to do because of
24 something that happened -- because you don't make the plumbing
25 and it expands. Well, I'm thinking -- I was up on I-40, and I

1 know at the point in time I was up there with the engineers,
2 there was a section up there where there was an egress, you
3 know, where it wasn't lined up correctly or something like that.
4 But it's like once you start working on it, then you've got to
5 finish it. So it's like...

6 MR. ROEHRICH: Well, Madam Chair. I'm not sure
7 how to address this other than to say, we don't build projects
8 knowing that there's deficiencies within them. And yes,
9 within each individual project, if we're going out to do a
10 pavement preservation project, but we get out there and we see
11 that there is a drainage issue, that's why all projects have a
12 contingency. We will address it at that time, because the
13 intent is while we're there on that stretch of road, we want to
14 correct any of the improvements or any deficiencies or any
15 problems that we identify at that time. But when we build it or
16 complete it, the intent is it's built to standard, and we do not
17 build in deficiencies in hopes that nothing happens and then we
18 don't have to defend it later on. We build it to the standard
19 of what it is, and we will address all the concerns at that
20 time.

21 MR. LA RUE: Madam Chair, if I may.

22 CHAIRWOMAN BEAVER: Yes. Board Member La Rue.

23 MR. LA RUE: Bob, excellent report. I hope that
24 the board members realize there's a lot going on here, the
25 Maricopa County, Greater Phoenix region. What amazes me is when

1 you see all of those projects up there that, you know, you've
 2 got hundreds of thousands of people going to work every day,
 3 going to school, you know traveling. I mean, it's amazing the
 4 work that ADOT and MAG is doing on this.

5 Bob, and I think I've -- you've heard this down
 6 at MAG a few times. I think when I look at all this, these
 7 are all projects that are absolutely necessary, but there is
 8 one there that just gives me a little bit of -- I don't know
 9 the right word -- trepidation or a little bit of fear or
 10 whatever, but 1-10 out in the West Valley is packed.

11 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Yes.

12 MR. LA RUE: I think the other day there was a
 13 fire, you know, on that facility, and it backed up traffic all
 14 day long. And as I-10 backs up, it backs up into I-17, backs up
 15 into these other areas. So the State Route 30, we see it up
 16 there in 2022. I mean, that's a critical project, not just for
 17 west -- the west side of Phoenix. It's a critical project, I
 18 think, for a much greater region given that I-10 is such an
 19 important thoroughfare for the entire state. I think whatever
 20 we can do to accelerate it, build it out fully from 85 to the
 21 Durango Curve, whatever -- whatever we can do there is
 22 absolutely necessary.

23 MR. HAZLETT: Madam Chair, that kind of goes to
 24 the next part of my presentation.

25 MR. LA RUE: Oh, good. See, I wanted to help you

1 transition.

2 MR. HAZLETT: Thank you. I appreciate that.

3 Madam Chair, was -- did Board Member Thompson
 4 have a question?

5 CHAIRWOMAN BEAVER: Go ahead. Proceed. Oh,
 6 I'm sorry. Board Member Thompson.

7 MR. THOMPSON: Madam Chair, members, up in the
 8 northern part, we're still talking about preservation, and
 9 here we're trying to -- what I'm seeing is that a lot of the
 10 issues regarding safety is coming up. Now I'm thinking, once
 11 we get this all done, at what time, within what period will we
 12 begin to move forward to add on to what we have being proposed
 13 here today? I mean, there will be a time where you're going to
 14 have to do more modification --

15 MR. HAZLETT: Sure.

16 MR. THOMPSON: -- (inaudible) project. So that's
 17 kind of what I am thinking.

18 MR. ROEHRICH: Madam Chair, Board Member
 19 Thompson, I think the thing to remember here is the way the
 20 funding is programmed. It is regionally. So even in the MAG
 21 region, because of, again, their half-cent sales tax, with their
 22 distribution of funds through HURF as well as through federal
 23 funds, the funds that they get are staying in this region, and
 24 that's what gives programs to these projects. And then these
 25 project sets are complete, they're going to program more

1 projects.

2 MR. THOMPSON: Uh-huh.

3 MR. ROEHRICH: So now then you look at the other
4 regions, and that's where the Greater Arizona, like in
5 Northeastern Arizona. So, when will we move into that?
6 Again, as we at staff evaluate the available funds that we
7 have --

8 MR. THOMPSON: Uh-huh.

9 MR. ROEHRICH: -- as well as the balance of the
10 existing system plus funds for new expansion or modernization,
11 we will meet with this board, and this board will help us
12 define and prioritize when we put funding on those programs. So
13 regardless of what's going on in Maricopa County, that's not
14 affecting projects around the rest of the state. What's
15 affecting projects around the rest of the state is the available
16 funds that -- for transportation that we receive and that we
17 have available to program.

18 MR. HAZLETT: Okay.

19 CHAIRWOMAN BEAVER: Thank you.

20 MR. HAZLETT: Thank you, Madam Chair.

21 Moving forward here, and again, these will be
22 the -- be on your agenda for action at you next business meeting
23 in June. These are -- what we're going to be requesting are for
24 the Board to weigh in on the amendments that we want to make to
25 the Regional Transportation Plan. We call them major

1 amendments, and they are defined under Arizona law that we're
2 supposed to have certain actions happen, and I'll get to that
3 slide here in a moment. But we're going be asking for action on
4 both Interstate 11 and Arizona State Route 30, to continue on
5 with what Board Member La Rue has talked about.

6 Just to kind of give everyone -- this is the
7 information we gave to the MAG Regional Council. It's just
8 kind of the history of Interstate 11 and how it has evolved
9 over time, starting back in 2008 with the Buckeye General Plan
10 and the Interstate 10/Hassayampa Valley Framework Study. The
11 MAP-21 designation along US-93 between Metro Phoenix and Las
12 Vegas, and then, the ADOT/Nevada DOT study that was completed,
13 the I-11 and Intermountain West Corridor Study, and then the
14 FAST Act, the current surface transportation policy, federal
15 surface transportation policy -- pardon me -- extended the I-11
16 designation south to Nogales in Arizona and north to Reno in
17 Nevada. And then right now, ADOT is underway with a tier one
18 environmental impact statement study for the segment between
19 Nogales and Wickenburg. And you see I have in there SIU, which
20 stands for "segment of independent utility" two, three, and four
21 that was identified in the study that was completed back in
22 2014.

23 And so as this -- as planning comes together,
24 these are the -- kind of the general segments. These are not --
25 by no means the center lines, but you can kind of see what was

1 identified as part of the inter -- I-11 and Intermountain West
 2 Corridor Study back in November of 2014, here in the MAG region,
 3 and that identifies both SIU's three and four.

4 MAG Regional Council took a resolution supporting
 5 the SIU four corridor, that it be west of the White Tank
 6 Mountains. And so, I think that's why now, for the tier one
 7 EIS, most of the study has always been west of the White Tank
 8 Mountains and looking in that area between Buckeye and
 9 Wickenburg. ADOT's team's done a terrific job of identifying
 10 areas to avoid, and so we're starting to now start to see a
 11 lot of center lines -- pardon me -- corridor lines, but they're
 12 not really, truly center lines. The idea of the tier one EIS is
 13 to identify about a 2,000-foot corridor, and that is what we
 14 have money for right now.

15 But the thing that we've been looking at with
 16 MAG, and a lot of it has to do with, again, funding constraints
 17 and being able to show that we can start to work this, our
 18 current addition of our 2040 Regional Transportation Plan is
 19 allowing us to identify that we can at least get into the plan
 20 that has a 2040 horizon, funding for Interstate 11 for the
 21 section between I-10 and Buckeye and US-93 up in Wickenburg.
 22 And so before we can do that, though, to do -- to move it to a
 23 tier two environmental impact study -- statement study, EIS, we
 24 would like to -- need to have that be a major amendment to our
 25 Regional Transportation Plan.

1 And one of the reasons that we want to move that
 2 forward is a 2,000-foot corridor. Unfortunately, the pointer
 3 doesn't work, but you can kind of see the word varies on either
 4 side. That still makes it very difficult for us to continue to
 5 do regional planning as well as private parties to be able to do
 6 their own planning in the area when a 2,000-foot corridor is --
 7 has been identified.

8 And so, the purpose of the major amendment is
 9 to go ahead and bring for SIU four, at least, the Interstate
 10 11 corridor in. It's kind of the biggest missing link, if you
 11 will, of a future Interstate 11, and to bring that into the MAG
 12 2040 Regional Transportation Plan.

13 Turning our attention to Arizona State Route 30,
 14 as Board Member La Rue had talked about, that is a very
 15 important corridor. Interstate 10 is our primary trade route
 16 with Southern California and the ports in Long Beach and Los
 17 Angeles. This corridor was identified as part of the Regional
 18 Transportation Plan back in 2003; however, when we had the
 19 economic recession back in 2009, we had to defer the corridor to
 20 the unfunded part of the RTP, and as I just showed you, as part
 21 of rebalancing, this center section has been brought back in.
 22 It's identified as a six-lane freeway back in 2003. There's
 23 been a continuing environmental assessment study that's been
 24 underway since 2006. And so this corridor is really not the
 25 subject of the major amendments between Loop 303 and Loop 202,

1 because again, action and such is moving forward on it.

2 But the sections that need the major amendment,
3 the first one is the west section from State Route 85 to Loop
4 303 through Buckeye. It was identified as a phase one interim-
5 type facility back in the 2003 Regional Transportation Plan with
6 acquisition for a future full freeway; however, that was
7 deferred back in 2009. And then the -- and then, again, we've
8 had studies that have recommended the freeway construction. The
9 I-10/Hassayampa Valley Framework Study confirmed the need for it
10 to be a full freeway and identified the traffic interchange
11 locations that were adopted or accepted -- pardon me -- as part
12 of the end of the Regional Transportation Plan when that
13 framework study was accepted back in 2008.

