

STATE TRANSPORTATION BOARD MEETING MINUTES
 9:00 a.m., Friday, November 17, 2017
 Town of Wickenburg Council Chambers
 155 N. Tegner Street, Suite A
 Wickenburg, AZ 85390

Pledge

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

Roll call by Board Secretary Linda Priano

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

Absent: None.

There were approximately 30 people in the audience.

Opening Remarks

Chairwoman Beaver thanked the Wickenburg Chamber of Commerce staff, the Town of Wickenburg staff and past Board Member, Rusty Gant, for the coordination of arranging the lodging, hosting the evening reception and board meeting facility.

Joe La Rue stated when he first became a board member Wickenburg employees had done a great job of showing him Wickenburg's needs, strategies, and development opportunities. He recommended this also be done with the new board member coming on. Jesse Thompson wished everyone a Happy Thanksgiving and stated it was important to reflect on what we are grateful. He stated he was grateful for veterans and his heritage. Chairwoman Beaver also provided a brief history on a road bulletin that was published in the Arizona Republic on November 15, 1921.

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. Vince Loreface, Town Manager, Wickenburg, re: expressed his appreciation to the Board for coming to the area and stated they are always welcome. He also thanked ADOT for their partnership.
2. Christian Price, Mayor, City of Maricopa, re: invited Board Members to the SR347 Overpass Groundbreaking on November 20. He also discussed the passing of Prop 416/417 on November 7th and noted the plan includes \$30 million towards the fixing of SR347, which shows how important transportation is to Pinal County. He thanked the Board and ADOT for their continued partnerships.
3. Virgo Nez, Seba School Board, re: provided a letter from the Maye Bigboy, Principal of Seba Dalkai Boarding School, expressing the concern of current road conditions in the rural area of Navajo County, which is resulting in students being unable to get to school. He added he is surprised how well developed Wickenburg has become and would like to know how that was accomplished.
4. Vincent Gallegos, Director, Lake Havasu MPO, re: recognized Chairwoman Beaver for her time and service on the Board. He also expressed his appreciation for the partnership with ADOT staff and District Engineer, Alvin Stump. Mr. Gallegos also discussed the next Rural Transportation Summit on Agenda Item 14.
5. Charlie Odegaard, Flagstaff Councilmember, re: discussion under Agenda Item 7.
6. Craig Brown, Yavapai County Supervisor, CYMPO Chair, re: discussion under Agenda Item 7.
7. Billie Orr, Prescott Councilmember, CYMPO Board Member, re: discussion under Agenda Item 7.

STATE TRANSPORTATION BOARD MEETING – NOVEMBER 17, 2017

I N D E X

PAGE

ITEM 1: DISTRICT ENGINEER'S REPORT (Alvin Stump)	3
ITEM 2: DIRECTOR'S REPORT (John Halikowski)	5
ITEM 3: CONSENT AGENDA	10
ACTION TAKEN	
MOTION TO APPROVE CONSENT AGENDA.....	12
ITEM 4: LEGISLATIVE REPORT (Floyd Roehrich, Jr.)	12
ITEM 5: FINANCIAL REPORT (Kristine Ward)	14
ITEM 6: ROAD CONDITIONS ON TRIBAL LANDS (Jesse Thompson)	21
ITEM 7: PROPOSED PROJECT MODIFICATIONS TO THE FY2018-2022 FIVE-YEAR TRANSPORTATION FACILITIES CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM (Dallas Hammit)	25
ITEM 8: ARIZONA STATE TRANSPORTATION BOARD POLICIES (Floyd Roehrich, Jr.)	72
ITEM 9: DRAFT 2018 BOARD MEETINGS AND PUBLIC HEARING DATES AND LOCATIONS (Floyd Roehrich, Jr.)	73
ITEM 10: MULTIMODAL PLANNING DIVISION REPORT (Greg Byres)	77
ITEM 11: PRIORITY PLANNING ADVISORY COMMITTEE (PPAC) (Greg Byres)	82
ACTION TAKEN	
MOTION TO APPROVE PROJECT MODIFICATIONS ITEMS 11a through 11h	83
MOTION TO APPROVE NEW PROJECTS ITEMS 11i through 11n	85
ITEM 12: STATE ENGINEER'S REPORT (Dallas Hammit)	86
ITEM 13: CONSTRUCTION CONTRACTS (Dallas Hammit)	90
ACTION TAKEN	
MOTION TO APPROVE ITEM 13a.....	91
MOTION TO APPROVE ITEM 13b	92
MOTION TO APPROVE ITEM 13c.....	93
MOTION TO APPROVE ITEM 13d	94
MOTION TO APPROVE ITEM 13e.....	95
ITEM 14: RURAL TRANSPORTATION SUMMIT 20 YEAR ANNIVERSARY IN 2018 (Deanna Beaver & Floyd Roehrich, Jr.)	96
ITEM 15: SUGGESTIONS	114

1 (Beginning of excerpt.)

2 CHAIRWOMAN BEAVER: Now we will move into the
3 district engineer report. Alvin. I know you're replacing me on
4 the MPO board, so they'll be in good hands. Probably better.

5 MR. STUMP: I don't know about that.

6 Well, good morning, Madam Chair, Board and
7 Director. I'm going to give you a US-93 update. Corridor -- I
8 know this is hard to see, but I'll -- I'll just kind of point
9 out. These are all of the projects between I-40 and the Santa
10 Maria River. The blue boxes are all the projects that have been
11 completed, and the two red ones there in the middle are Cane
12 Springs and Carrow Stephens.

13 And then between the Santa Maria River and
14 Wickenburg, you can still -- there's several projects left, but
15 there are -- like the very bottom, red one, there's the Gap
16 project, and then the top red one's Big Jim Wash. So those are
17 some that were -- we have working.

18 The -- in -- next spring, we expect to advertise
19 the Carrow Stephens project. It's -- 35 and a half million is
20 the estimate, and then, of course, we'll talk more about the Gap
21 project in a minute. But then, right now, in our development
22 project, we have the Cane Springs project for 35 million in
23 fiscal year '23, and Big Jim Wash for 50 million in the fiscal
24 year '25.

25 And this is just kind of a little map to show

1 where these projects are. The additional one up there is the
2 West Kingman interchange in year '24 of the development program
3 for 55 and a half million.

4 We're working away on the Gap project. One thing
5 that's changed is we have divided it into two projects at the
6 request of the developer for -- just for their phasing. Project
7 A is from Wickenburg Ranch to 89-93, and then Project B is from
8 Tegner to Wickenburg Ranch.

9 Project A is 100 percent developer funded and is
10 planned to begin construction in the spring of 2019. Project B
11 is mostly funded by ADOT, but the developer will contribute the
12 difference between 9.8 million and the cost of Project A to that
13 project. And construction is looking to be sometime after July
14 of 2019.

15 And I know the exhibit's kind of hard to see out
16 there, but basically, this is Project A, which goes -- you see
17 it not only includes widening of -- from Wickenburg Ranch to 89,
18 but also the intersection and the approaches to the 89-93
19 intersection.

20 And then for Project B, of course, is going from
21 Wickenburg Ranch all the way down to Tegner, and includes quite
22 a bit of frontage road as well on that.

23 And so as far as their schedule, the developer's
24 planning to submit their 30 percent plans at the end of the
25 year. And as far as our Project B, we're basically at 30

1 percent. We'll be submitting those pretty soon.

2 The joint project with the developer is nearly
3 complete. We had to do some revisions, because we created -- by
4 creating two projects, we had to go back and make some changes,
5 and that's taken some additional time, but I expect we'll have
6 that done here in the next month or two.

7 So that's all I have. If you guys have got any
8 questions.

9 CHAIRWOMAN BEAVER: Is there any additional
10 questions?

11 Thank you.

12 MR. STUMP: Yeah.

13 We'll move on to Item 2, the Director's report.
14 Mr. Halikowski.

15 MR. HALIKOWSKI: Thank you, Madam Chair. It's
16 good to be back, and I'm happy to be here in Wickenburg, the
17 middle of nowhere, I guess, but lots of things are happening
18 around Wickenburg, so...

19 I just want to brief you on a few things. The
20 governor and I last week were in San Luis, Arizona, and joining
21 us were the mayors of San Luis in San Luis, Colorado. And the
22 purpose of the visit was for the governor to see the port of
23 entry. We have two there, San Luis 1 and San Luis 2, and to
24 look at how truck inspections were going. This is very
25 important to him from the perspective of the international

1 economy. Time is money, and we are concerned not only about
2 safety, but ensuring that the trucks that are approaching our
3 border are able to cross quickly.

4 San Luis 1, though, presents a different problem
5 to our economy in that it's previously pedestrian traffic, and
6 it's estimated that anywhere from 6 to 8,000 workers, depending
7 on the season, start lining up at 1:00 a.m. to cross over to be
8 in the fields by six o'clock in the morning. As you know,
9 during the winter, this becomes the nation's primary source for
10 all of the green vegetables and lettuce and salads that we eat.
11 So we're working closely with CBP, our Congressional delegation,
12 and GSA, who is planning a remodel of San Luis 1. And we'll
13 probably be moving not just commercial traffic, but also some
14 passenger traffic into San Luis 2 as the Presidential permits
15 get approved.

16 So looking at our port system, we'll begin
17 working with GSA and our partners in Mexico, because we are
18 going to be heavily involved with the county and local entities
19 in order to bring more efficiency to that entire network. And
20 as you know, the Board has been aware of the bi-national study
21 we're doing with the government of Mexico for Highway 15, which
22 leads right into Arizona, is in our -- the main artery.

23 All this becomes important in the future,
24 especially as we begin to discuss not only our own key commerce
25 corridors, but those we'll need in the future such as I-11. And

1 so the reason I bring this up is all of this is related not only
2 to our transportation system, but very heavily as a foundational
3 element to our economic improvement in Arizona.

4 The other two items, the first I want to bring to
5 you on is ADOT has launched an app called "ADOT Alerts," and
6 this is a new app that we have just put out. You can download
7 it for free in the app store, or if you have an android -- I
8 forget what the area is called that you can go into their and
9 download ADOT Alerts, also. And we got going on this based on a
10 number of reasons, but typically, the primary reasons are to
11 warn motorists of road hazards, the weather, and more
12 importantly, we're able to geofence that app so that we can warn
13 people within a 20-mile radius of wrong-way drivers on our
14 system. So this app has already been downloaded by thousands of
15 people. It's becoming very popular. We look for this as a new
16 tool in our arsenal to not only make our system more efficient,
17 but much safer as well.

18 And the last thing I want to talk about is the
19 governor is working closely with us through the Arizona
20 Management System on an effort to reduce fatalities. And ADOT
21 is working with DPS, the Governor's Office of Highway Safety and
22 our Department of Health Services, and we are focusing on the
23 increase that we're seeing in fatalities. We're due in Arizona
24 to probably have over 1,000 deaths on the entire transportation
25 system next year. That includes state highways, county roads,

1 cities, pedestrians, bicycle, all of the fatalities related to
2 the system. This is not the right direction to be moving in,
3 and the projections keep trending upwards and not downwards.
4 And so we're looking for root causes, which not surprisingly
5 will be probably related to impairment, speed, aggressive
6 driving, and we're focusing, also, in these areas, as two side
7 notes, the idea of wrong-way driving and also motorcycle
8 fatalities, which went up 53 percent in the prior year.

9 So we're working closely to bring that down,
10 because if you think about 1,000 people dying on our systems a
11 year, if we had four jumbo jets crash at Sky Harbor, something
12 would be done immediately, and yet this trickle effect of losing
13 more and more people. It's very difficult to change the culture
14 to get people to drive unimpaired and safely.

15 So you'll hear more on that as we begin to
16 produce the measurements and countermeasures that will be due to
17 the governor next year.

18 That's all I have, Madam Chairman. Thank you.

19 CHAIRWOMAN BEAVER: Thank you. And I'd also like
20 to thank you for your continued engagement with our border
21 communities and the international counterparts. Thank you.

22 Board Member Hammond.

23 MR. HAMMOND: Thank you, Chairman Beaver and
24 John.

25 Yeah. You've heard me say this before, but I

1 really thank you and applaud you for your attention to
2 cross-border trade, and certainly the governor's support of it
3 amid all of the -- kind of the negative rhetoric that comes
4 across these days on border issues.

5 And just to bring some of the point home, I don't
6 know how many of you have taken the time to see, for example,
7 the Mariposa port of entry in Nogales, where the lines coming
8 into the country -- there's two checkpoints, one right at the
9 border, and one about 50 miles south of the border -- can be as
10 long as three miles long. As John said, most of this is
11 produce. It's time dated. The port closes at 10:00 at night,
12 so if the truck shows up at one minute after 10:00, it sits
13 there running all night to wait for it to open up at 6:00 the
14 next morning. A lot of produce rots for various reasons along
15 that process and delay. So it's -- it is really a very, very
16 important economic issue to the State, and the governor has
17 really been correctly focused on, and John has taken the time or
18 the director has taken the time to really understand this issue,
19 participates on cross-border committees and commissions and
20 really understands this issue, and I thank you for it.

21 MR. HALIKOWSKI: Thank you.

22 I want to assure you it's not just meeting and
23 talking. We've already seen positive efforts come out with CBP
24 and Mexican Customs co-locating and doing one inspection instead
25 of one on each side. That's cutting inspections down from

1 sometimes four hours to eight to under 30 minutes in some cases.
2 So these are having a very positive effect. And the key is not
3 only to bring produce to us, most products before they're
4 finished cross the border up to four times. And the key will be
5 to locate businesses on both sides on the border that are
6 providing jobs to people and manufacturing our goods that we
7 make here, sell somewhere else and bring that money back to
8 Arizona.

9 CHAIRWOMAN BEAVER: Thank you.

10 Is there anyone else that would like to --

11 MR. ROEHRICH: Well, Madam Chair, we have to be
12 careful about opening debate. This was not on the agenda.

13 CHAIRWOMAN BEAVER: Okay.

14 MR. ROEHRICH: And I know the director's awesome,
15 but if you want to tell him he's awesome, next time we'll agenda
16 it.

17 (Speaking simultaneously.)

18 MR. HAMMOND: I withdraw the compliment.

19 CHAIRWOMAN BEAVER: Okay. We'll move on.

20 The consent agenda. We do have just a little bit
21 of change with regard to Item 3L and 3M, which I think Dallas
22 will speak to at that time. So do we have a motion to approve
23 the consent agenda as presented with the exception of Item 3L
24 and 3M, which will be addressed separately?

25 MR. SELLERS: So moved.

1 MR. THOMPSON: Second.

2 CHAIRWOMAN BEAVER: Motion by Board Member
3 Sellers, seconded by Board Member Thompson as -- to approve the
4 consent agenda as stated.

5 All those in favor?

6 BOARD MEMBERS: Aye.

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

9 Dallas, would you like to speak to Item 3L and
10 3M?

11 MR. HAMMIT: Thank you, Madam Chair, members of
12 the Board. And if it pleases the Board, I can take them both
13 together, because it's the same issue.

14 CHAIRWOMAN BEAVER: That's fine.

15 MR. HAMMIT: On both of these projects, one's a
16 project -- 3L is in Yuma county. It's a local project. Item
17 3M is a bridge project on US-160. On this, the department is
18 working with the contractor reviewing their DBE submittals.
19 They were not ready for today's action, and so we requested the
20 Board postpone action to a future board meeting so we can work
21 out the DBE concerns.

22 CHAIRWOMAN BEAVER: Okay. Thank you.

23 Do we have a motion, and since we combined them,
24 do we have a motion to accept and approve staff's recommendation
25 to postpone Item 3L and 3M as presented?

1 MR. HAMMOND: So moved.

2 CHAIRWOMAN BEAVER: Motion by Board Member
3 Hammond. Second?

4 MR. STRATTON: Second.

5 CHAIRWOMAN BEAVER: Second by Board Member
6 Stratton.

7 If there's no further discussion, all those in
8 favor?

9 BOARD MEMBERS: Aye.

10 CHAIRWOMAN BEAVER: All those opposed? The
11 position carries.

12 MR. HAMMIT: Thank you.

13 CHAIRWOMAN BEAVER: Thank you.

14 Now we'll move on to Item 4, the legislative
15 report. Mr. Roehrich.

16 MR. ROEHRICH: Thank you, Madam Chair. And I'll
17 just give it from here if that's okay.

18 CHAIRWOMAN BEAVER: Perfect.

19 MR. ROEHRICH: The 2017 federal transportation
20 grant season has already started, and ADOT has submitted
21 candidates for both the TIGER grant and the INFRA grant. So the
22 ninth round of the TIGER grant program is open, and ADOT has
23 submitted the ultimate buildout for the full project on State
24 Route 189, connecting the Mariposa port of entry in Nogales with
25 Interstate 19. This project would make much easier and access

1 improvements along State Route 189, as well as enable dedicated
 2 I-19 on and off ramps for traffic management movement, as well
 3 as take care of a safety concern at the heavily congested
 4 intersection at Frank Reed Road.

5 The Department's INFRA submittal is an innovative
 6 approach to resolving the congestion and capacity problems of
 7 I-17, in which relatively minor accidents can result in -- who
 8 wrote this -- full highway closures lasting for hours on end.

9 Basically, we're going to submit an Interstate 17
 10 project to have widening, a general purpose lane in each
 11 direction from Anthem to Black Canyon City, as well as a set of
 12 reversible lanes from Black Canyon City to Sunset Point that
 13 will allow four lanes of traffic in peak hours to go
 14 directionally either north or south, depending upon the traffic
 15 demand, holiday weekends and things like that. It gives us an
 16 opportunity as well to help manage the traffic accidents along
 17 that corridor, as well as the whole movement of traffic. Both
 18 the INFRA and TIGER grants received strong and widespread
 19 support from throughout the State, including the governor and
 20 our Congressional delegation. So we're hopeful as the US DOT
 21 evaluates those that we'll be successful.

