

**STATE TRANSPORTATION BOARD MEETING MINUTES**

9:00 a.m., Friday, July 21, 2017

**Mohave County Board of Supervisors  
Auditorium  
700 W. Beale Street  
Kingman, AZ 86402**

**Pledge**

The Pledge of Allegiance was led by Chairwoman Deanna Beaver.

**Roll call by Board Secretary Linda Priano**

**In attendance:** Deanna Beaver, William Cuthbertson, Joe La Rue, Jack Sellers, Mike Hammond and Steve Stratton.

**Absent:** Jesse Thompson.

There were approximately 40 people in the audience.

**Opening Remarks**

Chairwoman Beaver thanked the city of Kingman and the Mohave County Board of Supervisors for their hospitality in hosting the board meeting in Kingman. She also thanked them for the dinner that they hosted at Calico's Restaurant adding that the location, food and networking opportunities were well received. Chairwoman Beaver provided a brief "history minute" on Route 66. She also recommended visiting the museum in the area.

**Title VI of the Civil Rights Act**

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

**Call to the Audience:**

The following members of the public addressed the Board:

1. Karen Flenniken, Mohave County Transportation Commission Vice Chair/Secretary for the Colorado River of Republican Women, re: asked the Board to reconsider building two new roundabouts on Highway 95 as many residents do not think this is a good idea.
2. Tom Brady, Mayor of Bullhead City, re: expressed his appreciation for the investment on SR 195. The Mayor also stated he has objections and concerns in regards to the roundabouts being planned for Highway 95. He urged the Board to consider local input before moving forward with the roundabouts.
3. W. Mark Clark, Mohave County Maintenance Division Manager, re: stated transportation needs continue to grow and resources need to be established. He discussed the possibilities of dedicating sales tax for growing transportation needs.
4. Steve Johnston, Arizona Airport Association, re: thanked the board for their support and work on the airports throughout the state.
5. Cathy Rosengrant, Mohave County Transportation Commission, District Four, re: is in favor of the I-40 /93 Traffic Interchange-Phase One due to current heavy traffic congestion and hopes this can get completed sooner rather than later.
6. Christian Price, Mayor of Maricopa, re: thanked the Board for their service and provided an update on the Pinal County RTA and ½ cent sales tax plan that will be on the ballot in November. He also discussed the Study of I-11 and congressional representative involvement. The Mayor also thanked

the Board for the funding of the 347 Overpass and stated work is underway with a groundbreaking event scheduled to take place in October.

7. Kee Allen Begay, Jr., Apache County and member of Navajo Nation Council, re: asked for support on Highway 191, between Many Farms and Chinle. He explained with the increase of traffic due to tourism in the area (Grand Canyon, Canyon de Chelly, etc.) it shows great need for improvements. He asked the Board to consider his efforts and to consider focusing on this area.
8. Chris Bridges, CYMPO Administrator, re: discussed the CYMPO I-15 Resolution that was adopted and the Rural Transportation Summit taking place in October 25, 2017.
9. Duane Eitel, City Engineer, Casa Grande, re: discussed two I-15 Resolutions; one from Eloy and one from Casa Grande. He also thanked the Board and ADOT staff for approving and moving a project up for a pedestrian hybrid beacon in Casa Grande to curb pedestrian fatalities in that area.
10. Craig Brown, CYMPO Chairman, Yavapai County Supervisor, re: thanked the Board for their continued efforts and discussed a JPA Agreement between the city of Prescott, Yavapai County, Yavapai County Flood Control District and CYMPO. He requested they move forward with the design of Highway 69 in the Five Year Plan.
11. David Wessel, Flagstaff MPO Manager, re: requested the Fourth Street Bridges over I-40, (Agenda Item 8) be placed in the Five Year Plan. He also discussed the amount of funding the city will be providing to the project.
12. Barbara Pape, Local Resident, re: questioned why there is still not a signal at Corwin Drive/I-95. She also stated roundabouts would not be good for the traffic flow in this community and gave reasons why this design would not be fitting to the area.
13. Marc Montgomery, City of Maricopa, Media Publicist, re: stated how thankful he is of the way the Board and ADOT communicate with the public and local communities via Twitter, as well as on the digital highway boards. He suggested ADOT open an Instagram account. Mr. Montgomery also suggested giving a \$1,000 fine to drivers who are driving too slow and spoke about the need to improve Highway 347.
14. Eva Corbett, Resident of Bullhead City, re: stated the roads in Mohave County are very bad, especially Highway 95 and said it is an embarrassment. She urged the Board to fix the roads instead of installing roundabouts.

STATE TRANSPORTATION BOARD MEETING – JULY 21, 2017

I N D E X

PAGE

ITEM 1: DISTRICT ENGINEER’S REPORT (Alvin Stump) .....3

ITEM 2: DIRECTOR’S REPORT (Floyd Roehrich, Jr.) .....6

ITEM 3: CONSENT AGENDA .....6

ACTION TAKEN

    MOTION TO APPROVE CONSENT AGENDA.....6

ITEM 4: LEGISLATIVE REPORT (Floyd Roehrich, Jr.) .....6

ITEM 5: FINANCIAL REPORT (Kristine Ward).....10

ITEM 6: MULTIMODAL PLANNING DIVISION REPORT (Greg Byres) .....14

ITEM 7: PRIORITY PLANNING ADVISORY COMMITTEE (PPAC) (Greg Byres).....22

ACTION TAKEN

    MOTION TO APPROVE PROJECT MODIFICATIONS ITEMS 7a through 7b.....24

ITEM 8: PROJECT MODIFICATIONS TO THE FY2018-2022 FIVE YEAR TRANSPORTATION FACILITIES CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM (Dallas Hammit).....25

ITEM 9: STATE ENGINEER’S REPORT (Dallas Hammit) .....43

ITEM 10: CONSTRUCTION CONTRACTS (Dallas Hammit) .....51

ACTION TAKEN

    MOTION TO APPROVE ITEM 10a.....53

    MOTION TO REJECT ITEM 10b .....53

    MOTION TO APPROVE ITEM 10c.....54

    MOTION TO REJECT ITEM 10d .....59

    MOTION TO APPROVE ITEM 10e.....59

    MOTION TO POSTPONE ITEM 10f .....61

    MOTION TO POSTPONE ITEM 10g.....63

    MOTION TO APPROVE ITEM 10h .....63

    MOTION TO APPROVE ITEM 10i.....64

    MOTION TO APPROVE ITEM 10j .....65

    MOTION TO APPROVE ITEM 10k.....66

ITEM 11: SUGGESTIONS.....68

1 (Beginning of excerpt.)

2 CHAIRWOMAN BEAVER: Okay. We'll now move on to

3 the district engineer's report. Alvin Stump.

4 MR. STUMP: Well, good morning, Madam Chair and

5 Board. Just a quick district update. Right now on I-40, we

6 have several projects going on between Seligman and Kingman.

7 Most of them are -- are bridge projects. We do have one rock

8 fall project within the Willows area, and later this fall, we

9 will have a pavement pres. going on in that same area.

10 And then on 93, we are just finishing up a

11 pavement preservation and shoulder widening project up north

12 from Milepost 17 to 28.

13 And then south of I-40, we do have a drainage

14 project as well as another bridge rehab project just getting

15 started.

16 One of our focus areas is on 95 in the Bullhead

17 City area to look at improving safety. Part of it is looking at

18 access management, and another part of it is trying to identify

19 a parallel corridor to relieve some of the traffic volumes off

20 of 95. As far as the study area, we've been working on ideas

21 for the -- the past few months, and we will be presenting these

22 concepts and proposed solutions to the public this fall, and

23 also, we will be pursuing HSIP funding for certain areas.

24 And then about 10 years ago, Mohave County

25 conducted a design concept report to look at a parallel corridor

1 known as the Vanderslice study -- or corridor. And so what  
2 we're looking at now is to do another study to see how we can  
3 maybe phase that in in smaller, more affordable segments. The  
4 estimate was a little over 40 million. So knowing that funding  
5 is tight, looking at how we can break that up over time.

6 Another safety project down in Lake Havasu, to  
7 construct a center raised median from Kiowa Avenue past the  
8 strip mall area. This project is moving along. It's scheduled  
9 for this fiscal year. We are adding a signal at the far end to  
10 help with the left turn volumes.

11 And as far as over here, the West Kingman  
12 interchange, we are looking forward to that going as -- as we  
13 talked about last night, there's several times when traffic  
14 backs all the way up to the 68 interchange, and so right now, in  
15 fiscal year '18, we have 5 million for design, and then in '20  
16 we have 10 million set aside for the right-of-way. And then in  
17 the development program, we -- we have 55 million for the  
18 construction of it. And this is just the phase one, the Phoenix  
19 to Vegas segment. The Vegas to California would be at a future  
20 date.

21 And then two other interchanges of interest are  
22 the Rancho Santa Fe TI and the Kingman Crossing TI. The one on  
23 the right is the Rancho Santa Fe, which connects to the airport  
24 area. This will support the industrial development in that area  
25 as well as remove the truck traffic in that area from -- from

1 Andy Devine as well. And then to the left is the -- the Kingman  
2 Crossing interchange, which will provide access to the hospital  
3 as well as the property in that area, which is suitable for  
4 commercial retail. So we have recently been meeting with the  
5 City and stakeholders to discuss partnerships and possible  
6 funding strategies. So that's something we're going to continue  
7 to do and see what we can work out.

8 So that's -- that's all I have. Do you have any  
9 questions?

10 CHAIRWOMAN BEAVER: Alvin, I was wondering if you  
11 could just clarify for me. I was of the understanding that  
12 where the Kingman Crossing TI is at that maybe the City had also  
13 put some drainage in or something. That wasn't anything that  
14 was addressed yesterday. I was just wondering if you could  
15 elaborate on that.

16 MR. STUMP: The -- I'm sorry. The drainage?

17 CHAIRWOMAN BEAVER: Was there some type of  
18 infrastructure that the City of Kingman had done sometime back  
19 maybe?

20 MR. STUMP: Oh, yeah. There was one -- there's  
21 one easement that we were talking about maybe some of that  
22 easement could go back to the City.

23 CHAIRWOMAN BEAVER: Thank you.

24 MR. STUMP: So that would be another discussion.

25 CHAIRWOMAN BEAVER: Does anyone have anything

1 additional?

2 Thank you.

3 MR. STUMP: All right. Thank you.

4 CHAIRWOMAN BEAVER: Now we'll move on to the  
5 director's report.

6 MR. ROEHRICH: Good morning, Madam Chair, members  
7 of the Board. The director sends his regrets. He had a  
8 conflict today. He could not be here.

9 He had no final issues to report. If there are  
10 issues that you want the director to address at a future  
11 meeting, please let me know and we'll make sure to get them on  
12 the agenda and prepared for him to present. Thank you.

13 CHAIRWOMAN BEAVER: Thank you.

14 We'll move on now to the consent agenda. Do we  
15 have a motion to approve the consent agenda as presented?

16 MR. LA RUE: So moved.

17 MR. HAMMOND: Second.

18 CHAIRWOMAN BEAVER: It's motioned by Board Member  
19 La Rue, seconded by Board Member Hammond to approve the consent  
20 agenda as presented.

21 All those in favor?

22 BOARD MEMBERS: Aye.

23 CHAIRWOMAN BEAVER: All those opposed? The  
24 motion carries.

25 Move on now to the legislative report.

1 Mr. Roehrich.

2 MR. ROEHRICH: Thank you, Madam Chair.

3 This is kind of the quiet time with the --  
4 especially at the state level as well as federal level. There  
5 wasn't a lot to report, but there are a couple of things.