14 So, this is part of the amendment, and then the
15 other part of the amendment that's needed is for this east
16 section between the Loop 202 South Mountain Freeway and
17 Interstate 17. This was not a part of the Regional
18 Transportation Plan back in 2003. It was a corridor that -- or
19 it's a -- it's definitely a link that was -- that wasn't looked
20 at. There was a lot of fears of -- that if we tied it in, that
21 it would cause some major redesign issues with Interstate 17.
22 And so, it was looked at in 2013 as part of the Central Phoenix
23 Transportation Framework Study, and a rough corridor was
24 identified. But again, that corridor still has to -- still has
25 to undergo the proper study by ADOT. But we want to bring it

1 into the Regional Transportation Plan to be able to show a
2 uniform 31-mile corridor from State Route 85 to I-17 at the
3 Durango Curve.

4 Now, when we -- so again, these are the purpose
5 of the major amendments for State Route 30. When we bring --
6 when we do a major amendment, the Arizona Revised Statutes
7 28-6353 has to -- has some certain things that we at MAG have
8 to follow. It went for consideration to the TPC, and then it
9 was further endorsed by the Regional Council in April of this
10 year. And if it is, then it is submitted to review by the
11 Regional Public Transportation Authority, State Transportation
12 Board, Maricopa County of Board of Supervisors, the Indian
13 communities, cities, towns, and the Citizen's Transportation
14 Oversight Committee. It goes to those for review, but we need
15 to have a vote on the recommendation from the Regional Public
16 Transportation Authority, the State Transportation Board, and
17 the Maricopa County Board of Supervisors.

18 And so, again, we wanted to bring this up in
19 study session so that the Board can understand this is the
20 reason the amendments are going to be brought to you at your
21 next business meeting.

22 The schedule that we have identified, again,
23 the Policy Committee and the Regional Council accepted -- or
24 approved the concept and requests a consultation for the major
25 Regional Transportation Plan amendment in April. We're in this

1 June, July period right now, where we're going to be working
 2 with the RPTA, the State Transportation Board and the Maricopa
 3 County Board of Supervisors. And then in August, it'll come
 4 back to the Regional Council, probably TPC and the Regional
 5 Council, to recommend the major amendment to the RTP, and then
 6 Regional Council will do the final action to amend the Regional
 7 Transportation Plan in September. And then -- but that's all
 8 going to be contingent upon finding of air quality conformity,
 9 which will be -- which will come to us through the U.S.
 10 Department of Transportation. So we're still -- this is the
 11 schedule that we're working with, and we wanted to bring this to
 12 you in study session for questions and hopefully answers.

13 So, Madam Chair, that completes my presentation.
 14 I'll just leave this up on the major amendments, and I'll be
 15 happy to take any further questions from the Board.

16 CHAIRWOMAN BEAVER: Thank you. And your report
 17 will -- the PowerPoint will be available online?

18 MR. HAZLETT: Yes, ma'am.

19 CHAIRWOMAN BEAVER: Is that correct?

20 MR. HAZLETT: Yes.

21 CHAIRWOMAN BEAVER: Okay. Thank you.

22 Board Member Stratton.

23 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Madam Chair, if I could
 24 just thank Bob and Dennis Smith and Eric Anderson, the
 25 leadership at MAG. All of these issues, especially the Spine,

1 have been extremely complex to work through as we deal with all
 2 the various entities, and I just want to thank MAG for their
 3 leadership and their cooperation in getting us to this point.
 4 These are some excellent things that we're working on. Sorry,
 5 Mr. Stratton, but thank you.

6 MR. STRATTON: Thank you, Madam Chair. And
 7 John, this question may be more for you.

8 Should Highway 93 become the designation of
 9 Interstate 11, will that open up any more Federal funds for that
 10 portion outside the MAG area so that the impact on rural Arizona
 11 would be less?

12 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Floyd's got his hand up,
 13 so...

14 (Inaudible conversation.)

15 MR. ROEHRICH: Madam Chair, I'm going to start
 16 the answer, but I'm sure John will probably maybe have some
 17 comments as well.

18 The designation of Interstate 11 brought no
 19 additional funds. What it did get is a priority designation by
 20 Congress, which if we as a state who get our federal funds
 21 appropriated every year would choose to put them on that
 22 corridor, it's a designation that we could use as we go through
 23 the process that may give us some leverage with other federal
 24 agencies to help review the process or to move the steps along,
 25 but it comes with no additional funding.

1 So any funding that does get put onto that will
 2 either come through and get programmed by this board or the
 3 local region, like in MAG (inaudible) region for that
 4 designation. When we're ready to go with and complete
 5 environmental studies, there are some grant opportunities out
 6 there, FAST Lane grants for freight and other things -- and
 7 freight will be a significant part of this corridor -- that
 8 could possibly be looked at above the TIGER grants and things
 9 like that, but above our distribution, but it's all a
 10 competitive process. It brings no addition funding.

11 MR. HALIKOWSKI: So looking out to the future,
 12 again, leaving the portion of I-11 outside of Maricopa County
 13 outside of the discussion for the moment, it's really too much
 14 of a mixed bag to tell right now between what the Trump
 15 administration is proposing, which we really haven't seen the
 16 details on that yet, and what Congress may be proposing. You
 17 know, there's been talk of this trillion dollars coming to the
 18 states, but based on everything we know, we still don't know if
 19 that's going to be a \$200 billion cash infusion or if that's
 20 going to be a \$200 billion cash infusion that's going to be
 21 leveraged by private funds. And then the additional parts of
 22 that trillion dollars are through streamlining and regulatory
 23 reforms and other things that the administration is looking at.

24 The other thing I would say is that they keep
 25 waving back and forth, and the focus seems to be on projects

1 that are shovel ready. And I use that term a little bit
 2 loosely, but that have been through the environmental process
 3 and design or close to construction.

4 As Bob stated, I-11 is under a tier one right now
 5 on that portion between Wickenburg and Nogales. And our
 6 intention is to conclude that tier one by 2019, but we will have
 7 a preferred alternative about this time next year. So that will
 8 give folks within that 2,000-foot wide swath a pretty good idea
 9 of where the recommended alternative is.

10 So at this point, it's just too early to use the
 11 magic eight ball to tell us whether I-11 will be there in a
 12 position to receive additional federal funds. So right now
 13 we're just doing everything we can, as the I-11 Corridor
 14 Coalition says, is to get our guns loaded and keep this whole
 15 idea moving forward. So as we conclude the tier one in Maricopa
 16 County -- I'll move us back the region now -- we will seamlessly
 17 move into the tier two study to get a signature by FHWA that
 18 would allow us, as Bob said, to do construction on segments of
 19 independent utility. But in order to get to the tier two and
 20 complete it, the Regional Council has to send a major amendment
 21 to you, which essentially says that we have met the items of
 22 fiscal constraint, and it's in the MAG long range plan. So it's
 23 too early to tell on funding yet.

24 MR. HAZLETT: And if I could add one thing, Madam
 25 Chair. Yes, the one thing that we have to do in our Regional

1 Transportation Plan is we always have to show that there is
 2 reasonable expectations of funding to be able to cover future
 3 construction, and as we started looking at our 2040 Regional
 4 Transportation Plan, which the Council is set to adopt here in
 5 June, we hope, we've projected that out, and we see that there
 6 is -- if things like the half-cent sales tax continues and the
 7 levels of funding that we expect out of the federal government,
 8 as well as the gas tax revenues continue to happen over time, we
 9 do see that we can cover in Maricopa County the section of I-11.

10 CHAIRWOMAN BEAVER: Board Member Sellers.

11 MR. SELLERS: Just a quick comment. First of
 12 all, excellent presentation. Thank you.

13 But I think most people here know, but I
 14 nonetheless will point out for anyone who doesn't know that Joe
 15 La Rue and I both serve on the MAG Regional Council, and we both
 16 are very involved with MAG on all these issues.

17 MR. HAZLETT: Madam Chair, he stole my last
 18 minute line, was to compliment both Board Member La Rue and
 19 Board Member Sellers for their continuing participation on the
 20 MAG Regional Council, as well as the Transportation Policy
 21 Committee. Their wisdom and counsel has been very good for us.

22 MR. ROEHRICH: But neither of them have been the
 23 recipient of the 64-colored box of Crayolas that you used to
 24 draw I-11, have they?

25 MR. HAZLETT: Well, you know...

1 MR. ROEHRICH: I have it on my desk.

2 MR. HAZLETT: It's on my desk, too.

3 CHAIRWOMAN BEAVER: Board Member Thompson.

4 MR. THOMPSON: I guess (inaudible) trying to say
 5 exact. Any new construction, any new improvement in the future
 6 is going to require some preservation. How are all these
 7 incorporated in the (inaudible) year plan (inaudible)?

8 MR. HAZLETT: (Inaudible) about, I mean --

9 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Sure. Go Ahead.

10 MR. HAZLETT: Continuing maintenance of the
 11 system that we have here in the Valley is a concern of ours, and
 12 right now the half-cent sales tax that were collected under Prop
 13 300 and Prop 400 were mainly meant for capital expansion,
 14 although with Prop 400, one could argue that we've -- in terms
 15 of adding lanes to the facilities, that we've done some
 16 preservation as parts of the -- a part of those projects.

17 But right now, Eric Anderson, the Transportation
 18 Director at MAG, just started. There's a discussion with our
 19 Transportation Policy Committee this month. The whole notion,
 20 we don't what the proposition number will be, but it's -- kind
 21 of the working number is 500, but what would be the renewal of
 22 the half-cent sales tax, and certainly operations and
 23 maintenance is a huge part of our discussion that we have on a
 24 day-to-day basis.

25 We've already kind of figured that between now

1 and 2040, the region's going to need something in the
 2 neighborhood of about \$3.5 billion of loan in preservation and
 3 in continuing maintenance, and we see that as a very hard, very
 4 real number, and it might -- it's probably going to grow.

5 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Uh-huh.

