

STATE TRANSPORTATION BOARD MEETING
9:00 a.m., Friday, March 15, 2019
City of Tucson
Council Chambers
255 W Alameda
Tucson, AZ 85726

Call to Order

Vice Chairman Hammond called the State Transportation Board Meeting to order at 10:21 a.m.

Roll Call by Board Secretary was done during the Public Hearing, prior to Board Meeting

A quorum of the State Transportation Board was present. **In attendance:** Vice Chairman Hammond, Board Member Stratton, Board Member Thompson, Board Member Elters and Board Member Knight. Chairman Sellers was not in attendance. There were approximately 45 members of the public in the audience.

Title VI of the Civil Rights Act was done during the Public Hearing, prior to the Board Meeting

ADOT Executive Officer, Floyd Roehrich, Jr. reminded all attendees to please fill out the optional survey cards to assist our Civil Rights Department.

Call to the Audience for the Board Meeting

An opportunity was provided to members of the public to address the State Transportation Board. Members of the public were requested not to exceed a three minute time period for their comments.

1. Kee Allen Begay, Navajo Nation Council
2. David Higuero, Tucson Resident
3. Mike Humphrey, Tucson Resident
4. Stanley Levine, Tucson Resident (did not speak but did fill out a comment card for public record)

ARIZONA STATE TRANSPORTATION BOARD
STATE TRANSPORTATION BOARD MEETING

REPORTER'S TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS

City of Tucson Council Chambers
255 West Alameda
Tucson, Arizona 85726

March 15, 2019

PREPARED FOR:
ADOT - STATE TRANSPORTATION BOARD

(Certified Copy)

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

CALL TO THE AUDIENCE

SPEAKER:	PAGE:
Kee Allen Begay, Junior.....	4
David Higuero.....	5
Mike Humphrey.....	12
Stanley Levine (Did Not Speak).....	XX

AGENDA ITEMS

ITEM NO.	PAGE:
Item 1 - Director's Report, Scott Omer, ADOT Deputy Director Chief Operating Officer.....	7
Item 2 - District Engineer's Report, Doug Moseke, Assistant Southcentral District Engineer.....	17
Item 3 - Consent Agenda.....	22
Item 4 - Financial Report, Kristine Ward, Chief Financial Officer.....	23
Item 5 - Multimodal Planning Division Report, Greg Byres, Division Director, Multimodal Planning.....	27
Item 6 - Priority Planning Advisory Committee (PPAC), Greg Byres, Division Director, Multimodal Planning	30
Item 7 - State Engineer's Report, Dallas Hammit, Deputy Director of Transportation/State Engineer.....	33
Item 8 - Construction Contracts, Dallas Hammit, Deputy Director of Transportation/State Engineer.....	34
Item 9 - Suggestions.....	43

1 (Beginning of excerpt.)

2 VICE CHAIR HAMMOND: We're now opening up the
3 board meeting. And we do have a call to the audience for the
4 board meeting, and we'll ask Mike Humphrey to come up and speak
5 first. I hope I didn't misunderstand when he said he did not
6 want to talk under the yellow card section. Okay. So if he
7 comes back for the restroom, we'll put him on.

8 Kee Allen Begay, Junior.

9 MR. BEGAY: Good morning, board members. I just
10 wanted to continue to advocate for the Highway 191 north, on our
11 northeast corner of the state of Arizona on the Navajo Nation.

12 I appreciate Arizona Department of Transportation
13 administrators and the Board -- some of the board members were
14 at a meeting between the local community of Many Farms and
15 Chinle, Arizona. We've gone to a certain extent to have
16 clarification of what's been -- what's needed in the previous
17 presentation. There's several documents that needs to be
18 forward by the Navajo Nation, which will -- we'll continue to
19 address.

20 I continue to ask and seek for your support,
21 continue to ask for your technical assistance on this particular
22 project. It is a 13-mile between the community of Many Farms
23 and Chinle on the Navajo Nation. We do what we can to help.
24 It's not a matter of -- for us to just look towards the ADOT
25 administration or the State, but more of how can we also

1 participate to help as far as a governing sovereign nation, as
2 Navajo Nation, how can we continue to also help out in
3 improving, addressing the State right-of-way on the tribal land.