6 From the ADOT Omnibus Bill, there was a provision  
7 made for ADOT to start negotiating with the Federal Highway  
8 Administration to take over the certification of the NEPA  
9 process, the National Environmental Protection Act process.  
10 That is ongoing. We've been coordinating with Federal Highways.  
11 They're conducting a session out with us later this year. We're  
12 on track that we think by, basically, next summer, we should be  
13 able to move forward, get self-certified to conduct the NEPA  
14 process as a state, as a state lead agency. So that is -- is  
15 ongoing.

16 And at the national level, a couple little  
17 things. Recently, the administration has removed all the  
18 funding out of the program for TIGER grants, but they have  
19 started to look at other FASTLANE grants as well as a new  
20 criteria for an INFRA grant, which is the Infrastructure For  
21 Rebuilding America grant. So again, we're targeting key  
22 strategic corridors and key strategic improvements that we can  
23 go after these grants and still have the opportunity to -- to  
24 bring that funding into the program, which would then hopefully  
25 help us to address any other additional needs that are moving

1 forward.

2           Recently, the Federal Highway Administration came  
3 out with new guidance on the use of variable message boards for  
4 advertising as part of some of the states who have been looking  
5 at opportunities to generate revenue to help with -- with the  
6 costs associated with their transportation initiatives. We have  
7 looked at putting advertisement on overhead signs and other  
8 programs. That has been rejected by the Federal Highway  
9 Administration. So we're back looking at what opportunities  
10 may be available.

11           At that time, Madam Chair, that's kind of the  
12 basic update of what we have. And as we continue to monitor  
13 what's going on locally as well as nationally, we'll be able to  
14 provide more updates as we see things start breaking loose,  
15 especially if Congress and the administration do address any  
16 transportation issues later this year.

17           MR. LA RUE: Madam Chair.

18           CHAIRWOMAN BEAVER: Yes. Board Member La Rue.

19           MR. LA RUE: Can we ask a question?

20           CHAIRWOMAN BEAVER: Sure.

21           MR. LA RUE: So Floyd, with TIGER grants, you  
22 know, recently we've had a lot of success or some moderate  
23 success, and I think some of that success was really because the  
24 -- a lot of stakeholders came together and spoke as one voice  
25 and did not, you know, present competing projects and, you know,

1 confuse those that make the decisions. Now that it seems like  
2 TIGER grants are going away and we're getting in -- the table's  
3 being reset with, you know, something new, do you think we'll  
4 still have that consolidated stakeholders speaking with one  
5 voice concept, because that's seemed so successful before?

6           MR. ROEHRICH: Madam Chair, Mr. La Rue, I  
7 actually think it's going to be more critical that we build that  
8 in the future. Part of -- and we're still learning what this  
9 new INFRA grant, this Infrastructure For Rebuilding America  
10 grant -- the intent of that grant, from the basic information --  
11 the limited information we got so far was more emphasis on  
12 taking existing local dollars and then the federal government  
13 enhancing or leveraging off of that.

14           So before when we were able to put together,  
15 like, some of the FASTLANE grant previously and TIGER grants  
16 previously, that we were able to be successful at, we usually  
17 had a match somewhere between 20 to 50 percent, closer to about  
18 that 20 percent of local funds, and then the rest would be  
19 federal funds.

20           They're really -- this administration now under  
21 this grant process is really looking at the locals bringing a  
22 greater percentage of funds, taking those funds and enhancing it  
23 with a portion of federal funds, but then using that to leverage  
24 into more infrastructure. So I think being able to target  
25 partnerships, especially -- let's take, for instance, Interstate

1 15, which people talked about. Can we work closer with Utah and  
2 Nevada on doing something on that to come together to target  
3 corridor improvements there? Along Interstate 10, you know,  
4 with MAG's input and the State Transportation Board's input and  
5 maybe some other local government input, could we start building  
6 a partnership that will show that we're bringing funds locally,  
7 and then, therefore, you, federal government, the funds you give  
8 really enhance this?

9           So I think it's going to be more critical that we  
10 do that. What I don't believe we really sat down and looked at  
11 is how competitive will that be for these other partners if they  
12 really -- everybody's got a great amount of need. How much are  
13 they going to be willing to partner with us, because they've got  
14 to bring more money into these? So strategically, I think the  
15 projects you go after really -- to be competitive, really have  
16 to show strong partnership, but they have to strong -- show a  
17 strong commitment to help fund.

18           MR. LA RUE: No. That's good information. So  
19 that could create the angst on a local level as they're trying  
20 to allocate to their highest and greatest need. So -- well, you  
21 know, keep us apprised. Thank you.

22           MR. ROEHRICH: Yes, sir.

23           CHAIRWOMAN BEAVER: If there's no further  
24 questions on that, we'll move on to the financial report.

25           Kristine. Welcome back, and you've got a smile

1 on your face. So is that good news?

2           MS. WARD: You know, I try to just come with a  
3 smile each time to keep you guessing the whole time.

4           Good morning, Madam Chair, Board members. My  
5 morning started out with sitting down with Mr. La Rue and Board  
6 Member Stratton, and one of the questions Mr. La Rue asked is:  
7 "Do you have good news for me -- for us today?" And I said,  
8 "Kind of." So --

9           MR. LA RUE: And luckily my breakfast was over by  
10 the time you said that, so...

11           MS. WARD: So in the spirit of "kind of," we have  
12 finished our FY '17. The FY '17 numbers are in, and we have  
13 eclipsed \$1.4 billion in HURF revenues. That has been a long  
14 time coming, and the reason -- the 1.4 billion is the good news.  
15 The fact that that is only 1.7 percent higher than FY 2007  
16 revenues is the part that makes it the kind of good news.  
17 Because we have just reached our 2000 level -- 2007 revenue in  
18 FY 2017. So...

19           And during that same period -- maybe I shouldn't  
20 have put all these little fascinating facts together -- but  
21 during that same period, we have experienced 10.7 -- over that  
22 same period, 10.7 percent of population growth, but personal  
23 income growth over that same period, also, 33 percent growth  
24 over that same period. So what we're basically coming down to  
25 is we are not seeing -- we are not seeing the growth that we

1 have experienced historically.

2 Oh, we went back a slide. Yes. We went back all  
3 the way to 2007. So let's catch back up.

4 So overall, our forecast, I'm sorry I can't give  
5 you more exciting news, but \$1.4 billion is something to be  
6 thankful for. With regards to our forecast, we were pretty much  
7 on target. We were a little bit behind. .7 percent behind our  
8 forecasts, and we experienced about 3.6 growth on the year.

9 In the Regional Area Road Fund, we again topped  
10 -- crested over another number. We've gone over \$400 million in  
11 Regional Area Road Fund revenues this year, with about 4.3  
12 percent growth. We were just a -- just a little over forecast  
13 on that.

14 Moving on to the -- I have nothing to report on  
15 the federal aid program, but I am happy to report that a  
16 couple of board meetings ago you authorized us to proceed with  
17 a grant anticipation note issue of \$76 million. That is right  
18 on schedule. Next week we will be presenting to the rating  
19 agencies, Standard & Poor's, Moody's and Fitch. So that is --  
20 that is moving right along. And we will be going to market with  
21 those bonds at the end of August, 29th, 30th, 31st time period.

22 With that -- oh, Aviation Fund, just a brief  
23 report on that. That has -- we have finally gotten that fund  
24 under control, I would say, and we -- the deferred payments, all  
25 but one has been made, and we are making payments on that

1 remaining, and we are now once again in the process of  
2 authorizing projects again, which I believe Greg will speak to  
3 in the MPD.

4 So with that, if you have any questions, I would  
5 be happy to answer them.

6 CHAIRWOMAN BEAVER: Thank you. Do we have any  
7 questions?

8 Board Member Stratton.

9 MR. STRATTON: As you spoke about the -- we're  
10 starting to fund again, I believe there was two projects today.

11 MS. WARD: Uh-huh. Yes, sir.

12 MR. STRATTON: Were those two that were on the  
13 list that we had to shelve a couple years ago? I think there  
14 was 20-some projects that we had to take off the books and not  
15 fund because we didn't have the money after the Legislature took  
16 the balance out. Are these two projects from that list, or are  
17 these two that are brand-new and were not on that old list that  
18 we got rid of?

19 MS. WARD: Chairman -- Chairwoman Beaver and  
20 Board Member Stratton, I do not have the answer to that. I'm  
21 going to defer to Greg, and hopefully I just deferred to him a  
22 question he knows the answer to. But I apologize. I do not  
23 know the answer to that.

24 MR. STRATTON: Okay. Thank you.

25 MS. WARD: Is there anything further? Thank you.

1 CHAIRWOMAN BEAVER: We'll move now on to  
2 Multimodal Planning Division report. Greg.

3 MR. BYRES: Madam Chair, Board members, I have a  
4 hard time with the multimodal, too. So it's a -- an excuse for  
5 the cough. I'm trying to get over a cold, and it's been taking  
6 me awhile.

7 We have a couple of items. On aviation, again,  
8 we're going ahead and approving projects coming through for the  
9 grants. The two that we have on for today are --

10 MR. LA RUE: I hate to cut in, but I'm confused.  
11 Are we on Item 6 or Item 7?

12 MR. BYRES: I was just trying to answer the  
13 question that was asked previously.

14 CHAIRWOMAN BEAVER: We're still on Item 6.

15 MR. LA RUE: And you're going to allow the answer  
16 to the question that really relates to Item 7?

17 CHAIRWOMAN BEAVER: Are you wanting to kind of  
18 merge the two together? Is that what you're trying to do?

19 MR. BYRES: I can just keep that off until the  
20 next item.

21 MR. LA RUE: I just wanted to make sure we were  
22 all clear on what we were on, but I defer to the Chair.

23 CHAIRWOMAN BEAVER: Okay. We'll just go ahead  
24 and hold off on that until we get to Item 7 unless we --

25 MR. BYRES: That's fine.

1 CHAIRWOMAN BEAVER: -- unless we kind of just --

2 MR. BYRES: Aviation's part of the multimodal.  
3 So that's why I was going through what we're doing as part of  
4 multimodal.

5 MR. LA RUE: That's fine. So...

6 CHAIRWOMAN BEAVER: Well, if there's no  
7 objection, I think maybe we should just go ahead make it  
8 inclusive, all in --

9 MR. BYRES: That's fine.

10 CHAIRWOMAN BEAVER: -- one, and we can go ahead  
11 and just identify Items 6 and 7, that we're kind of merging them  
12 together, and you can give your report, and then we can go ahead  
13 and either take action or not take action on item -- the part  
14 that has to do with Item 7.

15 MR. BYRES: Madam Chair, that's fine. I'll just  
16 go ahead and go through.

17 The first item that I had on the list was  
18 aviation. So we are proceeding now with disbursing funds for  
19 the federal, state, local program, and the two projects that we  
20 currently have that are being approved through the PPAC are --  
21 are part of that grant program. Those are not projects that  
22 have been delayed. Those are projects that are coming through,  
23 the federal grants were granted, and we're providing the match  
24 for those projects. So...

25 MR. STRATTON: Madam Chair.



1 CHAIRWOMAN BEAVER: Board Member Stratton.

2 MR. STRATTON: I believe when it was recommended  
3 to postpone the 20-plus projects, whatever the number was, one  
4 of the questions I had at that time was would the people that  
5 were on that list that we had to postpone have any preferential  
6 treatment or come back on the list when we have the funds. And  
7 that was going to be discussed with finance and the aviation  
8 department, and I don't believe we ever truly sorted that out.  
9 And I'm just wondering if those people that we delayed now can  
10 start applying again, or were these on the list, or where are we  
11 at?