6 MR. HAZLETT: And so we want to make certain that
 7 our partners here at ADOT who have been absolutely wonderful for
 8 the last 30 plus years, we want to make certain that they have
 9 the funds that they need to make that happen.

10 MR. ROEHRICH: Madam Chair, if I could just add a
 11 little bit to Mr. Thompson's comments.

12 And then on a statewide basis, obviously, as you
 13 seen in the first -- or in the public hearing that we've had,
 14 the last public hearings as well as maybe a quick summary that
 15 Brent will talk about, when we look at the future transportation
 16 funding without any projected growth at all, you're seeing a
 17 program that has slowly evolved (inaudible) preservation of
 18 maintaining what we have with very limited opportunities for
 19 either the modernization and expansion is very strategic and
 20 very limited in its capabilities. Again, all dependent upon the
 21 transportation revenues that we have.

22 And I know there's been a number of times this
 23 board has wanted to talk about revenues, and we are planning
 24 that for one of our future study sessions this year. In order
 25 to kind of delve into that, what the local discussions have been

1 around the funding, as well as hopefully more clarity, as the
 2 director said, on the administration or Congress' take on
 3 federal funding as well. And then kind of look at as well some
 4 of the things the local governments are looking at, and some of
 5 the local governments here in the state that have been
 6 addressing it, such as Maricopa, Pima County, Coconino County,
 7 and the one Pinal County is considering for later this year. So
 8 there's a lot of talk about transportation revenue, but without
 9 the completion of any of any initiatives or without the legal
 10 ability to raise revenues, our revenues have been stagnant, as
 11 Ms. Ward has been reporting on month after month. So thank you.

12 CHAIRWOMAN BEAVER: I just have a concern, and
 13 correct me if I'm wrong in my understanding. But if MAG has the
 14 capacity, and I believe PAG, to actually have the voters in
 15 their areas vote for a sales tax and they put it in place, those
 16 regions get that benefit, but if the statewide and the rural
 17 part of the state has to go to the State Legislature to get them
 18 to consider a sales tax, then MAG and PAG, they've already got
 19 their sales tax. Would that not cause, you know, the MAG and
 20 PAG areas will not be interested in supporting a statewide sales
 21 tax for gas increase?

22 MR. ROEHRICH: So, Madam Chair, there is probably
 23 at least three questions or issues in there, but let me start
 24 with the last one first.

25 And I don't mean to speak for MAG and PAG, but

1 it's obvious that their economies depend on not only interstate
2 trade, but international trade and the roadways or the freeways,
3 the interstates or how you move cargo back in and finished
4 products out. So essentially, everybody in the state has an
5 interest in maintaining the state highway system and interstate
6 from an economic perspective. Also, the residents in the MAG
7 and PAG regions don't just drive around in their regions, as you
8 experienced on I-17. From a quality of life and tourism issue,
9 there's lots of folks moving in and out for recreation and other
10 purposes.

11 So from our perspective, as you look at it,
12 yes, there are regional funding sources, but I would not ever
13 believe that MAG and PAG's planning is confined only to their
14 region as they look out. So they are definitely looking at not
15 only the Sun Corridor, but as we travel around MAG's interest,
16 and SR-189 from the border perspective, the resolutions that MAG
17 and PAG passed on what is ostensibly a rural piece of highway.

18 So I would say that the interest as far as the
19 state efficiency and capacity doesn't stop at the borders of
20 their region. However, the way the funding is set up for their
21 half-cent sales tax, those are set up within the county. And I
22 want to be sure folks here understand they don't have a free
23 pass just to go to the voters anytime that they want. On Prop
24 300, permission had to be given by the Legislature through a
25 bill, and that was also true of Prop 400, and it continues to be

1 true of Prop 500. Before the County Board of Supervisors can
2 authorize a vote, the Legislature had to provide that permission
3 for the half-cent sales tax. The same is true in Pima County.

4 And then the last issue I would say I want to
5 dispel is that any region could go for a half-cent or a
6 quarter-cent or whatever, as we're seeing right now happen
7 with the Pinal County region. Gila County has a half-cent
8 sales tax already. The problem you run into is there's not
9 enough value in those areas in the tax base to necessarily
10 generate significant revenue. And I'll use Apache County as
11 an example. I think their sales taxes are probably 11 or 12
12 per -- cents on the dollar, and if you were to raise that
13 another penny, it becomes very high as a sales tax, and it's
14 quite regressive, also. So you want to be careful about where
15 you raise tax, but obviously there is a statewide system need.
16 And I've never seen MAG and PAG not be supportive of the
17 statewide system needs. So with that, I hope I've answered the
18 question.

19 CHAIRWOMAN BEAVER: Well, I've -- and thank you.
20 There was never any slight intended with regard to MAG and PAG.

21 MR. ROEHRICH: Oh, I didn't (inaudible).

22 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: No. That's okay.

23 CHAIRWOMAN BEAVER: It's just I think from a
24 legislative standpoint when, you know, we're, you know, trying
25 to consider how --

1 MR. ROEHRICH: Right.

2 CHAIRWOMAN BEAVER: -- do you raise revenues
3 statewide, and the gas tax is what comes up.

4 MR. ROEHRICH: Right.

5 CHAIRWOMAN BEAVER: I'm thinking if they're
6 raising taxes in MAG and PAG regions, it makes the Legislature
7 less interested in having a statewide increase in, say, gas
8 tax when MAG and PAG have that tax already. So how do we kind
9 of separate out the statewide area, which would lend itself to
10 Board Member Thompson --

11 MR. ROEHRICH: Uh-huh.

12 CHAIRWOMAN BEAVER: -- in generating a revenue?

13 I know from my perspective -- we live on the west
14 side of the state where that gas tax, if it was increased, a
15 high amount of it would come from tourism and California dollars
16 from --

17 MR. ROEHRICH: Right.

18 CHAIRWOMAN BEAVER: -- people coming into the
19 state that direction. I don't know about the eastern side of
20 the state, but I know from the western side that there is high
21 tourism all along the west side, which would be out-of-state
22 people paying that gas tax.

23 MR. ROEHRICH: Right.

24 CHAIRWOMAN BEAVER: And so I guess my is how do
25 we manage presenting it to the Legislature to seriously consider

1 a gas tax, but when MAG and PAG have the capacity that they
2 can -- you're saying that rural counties have the same capacity,
3 though. Did I understand that correctly?

4 MR. HALIKOWSKI: They do have the same
5 capacity, but at the end of the day, we all have to go back to
6 the Legislature, whether it's a gas tax or sales tax, to get
7 that permission for the County Board of Supervisors to hold a
8 vote of the people in that region.

9 Whether or not you include MAG and PAG in a
10 statewide vote is a policy question that you have to look at and
11 say, "What's the best approach?" Because remember, 85 percent
12 of your population lives in the Sun Corridor region, and that's
13 where a lot of the wealth is generated. And so, again, I think
14 you have to look at it as an entire system, and not separate out
15 the rural from the urban, because they really do have to work
16 together in order to complete a transportation system. So
17 whether it's a gas tax or some other form of revenue in the
18 future, I'd be careful about Balkanizing rural versus urban --

19 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Yes.

20 MR. HALIKOWSKI: -- because I think you want to
21 make sure that everybody's contributing to the system.

22 CHAIRWOMAN BEAVER: Does anyone have any
23 additional? We'll move on then.

24 Thank you very much.

25 MR. HAZLETT: Thank you. Thank you, Madam Chair.

1 MR. HALIKOWSKI: Thanks, Bob.

2 CHAIRWOMAN BEAVER: Item 3, 2018-2022 Tentative
3 Five-Year Transportation Facilities Construction Program
4 Review. Kristine and Bret.

5 MS. WARD: Good morning.

6 CHAIRWOMAN BEAVER: Good morning.

7 MS. WARD: Well, I will -- I'll start this off
8 briefly and then pass it over to Bret.

9 So on the 31st, January 31st, I came before you
10 guys and presented the financial plan for the '18-22 program.
11 And we went through the historic revenues and so forth as well
12 as what proposed debt we -- that issuances we were going to set
13 forth in the plan, as well as covered some elements of, you
14 know, operating cash requirements, and we'll also in this plan
15 be re-instituting the HURF swap.

16 Also, in those -- but since that January 31st
17 time frame, we've had a couple of things that have happened that
18 we want to adjust the financial -- a small component of the
19 financial plan for the '18-22 program in a good way. Since --
20 remember that since that presentation, the Legislature has
21 visited, and the Legislature has left, and Congress also has
22 passed the FY '17 federal funding.

23 The net effect of the changes from the
24 Legislature, as well as the Congressional changes that have
25 taken place have allowed us to add a few more dollars back in --

1 add a few dollars into the program. So the change that you will
2 see in the program that Bret is going to review with you today
3 is there is \$40 million more in the program than what I
4 presented to you on January 31st, and those -- that \$40
5 million is spread in FY 2018 as well as 2019. If things bode
6 well in the next programming cycle, we'll see if we can add some
7 more dollars. Those will go through the regular programming
8 cycle. But that is the change that you'll see financially that
9 has taken place since the January presentation.

10 So, with that, that's all that's changed from the
11 financial perspective, and I would pass it on to Bret to present
12 the tentative program.

13 Any questions?

14 CHAIRWOMAN BEAVER: Thank you.

15 MR. ANDERSON: Thank you, Kristine. Thank you,
16 Madam Chair, members of the Board. It's been my pleasure to be
17 with you for the last -- March, April and May, and present the
18 proposed tentative program to you, and I've got a couple of
19 slides here to go through, a couple things we're going to talk
20 about and go through.

21 Before you have -- before you, you have a new
22 book with the highlighted changes, along with a summary page of
23 all those changes as well. We've made the best to try and
24 capture the changes that we have there. So anything that you
25 see in yellow has been changed. And anything you see on the

1 summary page in yellow, that is a new project that's been added
 2 in. So that's -- hopefully you can crosswalk -- get a crosswalk
 3 through as you look up -- look through that the next couple
 4 weeks before the June meeting, and we'll be making the final
 5 presentation to you in the June meeting.