22 The second topic is the infrastructure package is
 23 still on hold. Although there's been a lot of talk out of
 24 Washington about a bipartisan support, the package -- the
 25 infrastructure package continues to be on hold while Congress

1 addresses many of the other issues related to health care as
 2 well as tax reform and other topics. They're hoping to see
 3 Congress come together on a non-divisive issue, such as
 4 rebuilding the nation's roads and bridges, although we'll likely
 5 have to wait until next year to see any signs of progress.

6 And then the last item to update is the rumors
 7 out of -- we've been hearing and seeing articles on about the
 8 potential of a tax -- gas tax increase, and although the
 9 President and (inaudible) officials have indicated that there's
 10 a possibility of supporting a gas tax as part of an
 11 infrastructure package, those discussions have been, let's see,
 12 tabled as they continue to look at completing these other issues
 13 before they attempt to take on an infrastructure package. So
 14 we're monitoring the issues, the conversation coming out of
 15 Washington, D.C., but it doesn't look like -- infrastructure may
 16 not be an issue that gets addressed this issue, will roll into
 17 next year.

18 And that's the update we have on the legislative
 19 report.

20 CHAIRWOMAN BEAVER: Thank you.

21 Okay. Now we will move on to the -- Item 5, the
 22 financial report. Kristine Ward.

23 MS. WARD: Good morning.

24 CHAIRWOMAN BEAVER: Good morning.

25 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Good morning.

1 MS. WARD: So I am happy to report that I have a
2 brief report.

3 You have a new toy up here. Let's see.

4 So starting off with HURF. The last couple of
5 months, I have been reporting we have been out of our target
6 range, and I'm happy to report that we have come back into
7 target range with 472, almost 473 million collected year to
8 date, and now we are just a bit below forecast, .7 percent. We
9 are examining still, and you'll see it in your report, and
10 Mr. La Rue, we discussed it briefly, but I noticed something
11 post our discussion. We are examining a singular item that has
12 impacted our use fuel forecast, and we're kind of digging into
13 seeing what that individual element is, and I'll report back if
14 it's something significant that is essential.

15 All right. Moving on to RARF. This is a neat
16 thing, but (inaudible).

17 MR. ROEHRICH: Kristine, could you come up to the
18 microphone a little bit? You're fading out as you a back away.

19 MS. WARD: Sure thing, Floyd. I'm on it.

20 MR. ROEHRICH: Thank you.

21 MS. WARD: On the -- with regards to RARF, we,
22 again, are within forecast. We're .7 percent above forecast
23 with contracting doing well; retail sales 3 percent over last
24 year, and restaurant and bar 4.7 percent over last year.

25 Now, with regards to the federal program, I

1 believe Floyd referenced the tax -- excuse me. Let me turn the
2 pages here. There we go. The impacted tax reform. There is
3 one particular element that is being discussed in both the House
4 and the Senate bill that are being bantered about with regards
5 to advanced refunding. And basically, what that means is
6 that -- that particular element, currently, the way statute, the
7 regulations are set up, we have flexibility, more flexibility
8 about when we refinance our debt. What they're talking about in
9 both of these bills will basically take that flexibility, a
10 large portion of that flexibility away from us in that we will
11 not be able to do refundings as frequently as we otherwise
12 would. What that flexibility means is that we can go into the
13 market at the most opportune times to get the most savings by
14 refinancing our debt to a lower interest rate. In recent years,
15 we've -- I have come to this board numerous times in my tenure
16 with ADOT, and we have done refinancings that have resulted in
17 33 to 38 million dollars worth of savings from a single
18 refunding. So needless to say we are watching what is being
19 debated quite a bit, because that flexibility will be -- if we
20 lose that flexibility, it will be quite disappointing.

21 On that very cheery note, I conclude my report,
22 and I would gladly take any questions.

23 CHAIRWOMAN BEAVER: Thank you.

24 Do we have any questions? Board Member La Rue?

25 MR. LA RUE: Madam Chair, (inaudible) Kristine

1 for that provision that you're talking about not only affects
2 just transportation organizations, but that's across the board
3 if you (inaudible) any kind of tax exempt bonds. I mean --

4 MS. WARD: Uh-huh.

5 MR. LA RUE: -- hospitals, universities, schools,
6 you name it. I mean, it's across the board, correct? And which
7 means that it's -- the entire country is going to weigh in on
8 that issue, I think.

9 MS. WARD: Yes. Madam Chair, Mr. La Rue, you're
10 correct. And understand that every time we do one of those
11 refinancings, and I say 33 to 38 million dollars, what that
12 means is our -- essentially, our mortgage payment has gone down.
13 Those are dollars that now can flow back into the program to be
14 programmed for other projects. So...

15 Nothing else? That concludes my presentation.
16 Oops.

17 MR. HALIKOWSKI: You mentioned Mr. La Rue had
18 asked about use fuel, i.e. (inaudible) fuel. Are we seeing a
19 downturn in revenues?

20 MS. WARD: We are -- we have seen in the first
21 part of the year, we have been well below forecast, and that is
22 due to a single refund, an IFTA refund that I was trying to
23 avoid explaining the International Fuel Tax Agreement at this
24 board meeting. But yes, we have found a single refund that --
25 for about one and a half million dollars. So it represents

1 about a 10 percent hit on our forecast.

2 MR. HALIKOWSKI: So Madam Chair, I just want to
3 say to the Board and the audience, we often think of electric
4 vehicles being personal passenger vehicles, but in tracking the
5 motor carrier industry, it's becoming very apparent that
6 electric trucks are coming, and they're getting much more
7 efficient in their capability, and it's not just electric
8 trucks. As I talked to some of the heads of the organizations
9 running major carriers, like Swift, United Parcel, you name it,
10 they're going to compress natural gas, and Arizona taxes neither
11 of those as a propulsion source as we do diesel. So when we
12 talk to policymakers, I think we want to be aware that we need
13 at some point to discuss how we bring Arizona law up to speed --
14 no pun unintended -- to talk about how we tax, whether it's C
15 and G, whether it's hydrogen, whether it's any of those other
16 propulsion sources otherwise from diesel, because I think we're
17 going to continue to see this, this downturn in our use fuel
18 collections as more and more of these vehicles come online.

19 So when folks talk about, hey, we would support a
20 10 cent gas tax increase, we're not just looking at gasoline.
21 We should be looking across the board at all these propulsion
22 sources.

23 CHAIRWOMAN BEAVER: Board Member La Rue.

24 MR. LA RUE: Yeah. Madam Chair, if I may,
25 Director, that's exactly why I asked the question. Thank you

1 for that follow-up.

2 And I think part of looking at that was not --
3 was also looking at our modeling to say, can we now with the
4 modeling project out and really raise this as a urgent issue,
5 because people see it kind of, you know, like a drip, drip,
6 drip. Well, you know, depending on how it's built into our
7 modeling, that drip, drip, drip turns into a flood downstream,
8 and so we need to really raise the urgency of that, and that's
9 what I was trying to hone in on seeing that trending down. Was
10 it a one-time event and we're not seeing this, or if it is,
11 like, the Director's pointing out, how do we raise that as a
12 more urgent issue than currently (inaudible)?

13 MS. WARD: Madam Chair, Mr. La Rue, the forecasts
14 that you see, that I present to you, have gone through a process
15 that has actually already incorporated that downward trend. So
16 what I'm -- the numbers I come to you with, we have convened
17 economists, transportation experts, to develop those forecasts,
18 and then they are indeed run through a model. But the
19 difficulty is, is imbedded in those calculations is already an
20 assumed reduction in growth, essentially, due to those factors.
21 So our -- the amount -- the degree of growth is being
22 diminished. We're not growing as fast because of these factors,
23 of the fuel efficiency factors.

24 MR. HALIKOWSKI: And if you take, Madam Chairman,
25 the fact that freight is projected to grow 35 percent over the

1 next 20 years, we want to get ahead of this and be looking at
2 bringing these revenues in as these vehicles convert over and
3 you see more freight on the highways.

4 CHAIRWOMAN BEAVER: Director Halikowski, do you
5 see this as something that maybe should be brought up at a study
6 session early next year where it can be addressed or --

7 MR. HALIKOWSKI: I don't know that it's worthy of
8 an entire study session. The Legislature's aware of it. We've
9 had discussion with the transportation chairman, and certainly
10 our administration is aware of it. How this gets wrapped up
11 into transportation changes right now, I don't know, but it's
12 certainly something that we're keeping folks aware of, and I
13 just wanted the Board to show up and ask how can we help. It
14 should be aware of this issue as we move forward. We're going
15 to need to work with our financial experts, because it's not
16 easy to tax, you know, electric car usage, and you're already
17 paying tax on the electricity that comes into your home. We
18 have to develop some sort of formula for C and G. Because right
19 now it's -- you know, we tax per gallon, per mile on diesel
20 fuel. So there's some work that needs to be done. It really is
21 just being aware that this is something that we want to get
22 ahead of.

23 CHAIRWOMAN BEAVER: Thank you.
24 Is there any other questions?

25 MS. WARD: Thank you.

1 CHAIRWOMAN BEAVER: Thank you.

2 We will move on now to Item 6, the road
3 conditions on tribal lands. Our Board Member Jesse Thompson
4 will provide a presentation on road conditions on tribal lands.

5 MR. THOMPSON: Thank you, Madam Chair and members
6 of the Board. Thank you for allowing me to make this
7 presentation today.

8 I'm going to be kind of focusing in on the Navajo
9 Nation, Hopi reservation, on the conditions, but I am assuming
10 that the conditions of roads that I'm going to talk about here
11 are similar, their conditions on other reservations as well, and
12 you do have a report that -- before you, and it kind of
13 summarizes how we were able to get the federal government to
14 look into the situation which I'm going to be talking to you
15 about.

16 So with that, again, thank you for allowing me
17 this time. Good morning and thank you for the opportunity an
18 important transportation concern within our state. I'll show a
19 few slides that demonstrates the poor condition of some of the
20 roads and school bus routes within Indian country, within our
21 Arizona state boundaries.

22 As you will see, the unacceptable condition of
23 these roadways and bus routes is causing our children to miss an
24 unacceptable amount of school year.

25 Hopi Route 60 that comes up, bus route on the

1 Navajo and Hopi lands within the Navajo County. Many days a
2 year this road is impassable for school children and access to
3 hospitals and other commerce. The detour route when this road
4 is impassable is nearly 100 miles.

5 As a father, grandfather and a county supervisor,
6 I know that our children on the Navajo Nation are having a hard
7 time getting to school because their dirt bus roads, including
8 culverts and bridges, wash out when it rains. Their parents
9 tell me when their children miss school, when their bus --
10 school bus has gotten stuck in the muck. I feel responsible for
11 doing something about it and appreciate the time to share this
12 important issue with you.

13 For the past years, Navajo County has been
14 helping the Government Accountability Office, or GAO, develop a
15 report to Congress that characterizes the condition of the roads
16 on tribal lands and recaptures an impact on school attendance.
17 This is what they found.

18 You have the report that's in front of you, so...
19 The video.

20 (Video played.)

21 MR. THOMPSON: Thank you.

22 You may be wondering what all this has to do with
23 the state of Arizona. In a word, "schools." We have -- just in
24 Navajo County alone, we have about eight or nine -- sorry about
25 that.

1 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Sorry about that. Sorry
2 about that.

3 MR. THOMPSON: Again, many students who live on
4 the reservation travel in school district buses to attend their
5 public schools off the reservation. And again, just in Navajo
6 County -- well, actually, look, the Navajo reservation and Hopi,
7 there's about seven school districts, and every day these buses
8 go on to these reservation (inaudible) to operate the
9 reservation school districts.

10 In summary, funding for tribal roads maintenance
11 is provided through the Department of Interior, not Federal
12 Highway Administration. However, in the last Federal Highway
13 bill, the FAST Act, Congress authorized construction funds to be
14 made available directly to certain tribes, including Navajo
15 Nation. Congress did this because they recognized that this
16 problem is real, but you have same. Nearly 25 percent of the
17 children are missing more than 15 days of school per year due to
18 impassable roads. This is not acceptable.

19 In addition, a driving force of commerce in the
20 state of Arizona is tourism, and millions of people come from
21 all over the world to see the Navajo Nation and, of course,
22 other Native American communities. The more they can see, the
23 more they can spend. Access means commerce and does nothing but
24 benefit the state of Arizona.

25 The purpose of my presentation today is to raise

1 awareness of this issue and problem. These roads may not be
2 under ADOT jurisdiction, but they are roads within our state
3 boundaries, and as stewards of the state transportation system,
4 I think it is important for us to be aware of this issue and to
5 look for every opportunity to provide support and assistance to
6 improve these conditions.

7 I believe there is a role for the State of
8 Arizona to play in tribal roads. It is in the State's best
9 interest to do so. Yes, there are multiple jurisdictions in
10 play, but that means there are multiple opportunities for
11 partnerships.

12 And there is precedent, like we have seen on that
13 screen right now. In 2013, US-89 south of Page collapsed.
14 After this happened, ADOT worked with the Navajo Nation and
15 multiple federal agencies to restore that road, and we did it.
16 We did it before. We can do it again. We can do it again. If
17 there is a will, there is a way. I believe we need to summon
18 that will together.

19 And thank you for your time. Again, thank you
20 very much. Again, any other additional information about the
21 report, the conclusion that (inaudible), they're all on your
22 desk. So thank you very much.

23 CHAIRWOMAN BEAVER: Would anyone like to ask
24 anything at this time?

25 Okay. Thank you Board Member Thompson.

1 MR. THOMPSON: Thank you.

2 MR. ROEHRICH: So Madam Chair, as you move into
3 Item 7, now would be the time I would recommend that you reopen
4 the call to the audience and bring up the three members who
5 wanted to speak to that specific topic, and then allow them to
6 speak, and then close the call to the audience, and then we'll
7 move on with staff's presentation on Item 7.

8 CHAIRWOMAN BEAVER: That sounded good. Without
9 repeating it --

10 MR. ROEHRICH: You know, those are words I've
11 never heard from my wife. Thank you, Mrs. Beaver.

12 CHAIRWOMAN BEAVER: We have, let's see, Charlie
13 Odegaard, Craig Brown, and Billie Orr. So I don't know. I will
14 allow you each to decide which is going to be in which order.

15 (Unintelligible conversation.)

16 MR. ODEGAARD: Thank you for having me this
17 morning. I'm glad to be here on this item. And thank you for
18 your support on this project. I was here along with you all
19 back in Payson earlier this year, and this is --

20 MR. ROEHRICH: Excuse me. Sir, could you
21 identify your full name and who you represent, please? .

22 MR. ODEGAARD: Yes. I'm sorry. I already
23 thought I had introductions, but I'll start again.

24 MR. ROEHRICH: You were introduced as "Charlie,"
25 so I want to make sure that (inaudible).

1 MR. ODEGAARD: Okay. Again, Councilman Charlie
2 Odegaard with the City of Flagstaff, and good morning.

3 And so this is a good opportunity for the City of
4 Flagstaff, for the Arizona Department of Transportation to work
5 on a project together concerning the 4th Street bridges over
6 I-40. We have brought dollars to the table, and I believe we've
7 brought more than 50 percent to the table, and we're just
8 looking for that difference. And I'm hoping that you'll find
9 this project very beneficial to you. I know you have already
10 dedicated 2 million for this project, and we were asking for
11 another 2 million, for a total of 4 million.

12 I believe there might be a little difference in
13 numbers coming forward with this project. It might be a little
14 higher, but I'm hoping with the good partnership that we have
15 between the City of Flagstaff and ADOT that we can still make
16 this project work for everybody and move this project along.

17 And so I just want to thank you for your support
18 on this, and hear what our teams have to say about this project.
19 And have a nice Thanksgiving and a merry Christmas. Thank you.

20 CHAIRWOMAN BEAVER: Thank you.

21 Now we'll move on -- hi, Billie.

22 MS. ORR: Hello. Thank you.

23 Good morning, Madam Chairman, members of the
24 Board. I'm Billie Orr, a councilwoman, City of Prescott. It's
25 great to be before you once again to talk about the widening of

1 State Route 69.

2 The State Freight Plan has State Route 69
3 identified as critical urban freight corridor. Just this past
4 Wednesday, the Federal Highway Administration approved the
5 freight plan. Highway 69 widening is a project that's simply
6 one mile, goes from six lanes to four lanes to six lanes. We've
7 talked many times about the hazardous driving that's in that
8 area. It is heavily traveled, and because of that, there have
9 been 582 crashes, 28 wildlife-related crashes; 462 of those are
10 rear ends and side ways, and there have also been four
11 fatalities. It is a much traveled area, as you were just in
12 Prescott, when you go through the city of Prescott down highway
13 80 -- 69.

14 CYMPO and the City of Prescott and Yavapai County
15 have fully funded the design of this project at \$1 million.
16 CYMPO has approved and programmed an additional \$1 million
17 toward construction. We are anticipating that it will not
18 exceed a \$10 million project cost, and we ask for your support
19 on getting this into the five-year plan. I talked to folks in
20 Prescott, Prescott Valley, Chino Valley, Dewey-Humboldt. It is
21 truly a regional situation, and you have to be there every day
22 to see the amount of traffic that's on that road. It's hard to
23 believe, but it's there, and because of the six lanes to four
24 lanes to six lanes, it is definitely a traffic hazard. So we
25 would appreciate your support. Thank you very much.

1 CHAIRWOMAN BEAVER: Thank you.

2 Now we'll move on to Craig Brown, Yavapai County
3 Supervisor.

4 MR. BROWN: Good morning, Madam Chair and Board
5 members. Nice to be back to see you again. Of course, you've
6 been seeing us probably just about once a month for, what, the
7 last six, eight months. So nice to see you all well and here
8 today.