12 MR. BYRES: Board Member Stratton, Chairman, what  
13 we currently have is three grant programs. So what's being  
14 funded currently is the federal, state, local program. The  
15 state local program as well as the asphalt pavement management  
16 program, those two are not being funded, but they'll be coming  
17 back online in 2019 and 2020 respectively.

18 At that point in time, any projects that have  
19 been delayed will come through. We are, in fact, requesting or  
20 suggesting to all of our airport entities to go ahead and apply  
21 for grants so that we can track those and have them -- have a  
22 list put together, so one, we can make sure that projects are  
23 hitting as quick as they possibly can once we do get funding,  
24 and two, to make sure that if we have projects that have gone  
25 from being a very minor project to becoming a major project,

1 because the funding wasn't there during that time, we need to  
2 know what's -- that that's happening so we can assist with that  
3 funding.

4 Yes.

5 MR. ROEHRICH: So Madam Chair, Mr. Stratton, if I  
6 could, I want to make sure I got this clear. The projects we  
7 deferred before were the projects that were only funded out of  
8 the State Aviation grants. The projects that have continued and  
9 the ones that are continuing today are grants that were approved  
10 by the federal government, and we're just providing the local  
11 match. So that State Aviation grant program and the Runway  
12 Management Program, that's what was deferred last time.

13 Those projects, when we bring that program  
14 forward in 2019, as Mr. Byres just said, then those projects are  
15 deferred before -- those locals, if they still want those  
16 projects in, they'll come in and then we'll start working on  
17 those. But that's a separate program than the ones we're asking  
18 to complete today. The ones today are the federal program,  
19 which they got approval from FAA and we just provide the local  
20 match. So the State grant program is the one that's still  
21 deferred.

22 MR. STRATTON: Okay. I appreciate the  
23 explanation, Floyd.

24 The only thing I would ask is those projects that  
25 were deferred, once we have the money, if those people that were

1 deferred could be contacted and notified that they could  
2 re-apply for grants.

3 MR. ROEHRICH: Madam Chair, Mr. Stratton,  
4 absolutely. And that's what we talked about last time when we  
5 did deferrals. The Board had asked for that, that guidance and  
6 consideration, and that's what we need to make sure that we're  
7 planning on that when we move forward. So I'll leave that to  
8 Greg and his team to take that.

9 MR. BYRES: Is that clear? We -- we'll be --  
10 those projects were never -- they were deferred, but they've  
11 never been lost. So those projects are still on our books to --  
12 and yes, they do have preferential treatment, per se.

13 MR. STRATTON: Thank you.

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

15 CHAIRWOMAN BEAVER: Board Member La Rue.

16 MR. LA RUE: So I appreciate, Steve, you bringing  
17 that up, because that was my recollection as well, that when  
18 this program restarts, there is a dialogue back with the Board  
19 to say, Here is how we're restarting it. Here are our general  
20 policies. Here's the communication piece that's going out to  
21 all of the affected member agencies. And I at least had an  
22 expectation that there would be that conversation back with the  
23 Board on the restart of that -- that program.

24 CHAIRWOMAN BEAVER: So it sounds like what we're  
25 asking is to have that on a study session agenda at a future...

1 MR. ROEHRICH: Madam Chair, Mr. La Rue,  
2 absolutely. That's what I going to suggest, is we'll bring that  
3 at maybe even a regular session like this, have Greg and his  
4 team, as they're ready --

5 MR. BYRES: Yes, Floyd.

6 MR. ROEHRICH: -- outline the steps moving  
7 forward, the time line for that. So we'll bring back it to a  
8 for -- a future meeting.

9 CHAIRWOMAN BEAVER: Well, I -- because my  
10 recollection was a little bit different, too. It seemed to me  
11 that when we deferred those, you made contact, if I'm correct,  
12 with each of those agencies, and each of those agencies said  
13 there was some deficiency in their paperwork or something at the  
14 time is why those were actually deferred, because they weren't  
15 even at a point where they could -- am I wrong on that? Excuse  
16 me. I'm looking to Kristine, I guess.

17 MS. WARD: No, ma'am. The reasons for the  
18 deferrals were not a matter of paperwork. They were literally a  
19 matter of cash flow. And the point that I was kind of standing  
20 here to the decide, when we did that re-assessment of the fund,  
21 we looked at all of the projects that were in the program  
22 underway, those projects that were underway, and those projects  
23 that were programmed for the future.

24 And we took that -- and those were projects that  
25 this board had approved. We took those projects and we cash

1 flowed all of those projects. We built them all into the cash  
2 flow to see when we could start doing future additional  
3 programming. So nothing was -- we did not remove projects. We  
4 just delayed and elongated the time -- the time over which those  
5 projects -- we would be able to reimburse for those projects.

6 Does that make sense?

7 CHAIRWOMAN BEAVER: Yes, it does. And I don't  
8 know if -- for the other Board members, possibly, is there a way  
9 that we could get a copy of a list of those that were deferred?

10 MS. WARD: We can.

11 CHAIRWOMAN BEAVER: Okay.

12 MS. WARD: Those deferrals are all but one of  
13 those of the airports, all but one of the airports has been the  
14 deferrals have been paid --

15 CHAIRWOMAN BEAVER: Okay.

16 MS. WARD: -- as of June 30th. There's only one  
17 remaining deferral, and that is being paid out over time.

18 MR. ROEHRICH: Madam Chair, and -- and Kristine.  
19 I want to make sure (inaudible). She's not talking about the  
20 deferral payments. She's talking about new grants that were  
21 deferred. So you're talking about the grants that have been  
22 approved and the payments were being deferred, but because we  
23 did not have the cash flow, we had had, like, the '19 and '20  
24 new grant requests, we deferred to new grants --

25 CHAIRWOMAN BEAVER: That's what I was talking

1 about.

2 MR. ROEHRICH: -- and that's the status I'm  
3 guessing you want the status on.

4 CHAIRWOMAN BEAVER: Yes.

5 MR. ROEHRICH: Where we're at when the new grants  
6 come back. And that's what Greg and his team need to pull  
7 together. And -- but it has to match Kristine's cash flow for  
8 the aviation grant, or again, it will not be a sustainable  
9 program.

10 MS. WARD: I apologize if I confused the matter  
11 at all.

12 CHAIRWOMAN BEAVER: No.

13 MR. ROEHRICH: I'm blaming Greg on this.

14 MS. WARD: Okay. We're going to let you carry it  
15 today.

16 MR. BYRES: Appreciate it.

17 CHAIRWOMAN BEAVER: We're straightened out now.

18 MR. ROEHRICH: There's no blame. This is no  
19 (inaudible). But we need to follow through as you'd asked.  
20 That is what you'd asked, and that's what staff will be prepared  
21 to do, and we'll get that on an agenda as soon as we can so we  
22 can give that update.

23 CHAIRWOMAN BEAVER: Okay. Thank you.

24 Does anyone have additional questions they would  
25 like to ask?

1           Okay. So are we now moving on -- do you have  
2 anything additional for the 6 part of the 6 and 7, or are we  
3 moving on to 7 where we can actually --

4           MR. BYRES: I did have a couple other items.

5           CHAIRWOMAN BEAVER: Okay.

6           MR. BYRES: In the transit forum that we have,  
7 we're currently issuing preliminary grant acceptance letters.  
8 We have our application in to the FTA. That went in this --  
9 this month. We should be hearing back from the FTA on that  
10 grant so that we can take the preliminary grant acceptance  
11 letters that went out to approximately 80 to 90 providers. We  
12 can make those final. So as soon as we get that appropriation  
13 through FTA, then we can -- we'll start running through that,  
14 and that should be occurring within the next two months, so..

15           We also have a long range plan. We're in the  
16 process of developing a draft plan document, and we're looking  
17 at bringing that to the Board in September or October for your  
18 review. We also have the freight plan. The freight plan is  
19 currently in the final draft. We met with the freight plan  
20 steering committee last week and got their review and comments,  
21 and we're looking at trying to bring that to the Board in  
22 September for the final on that.

23           The other things that we have, we have the  
24 selected studies. You've heard Alvin talk about several studies  
25 that we're looking at. Those are internal studies. We made

1 those preliminary selections two weeks ago, and we'll finalize  
2 those next week. So we'll have all those statewide internal  
3 studies going for MPD. That's all I had on Item 6.

4           CHAIRWOMAN BEAVER: Thank you.

5           Does anyone have any additional questions on that  
6 portion?

7           Okay. We'll now move on to item -- the part  
8 under PPAC.

9           MR. BYRES: We have --

10           CHAIRWOMAN BEAVER: The staff presentation for  
11 PPAC recommendations of action to the Board, including  
12 consideration of changes of the FY 2017-2021 State  
13 Transportation Facilities Construction Program.

14           MR. ROEHRICH: Madam Chair, just before we start,  
15 I want to identify that there's a typo in the agenda. It's  
16 actually 2018 to 2022 is the program, not the '17 to '18. So  
17 we'd made that mistake, but Greg will talk to the -- I -- the  
18 projects he's talking to are reference to the 2018 to 2022 year.

19           CHAIRWOMAN BEAVER: Okay. And thank you for  
20 clarifying that, because I did go through, and the pages 126 and  
21 27 do reflect the FY year 2018-2022, so...

22           MR. BYRES: Madam Chair, Board members, we have  
23 two projects. Both of these are airport projects. One of them  
24 is for the City of Lake Havasu. It is an electrical project  
25 that we're working at -- or looking at, and that is a

1 FAA-sponsored grant of \$40,000. The sponsor is putting in 1964  
2 [sic], and the State is putting in 1963 [sic], for a total of  
3 43,927.

4 The second project we have is for Flagstaff  
5 airport. That project is a runway reconstruction project that  
6 has an FAA grant of \$7,890,485. The sponsor is putting up  
7 \$387,332, and the State's matching it with -- at \$387,332, for a  
8 total of \$8,665,149. Those are the two projects that we  
9 currently have up for your approval.

10 CHAIRWOMAN BEAVER: Do we have a motion to accept  
11 and approve the airport projects Items 7A and 7 B as presented?

12 MR. SELLERS: So moved.

13 MR. CUTHBERTSON: Second.

14 CHAIRWOMAN BEAVER: Motion by Board Member  
15 Sellers. Seconded by Board Member Cuthbertson.

16 If there's no additional discussion, all those in  
17 favor?

18 BOARD MEMBERS: Aye.

19 CHAIRWOMAN BEAVER: All those opposed? The  
20 motion carries.

21 MR. BYRES: Thank you.

22 CHAIRWOMAN BEAVER: Thank you.

23 We'll now move on to Item 8, which is the project  
24 modifications to the FY 2018-2022 Five-Year Transportation  
25 Facilities Construction Program. Dallas Hammit, please.

1 Thank you.

2 MR. HAMMIT: Good morning, Madam Chair. Lynn's  
3 going to get me on board here.

4 So I was asked to prepare an update on two  
5 projects that had discussion last month in Payson, and so I'm  
6 going to go through those. The first one is on State Route 69.  
7 This is in the city of Prescott. You can see the limits of the  
8 project on the screen, and I'm going to zoom in a little bit and  
9 show you. So if you know the area, there is a Wal-Mart as  
10 you're approaching from Prescott Valley into Prescott, and the  
11 car dealer, and then you go down a hill, past Lowe's, and into  
12 the Frontier Village.

13 That area we go from three lanes to two lanes  
14 back to three and sometimes more. It's a bottleneck. The  
15 locals have identified this as a concern and have come -- not  
16 just identified it. Come with money and said, "Hey, we'd like  
17 to work with the department to improve this."