6 So what I'm going to propose to do is go through
 7 the general changes to the Greater Arizona program, some project
 8 adjustments. I've kind of -- the summary of the changes in the
 9 handouts in the proposed document. Expansion and delivery
 10 program, I'm going to cover that with a couple of slides. The
 11 development program, six-to-ten year program, projects to
 12 consider. The PAG, there is no changes in the PAG region. MAG,
 13 you've just heard the extensive changes for the MAG region. So
 14 I thank Bob Hazlett for that. And then the airport program,
 15 there is some updates and then a couple of next steps to cover.

16 So moving on with that, and this -- the general
 17 changes we've had, there's been a total of 76 changes between
 18 the bridge, pavement, new projects being added in. The net
 19 effect, as Kristine has said, is that it's zero, a net change.
 20 We've added some projects. We've moved some projects from 2017
 21 -- or from 2018 to 2017, things that aren't on track yet, and
 22 then we've also moved some projects from 2017 to 20-- -- back to
 23 2018 and adjusted some things throughout the program. But the
 24 net effect is a zero change to that.

25 So moving on to the next slide. I want to talk

1 about some of the comments, the public comments that we've
 2 received during this -- the March, April and May. This slide is
 3 a little bit out of sync, because this represents the changes
 4 that have -- were made up to, I believe our -- our last meeting
 5 in May at Flag- -- excuse me -- in Phoenix. We've -- I've just
 6 got some new information from Laura Douglas in our
 7 communications area, and so we've received 58 -- excuse me -- 58
 8 SurveyMonkey comments and then 17 emails. The 47 speakers at
 9 the public meetings, it's about a normal year that we've
 10 received. Flagstaff always seems to be a little bit more than
 11 our Tucson and Phoenix regions, but this is -- I would classify
 12 this as a -- about a normal year of our public comments.

13 One other -- a couple of other things to talk
 14 about on our public comment efforts that we've had. We had
 15 three news releases, three (inaudible) delivery notifications to
 16 the entire list of subscribers, a number of social media
 17 comments, Facebook and Twitter, and as always, we update our
 18 website, and then there's been several media interviews as well.
 19 So I believe that it's -- we've strengthened our level of public
 20 comment over the last few years, and we're getting good success
 21 with that, getting good reviews with that.

22 So moving on to the next couple of slides here.
 23 Proposed expansion projects. So what you have here is fiscal
 24 year 2018. We're proposing to add in -- we've -- I talked --
 25 Kristine's talked about the additional funding available. Okay.

1 So let me start first with the I-10 and the Pinal County
 2 project, the Picacho and Early to I-8. We -- you, at the last
 3 Transportation Board meeting, in an action moved about -- moved
 4 some money from fiscal year '18 up into '17 to get that segment
 5 -- I-10 segment started. We're going to be advertising that
 6 really soon and getting that started. We left the remaining
 7 money in fiscal year 2018 to continue out that project. So we
 8 advanced about \$58 million to 2017, and then we left the
 9 remaining money sitting in 2018 to cover the rest of the cost of
 10 that project.

11 We've left the Carrow to Stephens projects in
 12 fiscal year '18 on US-93, and then what we've also done is
 13 advanced \$5 million on US-93, the gap, to design that. We moved
 14 that project from fiscal year '19 up to fiscal year '18, and
 15 that as well as the US-93/I-40 West Kingman TI, phase one, the
 16 design for that. We've advanced that from fiscal year '19 to
 17 '18, and this is an effort to be prepared for whatever the Trump
 18 administration may do and get ready to go and have projects
 19 ready and on the table to take advantage of any funding that may
 20 come in.

21 So the next slide, fiscal year '19, we have
 22 advanced the Big Jim Wash and the Cane Springs design. We've
 23 moved those ahead. We were looking at trying to advance the
 24 I-17 design; however, there's some study money that is just
 25 getting started on that to get a final design or to go into

1 final -- to get ready to do the final design, and so that won't
 2 be ready to be completed until the end of fiscal year '18. So
 3 we didn't advance that yet. But so we left that in fiscal
 4 year '19. And then we also have the SR-189 project, the
 5 design/build project. We left that in 2019. So that -- those
 6 pretty much stayed the same that it was in the beginning.

7 Now moving on to fiscal year '20. So what we've
 8 proposed here is we left the \$41 million to construct the US-93,
 9 the gap project. We've left \$10 million in at US-93, the
 10 I-40/West Kingman TI to buy the right-of-way that may be needed
 11 for that project, and we've also left the \$5 million on the Lion
 12 Springs section of 260. We left that there.

13 The other things that you'll notice up there in
 14 red as well is through the public comment time, especially in
 15 the Flagstaff region, it was discussed or they made a great
 16 presentation about 4th Street Bridge widening. Now, these
 17 numbers here did not reflect adding this project in. However,
 18 if things were to come into play and the City of Flagstaff were
 19 -- be able to get a JPA and pull these -- pull that funding in
 20 together, then we would be able to add this project into fiscal
 21 year '20 with the ADOT bridge doing about \$2 million. That
 22 project is not line itemed in your book. However, the bridge
 23 group does feel that there is some structure work that needs to
 24 be done, some rehabilitation work needs to be done on that 4th
 25 Street Bridge that goes over I-40. And we could combine with --

1 if Flagstaff were to bring the \$5 million to the table, then we
 2 feel like we could be able to take advantage of it, find another
 3 \$2 million to complete that project. It's about a \$9 million
 4 project. So that is something that is proposed and brought
 5 before you today to discuss if you wish.

6 And I can move on and then -- then fiscal year --
 7 is there any questions on that, by the way, the 4th Street?
 8 That was something that we heard of this study session -- or the
 9 Flagstaff public hearing.

10 MR. LA RUE: (Inaudible) a question, Madam Chair.

11 CHAIRWOMAN BEAVER: Board Member La Rue.

12 MR. LA RUE: I think you -- I heard you say it's
 13 not line itemed in our book, but I do see a \$3 million
 14 placeholder -- a \$3 million line item in here. So what's that 3
 15 million on?

16 MR. ANDERSON: What page are you looking at?

17 MR. LA RUE: Page 42. I'm assuming it's the same
 18 project. It may be a different project. It says (inaudible)
 19 Avenue, TI and 4th Street overpass.

20 MR. ROEHRICH: Madam Chair, Board Member La Rue.

21 CHAIRWOMAN BEAVER: Yes.

22 MR. ROEHRICH: That's correct. That's correct.
 23 That's (inaudible) the bridge sub program, and what they've
 24 gotten is 3 million's for -- you can see that they've got four
 25 structures there, four bridges, and what that was intended to do

1 was to do some rehabilitation of the bridge decks. And what
 2 they're attempting to do is break 4th Street out, which was
 3 identified on that 3 million -- almost 2 million of that was
 4 just for the 4th Street bridges. Take that out and replace
 5 those bridges to widen them, and so that leaves 2 million out of
 6 that fund, and that would leave a million left for the other
 7 bridges, and then add two more million out of the program with
 8 the five million that they're bringing to do the bridge
 9 replacement, to widen that bridge. So that was a combination of
 10 four bridges in that line item. 4th Street was just a part of
 11 it.

12 MR. LA RUE: Thank you.

13 CHAIRWOMAN BEAVER: Just clarification, Bret.
 14 You said -- it is not included in those figures, but you see
 15 where we could get it into the year 2020.

16 MR. ANDERSON: We do have the capacity of being
 17 able to add that in if need, Madam Chair, yes.

18 CHAIRWOMAN BEAVER: Board Member Stratton.

19 MR. STRATTON: I believe it is our policy now
 20 that a JPA has to be in effect because of previous projects.

21 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Uh-huh.

22 MR. STRATTON: Is that correct?

23 MR. ROEHRICH: Madam Chair, Board Member
 24 Stratton, what we attempted to do was to get the IGA complete or
 25 at least drafted enough into its final stages. I mean, it's

1 been through legal review on both sides. So now we're just
 2 waiting for, you know, Regional Council to act to get it to the
 3 director to sign off on IGAs. So we intend to do that. Right
 4 now we are moving forward, planning based upon a commitment
 5 they've given us, but it has been more in -- through email,
 6 through a letter and through coordination. Nothing formalized
 7 yet.

8 But we view that it is a worthy project to move
 9 forward with, with somebody -- when a local entity is going to
 10 bring more than 50 percent of the cost of the project to it. If
 11 they bring the 5 million, we continue to move forward to find 4
 12 million in our program, we think it's -- there's little risk to
 13 start that process, because we've still got two programming
 14 cycles. If somehow the negotiations fall, we never get -- fail,
 15 we never get to a final agreement, you know, next programming
 16 cycle of the year after, we'll just reprogram those funds and do
 17 something else. But for now, we think it's a worthy effort to
 18 consider doing that bridge replacement with their funds, a
 19 combination of our funds, and the \$2 million the programming
 20 group is looking at being able to pull out of the program and
 21 still maintain fiscal constraint.

22 MR. STRATTON: Thank you. That is on my list to
 23 talk about later. Any time (inaudible) I think we need to give
 24 it very serious consideration, so thank you.

25 MS. WARD: If I may, Board Member, those JPAs,

1 the -- they -- and to Floyd's point, the reason they're so
 2 essential in order to be in place before we fully commit
 3 funding is because of the fiscal constraint option. So you have
 4 to show reasonable expectation of the funds, and so if you get
 5 into commitments that have not been documented, it starts to get
 6 a little -- a little fuzzy. So that's the essentialness of
 7 those.

8 CHAIRWOMAN BEAVER: Excuse me. Board Member
 9 Thompson.

10 MR. THOMPSON: I'd like to extend my thank you to
 11 you for listening to your (inaudible), and I know that NPOs has
 12 been working pretty closely with the district level district,
 13 (inaudible) and they've been working on (inaudible).