9 Billie has said most of what I have to say, but I
10 wanted to point out again, this is an example of Yavapai County
11 and the cities and towns within our county, we're coming
12 together and working towards a common goal to provide for the
13 safety of and welfare of our citizens, and I think we took what
14 Board Member Stratton said very much to heart back in Mohave and
15 looked at our -- reworked our project so that we could come back
16 in and say that we have 100 percent funding of this project in
17 -- for design and move that forward, and had unanimous support
18 from our executive board which represents all those cities and
19 towns. And just wanted to say that we hope you will consider
20 putting this into the five-year plan. It has to do with the
21 safety and security of our -- of our folks. So thank you for
22 your attention. Appreciate the comments from Board Member
23 Stratton. We had to do some finagling, but we got it done.
24 Thank you.

25 CHAIRWOMAN BEAVER: Thank you.

1 Oh, no. I didn't see one from Mr. Bridges. Not
2 this time?

3 MR. BRIDGES: No. I'm giving you a break this
4 time.

5 CHAIRWOMAN BEAVER: Okay.

6 MR. HAMMIT: Madam Chair, members of the Board,
7 most of my thunder was already taken. They give -- members of
8 the cities and the county give a good overview, but I'll give
9 you a couple things real quick on updates.

10 On the 69 project, as was stated before, we do
11 have a signed IGA for the design of the project. The moneys
12 have been received, and ADOT will be moving forward with the
13 design of that project. We advertised for a consultant
14 designer. That advertisement will take place right after the
15 first of the year, and we hope to have someone on board early
16 summer so we can start the design of the project.

17 Currently, in CYMPO's tip, in addition to the 1
18 million that they've put in for the design, they have -- if I
19 did my numbers right, 1.65 million. Is that what you have,
20 Chris?

21 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: No.

22 MR. HAMMIT: 650, 650 and 350?

23 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: I think (inaudible).

24 MR. HAMMIT: Okay.

25 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Yeah. So just \$1 million.

1 MR. HAMMIT: Okay. I must have -- so there's
2 \$1 million that they're putting towards the final construction
3 of the project. Right now, we have an estimate, as was said,
4 close to \$10 million. As design would go forward, that would be
5 refined to a better number. And that's pretty much the update
6 for that project.

7 I can brief 4th Avenue -- or 4th Street, or do
8 you want to ask questions on this one before we move on?

9 CHAIRWOMAN BEAVER: Is there any additional
10 questions on this particular one right at this time?

11 MR. STRATTON: Not right now.

12 MR. HALIKOWSKI: Madam Chair, I have a question.
13 Do you have a question, sir?

14 MR. LA RUE: I do. So when you say --

15 CHAIRWOMAN BEAVER: Board Member La Rue.

16 MR. LA RUE: Thank you, Madam Chair.
17 When you say \$10 million, is that entire project,
18 or is that just construction only?

19 MR. HAMMIT: From what I've been briefed, that
20 was on the construction only.

21 MR. LA RUE: Construction only.

22 MR. HAMMIT: But we have a scoping that's been
23 amended a couple times. So once we get into design, one of the
24 first things we would do would -- refine the scope and then get
25 a good estimate.

1 MR. HALIKOWSKI: So Dallas, I just had a
2 question.

3 CHAIRWOMAN BEAVER: Director Halikowski.

4 MR. HALIKOWSKI: Thank you, Madam Chair.

5 CYMPO has sent us a resolution on I-17 and
6 getting that widened under what seemed to be by any means
7 necessary in the future, and I know we're trying very hard to
8 put some funding together for that widening of 17 to ask for the
9 INFRA grant and also have State money to bring forward. If this
10 is a \$10 million project, and CYMPO's bringing 10 percent, and
11 the we'll have to put in the other 9 million, is this going to
12 affect the I-17 funding?

13 MR. HAMMIT: Right. Madam Chair, Director, in
14 our program, in -- if it's within the five year program, any
15 projects that would come in, we would have to take something
16 out. This being an expansion project, with our current funding,
17 our current long-range plan funding between preservation,
18 expansion and modernization, you're right. This would compete
19 with I-17.

20 MR. HALIKOWSKI: Thank you.

21 MR. STRATTON: Madam Chair.

22 CHAIRWOMAN BEAVER: Yes. Board Member Stratton.

23 MR. STRATTON: You can probably direct it to --
24 well, to whomever, Dallas or John. You said it would compete
25 with I-17. Could it not compete with any project in the Greater

1 Arizona area on -- for anything on the five-year plan, or does
2 it have to be I-17? And are there any other funds available,
3 contingency or otherwise?

4 MR. HALIKOWSKI: Well, I'll let Dallas chime in,
5 but we had discussions, you know, last year about State Route
6 189 when we accelerated that particular project, and we were
7 looking at not just doing phase one, but phase two. And we
8 alerted the Board at that time that in order to accomplish phase
9 two, if we were able to get the private funding component, which
10 has come together in Nogales from the industry, the Board might
11 consider putting an additional 25 in to get phase two done. So
12 that's another project that this would be competing against,
13 potentially, because somewhere we've got to come up with that
14 25 million.

15 When you look at the amount of capital you have
16 for Greater Arizona, there's not a lot out there beyond, you
17 know, that 25. Certainly you can move things around, but that
18 means either we take a hit somewhere else or perhaps in the
19 maintenance budget. And, you know, again, I know it's kind of
20 maybe a little joke about I-40, but we've got some serious
21 issues with reconstruction out there. So I just want the Board
22 to be aware this is an issue as we move forward, because it
23 also, then as we start to address the 4th Street issue -- I
24 mean, do I give priority to that with Flag bringing more than 50
25 percent in? So these become questions of where are we going to

1 pull money from, because there is an effect, I believe.

2 MR. HAMMIT: Madam Chair, Mr. Stratton, the
3 director covered it pretty well, but in the -- in our
4 programming, we have one project in Greater Arizona using the
5 expansion, and that is I-17 in '20 and '21. If we took it out
6 of preservation, yes, there's other funds in Greater Arizona,
7 but then we get the preservation program or -- and that's broken
8 up between bridge and pavement, or we take it out of the
9 modernization. And one of the challenges with modernization is
10 a lot of that is our safety program, which has to meet some cost
11 benefits.

12 Now, 69, I think, could qualify. Part of the
13 process going through the development would be to evaluate that,
14 but again, it would take something -- remove something else off
15 the item, because we have fully programmed our budget.

16 Contingency -- and Kristine knows it better than
17 I do -- our contingency is the current year. We start pretty
18 much with nothing for that future year. So there's -- we don't
19 build in one for a future year. It's only for the current year.
20 It's any contingency.

21 MR. HALIKOWSKI: And I just want to be clear,
22 Madam Chairman, Board Member Stratton. It's not that this isn't
23 a worthy project, but there's a process with -- when we develop
24 the five-year plan that we would bring it forward, you know, and
25 look at it through that process. So I don't know if you have

1 anything to add to that.

2 MR. HAMMIT: No. If the Board was looking for a
3 recommendation, at least from the state engineer, is we put this
4 in and compare it to all projects we come into. This is
5 bringing in and funding, and our Planning to Programming -- and
6 I confirmed that this morning -- that is something that would be
7 -- give it more value when we compare with all projects. So as
8 we go through our programming cycle, every project put in, and
9 our system has become more robust. We can show the Board not
10 only how it compares with all projects put into it, but if we
11 decide to take money out of one area, say, increase expansion,
12 or -- and Chairman Beaver, you've seen the Decision Lens in
13 work. We can show this will -- if we spend money here, this is
14 what happens to other parts of our program. It will -- this
15 will happen to our preservation or how the level of service
16 changes on these roadways. So we can show the Board that during
17 the programming cycle.

18 MR. STRATTON: Madam Chairman.

19 CHAIRWOMAN BEAVER: Board Member Stratton.

20 MR. STRATTON: Correct me if I'm wrong, but I
21 believe when we were in Payson to adopt or -- yeah, Payson -- to
22 adopt the five-year plan, at that time I asked about the
23 possibilities of putting it in the five-year plan, and I was
24 told that we don't do things contingent upon the signing of the
25 JPA or the CYMPO allocating the funds officially and such. And

1 so I was in agreement that we would bring it back up when that
2 was happening, which is now.

3 Do you want to take these items separately, Madam
4 Chair or individually, or does it -- after the presentation is
5 done?

6 CHAIRWOMAN BEAVER: Do you have additional
7 presentation to make?

8 MR. HAMMIT: I was going to brief on 4th Street.
9 No more on 69.

10 CHAIRWOMAN BEAVER: Okay. Why don't we do it --
11 let him go ahead and finish up. Okay.

12 MR. HAMMIT: On 4th Street, the project there,
13 there wasn't a JPA for the scoping, that ADOT and the City
14 worked together. As of this week, we did get some language to
15 begin an agreement between ADOT and the City for funding a joint
16 project. The numbers I received this week -- and it was said
17 that the scoping came in a little higher than some of us thought
18 it would, but our process once we get under design, we can look
19 for value engineering, how can we put it -- lower it.

20 But currently, the estimated cost including
21 design on this one is \$11.225 million. There is money
22 recommended -- or proposed from the City of \$5 million, which --
23 and then the State would have \$6.25 million needed to do that.

24 In the current program, in fiscal year 2020, ADOT
25 does have \$3 million in the program to rehab the existing

1 bridge. The current project that's being proposed would widen
2 the bridge but also lengthen the bridge. It's going over
3 Interstate 40, and that lengthening would accommodate future
4 expansion whenever that took place in the future for I-40 in the
5 Flagstaff area.

6 That's all I had on the update on that one.

7 CHAIRWOMAN BEAVER: Thank you.

8 Mr. Stratton.

9 MR. STRATTON: So if my math is correct,
10 basically, we would have to come up with another four and a half
11 million to replace the bridge rather than just repair it.

12 MR. HAMMIT: The -- we have 3 million -- if,
13 what, ADOT would have though come up with?

14 MR. STRATTON: Yeah.

15 MR. HAMMIT: Would be a little over 3 million,
16 3.25.

17 CHAIRWOMAN BEAVER: Is there any other additional
18 question?

19 MR. STRATTON: And do we have a signed JPA with
20 them?

21 MR. HAMMIT: We do not.

22 MR. STRATTON: Where about in the process --

23 MR. HAMMIT: We got the -- the numbers came in
24 this week to start the process with the JPA.

25 MR. STRATTON: Thank you.

1 CHAIRWOMAN BEAVER: I would just like to share a
2 concern, and I won't be on the board, so I guess it won't have a
3 whole lot of impact. But it seems to me that we were going with
4 the funding where we were going more towards preservation.
5 There's this gradual thing where, you know, when we had our
6 graphs and all that kind of stuff. You could see where -- where
7 the changing was coming. So I'm thinking where all is this --
8 these type of projects going to fit in if we're moving
9 everything towards preservation. And these communities are
10 bringing dollars to the table. Is it possible within the -- you
11 know, the discussion goes on this coming spring that maybe the
12 Board would want to look at not accelerating the preservation as
13 much as -- it looks like in order to accommodate these type of
14 projects. That was just something --

15 MR. HAMMIT: Madam Chair, yeah. The Board is
16 going to be in an unenviable position. As Mr. Byers presented
17 last month in the long-range plan, to meet -- to stay where
18 we're at with our preservation, we need to put in about
19 \$320 million a year. If we got to that level, that wipes out
20 expansion in the future. With revenues on a 1990 level, last
21 time we changed it, to continue expanding, we don't have the
22 funds to continue to do both. We're going to have to make a
23 decision. Do we maintain our infrastructure as we have it? And
24 that's not improving to a great deal, but to get it up out of
25 poor into fair and good condition. But if we do that, we're

1 faced with in Greater Arizona where there's no other revenue
2 sources not to expand.

3 MR. HAMMOND: (Inaudible.)

4 CHAIRWOMAN BEAVER: Board Member Hammond.

5 MR. HAMMOND: To you and the point that was made
6 earlier by John is that we're in a death spiral, and we --

7 MR. ROEHRICH: That's a little strong.

8 MR. HAMMOND: Everybody in this room needs to get
9 action (inaudible) increasing awareness that revenues need to
10 come into the transportation funding mechanism, whether it's
11 federal or state, and I think we all need to as much as we can
12 raise the awareness at the local level with our Legislature
13 (inaudible) because we are in a death spiral, so...

14 MR. STRATTON: Madam Chair.

15 MR. HAMMOND: And if I -- if that was an
16 inappropriate comment, I withdraw it, John.

17 MR. HALIKOWSKI: It's a little strong there.

18 CHAIRWOMAN BEAVER: Board Member Stratton.

19 MR. STRATTON: I'd like to add to that comment by
20 Board Member Hammond. I agree with him we have to have new
21 funding, but I also believe that we have to have a capable
22 partner with the local entities and cost share as we have done
23 with the Town of Maricopa, and as CYMPO and the City of
24 Flagstaff are proposing to do. That's the only way I can see
25 that we can stretch our dollars out until we receive new

1 fundings, alternate fundings of some type. So I definitely
2 would like to express my appreciation to the entities that have
3 come forward and are trying to help us, and kudos to you in your
4 communities that are doing this.

5 I do have one other question on Highway 69. With
6 the design going forward, apparently, this spring, we'll begin,
7 what year would that be ready for construction?

8 MR. HAMMIT: Generally, our -- Madam Chair,
9 Mr. Stratton, our design, we would look to have those done in
10 two years.

11 MR. STRATTON: So about 2020.

12 MR. HAMMIT: 2020.

13 MR. STRATTON: Okay.

14 MR. HALIKOWSKI: Madam Chair.

15 CHAIRWOMAN BEAVER: Yes. Director Halikowski.

16 MR. HALIKOWSKI: And I want to be clear, too, is
17 that ADOT values these partnerships and folks bringing money
18 forward. As we've seen with City of Maricopa, we've been able
19 to do some great work there. But although "death spiral" is a
20 little strong, I guess the thing I would say is that things are
21 getting tighter and tighter, because costs are going up, and
22 revenues are basically flat. And so when we talked about these
23 partnerships, you know, I want to be clear that the funding is
24 important, but then we have to look at priorities, as Dallas
25 said, and you've indicated on maintenance. Just because

1 funding's coming to the table, that may not tip it over into
2 being a priority project, and I think we need to be more
3 transparent with the Board through this Decision Lens process of
4 what needs to move forward first. And even though there may be
5 money on the table, we may not be able to match it in the
6 future.

7 The other thing I think that's critical is when
8 is the funding available? Because I think on one of these
9 projects, the money wasn't going to be available from the local
10 entity all up front. It was going to come over time. So that
11 also has to figure in to our calculations instead of how we do
12 these things.

13 So -- but I do want to echo Board Member
14 Stratton. I think it's important that we continue to discuss
15 and work these and see how we can -- how we can accomplish, but
16 there are going to be, I think, increasingly tightened
17 restraints as we look forward unless something changes.

18 CHAIRWOMAN BEAVER: Board Member La Rue, were
19 you...

20 MR. LA RUE: Madam Chair, I think maybe the
21 director said most of what I was thinking, and so maybe I'll
22 just make it brief.

23 So on the -- well, first off, I want to say, you
24 know, these communities coming forward, this is exactly what
25 we've been talking about for many years is let's partner. Let's

1 talk. Let's bring all the stakeholders in. So this is exactly
2 the (inaudible) we've been talking about.

3 But let me address the Flagstaff. So the
4 Flagstaff one, I am very with interested if we can, you know,
5 find a way to add additional 3 million and cure a significant
6 issue there, but we've also said we don't really advance on
7 these things unless there is that joint agreement in place and
8 then signed. So I -- that one to me still seems a little
9 premature, even though they did a lot of great work there. I
10 see this is up for action today, but that's that gives me pause
11 and concern, because there is no signed document.

12 On the 69, you know, that one, you know, we've
13 watched it quite awhile. We're seeing the work there. It's one
14 that it sounds like we've got something signed, but what I -- I
15 guess what I -- my expectation was is because we know we have to
16 move something, because we know we have to slot it in, I wanted
17 to kind of seeing that balancing the priority before I would
18 take action on it. And I'm not hearing that today. I'm hearing
19 that it would bump something, but we don't what that's to bump.

20 And we -- this board was very judicious when it
21 adopts its plans to really look at that, think about that, and
22 my recollection on the discussion on these projects then was we
23 really like the direction its headed, and if (inaudible) bring
24 it back mid cycle to try to fit it in the plan. But I think, at
25 least for the next 30 days that I'm on here, I really want to

1 look at it how it fits into the five-year plan, what adjustments
2 we're making before, you know, I would take action on it. So if
3 that --

4 MR. STRATTON: Madam Chair, if I may.

5 MR. HAMMIT: Clarification real quick. On the
6 69, we do have a JPA in place for the design, but we have not
7 executed one for the construction. And here's a problem that we
8 had, and it's come to my light in the last two months or so. We
9 put ourself in a (inaudible). I should not have my staff sign a
10 JPA with any of these committing the Board --

11 MR. LA RUE: Right.

12 MR. HAMMIT: -- to a project before the Board
13 approves it, and we've asked the community to have a signed JPA.
14 And so we kind of have a loop there that it puts us all in a
15 bind. So at some point we need to figure out a better way to do
16 that in there.

17 MR. LA RUE: That's a good point.

18 CHAIRWOMAN BEAVER: Board Member Stratton.

19 MR. STRATTON: I agree with you on that, but I
20 don't believe you can actually go to them, as you've said, with
21 a JPA until the Board puts it in the five-year plan somewhere.

22 MR. HAMMIT: Right.

23 MR. STRATTON: So what is the balance needed in
24 2020 that the current numbers, if they're coming up with their
25 million dollars?