4 As you know that during the summer, it always
5 increases to -- double increases the traffic count on the state
6 right-of-way. We have several monuments, Monument Valley, the
7 Four Corners and the Canyon de Chelly and so on that a lot of
8 people visits these sites. So it's just a matter of them criss-
9 crossing across the state of -- on the Navajo Nation. So more
10 of a safety. Of course, the local schools that we have for our
11 buses.

12 So again, I just -- I just -- I came here. We do
13 what we can to help, and I ask that you do consider for us to
14 provide some funding as well for this upcoming five-year plan,
15 and which I'll continue to come over to advocate.

16 So again, I appreciate the board members. Thank
17 you very much. You have a good day.

18 VICE CHAIR HAMMOND: Thank you.

19 Mr. Stanley Levine. Did we lose Stanley?

20 Okay. David Higuero. Hopefully I pronounced
21 your name correctly.

22 MR. HIGUERO: You did.

23 Mr. Chairman, members of the Board, my name is
24 Dave Higuero, I'm here representing myself. I'm a Tucson
25 resident. This is the first time I've ever attended an ADOT

1 meeting.

2 So my -- my statement is really just in terms of
3 the long-term planning that you guys are engaged in on behalf of
4 all the citizens of the state. And Mr. Chairman, you said
5 earlier that it's up to the public to create the political will
6 to raise more revenues, and I agree. I think that it would
7 behoove the Board as well and the Director and the Department to
8 put together a strategic communications plan about that that
9 helps the public plug in so that it's not just left to, you
10 know, us non-experts out in the public to try and convince this
11 the value of increasing revenues, but that you guys can really
12 help set the tone for that discussion with your expertise.

13 And I think most people in the public just have
14 no idea at all how large the need is and how minimal the
15 revenues currently are and the fact that, you know, gasoline tax
16 hasn't gone up in 25 years and all that stuff. I think most
17 people just aren't aware of that.

18 And the other piece of that long-term planning
19 piece is that if it's true that, in fact, the public is looking
20 to more fuel efficient vehicles or driving less and car sharing
21 more and all those kinds of things, then I will hope that the
22 long-term planning also includes how do we envision the major
23 way that folks will want to be transported in 20 years, and what
24 else are we missing besides highways.

25 So thank you.

1 VICE CHAIR HAMMOND: Michelle, I'm talking to you
2 here. We could have a long conversation on this, but we can't
3 talk during the call to the public, right?

4 MS. KUNZMAN: Well, it's part of the (inaudible)
5 you can talk.

6 VICE CHAIR HAMMOND: Well, what I would say is
7 board members have the right and the ability to kind of lobby,
8 if that's the right word. ADOT is an agency of the State. They
9 can point out shortages in funding, but they can't lobby. So
10 you are correct. The constituency that needs to push this
11 forward are the citizens, whether it's us as board members or
12 yourselves or others or other agencies.

13 But it does surprise me, the ignorance. And by
14 the way, the -- when I say nickel on the gas tax, it has to find
15 revenue sources for those that are using the highways with gas
16 with other electric vehicles. So it's -- it's a serious
17 problem, and it's only going to get worse if we don't do
18 something.

19 Okay. I'm not part of the public call to the
20 audience. I guess I should be quiet.

21 Any -- is Mike -- did Mike Humphrey return?

22 Okay. We will end the call to the public and now
23 have the director's report, and I think we've got a stand-in
24 here for Director Halikowski.

25 MR. OMER: Thank you, Mr. Chair, Board. For the

1 record, I'm Scott Omer, the Deputy Director and Chief Operating
2 Officer for ADOT. Thank you for allowing me to sit up here
3 today and give the director's report.

4 I'll give a brief update on some state and
5 federal legislation. First of all, there's something called
6 PRISM legislation. In December 2015, the federal FAST Act made
7 participation in the PRISM program a requirement for eligibility
8 for certain federal funding related to motor carrier safety.
9 The gist of it is in order to receive the federal funding, we
10 have to participate in the program with full participation to be
11 in effect in October of 2020.