14 MR. ANDERSON: Thank you, Board Member Thompson.
 15 Madam Chair, thank you.

16 Everybody, thanks for the discussion.

17 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: (Inaudible.)

18 MR. ANDERSON: So moving forward, we have fiscal
 19 year '21 and '22. You see the I-17 projects along with the --
 20 MAG's \$50 million. We have those projects ready to go. Again,
 21 like I said, we have -- the study is underway, and we have the
 22 final design sitting in fiscal year '20 as well to get those
 23 ready to go that will add -- well, it will do something with
 24 I-17 in the next -- in the future.

25 Again, just kind of highlighting where a lot of

1 our projects are in this state. You'll note, again, a lot of
 2 the projects follow the I-11 corridor, and this is just kind
 3 of -- this map kind of covers the locations of where our
 4 proposed expansion projects are.

5 MR. HALIKOWSKI: So we really don't have an I-11
 6 corridor, per se, yet, right? I mean --

7 MR. ANDERSON: Correct. That is just --

8 MR. HALIKOWSKI: Okay.

9 MR. ANDERSON: Just -- it's this --

10 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Proposed.

11 MR. ANDERSON: Proposed I-11 corridor.

12 MR. HALIKOWSKI: Potential I-11.

13 MR. ANDERSON: The potential.

14 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: (Inaudible.)

15 MR. HALIKOWSKI: Just be careful here. No
 16 pre-decisions.

17 MR. ANDERSON: That's true. Thank you.

18 So what you see here is our next -- our six- to
 19 ten-year program. Again, we're proposing to leave -- I want to
 20 jump back here to these slides here. I want to just cover up on
 21 the green bar down at the bottom there. We're -- the green bar
 22 represents the preservation or the rehabilitation of the
 23 pavement in the state. We're leaving those numbers relatively
 24 unchanged from the five-year program and the presentations we've
 25 done for the public comment, and you'll notice the -- we're

1 trying to stay at that \$260 million level, but again, as we move
 2 into the six- to ten-year program, you'll see out there in that
 3 ten year, the 2027, that we're trying to get up to about
 4 \$320 million.

5 So again, the green bar in preservation is
 6 important, as we've talked about today, and taking care of our
 7 system. And that the blue bars that you see at the top there,
 8 again, those blue bars are representing the expansion program
 9 that we're proposing and that we have. And they do exchange
 10 projects that we have designed for US-93, Cane Springs section,
 11 the SR-260, Lion Springs section, as well as the West Kingman TI
 12 on US-93 and I-40. And then we're moving forward with the Big
 13 Jim Wash. You get out to 2026 and 2027, those projects we do
 14 not have designed staged in the five-year program; however,
 15 these are next priority that we would have -- that we could talk
 16 about in the next 2019 to 2023 program. So that's our six- to
 17 ten-year program.

18 MR. SELLERS: Madam Chair.

19 CHAIRWOMAN BEAVER: Yes. Board Member Sellers.

20 MR. SELLERS: Yeah. Just backing up a little bit
 21 to the I-17 study that you're doing. I believe that one of the
 22 key things you're looking at there is the possibility of
 23 reversible lanes.

24 MR. ANDERSON: There's many, many options. Board
 25 Member Sellers, Board Member Beaver, yes, there's many options

1 that we're looking at to try and figure out exactly what it is
 2 to fine tune that and get it ready to go so we can take them and
 3 do what -- exactly what we're going to do with the \$15 million
 4 to maximize everything. Thank you.

5 CHAIRWOMAN BEAVER: Board Member Stratton.

6 MR. STRATTON: Thank you, Madam Chair. And I'm
 7 assuming this is the appropriate time to speak about potential
 8 other projects, or do you want to wait until later?

9 MR. ROEHRICH: Madam Chair, board members, now is
 10 the time to bring in adjustments to the program, because staff
 11 will need to have time to go through and make any adjustments.
 12 If you're asking for a different -- projects that -- again, so
 13 we have fiscal constraint, so please bring them up so we can
 14 start discussing them.

15 MR. STRATTON: One of the ones I think we should
 16 consider -- again, it's the enemy bringing money to the table --
 17 would be Highway 69 in Prescott, a project that Chris Bridges
 18 has spoke to us about many times.

19 The other one that I would like to see be
 20 considered in the future is increasing the capacity of 191,
 21 which is utilized extensively when we close the freeway going to
 22 the east, I-10. All the traffic's rerouted through Safford and
 23 Duncan and/or Globe. Also tagging on to what my question with
 24 the MAG (inaudible) was, what percentage of traffic comes out of
 25 the east? 10 percent of that traffic comes out of the east,

1 apparently, which is a pretty good number. And at some point in
 2 time, there will have to be some kind of bypass, whether it's in
 3 Tucson or around Tucson or something, and I would like for the
 4 191, 70, 60 corridor to be considered as the bypass, being that
 5 it's actually a shorter route if you're coming from the east to
 6 191 in to Safford, 70 across (inaudible), which I see you have a
 7 couple of passing lane projects on that would be helpful, and
 8 then Globe since we're finishing Highway 60 into Superior
 9 (inaudible). It's actually a shorter and quicker route for
 10 trucks to come -- or any traffic to come around Tucson, and
 11 therefore, alleviate a lot of the traffic in Tucson itself that
 12 we're increasing by the (inaudible) and I-11. So I would at
 13 least like to see a study on that portion.

14 I've been there and looked at it. There's
 15 approximately eight miles that can be done without any impact to
 16 any housing, which is a pretty significant amount of
 17 construction. There's no washes. It's pretty easy-looking
 18 construction. So I'd like to see at least a study on that.

19 MR. ROEHRICH: Madam Chair, Member Stratton,
 20 absolutely. We'll pass that along to the planning director to
 21 look at that. And I know that recently they have looked at 191
 22 as well and did some analysis, possibly some alignment there in
 23 conjunction with the mining operations in the area. But again,
 24 what does that future corridor look? We'll make sure that -- to
 25 pass that along.

1 Regarding the State Route 69 in Prescott, I think
 2 as we continue to work with the locals, as Mr. Bridges has said
 3 and others, I think that the intent is we want to kind of
 4 advance, get the design started, and I don't see that as maybe
 5 this fiscal year addressing the construction of that work, but
 6 let's get the agreement in place, let's get the design started,
 7 and then let's look at, as you'd said, how we bring that forward
 8 in -- into construction, along with all the other needs. But I
 9 think we can get started with developing that and getting it
 10 ready to go. And then if for some reason additional funding
 11 becomes available, it becomes shovel ready.

12 MR. STRATTON: That is one of the points, Floyd,
 13 is I'm not saying we should program it now. But they are
 14 working out of -- they're doing a lot of their side, and I think
 15 we at least need to acknowledge that and ask them to continue to
 16 move forward until we get things in place.

17 MR. ROEHRICH: Madam Chair, Mr. Stratton,
 18 absolutely. Yes.

19 CHAIRWOMAN BEAVER: If it could just be explained
 20 to me a little bit, I see under -- I guess it would be project
 21 75, the DPS officer (inaudible) the TOC.

22 MR. ANDERSON: Sure, Madam Chair and members. It
 23 was brought up that the DPS program has been -- MAG has mostly
 24 taken care of that for the MAG region. However, through
 25 partnering with them, they've identified that it is a benefit to

1 the entire state. So it was proposed from the TSMO section to
 2 fund it for the next five years, and it is a benefit to the
 3 entire state. So we've added that as a statewide program to
 4 house DPS officers at the Traffic Operation Center to look at
 5 the entire state, and that is one of the proposals that we've
 6 got from the -- recommendations from our internal traffic
 7 operations center or -- and our TSMO section as well. So that
 8 was proposed to happen --

9 MR. HALIKOWSKI: So Madam Chair, if I could just
 10 elaborate a little. It was a pilot program that we started in
 11 the MAG region, and the cost was split 50/50 between ADOT and
 12 MAG for the DPS officer. And what that is is coverage 24/7,
 13 because if you look at our traffic incident management studies,
 14 there is a cost, and it is quantifiable to every minute of delay
 15 due to a crash or fatality, and having DPS in the Traffic
 16 Management Center allows us to more quickly respond and stage
 17 both as ADOT and DPS out to these crashes.

18 So the return per dollar has been, I think, well,
 19 something like 40 to one. It's proven to be quite a great cost
 20 savings, because not only do you get the quick deployment, but
 21 the sooner you get traffic moving again, you negate secondary
 22 crashes. As we've seen on 17 and in other places in the state,
 23 you have traffic coming up on backed-up traffic because of a
 24 crash and rear ending a number of vehicles. So because this has
 25 been so successful, we now want to expand it, as was said,

1 statewide, because we feel that having a DPS officer in the TOC
2 who understands where the crash is and the conditions and
3 relaying that directly to the officers responding, it really
4 improves the response time and the ability to clear the crash
5 more quickly.

6 CHAIRWOMAN BEAVER: And Director Halikowski, mine
7 was just to bring this point up. I think half of the Board
8 maybe has been down to the TOC.