1 MR. HAMMIT: Madam Chair, Mr. Stratton, to do
2 both projects or the 69 project?

3 MR. STRATTON: 69 project.

4 MR. HAMMIT: The -- it would be approximately
5 \$9 million.

6 MR. STRATTON: 9 million?

7 MR. HAMMIT: Yes.

8 MR. STRATTON: Okay.

9 MR. HAMMIT: Assuming that it's a \$10 million
10 project and the locals were bringing 1 million to the table.

11 MR. STRATTON: I agree with Board Member La Rue
12 that with the Flagstaff project, there's nothing we can do or we
13 should do until we have a signed JPA, and that may be the next
14 cycle. However, having the signed JPA with Highway 69 and with
15 the commitments that the CYMPO board has given us and what we
16 have asked for from communities to come forward, I'd make a
17 motion that in the year 2020 we have \$50 million slotted for
18 I-15. I'd make a motion that we reduce that amount by
19 \$9 million and fund the Highway 69 project in the five-year
20 plan, 2020.

21 CHAIRWOMAN BEAVER: I'll second it.

22 MR. ROEHRICH: Madam Chair, could I ask a
23 question? Do we need to name a particular project we're going
24 to pull it from?

25 MR. STRATTON: It would be the --

1 MR. ROEHRICH: But no. I'm saying I don't know
2 that that would be the -- that's the place to pull 10 million
3 from, and do we need to make that decision on where it's coming
4 from?

5 MR. HAMMIT: And I would -- one of my concerns
6 were if you have a project that's going to cost \$50 million to
7 do the bridges there, if I remove 10 percent of it, or almost 20
8 percent, I've removed the whole project out, and that would be
9 my concern. I don't know the cost in detail off the top of my
10 head, but losing that much may remove the whole project, and
11 that is a area that we do need to repair that bridge.

12 MR. STRATTON: Madam Chair, I was waiting until a
13 later item, and hopefully I can address this legally at this
14 point. But part of my thought process was by reducing the
15 bridges and I-15 by the 9 million, I was going to ask later that
16 in the work session in January, alternative funding for the I-15
17 be placed, what the alternates are, what the possibilities are,
18 and then in the next five-year plan, we could see how we could
19 fund that to replace that \$9 million at that point.

20 MR. ROEHRICH: So Madam Chair, if I could.

21 CHAIRWOMAN BEAVER: Yes.

22 MR. ROEHRICH: Mr. Stratton --

23 CHAIRWOMAN BEAVER: Mr. Roehrich.

24 MR. ROEHRICH: -- I think that's a fantastic
25 strategy, Mr. Stratton, but I think what that leads to is the

1 recommendation staff has made before to not action it now, not
2 action it now, but action it as part of the five-year program
3 development cycle. This is two years out from -- from now. So
4 it's the second year in the new five-year program in 2020,
5 because the next five-year program we're going to do is, what,
6 '19 to '23 or something like that.

7 MR. HALIKOWSKI: Right.

8 MR. ROEHRICH: So we're two years out, which
9 means we can have that discussion, exactly what you're doing
10 here. Where does the funding come from? Do we have other
11 options to address, whether it's I-15 or the sub-program,
12 wherever the funding's coming from. But the Board can do it
13 transparently and look at the full picture.

14 So which is why when this subject first came up,
15 we as staff had said, we think it's appropriate to talk about
16 these partnerships, look at these projects, but because they're
17 in outer years, let's do it as part of the programing cycle so
18 you can debate the full issue and the full impact.

19 And I think as you just said now, the fact that
20 we're supposed to start that in January with the new tentative
21 program, we'll be able to look within those first four years
22 plus the fifth year for opportunities to do this, and because
23 then it will go to a public hearing, so transparently, the
24 public can see and have a chance to comment on the actions we're
25 taking. We could address all these things and not delay those

1 projects, not impact all the coordination and the activity that
2 are going on today, but do it in a more logical and responsible
3 manner that addresses the full project to either minimize the
4 impact or mitigate any impact in order to bring these forward.
5 That is what we had requested before, and I'm guessing, Dallas,
6 that's still our recommendation today as staff, is -- is to
7 let's continue this and then bring it back as part of the next
8 programming cycle.

9 MR. LA RUE: Madam Chair, I --

10 CHAIRWOMAN BEAVER: Board Member La Rue.

11 MR. LA RUE: -- I really would like to support
12 this project, but I -- I'm very reticent as a board member to
13 support it when we specifically pull it from a project without
14 really due consideration of the entire plan. So I would urge
15 kind of an amendment to the motion that's on the floor.

16 CHAIRWOMAN BEAVER: Is there any additional?

17 I seconded it because I thought we needed to have
18 that additional discussion. I would like some kind of
19 assurance, though, if I'm to withdraw my second, that this will
20 be very much part of the serious consideration for the next
21 five-year plan.

22 MR. HAMMIT: Madam Chair -- I don't want to jump
23 in (inaudible).

24 MR. STRATTON: Madam Chair, I believe when we
25 were talking about the five-year plan adoption in June last

1 year, or this past June, I feel like I made some commitments to
 2 these people asking for things. They did those things. In
 3 talking with the director afterwards and about contingent
 4 things, and I believe we've done this in a responsible manner,
 5 that we've given the ability to get the JPA signed, and had it
 6 been signed in June, I believe that that's -- this project would
 7 be part of the current five-year plan. And now if we wait until
 8 the following June, next year to approve this, their planning
 9 can be done with the MPO; however, it can't be cast in stone,
 10 and it's hard for them to move forward with other projects and
 11 their planning process, also. I feel like they followed through
 12 with their commitment, and I feel like we need to follow through
 13 with ours -- or mine.

14 CHAIRWOMAN BEAVER: Dallas, I guess what my
 15 question would be, if there was to be some consideration of the
 16 current five-year program, making some changes to it to
 17 accommodate this, would -- is there moneys available in the
 18 preventative maintenance that has not been expended that maybe
 19 could be a source for making the adjustment versus I-15.

20 MR. HAMMIT: Madam Chair, members of the Board,
 21 in our program, in the first three years, which this would be
 22 the third year, we've identified projects for all of the
 23 preservation funds that we have. So if we did bring something
 24 out for a preservation, we'd have to either move it back or
 25 replace it some other way, and I really like the idea of, like

1 the director, a different funding source. But with what we have
 2 today, we'd have to push it back in the program anything on the
 3 preservation we do program amount for the first three years of
 4 the program. That -- did that answer your question?

5 MR. STRATTON: And -- Madam Chair.

6 CHAIRWOMAN BEAVER: Board Member Stratton.

7 MR. STRATTON: If we move something, it has to be
 8 from the Greater Arizona area, obviously.

9 MR. HAMMIT: Madam Chair, Mr. Stratton, that's
 10 true. (Inaudible.)

11 MR. STRATTON: And that's why, because of the
 12 proximity, I would assume that's why you talked about I-17 and
 13 (inaudible). However, just as I've said many times before, that
 14 the I-15 gives little benefit to Greater Arizona, and that is
 15 the one to place that I believe that could be easier made up on
 16 alternative funding sources or whatever, and that's why I
 17 suggested it there, which it is part of Greater Arizona.

18 MR. HALIKOWSKI: Yeah. So Madam Chair, Board
 19 Member Stratton.

20 CHAIRWOMAN BEAVER: Director Halikowski.

21 MR. HALIKOWSKI: Thank you.

22 I don't disagree with anything you've said. I-15
 23 does give very little economic benefit to Arizona. If I could
 24 give it back to UDOT, I would. Unfortunately, that's not the
 25 cards, and although it may give us very little economic benefit,

1 under federal law, we're responsible for it, and my concern with
2 those bridges, as I talked to the engineers, is that if we incur
3 a fatal flaw, the liability is pretty huge if something goes
4 wrong.

5 So my question to Dallas is that is there a way
6 to keep things moving forward on 69 while -- you know, in
7 completing the design and other issues, and while we work the
8 rest of the project into the five-year plan? Is there any
9 alternative so that we don't lose any time?

10 MR. HAMMIT: Madam Chair, Director, yes. We have
11 the funding for the design. We will move forward, begin the
12 design of the project. And to go to your question earlier, the
13 staff will make that very public how the project rates with
14 everything else in the program, and that will be very visible in
15 the next planning cycle, no matter if we put it in today or not,
16 because we're going to evaluate the whole program with our new
17 tools that we have with the Planning to Programming and Decision
18 Lens.

19 MR. ROEHRICH: Madam Chair, I do want to address
20 one thing, because I know Mr. Stratton, you keep bringing it up,
21 and I feel compelled to say it. You want us to redo the program
22 but look at alternative funding sources. I think it's important
23 to realize that's not a fiscally constrained option.

24 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Thank you.

25 MR. ROEHRICH: We have to use only existing

1 funding sources that we program it to. When we go after grants
2 or we look for other funding sources, that is in addition to the
3 programming process we went through, and if we're successful
4 with those, then it frees up funds that you then can repurpose
5 into another area.

6 What you can't do is make the decision that
7 while I'm going a \$25 million INFRA grant or \$25 million TIGER
8 grant, so I'm going to program 25 more million dollars. That's
9 like buying a lottery ticket to buy a car, because (inaudible)
10 win the lottery. You can't do that. And it's -- it goes
11 against fiscal constraint, and it's also going to go against the
12 Board's policy of ensuring that we are -- we have programmed to
13 what we have in actual, available funding.

14 So it's a strategy to go after to find funding
15 once a project's in the program and we're developing it, and
16 then if we're successful with that, it frees up money to be
17 reprogrammed, and then that comes through this board through
18 PRB, PPAC and other processes, other at the beginning of the
19 year when we develop a new program, Kristine will bring in,
20 okay, these funds (inaudible) because we got (inaudible)
21 redistribution, we got a grant, we got -- or those funds now
22 become available for programming, and this board goes through
23 that process.

24 MR. HAMMOND: Madam Chair.

25 CHAIRWOMAN BEAVER: Okay. Board Member Hammond.

1 MR. HAMMOND: You know, I -- there are so many
2 levels of conversation in this discussion that I don't even want
3 to go there specifically. But first of all, I can always
4 appreciate Flagstaff's persistence in bringing these projects
5 forward. I appreciate Board Member Stratton supporting them,
6 and I don't hear lack of support from the Board.

7 I am uncomfortable supporting a motion that
8 doesn't particularly tell me how it's affecting the entire
9 program. This -- I mean, but I do hear support for this
10 project. It seems to me it's a natural, if we as a board want
11 to reward the -- this project with funds based on whatever
12 criteria and need and persistence, this is made for a study
13 session where we actually have the item on how are we going to
14 adjust the five-year plan or -- it doesn't seem appropriate to
15 have it come to the Board in this manner, or it would be
16 something I'd probably utilize in the future if this is a
17 workable method of getting, you know, the projects that I care
18 about in southern Arizona.

19 So I think it's -- as it's currently -- as the
20 motion is currently (inaudible), I couldn't support it. If
21 there's an amendment that changed that, I'd like to hear it.
22 But it seems more appropriate for -- and I don't mean to
23 stonewall, because that -- I kind of get the impression that
24 maybe there's a perception that, you know, staff hasn't
25 prioritized this when it should. Maybe not. I mean, I

1 apologize to Board Member Stratton if I'm reading something into
2 your comments that are inappropriate. Probably am. But we have
3 to -- if we support this as a board, then it would seem that we
4 should find a way to put it in there, but this isn't the proper
5 way to do it. That's kind of (inaudible).

6 CHAIRWOMAN BEAVER: Board Member Stratton.

7 MR. STRATTON: I'm not in any way suggesting that
8 staff doesn't think this is an important project. So if it came
9 across that way, I apologize to staff. That is not my intention
10 at all.

11 But I to have a question for John and Dallas on
12 this. If we did -- if the Board did put this into the five-year
13 plan utilizing, just as an example, I-15, to pull out the
14 \$9 million, could we not -- and that would keep things fiscally
15 balanced and constrained. At that point, can we also -- could I
16 add an amendment to that motion saying that in the next cycle,
17 we reduce the pavement preservation projected amount for the
18 next five years by \$9 million, replacing that 9 million that
19 we're using right now, and that would just give the assurance to
20 CYMPO that this is in the five-year plan, and it would take care
21 of the chairman's wishes that it would be in the five-year plan.

22 MR. HAMMIT: Madam Chair, Mr. --

23 MR. HALIKOWSKI: Can I maybe suggest an
24 alternative to that? And the reason I'll suggest this is
25 because I'm really reluctant to recommend to the Board that we

1 pull away from pavement preservation. That, to me, is probably
2 the least desirable option, but what I want to ask Dallas, Madam
3 Chair, is so we have a certain amount of money we've set aside
4 for 17. Is it possible to reduce that by the \$9 million, we
5 keep 17 in the program instead of pulling it away from 15 or
6 pavement preservation?

7 MR. HAMMIT: Madam Chair, Director, it's
8 possible, but we did use -- Floyd briefed the Board on the INFRA
9 grant, and we used in our grant proposal that we had that 65
10 million in that year available --

11 MR. HALIKOWSKI: Uh-huh.

12 MR. HAMMIT: -- and made it for our -- in our
13 application. So we've already told the Federal Highway
14 Administration, if we get this grant, we have this much money
15 available. We asked for \$100 million. We said we're bringing
16 200 million to the table. If we took away from there, it would
17 put us in a bind.

18 MR. ROEHRICH: Madam Chair, I --

19 MR. HALIKOWSKI: Sorry. I'm trying to find an
20 alternative.

21 MR. ROEHRICH: At least the Board --

22 MR. HALIKOWSKI: Mr. Stratton, we're trying to
23 get you across the finish line here.

24 MR. ROEHRICH: Yeah. Exactly. (Inaudible) the
25 Board, the state engineer's comments with one exception. I

1 don't know that it's possible, because the problem we're going
2 to run in against, we programmed a project that we knew had a
3 specific scope -- at the time it was an estimate -- and an
4 estimate. So arbitrarily reducing that estimate without a
5 corresponding reduction in scope makes it not fiscally
6 constrained, because then it looks as if you're putting
7 placeholders in as far as the projects, and I don't believe that
8 that's in the intent within the federal laws of a fiscally
9 constrained program and project.

10 I think that, again, addressing this issue as
11 part of our programming cycle, Mr. Stratton, I think makes your
12 commitment and meets your commitment -- again, I don't know what
13 specific commitment you made. Maybe not. Maybe I should back
14 up. Because moving forward, we're still negotiating the
15 construction JPA. We're still defining the scope and -- or
16 excuse me -- the design for the estimate on the State Route 69
17 project. And in January, we're going to kick off the study
18 session with the tentative program, and we'll have a discussion
19 of how we can fit this in, but do it under the normal
20 programming cycle, and there will be no delay to that project or
21 no difference, in my mind, in delivering whether you action it
22 today with a bunch of contingencies or adjustments to the five-
23 year program and that may make it fiscally constrained, or may
24 make it unconstrained, which then becomes an issue, or we
25 address it as part of the programming cycle; it gets into the

1 five-year program in the appropriate spot without any
2 significant mitigations or impairments.

3 So to just to arbitrarily say, I'm going to go
4 into a project that's in the program and just reduce the
5 specific amount to do something else, I think, puts in jeopardy
6 whether that program's fiscally constrained, because the project
7 now is not the project, scoped and budgeted that went into that
8 program that made it fiscally constrained. Is there some
9 measure of that being the case?

10 MS. WARD: That's exactly the case. If you're
11 going to move forward with 69, you -- and you want to get the
12 full cost of it, you would have to identify a fully funded
13 something and remove the -- you have to remove all of 15 in
14 order (inaudible).

15 MR. HALIKOWSKI: Well, you can't move it out a
16 year (inaudible).

17 MS. WARD: (Inaudible.)

18 MR. HALIKOWSKI: But I guess going back to what
19 Floyd said, Madam Chair, Board Member Stratton, if we can work
20 this so that there's no delay in time and come back with the
21 five-year process, it may not be a single project. It may be
22 from multiple sources that we could find the \$9 million.

23 MR. HAMMIT: Right. Right.

24 MR. HALIKOWSKI: But that would give us some time
25 to identify where that money's coming from and give you

1 recommendation of least impact. But I want to reiterate, you're
2 telling me there would be no delay in the dates for delivery.

3 MR. HAMMIT: Madam Chair, Director, if it was
4 funded in the next programming cycle for 2020, it would -- we
5 could deliver it in 2020, if we do it today or if we do it at
6 the end of the next programming cycle. It wouldn't delay that
7 at all.

8 MR. STRATTON: Madam Chair.

9 CHAIRWOMAN BEAVER: Yes. Board Member Stratton.

10 MR. STRATTON: I have a question on this then.
11 All these obstacles are appearing now. When I was asking the
12 questions in June, it appeared a very simple thing: Reduce
13 something by the X amount of dollars that we need and put this
14 project in if the Board so chooses. So if it was going to be
15 this complicated, why weren't we informed before we adopted the
16 five-year plan back then rather than -- I almost feel like I'm
17 being stonewalled.

18 MR. HALIKOWSKI: Well, let me assure you it's not
19 my intention to stonewall you. I'm trying to get over the
20 finish line with this, Madam Chair, Board Member Stratton.
21 Perhaps we didn't give it enough due diligence back then to
22 think of the issues as we were trying to get the five-year
23 program across. I'm not saying it can't be done, that we can't
24 identify the funding for it. I don't know if you have another
25 response, but in my mind, we just haven't sat down to do that.

1 MR. SELLERS: Madam Chair.

2 CHAIRWOMAN BEAVER: Board Member Sellers.

3 MR. SELLERS: I guess I'm struggling with why it
4 would be a problem to do what Floyd was talking about. If it
5 doesn't delay the program, then why is that an issue in doing it
6 the way Floyd was suggesting?

7 CHAIRWOMAN BEAVER: Board Member Sellers, from my
8 standpoint, I think from what I'm hearing Mr. Stratton say, and
9 I know what I would like to hear, is some kind of assurance that
10 in the next five-year cycle, that it would be seriously looked
11 at with the intent of including it in the five-year plan.