18 So where are we at today? A scoping document was  
19 completed a couple of years ago. As the project developed over  
20 time, there will be some modifications to that scoping document,  
21 but they're fairly minor. The major elements of the scoping  
22 document will remain. As of last week, July 12th, we did  
23 complete a joint project agreement, a JPA that all areas signed.  
24 And as Chris mentioned, Chris Bridges, earlier, it has multiple  
25 signatures. And I'll probably forget somebody, but with NPO,

1 the County and the county flood control and the City of Prescott  
2 have all signed on to that agreement. It was executed July  
3 12th.

4           With that, we have the opportunity to bring on a  
5 designer. We will go through ADOT's on call. Bring that in,  
6 and we should be able to have a designer on board by late  
7 October. One of the things that that will give us by the time  
8 we're in our next programming cycle, we will be at a point where  
9 we can get a good cost estimate exactly what this project will  
10 cost, and then we need to program. Right now we have a rough  
11 estimate from the scoping, but with those modifications,  
12 we're -- between two different folks that briefed me -- a couple  
13 million dollars different. So what this -- once we get going in  
14 design, we can get that -- we'll get to a 30 percent design and  
15 have good numbers that we could actually program very well.

16           Before I go to the Flagstaff project, any  
17 questions on this 69 project?

18           MR. STRATTON: Madam Chair.

19           CHAIRWOMAN BEAVER: Board Member Stratton.

20           MR. STRATTON: When you say you're a couple  
21 million dollars apart, what's the maximum it's looking like?

22           MR. HAMMIT: \$10 million.

23           MR. STRATTON: And the locals are bringing how  
24 much?

25           MR. HAMMIT: Right now, only thing that the

1 locals have brought in, they've brought the full amount for the  
2 design. They're looking at future years. My understanding -- I  
3 don't know if Chris is still here. \$1.2 million, two years of  
4 your -- he knows theirs better than I do. But we do not have an  
5 agreement started on the construction yet. Only on the  
6 development and design.

7           MR. BRIDGES: We currently have \$650,000  
8 programmed in fiscal year '20, and then we also have flexibility  
9 in fiscal years '21 and on that we could still move things  
10 around. If we needed additional funds, we could bring that back  
11 to our board and add another 650,000. So potentially another  
12 1.3.

13           MR. STRATTON: So that would be a little over \$2  
14 million you would bring at that point?

15           MR. BRIDGES: Right. \$1 million for the design,  
16 and potentially 1.3 for construction.

17           MR. STRATTON: And did your \$10 million, Dallas,  
18 include design, or was that construction only?

19           MR. HAMMIT: I believe that was the complete  
20 project total. So it would be design and construction. Again,  
21 with the change in the scoping, there's not a detailed estimate,  
22 so a lot of it is gut feels from experts, but we haven't fully  
23 scoped the project that's being -- that will be designed. So we  
24 don't have exact numbers at this time.

25           MR. STRATTON: So going through this detail,

1 obviously, it's something that I'm assuming the state engineer's  
2 office agrees needs to be done since you're doing the scoping  
3 and you're looking into the project in detail?

4 MR. HAMMIT: This is a need that we can support.  
5 At the same time, there's lots of needs, and within the  
6 system, when we bring this into -- if we brought it into this  
7 program or any other, we're going to bump out another project  
8 that we felt was very -- that had a need as well. So we haven't  
9 prioritized it above some of the others. And I don't know if  
10 I'm answering your question, but if we do this project, we're  
11 bumping out, say, a pavement preservation prong that's already  
12 in the program or some other project that's in there. I can say  
13 that it is a need. The priority is where we would have to have  
14 more discussion once we know the full dollar amount.

15 MR. STRATTON: Madam Chair, if I can continue.

16 CHAIRWOMAN BEAVER: Yes, Board Member Stratton.

17 MR. STRATTON: The moneys that we had the  
18 telephonic meeting on the 347 and we did move some funding  
19 around, weren't there about \$4.5 million left -- that came  
20 back to us because of the local share that was going into  
21 that?

22 MR. HAMMIT: Chairman Beaver, Board Member  
23 Stratton, I need to look at those details. I don't remember  
24 them off the top of my head.

25 MR. ROEHRICH: Madam Chair, Mr. Stratton, yes, as

1 part of that programming, they did reduce the money, rolled it  
2 into the contingency. What I don't know and I think we would  
3 need to research is has that gone to cover current projects. I  
4 can't tell you that there's money just sitting there without  
5 understanding if that money has already been reprogrammed into  
6 current projects.

7 MR. HAMMIT: And Madam Chairman, if it was, it is  
8 this year's money that we would not be prepared to spend on this  
9 project, so we haven't started design as of yet.

10 MR. ROEHRICH: Right now I think you're  
11 targeting 2020 is the construction (inaudible).

12 MR. HAMMIT: That is correct.

13 MR. ROEHRICH: So you'd be looking at studying  
14 projects in 2020 or 2021 and then how that would affect those  
15 projects lifting at that time and as you look at bringing it  
16 into the program.

17 MR. HAMMIT: That is correct. Yes.

18 MR. STRATTON: So if we were to fund this, we  
19 wouldn't have to move it all out of one year, it could be  
20 several years?

21 MR. HAMMIT: Madam Chair, Member Stratton, the  
22 year that we fund the construction, we have to have the -- all  
23 the money for this project in that year. So if it goes into FY  
24 2020, in FY 2020 we have to have the full amount for that  
25 project.

1 MR. STRATTON: One of the things and I'm sure all  
2 of you have realized this through the past meetings is as we  
3 receive officers, if you will, for these entities, whether it's  
4 Flagstaff or CYMPO or the town of Maricopa, I think it's  
5 terribly important that we recognize that and try and fund these  
6 projects if they are a priority to make our dollars stretch, and  
7 in order for these organizations to continue with their design  
8 and programming their money for future years, I believe it takes  
9 a commitment on our part so that they understand it will be  
10 done. I would really like to see this added to the five-year  
11 program. If we -- in 2020. If we don't have contingency  
12 moneys, our -- because it's a new year, this is the first month  
13 of the new year, then at this point I would ask that we look at  
14 other projects and maybe moving some money around.

15 MR. ROEHRICH: Madam Chair, I guess if I could  
16 just comment generally on that. I think that's a real great  
17 opportunity, as we talked about, for partnering. And especially  
18 the comments earlier that -- like Mr. La Rue had brought up when  
19 you look at the national level, if that's what Congress and the  
20 administration want to see is more local leverage for the  
21 federal government to come in with funding, I think it's great  
22 to do that.

23 To me, again, the comment here is timing. We're  
24 talking about trying to fit a project in to fiscal year '20 when  
25 we're in 2018, and we still got two programming cycles that, you

1 know, may allow us to see revenues increase a little bit in the  
2 future where this could be brought in without affecting a  
3 project. We just don't know that until we get to those  
4 programming cycles now. If you fit it in now, that means you're  
5 probably displacing something. But yet we're not delaying this  
6 project because design is on its way. The study is on its way.

7 Is there a measure of now that we know this is a  
8 priority -- and again, we want to work with the Board and we  
9 want to work with the locals -- as we look to bring in the  
10 construction in two years, could the next programming cycle be  
11 the time to bring it in where we could then see what the new  
12 estimates are, revenues? We could see what -- if projects are  
13 starting to shift around because of other -- the deferrals so  
14 the project's available.

15 As Dallas said, the contingency fund we have now  
16 is only for '18. Don't touch the contingency fund for '20. So  
17 there's no extra funds in '20 at this point until we make  
18 programming changes. So again, I think the question is -- and  
19 the Board needs to ask this question -- when you want to adjust  
20 the priority or you want to look at those partnerships to  
21 bringing projects in -- bringing projects in the program, when's  
22 the best time to do that and not delay those projects? You  
23 know, we could do this in the next programming cycle, and  
24 theoretically, maybe there might be an increase in funds or  
25 maybe there might be something where we know projects are



1 slipping, and that opens up the funding. And therefore, we have  
2 no impact on any other project, other than what was already  
3 occurring.

4 MR. STRATTON: Madam Chair.

5 CHAIRWOMAN BEAVER: Board Member Stratton.

6 MR. STRATTON: And I don't disagree with what  
7 you're staying, Floyd. I understand.

8 My concern is when we're dealing with an  
9 organization, in this case CYMPO, if we don't make the  
10 commitment, then how can they set their yearly budgets up in the  
11 future? How could they know, as Chris said, there could  
12 possibly be another 650,000? But if we haven't made a  
13 commitment of funding on our part, then how can they let that  
14 money sit and not do anything with it? They need -- they need  
15 some guidance, I believe. And maybe Chris can elaborate on this  
16 or what their process is, but my concern is if we don't make the  
17 commitment, then how can they commit their dollars to future  
18 projects? They may want to reallocate them, because they don't  
19 know if we're going to fund our portion.

20 MR. HAMMIT: Madam Chair, Member Stratton, one  
21 thing to remember, and Chris can correct me if I'm wrong, the  
22 moneys that they're committing are FY '21 and beyond funds,  
23 because the money that they're working on the design are their  
24 current years. So the moneys that they have available are FY  
25 '21 and beyond. So that's the first that their moneys are

1 available, if -- with those -- that's their schedule of their  
2 funds coming into our -- this project.

3 MR. STRATTON: I understand that, but my concern  
4 is if we don't make a commitment, then how can they hold those  
5 funds and not have entities want to put other projects up for  
6 those funds that they could do themselves? I feel very strongly  
7 that we have to -- especially on a project like this where  
8 there's been multiple fatal crashes. It affects a lot of  
9 Arizonans. I think we have to -- if this is what the Board  
10 wants to do and leverage dollars, as it seems to be the trend  
11 from the federal government down, then I think we have to step  
12 up and show a commitment. That's my personal opinion.

13 CHAIRWOMAN BEAVER: I would like to ask if Chris  
14 could just respond to that question about the 2021 and the...

15 MR. BRIDGES: Sure. Currently in our  
16 Transportation Improvement Program, we do have committed  
17 \$650,000 in fiscal year '20. That one's already been approved  
18 by the TAC and the Board. What I would need to do, what Dallas  
19 is talking about, those years, '21, '22, '23 and so on, we'd  
20 have to go back to the Board to add fiscal year '21 to this  
21 project in order to make it the full 1.3 million. So we do have  
22 '20 currently today as it stands. I'll be happy to take it back  
23 to our board. Supervisor Brown's here. He's the chairman of  
24 the CYMPO board, and I'll be able to talk to him right away  
25 about this and get that on an agenda in September. So that's

1 where we stand with our funding.

2 MR. STRATTON: Madam Chair.

3 CHAIRWOMAN BEAVER: Okay. Board Member Hammond  
4 has a question.

5 MR. HAMMOND: It's not a question. It's not a  
6 question. It's more of just an observation. I think the Board  
7 is very much in favor of this project, but I also -- I try to  
8 pay very close attention when I hear this -- any project  
9 discussed as to whether ADOT has -- is not listening, ADOT is  
10 not properly prioritizing, ADOT is not properly putting projects  
11 into the system in a priority that they feel is responsible.

12 And if -- I have not heard in my -- on this  
13 project or pretty much any project that ADOT's not listening.  
14 So when I hear a project's going to get bumped that ADOT thinks  
15 might have a higher priority to this project or any project, you  
16 know, I guess as a board member, I'm okay as long as it's coming  
17 out of the same district. If we're bumping projects, but if  
18 they're coming out of other districts, you know, then you kind  
19 of get my attention as a board member from southern Arizona.