12 The district did require some state legislation,
13 which has gone through. It's been sponsored by the Senate
14 Transportation and Public Safety Committee. A full vote of the
15 Senate and the House Transportation Committee appears headed
16 fairly soon with no opposition. Without that, it could put us
17 in risk of losing around \$10 million a year in federal funding
18 that the department and public safety receives for our work.

19 There's some fuel tax and VLT parity bills that
20 have been going through. Both House and Senate are attempting
21 to create some greater parity with alternative fuel vehicles
22 with the intention in both of those being that everyone would
23 pay the same and full VLT that gas-powered vehicles would pay by
24 January 2023. Whether or not those get out of the House and the
25 Senate and make it for a final vote is still to be seen.

1 Turning around like this is kind of awkward.

2 VICE CHAIR HAMMOND: You can look straight ahead.

3 MR. OMER: All right.

4 VICE CHAIR HAMMOND: We know you're talking to
5 us.

6 MR. OMER: County transportation excise taxes.
7 House Bill 2109 was sponsored by Representative Shope. It would
8 allow, provided a majority of the qualified voters approve, a
9 county transportation excise tax to be levied at 20 percent,
10 either alone or with a combination of other taxes. The current
11 laws allow for 10 percent. The bill's being pushed strongly by
12 transportation interests in Pima County. The bill was passed by
13 the House and is awaiting the vote in the Senate Transportation
14 and Public Safety Committee.

15 Moving on to the federal side -- excuse me. Our
16 staff attended the AASHTO Washington briefings in the last
17 couple of weeks with really -- with the intention of identifying
18 what is going on on the -- with federal legislation. Secretary
19 of Transportation Chao addressed the gathering of state -- of
20 the state officials and highlighted what the administration's
21 efforts to improve interagency coordination for -- and as a --
22 as an ADOT employee, we would greatly applaud any coordination
23 between any of the USDOT functions. It appears at times that
24 they don't necessarily coordinate and communicate with each
25 other. So we're in great support of this bill to allow for

1 greater coordination between environmental reviews, supporting
2 public trust in driverless car technology and its ongoing
3 actions to preserve the 5.9 gigahertz band for automated
4 vehicles and connected infrastructure.

5 Not to be surprised at the briefing, nothing of
6 great and substantive value came out of the meeting other than
7 the fact that they talked about that they should do a lot, and
8 they've been saying that for a long time. What did happen was
9 our staff went and we did get a chance, an opportunity to meet
10 with all 11 of our delegation, whether it was the members or
11 staff, and they briefed them on our -- on ADOT's priorities and
12 projects around the state in the coming years, including our
13 efforts to widen I-10 across the Gila River Indian Community,
14 the INFRA grant, which I'll speak about in a second, and also
15 the other major projects as they were asked questions about
16 those.

17 INFRA grant for I-17, ADOT has submitted an
18 application for roughly \$95 and a half million for the INFRA
19 grant funding for its I-17 flex demand project, which adds two
20 flex lanes between Black Canyon City and Sunset Point. I think
21 Greg mentioned this a little bit earlier. This is one of the
22 pieces of the puzzle for overall funding on I-17. If we do not
23 receive the grant, the project will still be funded. It's just
24 the way that it's funded over the ultimate life of the project
25 itself. The grant represents almost half of the total project

1 cost of \$195 million.

2 We've also seen the President has released his
3 budget for fiscal year 2020. That calls for full funding of the
4 highway program and the FAST Act. Again, I guess we will see
5 what happens once that makes its way through.

6 That's all we have for the federal update. I
7 don't have any additional issues for the director's report. I'd
8 be glad and happy to answer any questions.

9 VICE CHAIR HAMMOND: Board Member Stratton. No?
10 Board Member --

11 MR. ELTERS: Chairman, one question, Scott,
12 related to those bills in the state House Bill -- I believe 2536
13 is probably the one that is most impactful to revenue and our
14 ability to deliver and the discussion we had earlier. What does
15 the path look like? We hear and read different amendments and
16 different Tweets. Any insight on -- related to what that looks
17 like going forward?