12 MR. HAMMIT: If that's a question of me, Madam
13 Chair, yes, staff will bring it to the Board, and showing how it
14 evaluates with every project in the program. We are committed
15 to doing that.

16 CHAIRWOMAN BEAVER: Okay. I think the
17 difference, though, between how it evaluates and finding the
18 funds are the two different areas we're talking about, because
19 that to me sounds as though, well, we're just going to plug it
20 in there with all the rest, and then how it all unfolds, and if
21 it's high enough, then we'll go with it. If it's not, then we
22 won't. And I think because of the effort that they've put into
23 bringing those dollars to the project, I think is why -- that's
24 why I'm having a little bit of a hard time. That's what we
25 asked communities to do, and now they've done it, and now we're

1 saying, well, if it ranks high enough.

2 MR. HAMMIT: Madam Chair --

3 CHAIRWOMAN BEAVER: Am I hearing it wrong?

4 MR. HAMMIT: No, no. But as staff, we believe we
5 need to bring you the best projects, because we are losing
6 ground in our pavements and our bridges. And the reason -- I
7 don't want to speak for the director. The reason I would have
8 brought up I-17, that is the only expansion project shown in the
9 five-year program in those years. We have so few expansion
10 projects. So if we don't take it from I-17, we're taking it out
11 of a preservation or a safety project, modernization project.
12 So that's why that one came up. Wasn't because of proximity.
13 It's that's the only modernization -- or expansion project we
14 have in '20 and '21 in Greater Arizona. Almost the whole
15 program is preservation.

16 CHAIRWOMAN BEAVER: And see, I think those are
17 very important, but my concern is, is if we're looking at now
18 the funds that are available -- available through the statewide,
19 if we're now working, because it seems to me it was only a
20 couple years out, and we would be 100 percent, everything would
21 be going towards these preservation projects. I don't know. It
22 just seemed like it was totally -- there was -- you know, I
23 realize funds are tight, but it seems like everything now will
24 be focused just on preservation. And is there a way that we
25 could maybe back that up a few years?

1 MR. HALIKOWSKI: Well, certainly that's within
2 the Board's purview, Madam Chair. I will just tell you that
3 national studies, our own studies show that for every dollar you
4 delay in maintenance and preservation, you're going to pay \$7
5 down the road to fix it, and I'll use I-40 as an example. We
6 paved that two years in a row, or we paved it, and it lasted two
7 years, and we have to go back and completely reconstruct it.
8 Pavement is not a cure. In many cases, it's a Band-Aid, because
9 if you have to reconstruct the subbase, as we did with I-40, and
10 it's 50-year old porous concrete, it gets very expensive. And
11 so we're trying to stretch the life of the pavement out as long
12 as we can.

13 And I apologize to Board Member Stratton if we
14 weren't clear up front that, you know, this was going to have to
15 be added in, but we didn't explain all the ins and outs of
16 fiscal constraint and the other issues.

17 I'm not saying we can't do this, all I'm asking
18 for is that could we have a chance in the next cycle and make
19 the commitment that somehow we're going to work things around,
20 and we'll figure out where we come up with this and bring that
21 back to the Board for consideration? I just am really concerned
22 today if we identify a specific project, to pull it from that,
23 that has to move out. And if staff's assuring us that we can
24 accomplish the same time line and not lose any time on this and
25 keep this fiscally constrained in the next cycle, then we could

1 make that assurance today moving forward.

2 CHAIRWOMAN BEAVER: Board Member Thompson.

3 MR. THOMPSON: We've talked -- I've been working
4 with the Flagstaff Metropolitan Planning Organization, and
5 they're so dedicated 4th Street project and are very
6 appreciative of the fact that they're coming forward with some
7 dollars to reduce the amount that ADOT could be contributing to
8 the project, and I certainly do appreciate that. And on this
9 particular route that we're talking about, on 69, my first
10 question -- I don't know this, I don't know the history of it --
11 but have there been any local contribution towards I-15 or can
12 ADOT request more contribution locally, you know, so maybe
13 replace the dollar that might be coming out of? I know you said
14 that it's not something that, you know (inaudible).

15 MR. HALIKOWSKI: (Inaudible.)

16 MR. THOMPSON: (Inaudible.)

17 MR. HALIKOWSKI: With I-15, the problem we face
18 is that you've got eight bridges and their approaches within a
19 29-, 30-mile segment in a very sparsely populated area. The tax
20 revenues generated there are negligible at best. Because we
21 looked at why don't we fund them off the diesel taxes
22 specifically going through there, and if you could generate in
23 that short stretch even a million dollars a year, you're
24 probably doing well, because most people don't buy their fuel in
25 Arizona. It's just a pass through. So I wouldn't look for

1 local participation in I-15. We get federal dollars to maintain
2 the road and bridge system, and unfortunately, it's our
3 responsibility.

4 When we looked at alternative methods, i.e.,
5 tolling several years ago, governors of Nevada and Utah were
6 pretty upset with that idea. It's not that we are stop -- have
7 stopped looking at it, but we may have to figure out, if it's
8 not tolling, then some other alternative. There's a lot of
9 opposition to that, as you know, in Arizona.

10 So going back to that, it really isn't a local
11 fund issue. But I guess the other thing I'll point out is that
12 we're getting into the situation where I don't have enough money
13 to match other people's money to be able to spend it, whether
14 that's federal match that we have to meet with State dollars or
15 local communities match, and as the board are, again, unenviably
16 charged with deciding those priorities. We can bring you
17 recommendations, but if you decide to give preservation and
18 maintenance, you know, a decrease in funding, then that's what
19 the Board will do. All we can do is provide the
20 recommendations. If you want to move one project out and put
21 another one in, then again, we can give you the recommendation,
22 but that's your decision. So I would not look for local funding
23 on 15.

24 CHAIRWOMAN BEAVER: I see that it's possible,
25 maybe, the motion could be amended to -- with the assurance that

1 in the next five-year cycle, that there will be serious
2 consideration given specifically to the SR-69, because they --
3 the process is already started, in addition to the dollars that
4 they're willing to bring forward.

5 MR. HALIKOWSKI: Well, Madam Chair, rest assured
6 if the Board wants to put it in the five-year program, it's
7 going to be in there. I mean, it's not something that you
8 necessarily have to worry whether staff's going to bring it or
9 not. We'll definitely bring it, but I doubt after this
10 discussion the Board's just going to not put that in for due
11 consideration.

12 MR. STRATTON: Madam Chair, if I may.

13 CHAIRWOMAN BEAVER: Yes. Board Member Stratton.

14 MR. STRATTON: I would like to amend my motion,
15 and my amendment would be that I would make a motion that this
16 project be in the next five-year plan that is introduced to the
17 board in January, I believe it's going to roll it out.

18 MR. ROEHRICH: The tentative, program, yes, sir
19 will be rolled out --

20 MR. STRATTON: (Inaudible) --

21 MR. ROEHRICH: -- in January at the study
22 session.

23 MR. STRATTON: -- that this is scheduled in the
24 year 2020 in that program that comes to us, knowing that would
25 give some assurances to CYMPO. It would avoid this problem

1 right now, and would give Deanna and Board members the assurance
 2 that it will be in the program, I believe. So I would be
 3 willing to amend my motion that rather than impact or remove any
 4 single project that is currently in the five-year plan, to ask
 5 staff to see what projects, the scope can be looked at, the
 6 projects can be reduced by whatever amount they may be until you
 7 come up with the \$9 million that's needed to complete this
 8 project in 2020.

9 MR. ROEHRICH: Wow, that's a long motion. How
 10 about we just -- how about we just go back, Mr. Stratton, and
 11 say that I want a motion that the -- the State Route 69 project
 12 be included in the next five-year program and leave it at that,
 13 and then we'll work out the specifics and bring it back to you,
 14 all the actions that you said.

15 MR. STRATTON: Agreed.

16 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Second.

17 CHAIRWOMAN BEAVER: And I'll -- okay. Do I need
 18 to renew my second or amend my second?

19 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: (Inaudible.)

20 CHAIRWOMAN BEAVER: (Inaudible.)

21 MR. THOMPSON: Madam Chair, at this point --

22 CHAIRWOMAN BEAVER: Board Member Thompson.

23 MR. THOMPSON: Just one question. Dallas, what's
 24 your reading on the issue on the 4th Street at this point?

25 MR. HAMMIT: Madam Chair, Mr. Thompson, I guess I

1 don't understand the question, "the reading."

2 CHAIRWOMAN BEAVER: I think what he means --
 3 excuse me.

4 MR. THOMPSON: Go ahead.

5 CHAIRWOMAN BEAVER: But is it to how --

6 MR. THOMPSON: Yeah.

7 CHAIRWOMAN BEAVER: -- it moves forward? What is
 8 the next step that needs to be done for them to be as seriously
 9 considered as we are SR-69 if this motion passes?

10 MR. HAMMIT: Right now, as I read the recitals
 11 that came in this week for the JPA, one, they identified
 12 funding, and I may have missed it, but in what I was briefed on,
 13 I didn't see a year. So that would be something we'd want to
 14 clarify, and it could be there and I missed it, but I didn't see
 15 the funding's available in this -- whatever year it is. And
 16 then -- and maybe that's because we don't have design started.
 17 So I don't want to tell you when my cash is going to be ready
 18 until I know you have a design that can pay for it. I wouldn't
 19 want to put up my money until I knew you were going to spend it.
 20 So we need to work that out and set up a schedule with the City
 21 and do that. They may have that, but I'm not aware of it.

22 CHAIRWOMAN BEAVER: Does that --

23 MR. HAMMOND: Can I ask for a clarification?

24 CHAIRWOMAN BEAVER: Yes, Board Member Hammond.

25 MR. HAMMOND: (Inaudible) we will fund it in the

1 next five years, or will we --

2 CHAIRWOMAN BEAVER: Include it in the five year?

3 MR. HAMMOND: Yeah. It will be included, which
4 basically means we will fund it in the next five years? Is that
5 what this motion says?

6 MR. HAMMIT: I understood we'd bring it into the
7 tentative program that the Board would vote on.

8 MR. ROEHRICH: Correct. Madam Chair,
9 Mr. Hammond, that's what I thought. Unless I'm mistaken now,
10 Mr. Stratton, I thought the motion was that staff will bring in
11 -- at the time of the program will bring in the -- I want to say
12 concept, or what we'll do is we will bring in the State Route 69
13 project in the tentative program, and then the Board will
14 evaluate it and it will go to public hearing, and through the
15 process, will it stay in the program or will it get moved
16 because of something else.

17 CHAIRWOMAN BEAVER: That's the way I understood
18 it.

19 MR. STRATTON: Yes. My motion is that it be
20 rolled out in the five-year tentative --

21 MR. ROEHRICH: In the tentative five-year
22 program.

23 MR. STRATTON: I don't believe we can make
24 (inaudible) make a commitment of assurance of the next year's
25 five-year plan until we have a vote and comments. However, it

1 is very typical with this board and previous boards that 90
2 percent of what it is is brought to the Board from staff, and is
3 balanced budget and that -- it is approved. So I think if we do
4 that, it does give CYMPO the assurances they need to move
5 forward and continue -- gives Dallas the ability to start the
6 construction JPA and so on and so forth, so...

7 MR. ROEHRICH: (Inaudible) and I'm sorry. We'll
8 continue with -- all those actions will continue to include 4th
9 Street. Those are ongoing actions. But by keeping it simple,
10 just include this in the -- include the State Route 69 project
11 in the analysis of the tentative five-year program. Then staff
12 can assure that it's fiscally constrained, and we can address
13 any other impacts to projects will have been handled and
14 presented to the Board so they can decide is that the actions
15 they want to take. And if that's true, then we take it to the
16 public, and the public hearing process is transferred to the
17 public all the steps that were done.

18 MR. HAMMOND: Can we call the question?

19 CHAIRWOMAN BEAVER: Yes. I just have one
20 additional thing. What you just said, though, it would be
21 considered in the analysis part. I don't think that was what
22 Mr. Stratton was trying to say. I think he was wanting to see
23 it put into the five-year plan for consideration that the
24 Board --

25 MR. ROEHRICH: Right. I'm talking about analysis

1 by the Board. It will be presented in the tentative five-year
2 program for the Board's debate and discussion, and then once you
3 approve the tentative, we take it to the public.

4 CHAIRWOMAN BEAVER: Okay. We do have Board
5 Member Hammond that called for the question. So the motion --

6 MS. KUNZMAN: Floyd. I'm sorry. Can you just --
7 just for the record, Floyd, would you just restate what you
8 believe Mr. Hammond's motion is just to make sure that we have
9 it --

10 MR. ROEHRICH: Mr. Stratton.

11 (Speaking simultaneously.)

12 MS. KUNZMAN: -- on the record, and then if it is
13 confirmed, Mr. Stratton can confirm and then Ms. Beaver can
14 confirm her second.

15 MR. ROEHRICH: Yeah. Okay. Sure. (Inaudible.)
16 (Inaudible) 45 minutes and (inaudible).

17 MR. LA RUE: (Inaudible.)

18 MR. ROEHRICH: No, ma'am. Actually -- I actually
19 do think I have it. I think I have it, because I started to
20 actually write it out, but then we got talking and I stopped
21 writing. But I think the Board -- the Board has a motion. The
22 Board's motioning staff to include the State Route 69 project in
23 the tentative five-year program, present it to staff -- or
24 present it to the Transportation Board as part of the next
25 programming steps. If you leave at that, every other

1 administrative action, we're responsible to comply with. That's
2 the motion.

3 MR. STRATTON: (Inaudible.)

4 CHAIRWOMAN BEAVER: He confirmed it, and I
5 confirm it.

6 MR. STRATTON: Question.

7 CHAIRWOMAN BEAVER: So -- so the question was
8 what was just said. A motion and a second. All those --

9 MR. ROEHRICH: Are you comfortable with that?
10 Michelle, I just want to make sure.

11 MS. KUNZMAN: Yes. Yes.

12 MR. ROEHRICH: We need to get this right. You're
13 exactly right, because I don't want to have it -- debate later
14 on that we weren't clear on this. We --

15 MR. HALIKOWSKI: I am very clear.

16 MS. KUNZMAN: Mr. Stratton has confirmed with
17 (inaudible) description --

18 CHAIRWOMAN BEAVER: And I have seconded that I
19 have --

20 MS. KUNZMAN: Second. Is there any discussion?
21 No.

22 CHAIRWOMAN BEAVER: Let's hurry up and call for
23 the question.

24 All those in favor?

25 BOARD MEMBERS: Aye.

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

3 We will now move on to Item 8, Arizona --

4 MR. ROEHRICH: I would like to see you do that on
5 the phone.

6 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Madam Chair --

7 MR. THOMPSON: Madam, Madam Chair, with your
8 permission, can I have an update on the discussion on the 4th
9 Street from the director of MPO? I think it's already on the
10 agenda. So just an update on --

11 CHAIRWOMAN BEAVER: Yes.

12 MR. ROEHRICH: Madam Chair, the discussion would
13 be there's no update called on the agenda by anybody other than
14 staff. So if you're wanting comments from them, I think we
15 either -- two options. You open up the call to the audience
16 again and they comment on this topic, Item 7, specifically,
17 which has already been done --

18 MR. THOMPSON: Uh-huh.

19 MR. ROEHRICH: -- open that up if you want to
20 talk about 4th Street, but that's already been done, or we
21 agenda it to the future meeting.

22 MR. SELLERS: Madam Chair.

23 CHAIRWOMAN BEAVER: Yes. Board Member Sellers.

24 MR. SELLERS: I had a question on that as well,
25 because really all I heard as making a decision on -- in this

1 item was State Route 69.

2 MR. ROEHRICH: Madam Chair --

3 MR. SELLERS: We did not make a decision on 4th
4 Street.

5 CHAIRWOMAN BEAVER: That's right.

6 MR. ROEHRICH: That is correct. You did a motion
7 on State Route 69. I guess what I took it out, and Dallas,
8 (inaudible) me different, we will continue to do with the
9 coordination effort with the City of Flagstaff on the IGA, and
10 if the IGA is coming together and coalescing in January with the
11 tentative program, I figure we'd just bring that back as a part
12 of staff -- staff's analysis.

13 If you want a motion that says that, then I say
14 we do the same thing as we did with State Route 69.

15 CHAIRWOMAN BEAVER: Well, and I think we did ask
16 state engineer -- Dallas, that we did ask him that what -- where
17 are they at, what needs to be done, and he said based on the
18 information you had, you did not identify a year.

19 MR. HAMMIT: Madam Chair, I did -- these things
20 are great, because I can pull them up as I go. I did go back
21 and went deeper in the document. They -- and correct me if I'm
22 wrong, but it does appear that some design funds are available
23 in FY '18 of \$500,000 from the City, and five -- 4.5 million in
24 FY 2020 is what they said was available. Is that correct?

25 CHAIRWOMAN BEAVER: But we do not have a JPA

1 signed?

2 MR. HAMMIT: Madam Chair, that is correct.

3 MR. SELLERS: Okay. Well, I -- Madam Chair, I
4 guess my only concern is that when -- when they're bringing
5 forth more than half of the funding for this project that we not
6 do anything that jeopardizes what they're doing.

7 MR. ROEHRICH: Madam Chair, Mr. Sellers, I think
8 we totally agree, and I would hope that our partner out there
9 that we work with on these -- and we've got a long history of
10 doing agreements both with CYMPO and FMPO in the Flagstaff
11 area -- we are going to enter into those continued negotiations
12 and agreements to get an IGA and the -- and a project and a
13 program in place, and when it's ready, bring it back to board,
14 because we agree, we don't want to lose those, but we feel that
15 going through the normal programing cycle was the time to bring
16 it in, because right now those are future years, and there's no
17 delay as we continue to coordinate those efforts.