9 MR. HALIKOWSKI: Right.

10 CHAIRWOMAN BEAVER: And maybe the other half
11 hasn't.

12 MR. HALIKOWSKI: Right.

13 CHAIRWOMAN BEAVER: So it would be nice when they
14 have the opportunity, they can go down there. And we did have
15 the opportunity to see the DPS officer down there, and how
16 they're able to see things --

17 MR. HALIKOWSKI: Uh-huh.

18 CHAIRWOMAN BEAVER: -- almost in advance as
19 opposed to somewhat --

20 MR. HALIKOWSKI: Right.

21 CHAIRWOMAN BEAVER: -- that's on their way there
22 in a vehicle. They're able to --

23 MR. HALIKOWSKI: Right.

24 CHAIRWOMAN BEAVER: -- have a visual of things
25 that the -- you know, like you say, as far as time --

1 MR. HALIKOWSKI: Right.

2 CHAIRWOMAN BEAVER: -- saving time and safety, I
3 also believe, because -- and I think we've got newer members.
4 That's another study session probably in the future maybe where
5 we have DPS over and they were talking about --

6 MR. HALIKOWSKI: Uh-huh.

7 CHAIRWOMAN BEAVER: -- safety issues and the
8 different agencies from the -- the tow truck services --

9 MR. HALIKOWSKI: Right.

10 CHAIRWOMAN BEAVER: -- to the ambulance services
11 to all of those as far as --

12 MR. HALIKOWSKI: Right.

13 CHAIRWOMAN BEAVER: -- how they all tie together,
14 so...

15 MR. HALIKOWSKI: Yeah. We're looking at maybe we
16 could host a study session at the TOC at some point so all the
17 board members could (inaudible) there and we could bring DPS in.
18 But we'll set something up to talk about this some more.

19 MR. STRATTON: Madam Chair.

20 CHAIRWOMAN BEAVER: Board Member Stratton.

21 MR. STRATTON: I'm sure this will come as a
22 surprise to everybody. I'd like to talk about I-15 and the
23 increase to 17 million. I've expressed my displeasure about the
24 impact this has on rural Arizona. The increase to 17 million is
25 another hit.

1 A few questions and then I have a comment. The
2 question is I believe that's the only freeway in Arizona that
3 can pull triples; is that correct?

4 MR. ROEHRICH: Correct.

5 MR. STRATTON: Is the additional 36,000 pounds,
6 up to 36,000, it would be 18,000 per axle on the additional
7 trailers, is that causing more damage to the bridges because of
8 the way they're built? Is it causing the damage to accelerate?
9 Could we make the bridges last longer if it was only doubles?
10 That's one question.

11 The second question would be -- and I'm sorry.
12 I'll give you all the questions at once if you'd like or one at
13 a time, however you --

14 MR. ROEHRICH: It's okay. I'll probably ignore
15 both of them. Go ahead. Because you're asking some complicated
16 questions. I don't know how much we're going to get into it.
17 Yes, sir.

18 MR. STRATTON: Has there been any more talks
19 scheduled with Utah and Nevada about funding or other possible
20 options?

21 MR. ROEHRICH: Madam Chair, Board Member
22 Stratton, regarding to the weight, I think it's important to
23 remember that those weight restrictions came on after that
24 corridor was built. So I do think as we have been evaluating it
25 and looking at the maintenance needs on there, there's

1 probably -- anecdotally, there has probably been some impact
2 because of that. Quantitatively, can I tell what it is? I
3 don't know if we have that information. We can always ask the
4 maintenance group or the district if they've been really
5 quantifying that. But I could say pretty confidently and
6 anecdotally, there's probably been some degradation additional
7 because of the additional weight.

8 But I also think it's important to remember that
9 we continue to have a responsibility to maintain that corridor
10 as in this state, and our attempts to do that have been
11 stretched out in what we hope are a way that allows us to
12 balance needs up there to ensure that that corridor is managed
13 safely, as well as address the rest of the state. But it does
14 come out of the state program or the statewide program for that
15 corridor, specifically.

16 And then as far as the conversations, yes, we've
17 had conversations with specifically what to do, but to this
18 point, I would say the local states are supportive of efforts
19 we'd take, especially when we ask about grants or we go after
20 possible other funding sources, but they're not taking the lead
21 on this (inaudible) aggressively saying we're going to give you
22 our funding. They're basically saying the same thing as I would
23 expect if they asked us for funding. "We've taken care of ours.
24 You guys need to take care of yours."

25 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: That's good.

1 MR. STRATTON: Thank you for answering the
2 question.

3 My comment would be at this point I think
4 possibly we should consider as a board and staff is revisiting
5 the Casa Grande accords. Those are very old. I know
6 (inaudible) was, I believe, on the board at that time from Gila
7 County, and he and I spoke about them. At that time, there were
8 not the extensive freeways or the repairs that had to be made or
9 I'm not sure -- maybe it wasn't the intention of the Board or
10 the Casa Grande accords that all that money be spent on freeways
11 and taken away from rural Arizona. I understand we have a
12 liability and an obligation to maintain all of the freeways,
13 including I-15, because it is in the state. However, I think we
14 need to consider other possible ways of doing things so there
15 can be some expansion program in rural Arizona without the high
16 impact the freeways make.

17 MR. ANDERSON: Madam Chair.

18 CHAIRWOMAN BEAVER: Yes.

19 MR. ANDERSON: Thank you. That was great
20 questions. Good discussion. That's what the study session's
21 about is to hear what you guys have to say and to be able to
22 take everything into consideration as we put the next program
23 together.

24 So moving forward with the next stuff, so what
25 I'd like to do here, this one is just -- we don't have to go

1 back to Bob's slides or anything like that, but just kind of go
2 over -- there's some extensive changes that they did, and we
3 have in this -- in this program and what you'll see in the June
4 meeting is the final recommendations that they have as well.
5 Again, everything is contingent upon MAG Regional Council
6 approval and what they go through their process. So we've
7 updated all of the project information for the MAG region and
8 taken care of everything that Bob has talked about today during
9 his presentation as well.

10 And then moving on to -- and then it is noted in
11 the first part of this slide that there are no changes in the --
12 for the PAG region as well, so we've updated that -- or we've
13 kept that the same as it started out in the starting of our
14 public hearing and review process.

15 What I'd like to throw up now is the airport
16 program. And this is some of the -- this is just the statute
17 that governs the airport program. And the next slide that we
18 have here only shows -- it shows a significant change, only
19 showing our three and a half million dollars for the matching of
20 our FAA funds. This is -- again, it was a rebuilding year that
21 we've talked about through the public hearing process. This is
22 the amount of money that we feel is necessary to take care of
23 the FAA grants that do come in throughout the year.

24 Your book does represent the changes, and it
25 reflects the most -- the greatest -- the latest and greatest

1 information that you have in the back part of the book under the
2 airport capital program. That only shows the three and a half
3 million dollars that's available.

4 And then moving on, so we've had our public
5 hearings. We're here today at the study session. It is --
6 we're recommending what we take today and hear from today at the
7 end of our public -- our study session today, we'll make all the
8 final recommendations to you at the June 16th meeting in Payson,
9 and then we will present it to the Governor's office by the
10 30th, and then we will start everything again July 1 and get
11 ready for our next program.

12 Madam Chair, that's all I have for you today.

13 CHAIRWOMAN BEAVER: Thank you.

14 I do have a question to ask you, Bret. With
15 regard specifically to the I-15 and the bridge replacements, did
16 I not see under the bridges that there -- there's bridges up
17 there considered in poor condition? Am I reading --

18 MR. ANDERSON: We didn't show you the sufficiency
19 ratings and the bridge condition chart today, because we've been
20 showing you that for the last three months, so...

21 MR. ROEHRICH: Yeah. Madam Chair, if you
22 remember, there was some were about, like, 3 percent that were
23 in the poor condition. They're not unsafe, but they were poor.
24 The -- I don't remember if all the bridges on I-15 were, but I
25 know at least the ones we're trying to address are.

1 So we're continuing to address those through not
2 just the bridge program, but obviously programming additional
3 bridges as far as we move forward. But I think it's important
4 to remember we maintain all our bridges to safe condition. We
5 just know that there's some that definitely either need to be
6 replaced or rehabilitated, and with some reconstruction, we're
7 continuing to do those.

8 The ones -- the one on I-15 we're putting in, we
9 think is a priority that needs to be addressed.

10 CHAIRWOMAN BEAVER: Okay. I think sometimes I
11 have a hard time tying things together, but it was the
12 understanding that if we've got I-15 on here, and then there was
13 one that was in poor condition. That was probably why there's
14 this urgency to provide and move it along. Is that --

15 MR. ROEHRICH: Right, Madam Chair. And Board
16 Member Stratton's comment on I-15, it would be a great corridor
17 if we could come up with a different strategy, and I think the
18 director in the past has looked at some opportunities to
19 possibly even use a federal program that could (inaudible)
20 specifically for the improvements, but unfortunately there are a
21 number of issues within that that didn't lead to that being a
22 decision. We've not given up on continuing to look for funding
23 on Interstate 15, whether that is other TIGER grants, whether
24 that is other granting programs. We'll continue to do those at
25 the same time that we program as responsibly as possible and

1 bring to you recommendations on the project needs that are
2 necessary.

3 MR. HALIKOWSKI: And to that point, going back to
4 what may happen nationally, one of the issues, at least the
5 administration has lined out is where there's infrastructure
6 critical to interstate customers, like I-15, there may be
7 funding set aside to repair those particular facilities. So,
8 again, it's too early to tell whether or not we might get some
9 more federal help outside of the TIGER grant process, but we are
10 keeping a close eye on how that might work. That would be
11 something that would be very good to tell our Congressional
12 delegation, that we have a number of critical interstate
13 commerce facilities in Arizona, and if there were funding it set
14 aside for those, that would be very helpful.

15 CHAIRWOMAN BEAVER: Thank you. Board Member
16 Stratton.

17 MR. STRATTON: I want to go back to a comment you
18 made in last month's meeting, or earlier this month in Phoenix.
19 It struck me, and it stuck with me the fact that the feds
20 decided to put that road in Arizona, I-15, because it's such a
21 beautiful drive. It could have been built outside Arizona much
22 cheaper. But the federal government decided to put it in
23 Arizona -- which it is a beautiful drive. I've been on it.
24 However, that kind of puts us at a disadvantage, because it has
25 no use to us, but yet the feds say, "We're going to put it in

1 Arizona. Now you maintain it." And I just have a hard time
2 with that.

3 MR. HALIKOWSKI: I share your hard time.
4 Unfortunately, environmental issues and laws were different back
5 in the late '60s.