20 So I guess what I want to hear from Chris or  
21 anybody is that ADOT's not listening. ADOT's not being  
22 responsive. You know, we should override a process that is --  
23 seems to be functioning very well. I'm sure there's times when  
24 it doesn't. But that's what I'm really attentive to. Before  
25 I -- as a board member, at this meeting, for example, if it came

1 to it, decide to vote to do something that staff is not prepared  
2 to recommend. So I'm listening very attentively as to whether  
3 ADOT staff is not listening and being attentive, because that  
4 seems to be what you might be suggesting, and I would like to  
5 hear if that's actually the case.

6 MR. BRIDGES: Board Member Hammond, that is  
7 completely not the case. In fact, Dallas, Alvin, all the  
8 district staff and all the staff in ADOT have been completely  
9 responsive. They listen to our concerns. They work with us.  
10 In fact, we have an excellent partnership.

11 So, you know, in no way do I, you know, want to  
12 come across as ADOT's not listening. But, you know,  
13 unfortunately the times that we are in, with the tough dollars,  
14 it's a tough ask. And everybody has their projects. I realize  
15 that. It doesn't matter if it's me or Mayor Price or anybody  
16 else showing up here. You know, we all have our regional  
17 priorities, and we're trying to relay those to you, and  
18 hopefully we get to have those in there. I think we've made  
19 great strides on this.

20 Like I said, Dallas and Alvin have been  
21 tremendous on this. We're far enough along where our local  
22 communities have thrown in their cash as well, which is also  
23 tough for them. I think we're in a good position here. So I  
24 would like to keep moving forward with our great partnership,  
25 and I don't want to come across as we're not.

1 MR. HAMMOND: Thank you.

2 CHAIRWOMAN BEAVER: A comment I would like to  
3 make with regard to this is I guess we've been aware of this  
4 project for awhile now, and when we were going through the  
5 process and had the study session for the 2018-2022, I remember  
6 at the very end there were some projects that were added in. It  
7 seemed to me is it about 40 million -- there was money found,  
8 and so there were projects added in. I'm thinking it was at the  
9 study session down in Phoenix where this occurred. And there  
10 were some projects added in at the end because of this found  
11 money. And so I am thinking -- I guess my question is: This is  
12 something we were aware of. Did we feel that those other  
13 projects that were added in at the end basically -- bad choice  
14 of words -- but trumped this project.

15 MR. HAMMIT: Madam Chair, and if I get off track  
16 someone can help me, but one of the things to remember, every  
17 year when we present a program, we -- our long range plan is a  
18 funding strategy between capacity projects or expansion,  
19 modernization or preservation. We had a target to get to a  
20 minimum number of preservation dollars, about 260 at that time.  
21 In each year we have spent more -- and which would leave the  
22 Greater Arizona about \$25 million in expansion projects. Each  
23 year we've spent more than 25 million on expansion.

24 So when those moneys came available, my memory of  
25 those projects -- and I'd have to look at each one -- but the

1 vast majority I can say with confidence were a preservation  
2 project that we were able to move forward to meet that goal that  
3 the Board had set. "Hey, this is our funding strategy. We want  
4 this percentage in preservation, this percentage in  
5 modernization, and this percentage in expansion." And so those  
6 projects that came in were preservation projects that were in  
7 future years that we were just able to advance to the current  
8 year.

9 MR. ROEHRICH: And Madam Chair, I think that's a  
10 key point to remember. It's fiscal year, and that 40 million,  
11 if you remember, there was the 25 million goal the Legislature  
12 gave for 189. There was some of -- the measure of being able to  
13 bring in some preservation. But all of that was in this first  
14 year, 2018. And again, we're 20 -- if you look at 69, we did  
15 not recommend putting money in 69 with using that money, because  
16 it wasn't ready in 2018. Design started -- we're looking at  
17 now, if it's ready for construction in 2020, then we will have  
18 time to bring that into the program through our normal process  
19 to adjust when we update each year to the revenues that we have  
20 available and to look at what projects need to be prioritized in  
21 that year. So this board will have the opportunity to continue  
22 to focus on the priority of the projects you watch each fiscal  
23 year as we move forward through the programming cycle.

24 CHAIRWOMAN BEAVER: And if I'm correct, though,  
25 the question or the concern that Board Member Stratton's

1 bringing up is because they're moving along and they've got  
 2 commitment for certain dollar amounts right now, if we don't  
 3 build this into the program, are they going to be able to have  
 4 that ability to say, "Okay. This project's on track. We're  
 5 needing more dollars." And so I think that's where the question  
 6 is on their part, is that they're needing some kind of action  
 7 from our board that says, you know, "We're going to support  
 8 this," and then they can go forward with developing whatever it  
 9 is to get their funding portion.

10 MR. ROEHRICH: Madam Chair, I can't speak to what  
 11 Mr. Bridges and CYMPO need or want. That's up to them. I'm  
 12 just trying to react to the decisions this board makes relative  
 13 to our five-year program and make sure that whatever you're  
 14 guiding us or you're directing us to do as staff, we can look at  
 15 you and say it's fiscally constrained and it's the correct thing  
 16 to do given the programming requirements that we have.

17 MR. STRATTON: Madam Chair.

18 CHAIRWOMAN BEAVER: Yes. Board Member Stratton.

19 MR. STRATTON: First off, I'd like to follow-up  
 20 on Board Member Hammond's comment that we shouldn't be moving --  
 21 I'm not suggesting we take money out of MAG or PAG or anything  
 22 else if we fund this; that it should come out of Greater  
 23 Arizona.

24 But as Greater Arizona, other than possibly the  
 25 RTA in Pinal County if it passes in November, doesn't have the

1 option for help from a MAG or a PAG. And when we get the  
 2 opportunity to leverage dollars and make those stretch in  
 3 Greater Arizona for a priority or a warranted project, I really  
 4 believe we have to pay attention to that.

5 Secondly, if we'll go back to the conversation in  
 6 Payson, we don't like to do anything contingent, and I agree  
 7 with that. We shouldn't.

8 I'm going to ask that this be tabled until  
 9 September. I'd like for CYMPO to consider what you suggested  
 10 and see if they will make those commitments for future years,  
 11 and I think our scoping document will be a little bit further  
 12 along. We may have some better information, and we may know a  
 13 little bit more about contingency funds as we go through this  
 14 first quarter of FY '18. So I'd make a motion that this is  
 15 tabled until the September meeting.

16 MR. ROEHRICH: Madam Chair, Mr. Stratton, we  
 17 don't need a motion for that. You just guide us and say that  
 18 this will be a future topic. That's all we need.

19 MR. STRATTON: I'd like to see it on the  
 20 September meeting and discussion, and see what CYMPO has done  
 21 and see where we stand with the -- the scoping document and  
 22 such.

23 MR. HAMMIT: Madam Chair, Mr. Stratton, Chris  
 24 just informed me October would be better, because with their  
 25 meeting schedule, they won't be prepared to do that before

1 October.

2 MR. STRATTON: Then I'll ask that it come back in  
3 November, as I may be out of the country in October, and this is  
4 certainly a project I want to have input on.

5 CHAIRWOMAN BEAVER: So as I understand it, the  
6 request is to bring this back in November.

7 MR. ROEHRICH: Madam Chair, that's correct.  
8 We'll agenda this item in November.

9 CHAIRWOMAN BEAVER: Okay.

10 MR. ROEHRICH: And I'll be out of the country, by  
11 the way. Good luck, Dallas.

12 MR. HAMMIT: Where you going?

13 MR. ROEHRICH: I haven't figured it out yet.  
14 Believe me, I'm finding a place, a place with a beach.

15 MR. LA RUE: Book a flight for two.

16 CHAIRWOMAN BEAVER: Okay. So it looks now like  
17 we're moving on to the second --

18 MR. ROEHRICH: Well, okay. Yes. The second  
19 item.

20 CHAIRWOMAN BEAVER: The second half --

21 MR. ROEHRICH: Right.

22 CHAIRWOMAN BEAVER: The second half of the Item  
23 8, which now would be the 4th Street Bridge replacement in the  
24 city of Flagstaff.

25 MR. HAMMIT: So we're going to move north. This

1 -- the 4th Street Bridge is a bridge over Interstate 40 in  
2 Flagstaff. You can see that the big map -- and I'm going to  
3 zoom in on it. There's actually two bridges over Interstate 40.  
4 The -- ADOT was in the process of doing a preservation project  
5 on those bridges.

6 The City of Flagstaff approached the department  
7 and said, "While you're doing this work, it would make sense to  
8 widen these bridges to add for future capacity of 4th Street."  
9 And as you can see from the aerial, that to the north there,  
10 there is a widening of the existing roadway. ADOT had a scoping  
11 document completed. They are reconsidering that scoping,  
12 because the original scoping document was just to preserve the  
13 existing roadway -- or the existing bridges.

14 What do we need to do to -- if we want to expand?  
15 One thing we could do is rehab the existing and widen. The  
16 other thing we could do is reconstruct the whole thing. One of  
17 the advantages of reconstructing the whole thing is we can  
18 account for future widening of I-40. Someday we're going to  
19 need -- Audra would tell me it's today -- but someday we're  
20 going to need three lanes in each direction on I-40. And if  
21 we're going to put money into a bridge structure, it makes a lot  
22 of sense that that new bridge structure can span three lanes.  
23 So we're in that process.

24 At the same time, Audra and the district staff,  
25 are working with the City of Flagstaff, getting agreements on

1 costs. Right now the -- a rough estimate is around \$9 million.  
 2 ADOT ,looking at 4 million. The City, 5 million. And they have  
 3 a -- draft ideas for a JPA that have not been executed, but they  
 4 were moving forward. Once that can happen at the same time,  
 5 we'll finish the scoping to know, yes, it's going to be a new  
 6 set of bridges, or we can work with a preservation. That  
 7 decision should be made in the next -- I'll make sure, but I  
 8 think it will be done within the next month what type of  
 9 structures we're going to do. So that project is moving forward  
 10 through the negotiations of the JPA, and the scoping will be  
 11 completed early this year, this fiscal year.

12 CHAIRWOMAN BEAVER: Board Member Stratton.

13 MR. STRATTON: Dallas, if I'm correct, didn't we  
 14 have \$2 million budgeted for repairs?

15 MR. HAMMIT: That was in the preservation plan  
 16 for that. That was part -- that would be part of our 4 million  
 17 if we bring that forward. Yes.

18 MR. STRATTON: All right. And what year was that  
 19 for?

20 MR. HAMMIT: I believe it was 2020. Do you  
 21 remember? 2020.

22 MR. STRATTON: Thank you.

23 I'd ask that this come back to the Board at the  
 24 same time as the CYMPO project comes back. I think things will  
 25 be a lot further along. A JPA may be signed. Your scoping or

1 your recommendation of replacement or not would be done. I  
 2 think it would be appropriate to address both of these. It's  
 3 actually the same situation. We have an entity coming forward  
 4 with a lot of money, and it would cost ADOT very little in  
 5 addition to that. So I'd like to discuss it at that time again.

6 CHAIRWOMAN BEAVER: Okay. And do I understand we  
 7 don't need any kind of a motion on this, but we would like both  
 8 of them brought back for the November meeting?

9 MR. ROEHRICH: That's correct. Yes, ma'am.  
 10 Well, beyond the agenda.

11 CHAIRWOMAN BEAVER: If there's nothing further.  
 12 Are you -- would you like to share anything additional?

13 MR. HAMMIT: Not on Item 8, Madam Chair.

14 CHAIRWOMAN BEAVER: Okay.

15 MR. SELLERS: Madam Chair.

16 CHAIRWOMAN BEAVER: Yes. Board Member Sellers.

17 MR. SELLERS: That would not delay this project  
 18 in any way by delaying our decision on this until November?

19 MR. HAMMIT: Madam Chair, Member Sellers, no, it  
 20 would not.

21 CHAIRWOMAN BEAVER: Okay. If there's no  
 22 additional questions, we will move on to Item 9, the state  
 23 engineer's report.