18 MR. HAMMIT: Okay. Madam Chair, I guess,
19 Director here, I feel very comfortable that staff would bring
20 that -- as we did in the other, the 69 project, we will bring
21 that to the Board in the tentative program with all the details.
22 Do the same agreement with did with 69. We would do the same
23 thing for 4th Street.

24 MR. ROEHRICH: Madam --

25 MR. THOMPSON: Madam Chair, so that's an

1 assurance that we will continue to communicate and work on the
2 GP and the (inaudible) metropolitan planning organization.

3 MR. HAMMIT: Madam Chair, Member Thompson, not
4 only that. The staff will bring that as a part of -- so the
5 Board could evaluate -- it will be part of the tentative program
6 when you evaluate that in the coming year. So both of those.

7 MR. HALIKOWSKI: So we will bring both 69 and
8 this project back in January as soon as we begin discussion.

9 So Madam Chair, if I could, I just want to thank
10 you and Mr. Stratton for your patience and understanding as
11 we've gone through this, and I also just want to apologize that
12 we did not vet you more fully on all of these issues and brought
13 this here today. So I just want to say that. Thank you.

14 CHAIRWOMAN BEAVER: Okay. Do we need the seventh
15 inning stretch?

16 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: No. You're the chairman.

17 CHAIRWOMAN BEAVER: Okay. Item 8, Arizona State
18 Transportation Board policies. Mr. Roehrich.

19 MR. ROEHRICH: Thank you, Madam Chair.

20 At a study session about a month ago, we had
21 reviewed the policies and at that time made the determination
22 from staff that no updates or edits were needed. At the
23 meeting, Mrs. Beaver, you had asked for an inclusion of past
24 policy updates that were included in the previous updating
25 cycles. Those were added into the policies, and so I'm going to

1 have -- offer for you today is the adoption of the Arizona State
2 Transportation Board policies for 2000 -- November 17th, 2017,
3 and at this time staff is recommending that the Board adopts
4 those policies.

5 MR. HAMMOND: So moved.

6 CHAIRWOMAN BEAVER: Motion by Board Member
7 Hammond. Is there a second?

8 MR. CUTHBERTSON: Second.

9 CHAIRWOMAN BEAVER: Second by Board Member
10 Cuthbertson.

11 And just in addition to what Mr. Roehrich was
12 saying, that I'd noticed in the 2013, there actually were
13 identified the updates and when they happened dating clear back
14 to, I think, 2003. And so they've been (inaudible) in 2015. So
15 I just ask that they be incorporated back in.

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

18 BOARD MEMBERS: Aye.

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

21 We'll move on now to Item 9, the draft 2018 Board
22 meetings and public hearing dates and locations.

23 MR. ROEHRICH: Thank you, Madam Chair.

24 What you have in front of you, what was posted to
25 the public on the agenda was next year's calendar year 2018

1 Transportation Board meeting locations and dates. Just one
2 thing to point out. Traditionally, we've continued to follow
3 the third Friday of the Monday for board meetings, with the
4 exception of October, which was the fourth Friday, October 26th,
5 which coincides with the Rural Transportation Summit, and its
6 location being in Lake Havasu City.

7 We also see that we've identified three study
8 sessions. The first study session in January is when we roll
9 out the funding and the tentative program for the next
10 programming cycle. Then you've got the board hearings, followed
11 by the adoption of the five-year program in June. And again,
12 this year we've continued on the August break where there's no
13 specific board meeting, but there will be telephonic meeting to
14 award construction projects, which are usually much shorter
15 meetings.

16 So with that, Madam Chair, you have the dates and
17 the locations in front of you. I would ask for the Board to
18 adopt these dates and locations for fiscal year -- excuse me --
19 calendar year 2018 Transportation Board meetings.

20 CHAIRWOMAN BEAVER: Mr. Cuthbertson, since it
21 will in all probability be under your leadership, are you making
22 the motion to approve?

23 MR. CUTHBERTSON: I am.

24 CHAIRWOMAN BEAVER: Okay. So the motion's to
25 accept and approve the 2018 State Transportation Board meeting

1 locations as presented. Is there a second?

2 MR. STRATTON: Second.

3 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Second.

4 MR. THOMPSON: What I would like (inaudible).

5 CHAIRWOMAN BEAVER: There was a second.

6 MR. ROEHRICH: Excuse me, Madam Chair. The
7 second is by?

8 CHAIRWOMAN BEAVER: Board Member Stratton.

9 MR. ROEHRICH: Mr. Stratton. Thank you.

10 CHAIRWOMAN BEAVER: Okay. Board Member Stratton
11 will be the second.

12 MR. THOMPSON: Yeah. Just an additional comment.

13 CHAIRWOMAN BEAVER: Board Member Thompson.

14 MR. THOMPSON: We did meet over in Moenkopi, and
15 there are certain places that we wanted you to look at.
16 Unfortunately, time did not allow (inaudible). There is a
17 growing community up out the (inaudible) of Navajo County on the
18 reservation called (inaudible). I'd like to -- the nearest
19 hotel, motel you can stay is about an hour away, hour away to
20 Hopi, Hopi (inaudible) center or over in Chinle. So take you
21 (inaudible) to get there. I'd request that maybe sometime in
22 the future, you know, we can schedule an ADOT meeting there,
23 have a different feeling about the environment and, you know,
24 what you can experience being up there. So that's just my --
25 you know, I have no problem supporting the schedule right now.

1 CHAIRWOMAN BEAVER: Okay. Board Member Thompson,
2 if you would not mind, would it be possible if the locations
3 both for our meeting place and lodging, if you could provide
4 them to Mr. Roehrich --

5 MR. THOMPSON: Okay.

6 CHAIRWOMAN BEAVER: -- in the next year, and
7 possibly in the future when future board chairs are in place,
8 because they're the ones that kind of help set the calendar,
9 they could take --

10 MR. THOMPSON: Okay.

11 CHAIRWOMAN BEAVER: Would that be --

12 MR. ROEHRICH: Madam Chair, Mr. Thompson,
13 absolutely. Absolutely. These dates and times were already
14 coordinated with the expected incoming chair, and that's the
15 tradition of what's been done, is the incoming chair will work
16 -- work these items. Future dates, if we want to get -- go back
17 to the Hopi tribe or Navajo tribe, you can either request it
18 with a future chair, or Mr. Thompson, when you're the chair, we
19 can take those at those time.

20 MR. THOMPSON: Thank you.

21 CHAIRWOMAN BEAVER: Board Member Hammond.

22 MR. HAMMOND: Chair, or Board Member Thompson,
23 I'm -- I think it's my turn in the barrel the following year.
24 I'll make the commitment to -- sorry. That's a bad joke if you
25 know it. I'll make the commitment to have one up there.

1 MR. THOMPSON: Okay. Thank you.

2 CHAIRWOMAN BEAVER: Okay. If there's no further
3 discussion, all those in favor of the motion?

4 BOARD MEMBERS: Aye.

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

7 Okay. We'll move on to Item 10. Multimodal
8 Planning Division planning report. Greg Byres. Welcome.

9 MR. BYRES: Thank you, Madam Chair, Board
10 members. I just have a real quick report to do. I've got just
11 a couple slides if I can get this going. Here we are.
12 (Inaudible.)

13 We've just going a couple things going. Of
14 course, the five-year state transportation plan, as currently
15 been discussed, is ongoing. We've currently completed our P2P
16 process, and so we have our preliminary prioritization of all
17 the projects, of all of the projects that are going into the
18 plan. We are beginning the planning level scoping, which will
19 start next week on those. So all those projects that have been
20 or at least the upper tier of the prioritized projects will get
21 this planning level scoping, which was the first time we've done
22 this, but it will extend the scopes out, along with the project
23 estimates to being much closer to what the final has been in the
24 past.

25 Once that is completed, the projects will be

1 reprioritized and put back through the P2P process, and then
2 we're also doing another lens to this, which is the Decision
3 Lens will be implemented to see how we're doing with our
4 measurements that we're reporting back to the Federal Highway.
5 So we can see exactly where we're moving the dials with any of
6 the projects that are being prioritized into the plan. And the
7 motion that you had just passed will also be accommodated into
8 the plan as well.

9 The other thing they have going is the long-range
10 transportation plan. That is currently out for comment.
11 There's a link that you can find the plan that's currently out
12 for a 30-day period. There's also a phone number and a -- an
13 address that comments can be addressed to. That's -- like I
14 said, that's out for the next 30 days.

15 The only other item that I have is that our
16 freight plan was approved by Federal Highway this past week. I
17 would like to thank Federal Highway for their expeditious review
18 in getting that done. So it's currently completed and ready to
19 go.

20 That was the end of my report. Thank you.

21 CHAIRWOMAN BEAVER: Thank you.

22 Board Member Stratton.

23 MR. STRATTON: On the long-range plan that's up
24 for public comment now, once all the comments are collected,
25 does that come back to the Board for approval and modification?

1 MR. BYRES: It comes back for adoption.

2 MR. STRATTON: But at that point we have the
3 ability to take the public comments --

4 MR. BYRES: Correct.

5 MR. STRATTON: -- in consideration and alter that
6 as we would the five-year plan; is that correct?

7 MR. BYRES: I believe so.

8 MR. STRATTON: Thank you.

9 CHAIRWOMAN BEAVER: Thank you.

10 I do have one additional thing I would like to
11 inquire about since I won't be here next year. I had the
12 opportunity when Decision Lens, when we were starting our
13 relationship with them, they actually did, like, a workshop, and
14 so I went to the workshop, and so that's why I'm a little bit
15 familiar with it. But the other Board members, I don't think
16 they had the same opportunity, and so I'm wondering if there's a
17 way that there could be a PowerPoint presentation, some kind of
18 a presentation that could be done at a -- either at a study
19 session where the other Board members understand what this
20 Decision Lens is that we're talking about.

21 MR. BYRES: If I may, Madam Chair, when we have
22 our workshop, we're actually going to go through a whole process
23 on exactly how it's being utilized, and we will have all of our
24 data actually uploaded into it. So you can actually see what's
25 going on. So we'll have all of our dials already put together.

1 We'll have all of our dashboards done so that you can actually
2 see real data, and it will be real time that we can actually go
3 through and change. So the staff --

4 CHAIRWOMAN BEAVER: So is that going to be a
5 workshop then, or would it be something that could be compressed
6 for a Board study session?

7 MR. BYRES: It -- well, our plan was to compress
8 it into the study session so that you can see -- see what's
9 happening with real data, with real time, and with the measures
10 that we're actually reporting out Federal Highway.

11 CHAIRWOMAN BEAVER: Okay. So it will come to a
12 study session then.

13 MR. BYRES: Correct.

14 CHAIRWOMAN BEAVER: Okay.

15 MR. ROEHRICH: Madam Chair and Board Member
16 Stratton, I need to back up a little bit, because I don't want
17 there to be any confusion, not because of what seemed to happen
18 last June. I don't want that to start again.

19 I believe you commented on when the comment
20 period for the five-year program closes -- or excuse me -- for
21 the long-range program closes. Staff will then will bring it to
22 the Board to adopt, as Mr. Byers said, and then you had made the
23 comment that the Board can look at those comments and adjust it
24 based upon those comments. Is that what you were --

25 MR. STRATTON: That's exactly what I was asking.

1 MR. ROEHRICH: Okay.

2 MR. STRATTON: Is there have been, as I sit on --

3 MR. ROEHRICH: Right.

4 MR. STRATTON: -- an MPO board. There were many
5 comments at the meeting this past week --

6 MR. ROEHRICH: Okay.

7 MR. STRATTON: -- about that, and I told them
8 that the public hearing -- or the public comment --

9 MR. ROEHRICH: Right.

10 MR. STRATTON: -- was going to open, and that's
11 where they could voice those.

12 MR. ROEHRICH: So here's how I think I think that
13 process is supposed to work, and you need to tell me if this is
14 wrong. Staff prepares the long-range plan from ADOT. We have
15 gone through that process. We will take any comments. We'll
16 bring it into the long-range program. It's based upon the
17 guiding principles, planning principles that are in the policies
18 and that's given by the Transportation Board. We will bring it
19 back to the Board. If you want to adjust that, I believe the
20 process is the Board to recommend staff to go back and analyze
21 it to relook at the long-range plan with those comments from the
22 Board, and then we will go do that.

23 We're not bringing it to the Board so they can
24 edit it or they can change what's in that report. We're
25 bringing to the Board so they can again review it, comment, have

1 the debate on what's in it. And then if the Board wants to make
2 recommendations to change, it comes back to the agency to decide
3 to do that, because this -- I don't want there to be confusion
4 (inaudible) last time thinking that there was a different
5 process in here. And then if we have to go through multiple
6 iterations of that in order to make sure that happens, when the
7 Board's comfortable, then they adopt the long-range plan from
8 the agency, and then we distribute it and send it from there.

9 MR. STRATTON: I appreciate that explanation and
10 understanding --

11 MR. ROEHRICH: Right.

12 MR. STRATTON: -- completely now. My request
13 then to you would be to be in contact with the Sun Corridor MPO
14 and consider their comments in the plan.

15 MR. ROEHRICH: Absolutely.

16 MR. BYRES: We most certainly will.

17 CHAIRWOMAN BEAVER: Thank you.

18 We'll move on to Item 11, Priority Planning
19 Advisory Committee, the PPAC. Mr. Byers.

20 MR. BYRES: Madam Chairman, Board members, we're
21 bringing forth recommendations from the Priority Planning
22 Advisory Committee for adoption by -- or acceptance and approval
23 by the -- this board. So going through these, we have two sets
24 of projects, eight for modifications, then six new projects. So
25 I would like to start off with Items 11A through 11H. The only

1 items that I'd like to add to these is on 11B and 11C, both of
2 those were approved by PPAC with contingent approval by MAG
3 Regional Council, which is to meet January 31st.

4 CHAIRWOMAN BEAVER: Is there a motion to accept
5 and approve the project modifications Item 11A through 11H,
6 understanding that 11B and 11C are contingent on MAG's final
7 approval as presented?

8 MR. SELLERS: So moved.

9 MR. THOMPSON: Second, approval.

10 CHAIRWOMAN BEAVER: Motion by Board Member
11 Sellers, seconded by Board Member Thompson.

12 MR. THOMPSON: With a comment. We're having a
13 lot of discussion with the organization in Oak Creek.

14 MR. BYRES: Yes.

15 MR. THOMPSON: They're concerned in doing this
16 project, was that taken in any consideration to improving this
17 road (inaudible) quite a bit about the overcrowding and having
18 to deal with the parking. I'm wondering if maybe...

19 MR. HALIKOWSKI: Madam Chair, if I might.

20 CHAIRWOMAN BEAVER: Yes. Director Halikowski.

21 MR. HALIKOWSKI: Madam Chair, Board Member
22 Thompson, Mr. Roehrich and I, plus the district engineer, Audra
23 Merrick, were in Sedona last week meeting with Traffic Matters
24 and the folks that have their concerns about Oak Creek Canyon.
25 Let's just say that we're deeply involved in listening at this

1 point, but it is a complex issue --

2 MR. THOMPSON: Yeah.

3 MR. HALIKOWSKI: -- not involving just the
4 highway and parking.

5 MR. THOMPSON: Uh-huh.

6 MR. HALIKOWSKI: There's also state park issues.

7 MR. THOMPSON: Right.

8 MR. HALIKOWSKI: There's also federal lands and
9 federal parks issues going on there. So we are working this
10 issue. There are many possible solutions, but I want to be sure
11 that as we're moving forward, we're getting the right problems
12 and getting the right solutions, because everyone has a
13 suggestion --

14 MR. THOMPSON: Yeah.

15 MR. HALIKOWSKI: -- about what they think might
16 be the best thing, and we're certainly looking at the parking
17 situation, but also the emergency services situation, too.

18 MR. THOMPSON: Right.

19 MR. HALIKOWSKI: Because you have fire and police
20 that may take sometimes two hours to get in and out, and so we
21 had a very robust discussion about perhaps they need to locate a
22 substation there for emergency services. So I would just say
23 that as we're moving forward, this is going to be a multifaceted
24 solution, and we're working closely with State Parks right now
25 on trying to find that.

1 MR. THOMPSON: Thank you, Madam Chair. Thank
2 you, John.

3 CHAIRWOMAN BEAVER: Thank you.

4 Okay. The motion's to accept and approve the
5 project modifications Item 11A through 11H with the other items,
6 11B and C, contingent on the MAG board approval as presented.

7 If there's no further questions, all those in
8 favor?

9 BOARD MEMBERS: Aye.

10 CHAIRWOMAN BEAVER: All right. All those
11 opposed? The motion carries.

12 We'll move on now to new projects. Item 11I
13 through 11M.

14 MR. BYRES: Madam Chair, I would like to also
15 include 11N. There should have been another one in there.

16 CHAIRWOMAN BEAVER: Okay. So it will be 11I
17 through 11N?

18 MR. BYRES: Correct.

19 And again, PPAC has approved these, bringing them
20 as a recommendation to the Board for your approval.

21 CHAIRWOMAN BEAVER: Is there a motion to accept
22 and approve the new projects, Item 11I through 11N as presented?

23 MR. CUTHBERTSON: So moved.

24 CHAIRWOMAN BEAVER: Motion by Board Member
25 Cuthbertson. Is there a second?

1 MR. HAMMOND: Second.

2 CHAIRWOMAN BEAVER: Second by Board Member
3 Hammond to accept and approve new projects Item 11I through 11N
4 as presented.

5 If there's no further discussion, all those in
6 favor?

7 BOARD MEMBERS: Aye.

8 CHAIRMAN LA RUE: All those opposed? The motion
9 carries.

10 Item 12, state engineer report.

11 Thank you.

12 MR. HAMMIT: Thank you, Madam Chair. Kristine
13 told me I'd used all my time previously, but as usual, I ignored
14 her.