6 MR. STRATTON: Yeah.

7 MR. HALIKOWSKI: Again, reconstruction or new
8 construction, as you know today, is much more complicated by all
9 of the demands that are made on us by federal rules. So we're
10 going to continue to look at different ways to fund this,
11 because it is a drain on Greater Arizona, and as we've talked
12 before, the economic benefit to the rest of the state is pretty
13 slim. So rest assured we're going to keep looking for ways that
14 we don't have to impact Greater Arizona to such a degree to
15 maintain those bridges.

16 MR. STRATTON: Thank you.

17 CHAIRWOMAN BEAVER: Board Member Thompson.

18 MR. THOMPSON: Several things here. Not -- these
19 have already been presented to the Board during public comment
20 time, there's Flagstaff or Sedona group, questions for planning
21 dollars to begin discussing the needs (inaudible) 4th Street and
22 Flagstaff could use design dollars in 2019? (Inaudible)
23 reservation, I know that ADOT representative had time to go up
24 to Many Farms, I believe (inaudible), that's still a priority,
25 as well as the preservation of 260 and 60, and those particular

1 roads were presented to us in Flagstaff. So thank you for that.

2 We appreciate your high consideration. (Inaudible.)

3 CHAIRWOMAN BEAVER: Thank you.

4 So I don't know if it's in closing, because I
5 don't know if anyone else will have anything. Am I to
6 understand, correct me if I'm wrong, that all of these that are
7 highlighted on this --

8 MR. ANDERSON: Summary page.

9 CHAIRWOMAN BEAVER: -- revision, yes. They
10 equate to that 40 million that was found.

11 MR. ANDERSON: No.

12 CHAIRWOMAN BEAVER: No.

13 MR. ANDERSON: No. No. Okay. So let's kind of
14 go through a little bit about that, Madam Chair. I can explain
15 to -- your summary page that you're looking at right there, the
16 yellow -- okay.

17 So if you started with your book at the beginning
18 of the public hearing time in March, and then kind of went down
19 everything, the yellow sheet, the yellow pages, the yellow line
20 items that you see on that page represent new projects. If you
21 go out to the very last column, that's new money that's come in.
22 It wasn't in your current program, but through funding requests,
23 minor pavement -- minor projects program, we added these
24 projects into the program. And what that does is reduce the sub
25 program. So it was a net zero effect. So we -- so what this --

1 the sheet represents is what's your book like at the beginning
2 of the public comment time, and then you take the current book
3 that you have today, match that up, and that represents what the
4 changes have -- had made through the public comment time.

5 MR. ROEHRICH: I'm confused, too. Madam Chair,
6 right, that was a little confusing. I was trying to follow
7 along. Because you were able to accelerate some projects into
8 17, as you said, because you've made some adjustments to
9 projects, some different costs, but as well some moved. You
10 have rebalanced each of the fiscal years to make sure you got
11 fiscally constrained.

12 MR. ANDERSON: Funding in every year. Correct.

13 MR. ROEHRICH: Funding in each year.

14 MR. ANDERSON: That's correct.

15 MR. ROEHRICH: Each year is fiscally constrained,
16 as well as the five-year program. That's what Kristine and her
17 team make happen. So everything on this project, everything
18 that's not shaded is a change to an existing project that was in
19 at the beginning of the public hearing. And because of all the
20 adjustments, you're going to see some that balance out to zero,
21 and some that are just slight modifications. Then you're seeing
22 the ability to add in the new, which could be a combination of
23 funding because of the adjustments plus the 40 million that
24 Kristine had found that was distributed probably somewhere
25 regionally as well, between MAG, PAG and Greater Arizona. So it

1 all didn't go to one area.

2 Those adjustments altogether will add up, but
3 you're not going to see a specific \$40 million adjustment unless
4 you pull something out. What it does mean, though, is \$64
5 million, \$64.7 million was added to the program through a
6 combination of additional revenues, plus adjustments that were
7 made by accelerating projects and making adjustments. So the
8 effect of change to the five-year program that you received at
9 the beginning of the public hearing comment is this whole
10 summary sheet.

11 MR. ANDERSON: Madam Chair, Floyd, that is
12 correct.

13 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Could you repeat that?

14 MR. ROEHRICH: I don't think I could, to be
15 honest with you, because I started to ramble. I got caught in
16 the do loop there a little bit. I thought, "What in the hell am
17 I talking about?"

18 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Well, we're still
19 wondering.

20 MR. ROEHRICH: So that's when I said -- that's
21 when I turned to Bret and said, "Do you agree?" And will you
22 agree with me to say that I'm done?

23 MR. ANDERSON: That I'm done.

24 MR. ROEHRICH: I'm shutting up.

25 CHAIRWOMAN BEAVER: I -- just in follow-up then

1 to that, I understood, correct me if I'm wrong, that the
2 Flagstaff project for -- that was --

3 MR. ANDERSON: 4th Street?

4 CHAIRWOMAN BEAVER: -- displayed up that -- yeah.
5 The 4th Street is not included in this, but you have it showing
6 on this.

7 MR. ANDERSON: Madam Chair, the 4th Street Bridge
8 is on a page that Board Member La Rue brought up. That
9 \$3 million again is multiple bridges across I-40 for that year.
10 4th Street Bridge is one of those bridges that would add money
11 to --

12 MR. ROEHRICH: Okay. Hold on, Bret.

13 Madam Chair, you're asking for the \$9 million
14 project, is it in here? Are we showing the \$9 million project
15 yet, and not because of what Kristine said is since it would
16 come in in 2020, I think is what the time frame is, we will work
17 with the local government to get the agreement in place, to get
18 their \$5 million, and then we'll make the adjustment to bring
19 the other \$4 million in a future program (inaudible). For now,
20 it's still left in the program as the \$3 million for those four
21 bridges, 2 million of which would be for the --

22 MR. ANDERSON: 4th Street.

23 MR. ROEHRICH: -- 4th Street Bridge.

24 CHAIRWOMAN BEAVER: Okay. But --

25 MR. ROEHRICH: So we're not adding that total

1 project in until we get the IGA in place. But because it's two
2 years away, we will bring it in our next --

3 MR. ANDERSON: In the next programming cycle.

4 MR. ROEHRICH: -- programming cycle probably.

5 CHAIRWOMAN BEAVER: Okay. But it appeared on
6 that slide, if we could go back to that slide, that it was
7 identified as though we were incorporating it, but it wasn't
8 incorporated in yet.

9 MR. ANDERSON: Madam Chair, that's correct. It
10 -- we -- I put it up there for discussion purposes only just to
11 have the discussion that this is something that we have heard at
12 the public hearings through the -- through our process and
13 wanted to have the discussion with the Board today to get your
14 blessing or, you know, your discussion to see if this is
15 something that you would agree to as a staff recommendation and
16 as a Board recommendation.

17 CHAIRWOMAN BEAVER: Okay. The parliamentary
18 procedure, we can't vote on adding something in as a board. Can
19 we give consensus on adding something into -- --

20 MR. ROEHRICH: No. Madam Chair, you're right.
21 You don't -- all we're asking is do we -- from board members to
22 comment on that, whether your comment sounds good or your
23 comment -- I don't necessarily want to program that; let's
24 consider something else. That's only presented there for your
25 comment. That's all.

1 CHAIRWOMAN BEAVER: Okay. As one board member,
2 my comment is because they are bringing so much to the table,
3 the City of Flagstaff, we need to seriously look at including it
4 in.

5 MR. STRATTON: Madam Chair, Floyd, would you
6 anticipate having a (inaudible) in place with Flagstaff prior to
7 the Payson meeting?

8 MR. ROEHRICH: Madam Chair, Board Member
9 Stratton, no. I don't think this is going to happen this fiscal
10 year, quite honestly, which is why I think it's important to
11 note we're not asking really to -- you to take formal action on
12 that. We're telling you that we're going to coordinate that,
13 and we may bring it to you for -- in the future for action, but
14 I do not see that as part of this programming cycle, because
15 it's two years away.

16 MR. STRATTON: That's fine. I just wanted to put
17 a recommendation.

18 CHAIRWOMAN BEAVER: Board Member Thompson.

19 MR. THOMPSON: Madam Chair, members, contingency
20 fund, you know, (inaudible) all the details about it. When we
21 talk about preservation on many of the rural roads, I'm thinking
22 why can't we just go to the contingency funds and apply to these
23 roads. Is there anything that I'm not thinking through?

24 MS. WARD: Well, the reason the contingency fund
25 is established is as we go through the program year, projects

1 come in over budget, projects come in under budget. Excuse me.
 2 Trying to get over a cold here. And so we have -- you're a nice
 3 guy. Thank you.

4 So throughout the year, that's why that fund is
 5 maintained as established, and at the end of the year, we
 6 apply -- if there are any funds still existing, we apply them to
 7 projects that you've already approved, but we need to maintain
 8 that contingency as we go through the year to ensure that we are
 9 fiscally constrained when projects come in over budget.

10 So the funds that you have to apply to projects,
 11 you can take something else off of the island, but the
 12 contingency is needed to maintain that fiscal constraint. If
 13 you want to prioritize, take something else, another project,
 14 and take it off of the island, so to speak, or -- and put this
 15 in, then that's... If you'd like, I believe that you've got an
 16 upcoming orientation.

17 MR. THOMPSON: Yeah.

18 MS. WARD: And I'll go over the contingency fund
 19 in detail. Probably more than you want to know.

20 CHAIRWOMAN BEAVER: And is it not correct, also,
 21 that that contingency fund, we try to keep a certain dollar
 22 amount in it?

23 MS. WARD: Board Member Beaver, that is correct.
 24 We start out the year with a \$5 million figure, approximately,
 25 in that fund -- in that sub program.