24 MR. HAMMIT: Thank you, Madam Chair.

25 As far as the state engineer's report, currently

1 we have 116 projects under construction totaling \$1.527 billion.  
 2 Ten projects were finalized in April, totaling \$20 million, and  
 3 year to date, we have finalized 133 projects.

4 Another item in the state engineer's report, I  
 5 was asked to brief the Board on our safety corridors. Right  
 6 now, we have four safety corridors throughout the state.  
 7 Somebody asks, "Well, how did you pick these four? Why only  
 8 four?" We work very closely with DPS, the Department of Public  
 9 Safety, as well as the Governor's Office of Highway Safety on  
 10 identifying corridors that had a large number of crashes as well  
 11 as a large number of citations. DPS brought that information  
 12 in.

13 And the big thing is, is behavior. We believe on  
 14 these corridors, behavior is causing a number of the crashes.  
 15 So as you see, the corridors in this area on I-40, and I call it  
 16 between the 93s, so here in Kingman, 93 as you go north, you  
 17 take I-40 and then you go south to Wikieup. That segment of  
 18 I-40 is one of our safety corridors. This segment of I-10 as  
 19 you approach the tunnel is a safety corridor. The segment of  
 20 I-10 as you leave the 202 in Chandler and go through the Gila  
 21 River is another safety corridor. And then our last safety  
 22 corridor is also in the metro area on US-60.

23 In these areas, DPS is committed to extra law  
 24 enforcement. That's one reason we can't expand it to multi --  
 25 or a lot more areas, because it does expend multiple resources.

1 We participated by getting some signs as well as the Governor's  
 2 Office of Highway Safety brought money to the table in this  
 3 effect. So, again, we're working to educate the drivers and put  
 4 increased enforcement are key things we're -- or attempt to make  
 5 -- save lives by reducing unacceptable behavior. They're going  
 6 to be ticketing very close to the speed limit. Their signs say  
 7 zero tolerance, and I have had reports on I-10 that people have  
 8 been cited for less than five over at different times.

9 We're also -- target areas, as I said, where we  
 10 had a large number of fatal crashes and where there was a number  
 11 of citations based on behavior, speeding, lack of restraint and  
 12 impairment. So that's how we identified our safety corridors.  
 13 We have -- we're evaluating them over the next two years. We're  
 14 about nine months into it. We will evaluate it after that  
 15 period. We plan to continue the program, but we may switch  
 16 corridors. Did we make a difference? And if we did, maybe we  
 17 can find additional funds to put more law enforcement on another  
 18 corridor.

19 CHAIRWOMAN BEAVER: Excuse me. I would like to  
 20 ask you a question with regard to those safety corridors. Two  
 21 points. With the law enforcement, for those particular areas,  
 22 have you identified or have they identified for our use, which  
 23 I'm assuming if they've been identified as safety corridors,  
 24 they have, but the accidents and things that have happened on  
 25 those roads, is it speeding? Alcohol related? Drug related?

1 Texting on a phone? Like, what -- what is causing those  
2 particular areas to have a higher level of problem than other  
3 areas, one? And two, I'm just curious do those stretches have  
4 the overhead signage that are going up around the state?

5 MR. HAMMIT: Madam Chair, the answer to the first  
6 part is yes to all of them. These are identified because of  
7 behavior issues, a behavior of driving too fast, and that is the  
8 common thread throughout all of these four corridors. There's  
9 excessive speed.

10 But there is also impairment. They have details.  
11 They're putting details to do stops to see if there's impaired  
12 drivers. They're adding that to this.

13 They identify distracted driving. Right now we  
14 don't have a primary law that we can stop for distraction, other  
15 than if you're being careless. You know, they -- we don't have  
16 a stop for obvious texting or distracted, but if you're making  
17 erratic lane changes, they can stop you for that. They're  
18 looking for those behavior areas.

19 The second question, overhead message boards, in  
20 all of these areas we do have a number of overhead message  
21 boards that we can alert motorists for any number of -- you  
22 know, I was just in Star Valley two nights ago with the city  
23 council, and we worked with them after the Payson meeting to get  
24 on the message board to warn drivers to slow down. If you  
25 remember a few years ago, they had photo enforcement through the

1 town. That went away and they saw an increase in speed. They  
2 put up some speed feedback signs, so it says, "Your speed is,"  
3 and it flashes at you. And we used our message boards, and they  
4 were very happy that we're using that for safety purposes to  
5 help speed through their town, control behavior.

6 CHAIRWOMAN BEAVER: In addition, kind of for the  
7 benefit of Board members, if all of you have not been over to  
8 the TOC, because that's where those message boards -- the  
9 messages that are coming out on those boards come from there to  
10 begin with. If you haven't had the opportunity to have that  
11 tour yet, you might see if they can set it up for you. I think  
12 maybe Jesse and Steve, you haven't been there yet. Very  
13 interesting, though.

14 MR. HAMMIT: Madam Chair, I have one more. And  
15 on that note, I'd be happy to take anyone to the TOC if it's  
16 your first time or 10th time. We were constantly making  
17 changes. A couple years ago, we brought law enforcement in.  
18 That's been a game changer. Having them sitting right next to  
19 our operators communicating, not only to our staff, but through  
20 their staff, and they can see what's going on before their  
21 troopers are getting on site has been a game changer in the  
22 valley, and we're working to increase that throughout the state  
23 where we have cameras.

24 CHAIRWOMAN BEAVER: And I'd also add, I think  
25 that's where the Twitter feed is coming out of, too, for weather



1 and all of that. So it's just -- it's really, I think, a plus  
2 for the citizens of Arizona, because it just adds a level of  
3 oversight and safety that we haven't maybe had in the past.

4 MR. SELLERS: Madam Chair.

5 CHAIRWOMAN BEAVER: Board Member Sellers.

6 MR. SELLERS: Yeah. I think I'm the one that  
7 asked to have this on an agenda, and I guess one of my questions  
8 is: Do we know of other areas that have done something like  
9 this and what kind of results they've gotten? And I guess my  
10 other question is -- that people keep asking me is: Why don't  
11 we set speed limits that we're willing to enforce rather than  
12 just having certain areas where we're going to enforce the speed  
13 limits?

14 MR. HAMMIT: Madam Chair, Member Sellers, it has  
15 been done in other states, and we have seen success. Other  
16 states have different laws. So as you approach Grands, New  
17 Mexico on I-40, between Gallup and Albuquerque, they have a  
18 safety corridor. One thing New Mexico allows through their  
19 legislature, if you're speeding or you're ticketed within a  
20 safety corridor, it's a double fine. We don't have that  
21 legislation that would allow it in Arizona. But they do have  
22 that, and they've seen some reductions in crashes in that area.  
23 There's -- in the neighborhood of 10 states that we know of that  
24 have these safety corridors with a mixed area of success.

25 As far as speed limits, a number of these

1 areas -- US-60 is a good example. The speed limit is posted at  
2 65. When it's on the morning commute, you're lucky to go 45.  
3 But after that, we have a very -- we have a lot of pavement.  
4 It's very comfortable to drive, and probably your 85th speed  
5 average is 75 or above. It would not be prudent to sign that in  
6 an urban area at 75, even though we know that the 85th speed is  
7 75.

8 As far as enforcement, I think DPS would tell me  
9 that it's their availability of troopers, that they don't have  
10 enough to greatly enforce more than in these corridors. They  
11 are out there. I see them on the roads regularly pulling people  
12 over, but they're limited on the numbers of troopers they have  
13 to put out there.

14 CHAIRWOMAN BEAVER: Just it's something related  
15 to the safety issue, but I know this is the second time on that  
16 Corwin Drive in Bullhead City that it's come up. Is it possible  
17 we could just have Alvin look into that and see?

18 MR. HAMMIT: Madam Chair, I'll make sure you get  
19 a briefing on that, the status of that project.

20 CHAIRWOMAN BEAVER: Okay. Thank you.

21 MR. HAMMIT: And if I may, one thing that ties  
22 into our safety corridors, during holiday events, we've  
23 identified these holiday corridors. So on holiday events,  
24 Memorial Day, 4th of July, Labor Day, we are putting extra  
25 enforcements, very similar to the safety corridors, but we know

1 on holidays, I-17 is a challenge. I was on there on the 3rd for  
2 almost two-and-a-half hours trying to get to Phoenix to the  
3 airport. A rollover crash happened. 87 is another area, and  
4 I-10 between the (inaudible) between Phoenix and Tucson.

5 In addition to having the extra enforcement,  
6 again, we're working with law enforcement. We're staging  
7 equipment. So I put loaders, signs and those things in  
8 strategic areas during that period so if we do have a crash, we  
9 need to get people fast, I had the equipment already on site  
10 during those periods of time. So -- and they have been  
11 confused, because in the media they call those safety corridors  
12 as well, but I just wanted to point out the difference between  
13 our holiday corridors are specific times, versus the safety  
14 corridors are all the time.

15 And that's all for the state engineer's report.

16 CHAIRWOMAN BEAVER: Thank you.

17 I will -- I think -- I had heard a comment with  
18 regard to the -- because it actually flashes holiday corridor,  
19 and somebody said, "Well, the holiday's over." Well, it was,  
20 like, the day after, you know, and I don't think things had  
21 gotten changed yet. But there was still a lot of traffic that  
22 was coming home, but it was just one of those comments that  
23 somebody had made about it.

24 If there's nothing additional with regard to the  
25 state engineer report, we'll move on now to the construction

1 contracts.

2 MR. HAMMIT: Madam Chair, thank you. And all the  
3 Board, thank you for the approval of the items in the consent  
4 agenda.

5 We do have some projects to talk about. I want  
6 to point out in the summary sheet, year to date total, we have  
7 445 million, almost \$800,000 that we -- are low bids. Our  
8 estimate was 441, we'll call it. We were within 1.1 percent.

9 Starting next month we will start the fiscal year  
10 over. I asked because when I saw this yesterday -- or day  
11 before yesterday, why is it now we're in the July and the next  
12 fiscal year. These were the projects that were advertised in  
13 the past year, but starting the next year, we'll start this  
14 table over and -- for the new fiscal year. But as -- for the  
15 year, we're within 1.1 percent total.

16 And a lot of that change came in the last few  
17 months. We have seen more pricing volatility over the last few  
18 months.

19 Item 10A, if we're ready, Madam Chair.

20 CHAIRWOMAN BEAVER: Yes.

21 MR. HAMMIT: This is a project in Flagstaff. It  
22 is a widening of a local street, and one of the things -- I get  
23 information very fluid. So five minutes after the board meeting  
24 started, this project was originally listed asking the Board to  
25 postpone. I'm going to have a different recommendation.

1 Michelle said I will not go to jail if I recommend that, so I am  
2 going to move forward with it.

3 On this project, the low bid was \$538,000. The  
4 State's estimate was \$490,200. It was over the State's estimate  
5 by \$47,800, or 9.8 percent. One of the concerns that we were  
6 looking at on the postponement since it is a local project, did  
7 they have the money for the extra funds. I did find out this  
8 morning they do. So my recommendation is not to postpone, but  
9 after reviewing the bids that the department does believe this  
10 was a responsive and responsible bid and would recommend award  
11 to Ban Construction, Inc. And one note. If it -- if I'd have  
12 had the information earlier, this would have been on the consent  
13 agenda, because it's within those limits.