15 Currently, ADOT has 116 projects under
16 construction totaling \$1.556 billion. We did finalize only one
17 project in October, for 4 million, almost \$5 million. On year
18 to date, we have finalized 44 projects.

19 A couple other things in the state engineer's
20 report. I have briefed the Board on ADOT's efforts to --
21 through our NEPA assignment to assume some of the
22 responsibilities from Federal Highways.

23 Currently, for the categorical exclusion, the CE
24 projects, it is out for federal review. So it is on the federal
25 register. Not for federal review. For federal comments, so

1 people can make comments. That comment period ends a week from
2 today. So we look to move that forward and have that agreement
3 by sometime at the end of this year.

4 And the other update, I have briefed the Board on
5 the wrong-way driver project that we've been working on. All
6 the hardware is in place, and we are receiving data from all of
7 the cameras that we've installed on I-17. We still have some
8 work to do on the programming that would automatically move
9 cameras and do that sort of thing, but all the hardware has been
10 installed, and the contractor met our time frames, and we're
11 very happy with that.

12 That's all I have for the state engineer's
13 report.

14 CHAIRWOMAN BEAVER: Thank you.

15 Is there any additional questions of the state
16 engineer?

17 MR. STRATTON: Madam Chair.

18 CHAIRWOMAN BEAVER: Board Member Stratton.

19 MR. STRATTON: Just a question. After all of the
20 wrong-way driver things have been installed, could I ask that in
21 maybe six months, you come back and tell us how effective
22 they've been and how many --

23 MR. HALIKOWSKI: Right.

24 MR. STRATTON: -- how many drivers they've caught
25 and that type of thing?

1 MR. HALIKOWSKI: Well, so, Madam Chair, Board
2 Member Stratton, I want to be careful here in that the
3 cameras -- and I don't mean to be sarcastic, but as we want to
4 keep pointing out to the public, the cameras don't catch anyone.
5 They alert us to the wrong-way driver. It's up to the law
6 enforcement officers then. And what the cameras will do is very
7 quickly shrink the amount of time that it takes to notify our
8 Traffic Operations Center, light up the boards. And then your
9 app on your phone, if you've signed up for ADOT Alerts, will
10 also ping all the drivers in that 20-mile area that a wrong-way
11 driver has been spotted. The cameras, I believe, will allow us
12 to track the progress of that vehicle to give law enforcement a
13 better idea of where it is, because very often, given the speeds
14 and the number of freeways involved, right now it's very
15 difficult to track that.

16 So there's some other issues under consideration,
17 but rest assured we're not only going to file a report, but
18 we're also looking at this system for efficiencies and defects,
19 because we want to be able to expand it out to other areas.

20 MR. STRATTON: Bad choice of words on my part,
21 and I apologize for that.

22 MR. HALIKOWSKI: No, no, no. It's --

23 MR. STRATTON: My point being is I just would
24 like to know how effective they are --

25 MR. HALIKOWSKI: Yeah.

1 MR. STRATTON: -- for the money.

2 MR. HALIKOWSKI: Absolutely.

3 MR. STRATTON: And then hopefully it will point
4 out that we need to continue this program and expand it.

5 MR. HALIKOWSKI: Thank you.

6 MR. HAMMIT: Madam Chair, Mr. Stratton, if I may,
7 one thing it will also do, right now DPS has had over -- close
8 to 1,000 calls of wrong way incursions, and those are 911 calls,
9 and we don't have near that many sightings once we can find them
10 on the roadways. What these cameras will do, and in one
11 weekend, we saw it at one intersection three wrong-way driver,
12 but they self-corrected. And what we can do is see, okay, at
13 this intersection, they are going in, but they're
14 self-correcting. That means it's a confusion, not just an
15 impairment, and then maybe we can do some engineering and fix
16 it. The ones that keep going, that's what the director's
17 talking about, and we're finding other ways to track them. But
18 if we can -- the ones that are confused and fix that problem,
19 that gives us the opportunity here as well.

20 MR. HALIKOWSKI: Well, and to that point, too,
21 those confusion issues are of concern to us. We're working with
22 law enforcement to identify if there is a medical or some other
23 psychophysiological issue that doesn't involve impairment. We
24 send that driver through medical review to ensure that they're
25 okay to continue operating a vehicle.

1 So there's a lot of moving -- again, no pun
2 intended -- moving parts in this thing, but rest assured our
3 goal is to reduce the number of these crashes.

4 From an interesting statistical point, out of all
5 the fatalities in Arizona, I think your wrong-way drivers only
6 represent a small percentage.

7 MR. HAMMIT: It's less than 1 percent.

8 MR. HALIKOWSKI: Right. It's a small percentage,
9 but they're very horrific crashes, and we're working to reduce
10 that.

11 CHAIRWOMAN BEAVER: Thank you.

12 Are we ready for the construction?

13 MR. HAMMIT: Yes, ma'am.

14 CHAIRWOMAN BEAVER: Okay.

15 MR. HAMMIT: Thank you for approving the items on
16 the consent agenda.

17 There are five projects that need to be
18 justified. As you can see, year to date, the State estimate has
19 been -- on all the projects to date, \$189.6 million. They've
20 come in under our estimate, 172.3 -- or \$17.3 million, and one
21 big one is today, and I will explain that one as we go forward.

22 Madam Chair, if I may, Item 13A, that is a
23 project that came to the Board in September, and we asked to be
24 -- to be postponed. It did come over the estimate, and we were
25 working with the locals for the funding. On that project, the

1 low bid was \$1,297,667.97. The State's estimate was \$1,010,000.
 2 It was over the State's estimate by \$287,667.97, or 28.5
 3 percent.

4 We saw differences -- we underestimated the
 5 roadway excavation and some work around the retaining wall. We
 6 have reviewed the bids. We have worked with the locals. They
 7 do have the money. The Department believes it is a reasonable
 8 and responsive bid and recommends award to Intermountain West
 9 Civil Construction, Inc.

10 MR. STRATTON: So moved.

11 MR. THOMPSON: Second.

12 CHAIRWOMAN BEAVER: The motion is to accept and
 13 approve staff's recommendation to award the contract for Item
 14 13A to Intermountain West Civil Constructors, Inc. The motion
 15 was by Board Member Stratton, and the second was by Board Member
 16 Thompson.

17 If there's no further questions, all those in
 18 favor?

19 BOARD MEMBERS: Aye.

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

22 Item 13B.

23 MR. HAMMIT: Thank you, Madam Chair.

24 Item 13B is a local project in the city of
 25 Avondale. It is a sign project. The low bid was \$199,725.60.

1 The State's estimate was \$284,615.70. It was under the State's
 2 estimate by \$84,890.10, or 29.8 percent.

3 We did see better-than-expected pricing for the
 4 sign panels. The contractor informed us they went out and
 5 bought a truck attenuator, which they saved. They didn't have
 6 to subcontract that out. We have reviewed the bids and believe
 7 it is a responsive and reasonable bid and recommends award to
 8 Stormwater, LLC, doing business as SWP Contracting & Paving.

9 MR. LA RUE: So moved.

10 MR. HAMMOND: Second.

11 CHAIRWOMAN BEAVER: Motion by Board Member --
 12 Board Member La Rue, seconded by Board Member Hammond. Did I
 13 get them right?

14 MR. LA RUE: Yeah.

15 CHAIRWOMAN BEAVER: Okay. Good. To accept and
 16 approve staff's recommendation to award the contract for Item
 17 13B to Stormwater Plans, LLC, d/b/a SWP Contracting & Paving.

18 If there's no further discussion, all those in
 19 favor?

20 BOARD MEMBERS: Aye.

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

23 Item 13C.

24 MR. HAMMIT: Thank you, Madam Chair.

25 This is a widening project on Interstate 10,

1 widening and realignment. This is in the Picacho area, and I'd
 2 also point out this was a project that got a FASTLANE grant and
 3 also additional funds from the Legislature in past years. The
 4 low bid on this project was \$58,465,000. The State's estimate
 5 was \$74,237,017.59. It did come under the estimate by
 6 \$15,772,017.59, or 21.2 percent.

7 The biggest reason, during the advertisement, a
 8 material source was located right next to the project. It was
 9 located and all bidders had access to it. So it wasn't just one
 10 bidder had options, and if you looked at the bids, they were
 11 very close. We didn't have time to go back and redo our
 12 estimate. But that was the biggest. And what's nice about this
 13 source, they can get material to build the project, but there's
 14 a lot of demo, and we have to get rid of some of the material.
 15 They can use the pit to bury the old material. So it worked
 16 very well for them. We have reviewed the bid and believe it is
 17 responsive and reasonable, and recommend award to Coffman
 18 Specialties, Inc.

19 CHAIRWOMAN BEAVER: Do I have a motion?

20 MR. STRATTON: So moved.

21 CHAIRWOMAN BEAVER: Motion by Board Member
 22 Stratton.

23 MR. SELLERS: Second.

24 CHAIRWOMAN BEAVER: Seconded by Board Member
 25 Sellers to accept and approve staff's recommendation to award

1 the contract for Item 13C to Coffman Specialties, Inc.

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

4 BOARD MEMBERS: Aye.

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

7 Item 13D, please.

8 MR. HAMMIT: Madam Chair, this is a project on
 9 Interstate 40. Well, the interchange at Interstate 40 and I-17
 10 in the Flagstaff area. It is working on a bridge deck rehab and
 11 -- on two different bridges. The low bid was \$10,128,666.08.
 12 The State's estimate was \$7,555,158.83. It was over the State's
 13 estimate by \$2,573,507.25, or 34.1 percent.

14 We saw higher-than-expected pricing in the
 15 removals was a big one, the asphalt concrete, some of the
 16 connections that are going to be used in the concrete, the
 17 Portland cement concrete. We have reviewed the bid, and the
 18 department believes it is a reasonable and responsive bid, and
 19 recommends award to FNF Construction, Inc.

20 CHAIRWOMAN BEAVER: Do I have a motion to accept
 21 and approve the staff's recommendation to award the contract for
 22 Item 13D to FNF Construction, Inc.?

23 MR. THOMPSON: I'll move.

24 CHAIRWOMAN BEAVER: Motion by Board Member
 25 Thompson. Is there a second?

1 MR. CUTHBERTSON: Second.

2 CHAIRWOMAN BEAVER: Seconded by Board Member
3 Cuthbertson to accept and approve the staff's recommendation.
4 If there's no further discussions, all those in
5 favor?

6 BOARD MEMBERS: Aye.

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

9 Item 13E.

10 MR. HAMMIT: Thank you, Madam Chair.

11 And this project also was postponed at the
12 September board meeting due to funding. This project is on
13 US-70 east of Globe. The project's a roadway widening. It is
14 adding a two-way left turn lane in the project limits. The low
15 bid was \$856,168.15. The State's estimate was \$598,364.15. It
16 was over the State's estimate by \$257,804, or 43.1 percent.

17 The biggest difference, we saw
18 higher-than-expected pricing in the roadway excavation and in
19 the mobilization -- what the contractor's told us, they have a
20 very tight working area, and then their haul, not only the
21 distance -- it wasn't just the distance. They have to go very
22 slow through that area, and it increased their time. So their
23 production rates were lower. And again, the moneys are
24 available. The Department has reviewed the bids and believes it
25 is responsive and responsible, and recommends award to FNF

1 Construction, Inc.

2 MR. STRATTON: So moved.

3 MR. HAMMOND: Second.

4 CHAIRWOMAN BEAVER: Okay. Board -- motion to
5 accept and approve staff's recommendation to award the contract
6 from -- for item 13E to FNF Construction, Inc. I believe the
7 motion was made by Board Member Stratton, and the second was by
8 Board Member Hammond.

9 If there's no further discussion, all those in
10 favor?

11 BOARD MEMBERS: Aye.

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

14 Okay.

15 MR. HAMMIT: Thank you.

16 CHAIRWOMAN BEAVER: Seventh inning stretch again.
17 We move on -- thank you.

18 We'll move on to Item 14. Rural Transportation
19 Summit 20-year anniversary in 2018. I've asked --

20 MR. ROEHRICH: Madam Chair, if I could.

21 CHAIRWOMAN BEAVER: Yes.

22 MR. ROEHRICH: This item is only agendaed for you
23 or myself to speak, and obviously Board members can only weigh
24 in and other staff. If you're bringing up members of the public
25 to speak, I would recommend that you do it by, again, opening a

1 call to the audience. Vincent will need another one -- a slip
2 filled, and then we will limit it to three minutes in order to
3 do that, and unless there's a different approach to that, I
4 think that allows that to happen and still meet the opposite
5 meeting requirements of this agenda. Okay.

6 CHAIRWOMAN BEAVER: I believe we can. So we're
7 opening the call to the public.

8 MR. ROEHRICH: Opening call to the public for
9 Vincent to speak for -- again, for that approximate three minute
10 time frame as part of this Item No. 14.

11 CHAIRWOMAN BEAVER: Okay. Without repeating --

12 MR. ROEHRICH: And we can get a form to Vincent
13 afterwards --

14 CHAIRWOMAN BEAVER: Okay.

15 MR. ROEHRICH: -- if you don't mind, just so we
16 can make sure that we have that covered.

17 CHAIRWOMAN BEAVER: The reason I've asked Vincent
18 to speak is sometimes what I say gets lost in translation, and
19 he seems to -- can be very clear. So if you would, go ahead.

20 MR. GALLEGOS: Thank you, Chairperson Beaver and
21 members of the Board.

22 As I alluded to earlier, we'll be hosting the
23 Rural Transportation Summit, and I adjusted my notes slightly in
24 that. A very topic, as always, is funding, and I would like to
25 open the dialogue starting today and moving forward that,

1 really, at the heart of the Rural Transportation Summit is
2 funding. Most of you have attended, have been an active part of
3 the Rural Transportation Summit.

4 We are coming up on the 20th year. The heart and
5 the root of this started 20 years ago, and it started when we
6 looked at the funding, and we looked at the slice of the pie,
7 and I believe under Secretary Peters, then director of ADOT,
8 called together for the Casa Grande resolves. Many were
9 involved then. I believe Jack Hustead, a former State Board
10 member was a part of that, and some other individuals. But it
11 was really was to look at funding, was to look at the slice of
12 the pie and was to look at who was getting what, and out of that
13 came really what we work with today and how Greater Arizona is a
14 part of that.

15 Since then, we've had the summit held every year.
16 We've had RTAC, which was born out of that, and hopefully -- I
17 think where we've evolved and shifted is to how do we make the
18 pie bigger? Not necessarily how do we fight for our slice of
19 the pie, but in -- in the efforts of the summit, and you look at
20 this last summit, we were privileged to have able to have about
21 eight state representatives and I would say over 30 or more
22 elected officials there, and that dialogue took place. That
23 dialogue did take place.

24 So my point to this is, I think, two things.
25 History is going to be a huge part of that. You know,

1 Chairperson Beaver and I have spoke, and we do need to look at
2 what happened 20 years ago. What was the dialogue, and what has
3 happened since then? And I come to you as the -- as the leader,
4 the representative receiving this summit. You know, we keep
5 adding and we keep evolving it. And again, I said the
6 partnerships are essential with MPO, every COG, Federal
7 Highways, FTA, ADOT and RTAC.

8 With being the steward of this upcoming summit,
9 we really want to ensure that we are hitting that mark. So I
10 hope to open the dialogue, like I said, today. We could be
11 invited back to give additional presentations. What I have done
12 in the meantime, and it's very short or recent, is I have
13 contacted the director of NACOG, Chris Fetzer, and I asked if he
14 could take on a particular leadership role with this particular
15 topic of history. And I think having him be one of our point of
16 contacts will be really essential to be able to over the next
17 year kind of track -- be able to formalize the history, what
18 happened 20 years ago, be able to do some presentations, whether
19 it be here or elsewhere, as to how this summit has evolved and
20 be able to look at present day into the future, because I do
21 want to be sure we're serving its mission and its purpose. And
22 again, I think it directly ties to that funding issue: How do
23 we make the pie bigger as opposed to Greater Arizona fighting
24 for their slice of the pie?

25 So in this up coming summit, and I'm out of time,

1 but I really do want to showcase Greater Arizona and how we're
2 doing our part. So hopefully the program will reflect that, and
3 we'll take questions or comments if I can or however that may
4 work.

5 MR. ROEHRICH: Madam Chair, this is public
6 comment, so there are no questions or comments, but it was on
7 the agenda for you to present any topics for myself. So I guess
8 the question is where do you want to take this discussion at
9 this time?

10 CHAIRWOMAN BEAVER: Okay.

11 MR. ROEHRICH: And to be clear, Vincent, we can't
12 ask you questions. I think you're done. Your comments are
13 done.

14 MR. GALLEGOS: Thank you.

15 CHAIRWOMAN BEAVER: Thank you.

16 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Sit down.

17 MR. ROEHRICH: I didn't want to be that blunt, I
18 thought, you know, I think it might be better for you to -- to
19 watch the debate now, the discussion, you don't need to be
20 standing right there. But you can, you're welcome to stand
21 there (inaudible).

22 MR. HALIKOWSKI: Thank you, Floyd. Take the
23 shovel out of your hand.

24 CHAIRWOMAN BEAVER: The -- the gist of the way
25 the agenda reads is what does the State Transportation Board --

1 let's see exactly how it reads. The staff's coordination of
2 activities they would like to see take place as part of the next
3 20-year anniversary of the Rural Transportation Summit.

4 I have been doing some research, and aside from
5 that point, I think the two points that I would ask that could
6 be supported through the Board is, number one, that the process
7 of getting minutes or documentations would not have to go
8 through the open -- the process where you have to get public
9 record, you know, permission before you can get copies of
10 minutes and that. I would like for it to be speeded up where if
11 we needed access to minutes within a timely, you know, day or
12 two, we could have copies of minutes.