18 MR. OMER: Mr. Chair and Member Elters, if you're
19 talking about a House Bill that is -- is this for the public
20 safety fee?

21 MR. ELTERS: No. This is the one that was
22 introduced by Representative Campbell --

23 MR. OMER: Campbell.

24 MR. ELTERS: -- for the 25 cents increase to gas
25 tax.

1 MR. OMER: That's a great question. So as -- as
2 the department, we -- as you know, we don't necessarily have any
3 opinion on the bill itself. The outcome of the bill, if we were
4 to receive additional funding, of course, it would assist us in
5 many of our needs. The outcome of the bill, we've seen and
6 we've heard talk from both sides that says they're in great
7 support of it one day, and the next day it kind of wanes. So
8 without any real view of what the House or Senate are going to
9 do about it, it's kind of hard to predict what's going to happen
10 at this time, Mr. Elters.

11 VICE CHAIR HAMMOND: (Inaudible.)

12 Did Mike Humphrey return? I don't know whether
13 it's appropriate. Can we let him speak?

14 MR. ROEHRICH: Mr. Chair, you can open the call
15 to the audience again, and what you'll do is you'll accept
16 anybody who will ask to speak, you will give them an
17 opportunity. If it's only Mr. Humphrey, then that's all it is.
18 But you can open the call the audience again, but then you will
19 have to accept -- anybody who wants to speak will be given the
20 same three minutes.

21 VICE CHAIR HAMMOND: I think we're take that
22 risk. So we'll open the call to the public.

23 Mr. Humphrey, if you'd like to speak.

24 MR. HUMPHREY: Thank you for allowing me to speak
25 today. I was confused earlier in the call to the audience,

1 because you asked if I wanted to speak now, and I said yes, and
2 then --

3 VICE CHAIR HAMMOND: I thought I heard no. I
4 apologize.

5 MR. HUMPHREY: That's okay. I had to take a
6 friend back to work. So anyway -- anyway, here I am. So thank
7 you for the opportunity to speak. Welcome to Tucson. And my
8 name is Mike Humphrey, and I live at 3760 North Camino Sinuoso
9 in Tucson.

10 As I'm sure you guys probably recall, I lost my
11 wife and my sister in a cross-median crash on I-10 in a section
12 of I-10 that does not have a median cable barrier. I've come to
13 the board meeting today to ask the -- ask you members the
14 question why? Why are the recommendations made by the mayors of
15 Casa Grande and Maricopa, a Pima County supervisor, the Pinal
16 County Board of Supervisors, and the Sun Corridor Metropolitan
17 Planning Organization, to improve the safety of I-10, including
18 placing median barrier cables in crash points -- in crash prone
19 sections of I-10 being ignored? And I have a letter from the
20 mayor of Maricopa to that effect. You have the other letters in
21 my previous testimonies to you all.

22 Why is the recommendation of the 2013 Arizona
23 Roadway Departure Safety Implementation Plan that calls for
24 placing additional median barrier cables in crash-prone sections
25 of I-10 being ignored? Why is Arizona not following national

1 standards regarding transportation -- requiring transportation
2 departments to do two things: One, put in barriers where
3 there's a history of crashes. And two, develop a broader median
4 barrier standard based on traffic volume and median width.

5 Why does there appear to be no plan or mechanism
6 in place to assist motorists trapped in post-cross-median crash
7 traffic jams? The gentleman I -- who couldn't stay to testify
8 was in the cross-median -- the post-cross-median traffic jam
9 where the road was closed for seven hours, and he was going to
10 tell you all about what he observed in the cars that were
11 trapped in that post-crash traffic jam.

12 Why is there no liaison or communication
13 mechanism allowing families of crash victims such as myself and
14 others to communicate with ADOT short of the legal system? And
15 as an aside, a couple of years ago, ADOT was looking for a
16 blanket immunity so they wouldn't have to do that part either.
17 There needs to be a way for families like mine after something
18 happens to be able to communicate with ADOT officials about what
19 happened, why it happened, and just have an open dialogue. I
20 think if that happened, things would be a lot smoother in terms
21 of the relationship between the families and the agency.