14 CHAIRWOMAN BEAVER: Okay. Can --

15 MR. LA RUE: So moved.

16 CHAIRWOMAN BEAVER: Could I just have  
17 clarification? You said Ban Construction, and this is --

18 MR. HAMMIT: Oh, excuse me. It's Contracting.

19 CHAIRWOMAN BEAVER: Contracting, Inc.

20 MR. HAMMIT: Yes.

21 CHAIRWOMAN BEAVER: Motion --

22 MR. LA RUE: So moved.

23 CHAIRWOMAN BEAVER: Motion by Board Member La  
24 Rue. Second?

25 MR. CUTHBERTSON: Second.

1 CHAIRWOMAN BEAVER: Second by Board Member  
2 Cuthbertson to approve Item 10A.

3 All those in favor?

4 BOARD MEMBERS: Aye

5 CHAIRWOMAN BEAVER: All those opposed? Motion  
6 carries.

7 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Opposed.

8 CHAIRWOMAN BEAVER: Okay. Now we'll move on to  
9 Item 10B.

10 MR. HAMMIT: Madam Chair, this is a project in La  
11 Paz County. It is a shoulder repair. The low bid was  
12 \$1,361,893.08. The State's estimate was \$900,361.55. It was  
13 over the State's estimate by \$461,531.53, or 51 percent. We saw  
14 higher-than-expected for our concrete poured and mobilization.  
15 The County would -- since they were -- they're on the hook for  
16 coming up with addition funds, and to ask us to reject all bids,  
17 they'd like to take that, rescope it within the budget and  
18 re-advertise at a later date. So the recommendation is to  
19 reject all bids.

20 CHAIRWOMAN BEAVER: Is there a motion to accept  
21 and approve --

22 MR. HAMMOND: So moved.

23 CHAIRWOMAN BEAVER: Okay. Thank you. Board  
24 Member Hammond's made a motion to accept and approve staff's  
25 recommendation to reject all bids. Is there a second?

1 MR. STRATTON: Second.

2 CHAIRWOMAN BEAVER: Seconded by Board Member  
3 Stratton.

4 All those in favor?

5 BOARD MEMBERS: Aye.

6 CHAIRWOMAN BEAVER: All those opposed? The  
7 motion carries.

8 Item 10C.

9 MR. HAMMIT: Thank you, Madam Chair.

10 This is a project in the city of Glendale. It  
11 has some decorative pavement and lighting. The low bid was  
12 \$595,000. The State's estimate was \$477,867. It was over the  
13 State's estimate by \$117,133, or 24.5 percent. The local has  
14 come up with the additional funds. The reason in the difference  
15 was some of the special pavers that were used and the grading  
16 for the pavement. It was a tight area. With the additional  
17 funds, the staff has reviewed the bids and believes the bid is  
18 responsive and responsible and would recommend award to KAZ  
19 Construction, Inc.

20 MR. LA RUE: Move to award.

21 MR. STRATTON: Second.

22 CHAIRWOMAN BEAVER: Okay. Motion to accept and  
23 approve staff recommendation for award, the contract for Item  
24 10C to KAZ Construction was made by Board Member La Rue, and  
25 seconded --

1 MR. SELLERS: Can I ask a question?

2 CHAIRWOMAN BEAVER: -- by Board Member Stratton.  
3 (Inaudible.)

4 MR. HAMMOND: I'd like to ask a question. You  
5 know, this is in the middle of the city and you only got two to  
6 bid on it? Is that normal?

7 MR. HAMMIT: Not generally. I think with the  
8 lighting and the site work, it's a mix on who's going to be a  
9 prime. Is it going to be an electrical contractor or a paving  
10 contractor? I think as we put together projects or encourage  
11 locals, we need to look at that, because there's few that can do  
12 both those items of work. And remember, our contractors have to  
13 do at least 40 percent themselves. They can't sub out more than  
14 that.

15 MR. HAMMOND: Thank you.

16 CHAIRWOMAN BEAVER: Okay. The motion's to accept  
17 and approve staff's recommendation for Item 10C.

18 All those in favor?

19 BOARD MEMBERS: Aye.

20 CHAIRWOMAN BEAVER: All those opposed? Motion  
21 carries.

22 Item 10D.

23 MR. HAMMIT: Thank you, Madam Chair.

24 Item 10D is a multi-use path in the city of  
25 Litchfield Park. On this project, as we reviewed the bids, the

1 low bid -- low bidder submitted their DBE paperwork. It was  
 2 found that they did not meet the DBE goal. None of the other  
 3 three bidders submitted their DBE paperwork within the allotted  
 4 times. With that, they are all nonresponsive. So the staff's  
 5 recommendation is to reject all bids, and we will re-advertise.

6 MR. STRATTON: Madam Chair.

7 CHAIRWOMAN BEAVER: Board Member Stratton.

8 MR. STRATTON: Is this the project we received  
 9 the letter on from Combs?

10 MR. HAMMIT: Madam Chair, Member Stratton, that  
 11 is correct.

12 MR. STRATTON: I have a couple questions, if I  
 13 may then. Just curiosity.

14 Is it that all bidders have to put their DBE in  
 15 with the bid or within five days, or if the low -- apparent low  
 16 bidder did not submit or didn't meet it, then the next bidder  
 17 would have five days after notification to turn that in, or does  
 18 he have to turn it in at the time of the bid, he or she?

19 MR. HAMMIT: Madam Chair, Member Stratton, it is  
 20 all bidders have to turn in their DBE within five days of the  
 21 opening. This did change right at the first of the year, and if  
 22 you remember, I think we were in the Tucson area, we had a  
 23 similar issue. I briefed the Board at that time. At the same  
 24 time, the department did a lot of outreach with our Association  
 25 of General Contractors. They worked with us very closely on

1 developing this bid.

2 Our federal partners also worked with us. One of  
 3 the recommendations was wanted to turn in all your stuff at bid  
 4 time, there is some disadvantages for the contracting community  
 5 with that. The other was the top three have to turn it in every  
 6 time. The agency, the contractors had some concern with that.  
 7 One, you're asking a disadvantaged business enterprise, "Give me  
 8 paperwork and do this work, and you're not going to get the  
 9 job," because I was second or third, and they didn't think there  
 10 was going to be compliance.

11 So we worked out a compromise. Anyone who's  
 12 going to be considered for the project has to turn it in, but  
 13 there's no dissidence to the contractor if they don't. One  
 14 thing to point out to go to your question, before this started  
 15 this year, if we rejected, number one, number two had five  
 16 additional days. That's what changed within the spec, and  
 17 that's where we were told we were non-compliant by FHWA with our  
 18 current DBE process.

19 MR. STRATTON: Madam Chair, if I -- I do remember  
 20 you asking us to postpone a bid so that the next lowest bidder  
 21 could supply their DBE material, I believe. I didn't remember  
 22 if it was prior to the first of the year or since the first of  
 23 the year, but if we changed policies, did we advise all  
 24 contractors? Do we give them a notice or how was that handled?

25 MR. HAMMIT: So we work very closely with the

1 contractors association. Our staff briefed at our joint  
 2 luncheon. Their AGC went and briefed in their individual  
 3 meetings, because they were at the table when we drafted the new  
 4 specification, as well as it's in our specification at least  
 5 three times saying if you don't turn it in, you're  
 6 nonresponsive.

7                   So we did outreach. We sent out fliers. And in  
 8 addition to this, every project, the day after opening, our  
 9 business engagement group sends a email out to every bidder  
 10 saying, "Turn in your DBE paperwork." So they're reminded. We  
 11 did outreach on the project -- or on the process, on the new  
 12 specifications.

13                   MR. STRATTON: And this is the first it's come up  
 14 since the first of the year change of policy?

15                   MR. HAMMIT: As a protest, Mr. Stratton, that is  
 16 correct.

17                   MR. STRATTON: That's all, Madam Chair.

18                   CHAIRWOMAN BEAVER: Thank you.

19                   Do we have a motion?

20                   MR. LA RUE: I'd move to accept the  
 21 recommendation and reject all bids.

22                   CHAIRWOMAN BEAVER: Okay. Motion by Board Member  
 23 La Rue. Is there a second?

24                   MR. HAMMOND: Second.

25                   CHAIRWOMAN BEAVER: Seconded by Board Member

1 Hammond to accept and approve the staff's recommendation to  
 2 reject all bids.

3                   All those in favor?

4                   BOARD MEMBERS: Aye.

5                   CHAIRWOMAN BEAVER: All those opposed? Motion  
 6 carries.

7                   Item 10E.

8                   MR. HAMMIT: Thank you, Madam Chair.

9                   This project is in the city of Peoria. It's to  
 10 install closed-circuit television cameras for their freeway  
 11 operation. The low bid was \$242,484.42. The State's estimate  
 12 was \$211,057.50. It was over the State's estimate by  
 13 \$31,426.92, or 14.9 percent. Almost the whole difference was in  
 14 the electrical conduit price. We have reviewed the bids, and  
 15 the department believes it was a reasonable and responsive bid  
 16 and would recommend award to Contractors West, Inc.

17                   MR. LA RUE: Move to award.

18                   CHAIRWOMAN BEAVER: Motion by Board Member La Rue  
 19 to accept and approve staff's recommendations to award the  
 20 contract for 10E to Contractors West, Inc. Is there a second?

21                   MR. CUTHBERTSON: Second.

22                   CHAIRWOMAN BEAVER: Seconded by Board Member  
 23 Cuthbertson.

24                   All those in favor?

25                   BOARD MEMBERS: Aye.

1 CHAIRWOMAN BEAVER: All those opposed? The  
2 motion carries.

3 Item 10F.

4 MR. HAMMIT: Thank you, Madam Chair.

5 This project is another local project in the city  
6 of Nogales. The low bid was \$447,500. The State's estimate was  
7 \$392,722, or it is \$54,778 over the State's estimate, or 13.9  
8 percent. Right now the department is working with the City of  
9 Nogales. They are looking for the additional funds. They  
10 believe working that they will be able to come up with that  
11 funding, but at this time we are recommending postponement so  
12 they can get their finances in order.

13 MR. STRATTON: Madam Chair.

14 CHAIRWOMAN BEAVER: Board Member Stratton.

15 MR. STRATTON: I actually had a call from someone  
16 in Nogales that I happen to know. The deputy director. And he  
17 said they had found the funds, to his knowledge, and he has some  
18 concerns that postponing this too long, there may be some  
19 difficult weather issues, because they just had a sewer, water  
20 line project on that particular street. I understand we have to  
21 have it in writing from them, but I would ask that if you  
22 receive that, if we could call a telephonic meeting and get this  
23 passed so they could move forward in order to accommodate their  
24 concerns about weather.

25 MR. HAMMIT: Madam Chair, Member Stratton, if

1 that's the Board's prerogative, we'd be happy to do that as soon  
2 as we get the information.

3 Floyd's looking at me like, "What did you commit  
4 to?"

5 MR. ROEHRICH: Well, Madam Chair, don't forget  
6 next Friday, we got a telephonic meeting. So if this comes in  
7 early next week, we've got the meeting for the wrong way driver  
8 next Friday, and I would expect if this comes in, and as Dallas  
9 says, it's good to go, that could be included in that agenda,  
10 so...

11 MR. STRATTON: That would be --

12 MR. ROEHRICH: We've got an opportunity. So  
13 we'll keep monitoring that as staff.

14 CHAIRWOMAN BEAVER: Okay. Thank you.

15 So do we have a motion to approve -- accept and  
16 approve --

17 MR. CUTHBERTSON: Postpone.

18 CHAIRWOMAN BEAVER: Oh, to postpone. Excuse me.  
19 A motion to accept and approve the staff's recommendation to  
20 postpone Item 10F.

21 MR. HAMMOND: So moved.

22 CHAIRWOMAN BEAVER: The motion was by Board  
23 Member Hammond, seconded by Board Member Cuthbertson to postpone  
24 Item 10F as stated.