13 MR. THOMPSON: Uh-huh.

14 CHAIRWOMAN BEAVER: That's one. And the other
15 thing is, is I think Vinnie and I in our conversation, was that
16 at the point in time the program for the 20th anniversary is
17 developed, it would be nice, which I think he, as the -- taking
18 the lead on it, would put an invitation out to maybe the
19 director of ADOT, possibly even the governor could supply a
20 greeting in the program, you know, as likewise the mayor of Lake
21 Havasu City and the -- whoever's the chair of the Mohave Board
22 of Supervisors and the chair of the ADOT board. So that would
23 be the things that would seem to be -- that would fill the
24 request that I'm asking from you all.

25 Some of the history aspect, over the course of

1 time I have been on this board, Casa Grande resolves has been --
2 it comes up continually, and it's sort of like a unicorn. It's
3 out there, but it's like what exactly is it, you know? And I
4 think sometimes it gets lost over a period of time, and when I
5 really got to digging into it, I found that this all came about
6 through the federal government, the TEA, or the Transportation
7 Equity Act, for the 21st Century, was what kind of was the
8 impetus that started it.

9 And then -- and I'm not sure of the sequence of
10 events, but then it was -- it was also put into State statute,
11 Article 7, where it has the -- under transportation planning,
12 28.501, to 28.507, it articulates in State statute the seven
13 guiding principles which we have adopted. In fact, as of today,
14 we just -- our policy -- policies. And then the Arizona Rural
15 Transportation Advocacy Council, in conjunction with Arizona
16 Department of Transportation, and I believe the individual
17 serving in RTAC at the time is the mayor of Thatcher now, Bob
18 Rivera. So he might -- would also be a good source to go back
19 to as far as kind of, you know, what was going on at that point
20 in time. They did have a joint resolution that was signed by
21 RTAC on January 16th of 2004. It was Resolution 0401. So that
22 factors into it.

23 I also found where it was in the Federal Registry
24 as far as the -- the -- from the federal's expectation of the
25 relationship with the MPOs and COGs, which was done 2/14 of

1 2007.

2 Then, you know, like I said, I kept having this
3 curiosity about this document, the Casa Grande resolves and what
4 exactly what it was. Well, I did locate and there were those
5 seven guiding principles, which we adhere to today, you know,
6 and it discussed the distribution or the allocation of the
7 discretionary funds and the establishment of the Resource
8 Allocation Advisory Committee.

9 And I do remember back -- I went back and
10 reviewed the minutes of 3/14 of 2014, specifically page 50
11 through 52. Board Member Sellers had made an inquiry of
12 Ms. Ward at that time, and it was deferred over to Mr. Roehrich,
13 who responded. And in a nutshell, he kind of without giving the
14 dates and citations and that, he pretty much said the exact same
15 thing.

16 But I think sometimes we don't know where
17 something comes from. It's like it's just (indicating), just
18 drops down out of the sky, and that was where I was like, what
19 is the Casa Grande resolve? I wanted to, you know, kind of see
20 this document, this Constitution or whatever you want to call
21 it. And so I think all of this ties in to the Rural
22 Transportation Summit, because the very first one was held for
23 that very purpose.

24 So I guess that is why I see the linking
25 together, so to speak, of the ADOT with regard to the Rural

1 Transportation Summit. So in a nutshell, that's where we're
2 going, and I think in help with Chris Fetzter, who was there at
3 that time, you know, he can come up with some kind of a nice
4 history, you know, maybe even something annually that happened.
5 I know I was going through something. I was looking at some old
6 minutes from I think it was Greenlee County, and there was
7 comments made back at one of their award meetings.

8 And so I think it's just -- you know, these
9 happen, but there should be some purpose in it. And so it's
10 like if we're going to have them, we kind of need to know what
11 the history is as we move forward, so...

12 MR. ROEHRICH: Madam Chair, that's great. So I'm
13 going to turn it over to Kristine. That's a finance issue.
14 That's your problem.

15 No. Actually, I do have some comments on that.
16 I think what you're asking for is obviously to be relevant,
17 being that the 20-year anniversary next year. I think it's
18 important to remember that I don't know of anybody in this room
19 who was at the Casa Grande discussion when they had a resolved
20 or accord or whatever. There's been a few people I've
21 (inaudible).

22 (Speaking simultaneously.)

23 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: One guy.

24 MR. ROEHRICH: Oh (inaudible) haven't seen you.

25 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: (Inaudible).

1 CHAIRWOMAN BEAVER: (Inaudible) in the back of
2 the room, so he was (inaudible).

3 MR. ROEHRICH: But anyways (inaudible).

4 (Unintelligible conversation.)

5 MR. ROEHRICH: But he's saying he was there for a
6 whole lot more than the Casa Grande accord.

7 So anyway, what the issue is, the Rural
8 Transportation Summit is not an ADOT organization or a board
9 function. They put -- they put that on. It's done through the
10 MPOs, COGs and the other planning organizations. That's how it
11 was set up, and we always coordinate through them every year.
12 They put together agendas. We will look for speakers. We
13 identify topics. We'll continue to do that. By no means have
14 we ever said we don't want to be a party to that.

15 Whatever they choose as a theme for next year as
16 far as topics or whatever, we'll support. We'll provide the
17 information that we can in order to do that, but we don't host
18 or put on that summit. You know, so our role has always been
19 through cooperation, coordination and is, if you will, maybe
20 some sponsorship or maybe some other role in that, and we'll
21 always continue to do that.

22 How the Board would want to get involved, you've
23 always been invited, and you have a -- usually a panel there,
24 and it will coincide with the Board meeting. If there's some
25 issue that you as Board members want to take on, then I guess

1 define what that is and if the Board agrees we can do that.

2 As far as developing the history and recreating
3 what had been done, I realize that it was a long time ago. A
4 lot of that has led to, as you said, statutes that were adopted,
5 Board policies that were adopted, and practices that we've put
6 in place. I don't know exactly how to go back and recreate that
7 history, what specifically you're trying to recreate.

8 And this is where, Kristine, I'd ask is there
9 something that you see as an avenue to approach that. And I'm
10 not exactly sure at this time what you're asking or really how
11 to -- how to develop that.

12 CHAIRWOMAN BEAVER: Well, and I don't know that
13 I'm necessarily asking the Board. I think more than anything,
14 it was to get it out here. It gives us -- we've got, now, what,
15 a year to -- in the planning process.

16 MR. ROEHRICH: Uh-huh. Uh-huh.

17 CHAIRWOMAN BEAVER: I think we're looking at
18 being able to put this in the program that is developed at that
19 time. I think Vinnie and Jeanette, they'll be providing draft
20 form to the State, but I think, because I -- I haven't figured
21 out yet if I'm supposed to sit silent on my research and helping
22 the MPO, because I did volunteer to hand out name badges next
23 year. So you might see me again. So I know I have to sit
24 silent as it relates to this board, and in my interaction with
25 them, I need to try and not try and lobby them or anything like

1 that. So --

2 MR. ROEHRICH: As far as I'm -- you can talk all
3 you want. I don't know why you have to be silent --

4 CHAIRWOMAN BEAVER: So --

5 MR. ROEHRICH: -- but that might be a legal issue
6 you may have to resolve.

7 CHAIRWOMAN BEAVER: So I just more than anything,
8 it was if -- if they come back with an invitation asking if the
9 Board chair would like to sign a greetings for the program or
10 the director or even to the governor, I would hope that this
11 body would be supportive of that. If we needed to have access to
12 maybe some old minutes to kind of get a taste, a flavor of what
13 was going on at that point in time, you know, if we can have
14 access to those kind of in a timely fashion. So that's --

15 MR. ROEHRICH: Madam Chair, regarding the
16 minutes, those are public documents. They're available for
17 anybody who requests them. We keep those in the director's
18 office, and we've accessed -- there's a lot of them that are
19 posted. It goes only back a certain number of years. I realize
20 it doesn't go back all the way to the --

21 CHAIRWOMAN BEAVER: Yeah.

22 MR. ROEHRICH: -- beginning of the Transportation
23 Board, but we have electronic versions of those that are
24 available, and if somebody is not -- feels that they can't get
25 access to those, please let me know. We make those available to

1 anybody who asks.

2 CHAIRWOMAN BEAVER: Well, we're just in the
3 process, like right now, just trying to recreate who hosted, you
4 know, number one, and we understand that was Casa Grande. You
5 know, well, then there's a gap there of about five years where
6 it's like, okay, who hosted those. And then, you know, it
7 picked up. And then each year, there's -- there's probably
8 something that seemed to be significant in that year.

9 So I don't think it's as much as we're wanting
10 this -- this Board to say, you know, put money towards it or
11 anything like that. It's just if we could have access to the
12 resource as far as the minutes and -- that we could go back and
13 look at, and then, you know, at that point in time, if somebody
14 feels like submitting a greeting to the program, that would be
15 nice, too.

16 MR. HALIKOWSKI: Madam Chair, so I'd be happy to
17 do a greeting or a welcome message. The other thing I would ask
18 Floyd if are these State Board minutes posted to the State
19 Board's website? Are they available there?

20 CHAIRWOMAN BEAVER: They are, but only back to
21 2011.

22 MR. ROEHRICH: Right. We have them posted back
23 all the way (inaudible) the beginning. We only go back a
24 certain of years.

25 CHAIRWOMAN BEAVER: And this goes back to --

1 MS. PRIANO: We do have them available, and if
2 anybody calls them and requests them, I send them to them
3 electronically.

4 MR. HALIKOWSKI: Okay. So one of the things I'll
5 ask our ITD group is what it would take to digitize those and
6 perhaps provide some link on the Board's website to the minutes
7 going back farther, because we might be able to digitally
8 capture all of those. I just don't know what the effort is
9 involved, but we'll take a look at it.

10 The other thing I would say is as far as the Casa
11 Grande resolves, I know that Jack's here. I also know that Eric
12 Anderson and MAG was there when these were worked out, and they
13 are a bit ephemeral to someone new coming in trying to figure
14 out exactly what do these things do and what do they mean. And
15 so there is some history, I think, that Mr. McGee put together,
16 I think, a little white paper or something for me at one point,
17 but I think what's important for people to understand is that
18 really the resolves turned into the Resource Allocation
19 Committee. They were adopted in part in state statute as far as
20 distribution, but then also into Board policy.

21 And what might be good is for us to put on the
22 web site the resolves, but then links to what they actually
23 turned into so that you can follow them from the day that they
24 were made, but then how they are now presented in the statute
25 and in policy. So that might be helpful if we had that on our

1 website, too, to people -- when someone says, oh, it's in the
2 Casa Grande resolves, well, here's what that means. So we'll
3 look into that, too.

4 And then we can provide some links, as I said, to
5 the Board policies and statutes for that. So we'll see what we
6 can do from that end of trying to at least get folks
7 (inaudible). And I don't know about how this would work, but if
8 RTAC does have information and history that they're gathering,
9 we could provide a link to their website, also. So if you're
10 looking for transportation, you might start with us, and then be
11 led down (inaudible) --

12 CHAIRWOMAN BEAVER: Well, and I don't even know
13 if it would necessarily be -- I would -- I've seen it both as,
14 say, May of 1999 and April of 1999.

15 MR. HALIKOWSKI: Uh-huh.

16 CHAIRWOMAN BEAVER: So I'm not exactly sure. But
17 it might just be minutes leading up to it, because to me, that's
18 when the Board would have probably had some discussion. It's
19 not going to be every minutes from every board meeting the
20 entire year. You know, it's probably a little window of time
21 when those --

22 MR. HALIKOWSKI: Okay.

23 CHAIRWOMAN BEAVER: -- where the discussion
24 happened, so...

25 MR. HALIKOWSKI: Well, we'll take a look at it,

1 and like Floyd, I'll assign Greg Byres from Planning to do it,
2 so...

3 MR. ROEHRICH: I said Kristine.

4 CHAIRWOMAN BEAVER: Well, I was looking at
5 something. I think Harry Campbell from PAG was involved at that
6 time, and then, of course, Chris Fetzer from up in Flagstaff.
7 He was involved. And Jack Husted was involved at that time.
8 So there might be some others around that time that could kind
9 of give us, like I said, kind of a flavor of what all was going
10 on at that time.

11 From what I found in the early 2000s, there was
12 huge development going on in Pinal County. Well, we can see
13 that now in retrospect, looking back, and you know, at that
14 time, I think there wasn't the same level of funding maybe out
15 in the rural areas, and it -- to help get that part of the city
16 developed.

17 So anyway, it's just more than anything sharing
18 this information with you, and that that's kind of the direction
19 that the 20th summit's looking towards. So...

20 MR. LA RUE: Madam Chair.

21 CHAIRWOMAN BEAVER: Yeah.

22 MR. LA RUE: Not that I want to delegate more
23 work, but is -- I'm assuming that this 20th anniversary, which
24 is a big, big event, there would be a program committee or a
25 planning committee of some sort or a planning chair, program

1 chair, a planning committee of some sort, and then the question,
2 is there an ADOT rep on that committee so that as these things
3 come up, they're disseminated out. I mean --

4 MR. ROEHRICH: Madam Chair --

5 MR. LA RUE: -- normally these events kind of --

6 MR. ROEHRICH: Mr. La Rue, Greg Byres is our rep
7 as of now.

8 MR. LA RUE: Thank you. Very efficient.

9 MR. HALIKOWSKI: In all seriousness, do we have
10 somebody on the -- on this?

11 MR. ROEHRICH: Madam Chair?

12 MS. WARD: Ask Floyd.

13 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Floyd.

14 MR. ROEHRICH: Mr. La Rue --

15 (Unintelligible conversation.)

16 MR. ROEHRICH: In the past it started as I was
17 the state engineer, and I believe the state engineers before me,
18 whoever was hosting -- well, no. I'm going to get to. I'm
19 going to get to it. Whoever was hosting the Rural
20 Transportation Summit at some time would come to us and say,
21 hey, let's sit down and plan it out. A lot of times it was the
22 MPO executive director or the COG executive director or
23 somebody. And then as a state engineer, we'd go to staff and
24 we'd coordinate, is it a technical track, is it this history
25 track, is it funding we've put together, the issues.

1 I kept that when I left the state engineer, went
 2 in the director's office, I kept doing that. So for the past X
 3 number of years, every time the Rural Summit had gone to a new
 4 site, I would meet with whoever was hosting it and we'd talk
 5 about getting ADOT involved. So I have actually been
 6 coordinating that now for, you know, probably seven years or
 7 more and have been the primary contact. And I'm fine with
 8 continuing to do that, move forward, which is exactly how we
 9 would always have done it.

10 I mean, I guess that's how I saw it, is I wasn't
 11 sure where you were going with this topic or what you wanted to
 12 do. But Vincent, as you're laying out -- when you put together
 13 the program, I will coordinate those activities. You can
 14 coordinate back through me for ADOT's role, just like we've done
 15 for, and I don't see -- that's not doing anything -- we've never
 16 -- we've always done it.

17 CHAIRWOMAN BEAVER: Well, that's good to know.

18 MR. ROEHRICH: Yeah.

19 CHAIRWOMAN BEAVER: I think sometimes when you
 20 have a change of leadership, a change of positions and things
 21 like that, sometimes stuff gets lost. And so if we can get it
 22 programmed at least in the 20th year, it may not be done again
 23 until the 30th year, so we can go back to the 20th to review it.

24 If there's any additional discussion or no?
 25 Okay. Then I think that's good for the discussion on that.

1 And I think that the next item on the agenda is
 2 suggestions. Mr. Roehrich.

3 MR. ROEHRICH: Madam Chair, just a reminder that
 4 the next Transportation Board meeting is December 15th, Friday,
 5 December 15th. It will be in Phoenix. And again, that's
 6 anticipated to be your last board, unless you do a coop and give
 7 yourself another year. So at that time, that's what we have
 8 planned for this year.

9 The topics, there was one topic that has been
 10 brought forward to the Board Chair for December's meeting, and
 11 that was by the Town of Kingman, who wanted to come in -- or
 12 excuse me -- the City of Kingman who wanted to come in and
 13 present a proposal they have to fund the acceleration of two
 14 traffic interchanges on Interstate 40. They want to have that
 15 discussion with the Board.

16 And for other future topics, Mr. Stratton, we
 17 will track this wrong-way driver pilot program, kind of see as
 18 that progresses when there's enough sufficient information.
 19 Since we're gathering data, we're kind of looking at that
 20 analysis, bring that forward sometime probably mid next year or
 21 so. So give it a few months to really move forward, bring in
 22 kind of the status of how that's been progressing and what we're
 23 seeing out of that, and if there are decisions, operational
 24 decisions or other decisions the Department's thinking of based
 25 upon what we've seen so far.

1 So for December, Madam Chair, that's what we have
2 scheduled, and this is a future topic. And at this point, are
3 there any other topics?

4 MR. STRATTON: Madam Chair.

5 CHAIRWOMAN BEAVER: Yes. Board Member Stratton.

6 MR. STRATTON: At the January work session, big,
7 huge surprise to everyone, I would like to talk about
8 alternative fundings that are possible for I-15 that would not
9 have an impact on Greater Arizona.

10 MR. ROEHRICH: And Madam Chair, Mr. Stratton,
11 you're talking about alternative funding just for that project,
12 just for that -- the projects we're programming in that corridor
13 or alternative transportation funding that we can look at as
14 opportunities?

15 CHAIRWOMAN BEAVER: In general or specific?

16 MR. STRATTON: I think in general, but even more
17 specifically to I-15, because it does not have much impact on
18 Arizona, as the other freeways do.


19 MR. ROEHRICH: Yes, sir.


20 (End of recording.)
21
22
23
24
25

Adjournment

A motion to adjourn the November 17, 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 10:13 a.m. MST.


Deanna Beaver, Chairwoman
State Transportation Board


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