22 Why is it so difficult for the public to access
23 information about cross-median crashes? That information is on
24 the DPS accident reports. There's a check box. There's
25 actually a couple of them. Why is it so hard for people in the

1 public to find out how many cross-median crashes there are in
2 Arizona? Where they are? It shouldn't be that difficult.

3 Finally, given all the above, and with
4 cross-median crashes continuing to occur on I-10 and elsewhere
5 on Arizona highways, why doesn't this board place the issue of
6 cross-median crashes and median cable barriers on their agenda
7 for a public discussion and an action?

8 Thank you for the opportunity to speak.

9 VICE CHAIR HAMMOND: Thank you.

10 Is there anyone else that...

11 Okay. We will close the call to the audience and
12 move to the district engineer's report. Doug Moseke.

13 MR. THOMPSON: Chairman, can you go back to the
14 director's report?

15 VICE CHAIR HAMMOND: Certainly.

16 MR. THOMPSON: Scott, on HB 2047.

17 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Can you put your
18 microphone on, please.

19 MR. THOMPSON: (Inaudible.) On 2047 HURF
20 distribution, cities, towns, counties, I see an opportunity to
21 include the tribal communities in this portion. Could I have
22 that researched, if I could have that done?

23 MR. ROEHRICH: Mr. Chair, Mr. Thompson, I think
24 it's important to remember that those bills are created by the
25 Legislature, and although we -- we're maybe asked our -- our

1 participation, our input, we do not have the ability to modify
2 those. So if you're talking about trying to modify a bill to
3 add -- whether it's a tribal nation or some other element of the
4 bill, that needs to go through the legislative committee. The
5 agency can't ask for that.

6 MR. THOMPSON: Chairman, I do understand that. I
7 just want some information on it. I guess it would be to legal.

8 MR. ROEHRICH: I guess what information are you
9 asking?

10 MR. THOMPSON: You know, could that be done? I
11 mean, what would be the recommendation if that's what I would
12 like to see happen?

13 MR. ROEHRICH: Well, if you're asking can the
14 bill be modified, the answer is yes, but it would have to go
15 through the legislative process, meaning either a sponsor of the
16 bill or somebody who has asked to modify an existing bill would
17 have to sponsor that, but it would have to be a legislator. It
18 can't be an agency or a staff.

19 MR. THOMPSON: Yeah.

20 MR. ROEHRICH: So it would have to go back
21 through somebody in the Legislature.

22 MR. OMER: Mr. Chairman --

23 MR. THOMPSON: I do understand that now. I --
24 you know, that's what I wanted --

25 MR. OMER: Mr. Chair, Mr. Thompson, what we can

1 do is we can ask some of our legislative staff to reach out to
2 Mr. Thompson to help him understand the process of it better and
3 to indicate who he could potentially talk to, but we couldn't
4 work on modification of the bill at all.

5 MR. THOMPSON: I certainly understand that. I
6 just want some kind of a clarification on that. So thank you,
7 Chair.

8 VICE CHAIR HAMMOND: Okay. Moving on to the
9 district engineer's report. Mr. Moseke.

10 MR. MOSEKE: Good morning, Mr. Chair and members
11 of the Board. Welcome to the Southcentral District. Thank you
12 for the opportunity to present the district engineer's report
13 today. My name is Doug Moseke. I'm one of the two assistant
14 district engineers representing Rod Lane today.

15 The Southcentral District boundaries this year
16 have not changed from our presentation last year. We still have
17 three interstates, I-10, I-19 and Interstate 8. We do have a
18 significant rural component to the district. We also have four
19 international border crossings, five councils of governments,
20 and metropolitan planning organizations, as well as five tribal
21 nations.

22 We'll hit a quick highlight of the construction
23 projects. The first project you'll notice in the lower right-
24 hand corner is a preservation project. This is at State Route
25 92 in Sierra Vista. Contractor Fisher Sand & Gravel, with the

1 contract amount of just under \$7 million. The projects's 97
2 percent complete and is looking to be complete in spring of
3 2019. They just need to do some final paving and striping.