1 MR. LA RUE: Madam Chair, if I may.

2 CHAIRWOMAN BEAVER: Board Member La Rue.

3 MR. LA RUE: So a comment and then maybe a
 4 question. So the comment, I think you were asking about 4th
 5 Street and (inaudible). If the JPA does come forward, I think
 6 it's very consistent with the Board's direction in past years to
 7 encourage this kind of cooperation (inaudible) --

8 MS. WARD: Uh-huh.

9 MR. LA RUE: -- and other things. So as a board
 10 member, whether I'm still a board member when that comes
 11 forward, I would be supportive, and I think it's consistent with
 12 prior Board action.

13 And then following on Board Member Thompson, I
 14 think he mentioned something about the Sedona group.
 15 (Inaudible) been here a number of times. I thought that he
 16 might have said something about there was something in here
 17 addressing that, and I don't believe so. So could you confirm
 18 that?

19 MR. ANDERSON: Madam Chair, Board Member La Rue,
 20 we don't have anything in there covering the Sedona --

21 MR. LA RUE: Okay.

22 MR. ANDERSON: -- information.

23 MR. LA RUE: And so when I heard them, they've
 24 been here very consistently over a number of months. They
 25 talked about changing up parking, trying permits, transit, a lot

1 of those things. I don't see as those things really fit in our
2 capital program the way we dial it up. So I would expect that
3 there's other things that ADOT is doing in conjunction with all
4 those stakeholders to address those issues.

5 MR. ROEHRICH: Madam Chair, Board Member La Rue,
6 that's exactly right. Our district engineer, Audra Merrick, has
7 been part of that committee that (inaudible) had talked about,
8 the traffic matters folks, in order to meet and talk about these
9 options.

10 Right now these are options that are being
11 considered to talk about. As they get implemented, there are
12 things that we will -- we'll do. We'll probably -- part of an
13 operating program or maintenance functions or operating
14 functions, things like that. If we end up getting to the point
15 of developing capital improvement projects, then those would
16 come through the Board for consideration within the five-year
17 program.

18 But as we work with that group, as well as the
19 local, you know, federal land management agencies, the local
20 government agencies, other advocates within the area start
21 talking about these options, there are a number of issues we've
22 got to go through. Legal issues, liability issues. And then
23 what's the authority level to do that?

24 So there's a lot that is being considered now as
25 that group meets. Actions in the future will be managed through

1 the agency, unless it rises to the point of becoming a project.
2 Then we would look at bringing something to the Board to
3 program. But right now we don't -- we haven't identified that
4 as early as that group has been starting to meet.

5 MR. HALIKOWSKI: Well, and as you know, we're a
6 pass through for federal transit funds, but we don't program
7 those here as part of the five-year plan. So we don't have a
8 budget for transit. We're just a pass through for federal
9 money.

10 MR. LA RUE: And that would be done more on the
11 local level.

12 MR. HALIKOWSKI: Yes.

13 MR. LA RUE: Regionally.

14 MR. ROEHRICH: A lot of the cost (inaudible) of
15 the government, even some cities or special transit agencies
16 that get (inaudible) organizations. Those funds go from us to
17 them through a granting program and process.

18 MR. LA RUE: So what I -- I appreciate that, and
19 maybe I'm speaking on behalf of Board Member Thompson, is just
20 updates on that from ADOT and what board members, especially the
21 board member that that's their district, could be involved and
22 help (inaudible).

23 MR. HALIKOWSKI: Right. So I forget the
24 gentleman's name at the last board meeting here in Phoenix, but
25 he was from traffic matters, and I committed to meeting with the

1 group. So we're going to stay involved to see what ADOT can do
 2 from its part to help the situation. But again, as Floyd points
 3 out, many of these things involve other federal agencies or fund
 4 -- funding that is not with necessarily in our control.

5 CHAIRWOMAN BEAVER: Director Halikowski, if I'm
 6 -- again, maybe I misheard, but it looks like they've got two
 7 separate things. They've got the parking and the things that
 8 have to do with -- along Oak Creek Canyon area, and they also
 9 have the TI. Did I understand that? It's actually in the city
 10 of Sedona that's at that junction.

11 MR. ROEHRICH: Madam Chair, they -- yeah. They
 12 use the term "rotary." It's a roundabout. There are a number
 13 of roundabouts on intersections State Route 89 and 179 through
 14 the Sedona area, 89 through the Oak Creek Canyon area. But
 15 there's no interchanges specifically like you would have a great
 16 separation interchange, but there are intersections, roundabout
 17 intersections and other configurations through that area.

18 CHAIRWOMAN BEAVER: Okay. Maybe since the last
 19 time I was up there -- I don't remember a roundabout being
 20 there, but it seemed at that junction, I could see where there
 21 would be traffic that will back up. Since then, evidently
 22 there's been a roundabout put in there?

23 MR. ROEHRICH: Madam Chair, yes. I think they're
 24 talking about the junction of 89 and 179 --

25 CHAIRWOMAN BEAVER: Uh-huh.

1 MR. ROEHRICH: -- is the two routes that come in
 2 there. And there's been a lot of discussion over the years with
 3 the Oak Creek Canyon folks, Sedona folks. You know, we were
 4 going to expand 179, but there was a big concern about the
 5 footprint. So we narrowed it down, put in the roundabouts, put
 6 in what we felt were more traffic calming as a way to move
 7 traffic.

8 But there -- and like a lot of areas, like
 9 Interstate 17 (inaudible), it's a capacity issue. How much
 10 capacity are you going to be able to move through, and how much
 11 demand is there? And as the economy gets better and more people
 12 recreate, you're obviously seeing an increase in traffic,
 13 increase in tourism, and the roads themselves are built for an
 14 average level of traffic, but then on a specialty week, on,
 15 like, a holiday weekend where traffic might be four times more
 16 than that, it's just not designed to handle that type of
 17 traffic.

18 MR. HALIKOWSKI: I just want to put a finer point
 19 on it. The 179 happened, I think, before any of us were here,
 20 and there was, as I understand it, a great deal of outreach with
 21 the local communities, and there was great concern over taking
 22 out trees, turning it into a four-lane -- two-lane -- you know,
 23 four-lane --

24 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Four-lane divided.

25 MR. HALIKOWSKI: -- divided and what that would

1 do to the drive and the scenery. So there were great pains
 2 taken by the department under Governor Napolitano's
 3 administration to ensure that 179 was designed and built the way
 4 that it is now. So what you do have is a series of roundabouts
 5 through there, but again, we tried very hard to work with the
 6 local community to get to what they would approve.

7 CHAIRWOMAN BEAVER: Well, I would just have them
 8 (inaudible) the reason I bring up that one particular junction
 9 is that would fall under ours, but I'm not hearing anything
 10 about the county or the city comes to us with any dollars at
 11 this point in time.

12 MR. ROEHRICH: Madam Chair, that is correct. I
 13 mean, we study it and we monitor it, and our folks, maintenance
 14 folks and others make sure that it's maintained and it's
 15 functioning to the degree that it is, but we've not identified
 16 it as a reconstruction or capacity project in there. That
 17 conversation has not started.

18 CHAIRWOMAN BEAVER: But based on what we have
 19 been as a board approving or kind of delaying, based on those
 20 communities, as in the case with Flagstaff looks to be bringing
 21 dollars to the table, versus Sedona, if that interchange -- or
 22 intersection there or TI or junction, I haven't heard anything
 23 where they're coming to us saying, you know, "We've got this
 24 much money to help put up towards improvement on that."

25 MR. ROEHRICH: Madam Chair, I'm going to ask the

1 North Central District engineer if she's had any conversations
 2 with the local governments about bringing funding into this
 3 program. I'm taking advantage of Audra being here.

4 Hello, Audra.

5 MS. MERRICK: Thank you.

6 Madam Chair, members of the board, Sedona has
 7 been perform some studies in the local area, but there hasn't
 8 been any discussion in terms of bringing money to the table to
 9 facilitate any projects that they might propose.

10 MR. ROEHRICH: But I think (inaudible) knowing
 11 though is they do their studies, we do our studies, we will have
 12 those conversations. Those will be something in the future that
 13 may lead to something, but for now, we're all kind of looking at
 14 it individually and working through the traffic matters with
 15 advocates on specific issues, but...

16 MS. MERRICK: Now I have the mic again.

17 MR. ROEHRICH: Give me that microphone.

18 MS. MERRICK: In regards to traffic matters on
 19 State Route 89A, one of the requests that they had was that --
 20 was parking on State Route 89A, and the district, the
 21 applications, I believe, are due tomorrow, but the district has
 22 requested a study for Route 89A to look at closing some of the
 23 parking areas on some of the shoulders of the roadway.

24 MR. HALIKOWSKI: So I just want to say that I
 25 don't want to jump to solutions too quickly and focus on a

1 particular interchange or particular solution. Because as we've
2 learned, that there are many different constituents in the area,
3 and we want to make sure that we vet all these through
4 appropriately and not come up with a solution that's not going
5 to be supported. So we're hearing from a group, but as has been
6 pointed out, we really haven't been approached by local
7 government yet as the issue. But we'll continue to meet with
8 the interested constituencies like traffic matters and other
9 folks. But again, I don't want to jump to a quick solution at
10 this point.

11 CHAIRWOMAN BEAVER: So I'm guessing you were
12 being the closer right then and that was kind of the closing.

13 MR. HALIKOWSKI: I hope so, but I'd be happy to
14 answer any other questions.

15 CHAIRWOMAN BEAVER: Is there any additional
16 questions?

17 MR. THOMPSON: Madam Chair.

18 CHAIRWOMAN BEAVER: Board Member Thompson.

19 MR. THOMPSON: Although there's not too much that
20 we can do at this time, I believe that there's been discussion
21 and continue to be discussion (inaudible).


22 CHAIRWOMAN BEAVER: Thank you.

23 (End of excerpt.)
24
25

Adjournment

Chairwoman Beaver gaveled the meeting to a close adjourning at 11:39 am.

Meeting adjourned at 11:39 a.m. MST.


Deanna L. Beaver, Chairwoman
State Transportation Board


John S. Halikowski, Director
Arizona Department of Transportation