25 All those in favor?

1 BOARD MEMBERS: Aye.

2 CHAIRWOMAN BEAVER: All those opposed? Motion  
3 carries.

4 Item 10G.

5 MR. HAMMIT: Thank you, Madam Chair.

6 This is another local project. This one in the  
7 city of Summerton. It is a shared use path is the project. The  
8 low bid was \$743,936. The State's estimate was \$701,573.85. It  
9 was over the State's estimate by \$42,362.15, or 6 percent. Like  
10 the previous one, the City of Summerton does believe they can  
11 come up with the funding. They're just going through the  
12 process and working out that agreement. The staff's  
13 recommendation is to postpone and let us work out that agreement  
14 with the City of Summerton.

15 CHAIRWOMAN BEAVER: Is this one likewise one that  
16 might be ready by Friday?

17 MR. HAMMIT: When I get back or even on the way,  
18 I will call and see where we're at with them moving forward.  
19 And if it is, Madam Chair, we'll bring it forward as soon as  
20 it's ready.

21 CHAIRWOMAN BEAVER: Okay. Do we have a motion to  
22 accept and approve staff's recommendation to postpone Item 10G?

23 MR. SELLERS: So moved.

24 CHAIRWOMAN BEAVER: Motion by Jack Sellers or  
25 Board Member Sellers, seconded by Board Member Stratton to

1 postpone Item 10G.

2 All those in favor?

3 BOARD MEMBERS: Aye.

4 CHAIRWOMAN BEAVER: All those opposed? The  
5 motion carries.

6 Item 10H.

7 MR. HAMMIT: Madam Chair, this is a intersection  
8 improvement. This is a project we've worked on for a long time  
9 in the Florence area on 79 and 79B. The low bid was  
10 \$618,961.62. The State's estimate was \$809,624.22. It was  
11 under the State's estimate by \$190,662.60, or 23.5 percent. We  
12 did see better-than-expected prices for the removals of the  
13 existing aggregate base and the asphaltic concrete. After  
14 review of the bids, the department believes it was a reasonable  
15 and responsive bid and recommends award to Combs Construction  
16 Company, Inc.

17 MR. STRATTON: So moved.

18 CHAIRWOMAN BEAVER: Motion by Board Member  
19 Stratton to accept and approve staff's recommendation to award  
20 the contract for Item 10H to Combs Construction Company, Inc.  
21 Is there a second?

22 MR. LA RUE: Second.

23 CHAIRWOMAN BEAVER: It's been seconded by Board  
24 Member La Rue.

25 In there's no further discussion, all those in



1 favor?

2 BOARD MEMBERS: Aye.

3 CHAIRWOMAN BEAVER: All those opposed? The  
4 motion carries.

5 Item 10I.

6 MR. HAMMIT: Thank you, Madam Chair.

7 This project is within the city of Sierra Vista  
8 on SR-90. It's a roadway rehab and widening. The low bid was  
9 \$2,633,000. The State's estimate was \$2,145,017. It was over  
10 the State's estimate by \$487,983, or 22.7 percent. We saw  
11 higher-than-expected pricing within the asphaltic concrete, the  
12 aggregate base, and then they have a retaining wall. We saw a  
13 higher-than-expected price there. After review of the bids, the  
14 department does believe it was a reasonable and responsive bid  
15 and would recommend award to KE and G Construction, Inc.

16 CHAIRWOMAN BEAVER: Do we have a motion to accept  
17 and approve the staff's recommendation?

18 MR. CUTHBERTSON: So moved.

19 CHAIRWOMAN BEAVER: Motion by Board Member  
20 Cuthbertson. Is there second?

21 MR. HAMMOND: Second.

22 CHAIRWOMAN BEAVER: Seconded by Board Member  
23 Hammond. Motion's to accept and approve staff's recommendation  
24 to award the contract for Item 10I to KE and G Construction,  
25 Inc.

1 If there's no further discussion, all those in  
2 favor?

3 BOARD MEMBERS: Aye.

4 CHAIRWOMAN BEAVER: All those opposed? The  
5 motion carries.

6 Item 10J.

7 MR. HAMMIT: Thank you, Madam Chair.

8 So we're going home for Mr. Cuthbertson here.  
9 This is in Clifton. We met with the community about a year-  
10 and-a-half ago, and we talked about some traffic calming  
11 opportunities through the area. On this project, the low bid  
12 was \$668,231. The State's estimate was \$462,946 -- or excuse  
13 me, \$462,496. It was over the State's estimate by \$205,285, or  
14 44.3 percent. We saw higher-than-expected pricing in the  
15 concrete mobilization. The groups will have to mobilize quite  
16 some distance. We did review the bids. The staff believes it  
17 was a reasonable and responsive bid and would recommend award to  
18 AJP Electric, Inc.

19 CHAIRWOMAN BEAVER: Is there a motion to accept  
20 and approve staff's recommendation?

21 MR. CUTHBERTSON: Move to approve.

22 CHAIRWOMAN BEAVER: Motion by the Board Member  
23 Cuthbertson to accept and approve staff's recommendation to  
24 award the contract for Item 10J to AJP Electric, Inc. Is there  
25 a second?

1 MR. STRATTON: Second.

2 CHAIRWOMAN BEAVER: Seconded by Board Member  
3 Stratton.

4 With no further discussion, all those in favor?

5 BOARD MEMBERS: Aye.

6 CHAIRWOMAN BEAVER: All those opposed? The  
7 motion carries.

8 Item 10K.

9 MR. HAMMIT: Thank you, Madam Chair.

10 And this is my last one. I'm sure right now  
11 Mr. Hammond is kicking himself, because he told me last night,  
12 "We do not hear enough from you at the board meeting." So right  
13 now I'm sure he's kicking himself.

14 MR. HAMMOND: You made up for it.

15 MR. HAMMIT: On this project, it is a removal of  
16 a water supply. When we did some work on the 260 corridor, a  
17 number of projects we put in a water system supply to supply  
18 construction water for this project. For the last project, we  
19 have a different source. So we need to remove this as a part of  
20 our contract and agreement with The Forest Service. The low bid  
21 was \$482,564.54. The State's estimate was \$857,305.77. It did  
22 come under the estimate by \$374,741.21, or 43.7. We saw better-  
23 than-expected pricing for the removal of the pipe, the pump  
24 station, some of the structures. One of the things the  
25 contractor does receive these materials and sees the salvage

1 value that they can put into it, and we saw that in the pricing,  
2 the good pricing that they gave us. After review of the bids,  
3 the department believes the bid is reasonable and responsive,  
4 and would recommend award to Hatch Construction and Paving, Inc.

5 MR. STRATTON: Madam Chair, if I may?

6 CHAIRWOMAN BEAVER: Board Member Stratton.

7 MR. STRATTON: A couple questions, Dallas. Will  
8 this affect the Lion Springs project in any way?

9 MR. HAMMIT: Madam Chair, Member Stratton, no.  
10 We have found another water source that we do not need this one  
11 to do work there.

12 MR. STRATTON: And will this complete our -- I  
13 believe that agreement's between SRP, Forest Service and ADOT

14 MR. HAMMIT: That is correct.

15 MR. STRATTON: And the injection wells, is that  
16 going to be completed by another contractor, or do we have to do  
17 anything there? Is this going to complete and fulfill that  
18 contractual?

19 MR. HAMMIT: Madam Chair, Member Stratton, I  
20 believe we have got the water table up to where we need it to  
21 be, and so we have met our requirements with SRP.

22 MR. STRATTON: So will we have to do any further  
23 removal of any equipment other than what this contract --

24 MR. HAMMIT: My understanding, and I'll confirm  
25 it, but my understanding is this completes all of our

1 obligations when we put the water system in.

2 MR. STRATTON: Move to approve.

3 CHAIRWOMAN BEAVER: Motion by Board Member  
4 Stratton to accept and approve the staff's recommendation award  
5 the contract for Item 10K to Hatch Construction and Paving, Inc.  
6 Is there a second?

7 MR. CUTHBERTSON: Second.

8 CHAIRWOMAN BEAVER: Seconded by Board Member  
9 Cuthbertson.

10 If there's no further discussion, all those the  
11 favor?

12 BOARD MEMBERS: Aye.

13 CHAIRWOMAN BEAVER: All those opposed? The  
14 motion carries.

15 MR. HAMMIT: Thank you, Madam Chair.

16 CHAIRWOMAN BEAVER: Wow. Okay. We are now on to  
17 Item 11, suggestions.

18 MR. ROEHRICH: Madam Chair, just a couple of  
19 things for the Board's consideration. As already identified,  
20 next Friday on the 20th of July, we have scheduled a telephonic  
21 board -- a meeting to award the wrong way driver detection  
22 system project. In addition, we will monitor -- monitoring the  
23 Items 10F and 10G to see if those are prepared and ready to be  
24 awarded at that time. Agenda should go out early next week, and  
25 so we'll be prepared to do that.

1 I also wanted to remind the Board that, again,  
2 there's no meeting in August. Remember, August was the month  
3 off. In consideration of that, I have been working with the  
4 Board chair. There will be no study session in August. We are  
5 looking at preparing the items that we've been asked to look at  
6 for a study session would roll into the October study session.  
7 So we're moving forward with the coordination and preparation  
8 for that.

9 But I do want to remind the Board that in August,  
10 we still need to address -- because of the contract time frame  
11 requirements, we still need to address construction contracts.  
12 So we will look at working with the Board's chair schedule and  
13 your schedule a time that week of the 14th to the 18th,  
14 basically, when the board meeting would have scheduled, to get a  
15 telephonic meeting in that and get ourselves prepared so we can  
16 address the Board awards at that time.

17 And then the last item just for consideration in  
18 September, reminder, we were coordinating a meeting on the Hopi  
19 Nation up in the Second Mesa area, and in coordination with  
20 their leadership, it looks as if we're settling on a location on  
21 -- at Moenkopi, which is just next to -- or Moenkopi, excuse me,  
22 Moenkopi, which is just next to Tuba City. So they have a  
23 facility there that will be able to host the meeting. In  
24 addition, they have a number of events that they're looking to  
25 schedule that Thursday in the afternoon, afternoon into evening,

1 to include a little tour of the area, a little bit of discussion  
2 on the culture, the Hopi culture, a traditional dance, as well  
3 as a dinner that night in consideration of the Board having the  
4 meeting there.

5 So we'll have more information as Lynn and I are  
6 able to coordinate and get that set up. But just some things to  
7 consider over the next couple of months, activities, and then if  
8 you've got, obviously, any questions, as we provide the  
9 information, just let Linda or myself know.

10 CHAIRWOMAN BEAVER: Okay. I would just like to  
11 ask that an invitation be extended to Arlando Teller, our former  
12 board member. The reason we're even having it up in that area  
13 is because he made the request. So since he's no longer on the  
14 Board, I'd like to at least invite him to --

15 MR. ROEHRICH: Yes, ma'am.

16 CHAIRWOMAN BEAVER: Thank you.

17 MR. ROEHRICH: Yeah. We'll work on that.

18 So with that, if there are any other agenda  
19 items. We do capture the one for November to get a further  
20 update on our coordination on the State Route 69 project and the  
21 4th Street Bridge project. If there are any other agenda items,  
22 please let us know.

23 (End of recording.)  
24  
25

**Adjournment**

**A motion to adjourn the July 21, 2017 State Transportation Board meeting was made by Board Member Cuthbertson and seconded by Board Member Sellers. In a voice vote, the motion carries.**

**Meeting adjourned at 11:13 a.m. MST.**

  
Deanna Beaver, Chairwoman  
State Transportation Board

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