4 The next project is Interstate 19, the Canoa
5 Ranch to Duvall Mine Road. The contractor is The Ashton
6 Company, with a contract amount of just under \$9 and a half
7 million. This project is 90 percent complete and is also
8 estimated to be completed spring of '19. It's also, again, just
9 some final striping and a little paving.

10 The next project is I-10 and Wilmot bridges.
11 This project received a lot of press last year with the
12 temporary bridge that was installed for construction. Pulice
13 Construction is the contractor. Contract amount at \$4 million.
14 The project's 95 percent complete. Also looking to wrap up this
15 spring. Again, some final paving and striping.

16 The next project is I-10 Pima Mine Road bridge.
17 KE&G is the contractor on this project. 4.75 million. The
18 project's 95 percent complete. Also completing this spring.
19 Again, some paving and striping.

20 The next project is State Route 86 from Valencia
21 to Kinney. The contractor is The Ashton Company. This is a
22 contract amount of \$40 million. The project's 95 percent
23 complete, and it's also going to be completing in the spring.
24 We've got some final asphalt and striping to do on the west end
25 of that project. This project, as you can see, is an expansion

1 project versus a preservation project.

2 To the east side of town, we have Interstate 10
3 at the State Route 83 eastbound off ramp. The contractor is
4 Southern Arizona Paving. It's a \$410,000 project. It's 95
5 percent complete. The work is basically complete. They just
6 need to do some final striping. This was a modernization
7 project as well.

8 One of the -- one of the big projects in the
9 district is -- is Ina Road. We are celebrating the -- the
10 opening of Ina, being able to cross Interstate 10 as of Thursday
11 morning. The contractor here is Sundt/Kiewit, joint venture.
12 It's a \$124 million project. It's 82 percent complete, with the
13 expected substantial completion in June. We're working towards
14 trying to open the on ramps. Those are actually probably going
15 to occur in a month or so. But that project, we're excited to
16 see it reaching its completion.

17 Part of the Ina Road project is also the
18 improvements to Ina to the west of the interstate. This is the
19 Santa Cruz River Bridge. The paving on the north side of Ina is
20 one of the last major projects -- or major components of the
21 project to be completed.

22 At Interstate 10 and the TIs of Wilmot, Kolb and
23 Rita, we're doing some paving improvements and installing
24 traffic signals. The contractor here is Sturgeon, with a
25 contract amount of \$1.75 million. This project's 61 percent

1 complete. Estimated completion this summer. Most of the paving
2 is complete. The foundations for the signals are installed.
3 One signal has been installed. We're basically just waiting for
4 the -- for the other signal equipment to arrive.

5 Interstate 10 at SR-87 in Picacho actually falls
6 in Southcentral District, but with the manpower challenges, the
7 Central District is actually managing this project for us. The
8 contractor here is Coffman Specialties. Contract value is \$58
9 and a half million. It's a main line widening and new traffic
10 interchange, along with some dust detection. 68 percent
11 complete. Expected to be completed fall of this year.

12 We then have the widening of I-10 at Interstate
13 8. Contractor is Ames/Combs joint venture. This also falls in
14 the Southcentral District but is being managed by the Central
15 District of ADOT. Contract value here is \$36.6 million. It's a
16 main line widening. It's also 70 percent complete, with an
17 expected completion -- pardon me -- in August of this year.

18 I-19 at Ajo on the south side of Tucson. Phase 1
19 of the project was completed last year, and we've started Phase
20 2. Contractor is FNF Construction, with a contract value of
21 \$32 million. It's 33 percent complete. This project is going
22 to construct new -- a new bridge over the Santa Cruz, extend the
23 Irvington Road off ramp, install some noise walls as well as a
24 pedestrian bridge over Michigan Avenue. We're expecting to
25 complete this in February of 2020.

1 I-20 and Pinal Air Park is a bridge deck
2 replacement. That bridge deck was placed about 10 days ago now.
3 The contractor is FNF Construction. It's \$1.7 million. It's 36
4 percent complete, and we're expecting to complete that spring of
5 this year.

6 The district's also working on the I-10 and I-19
7 rest areas at Sacaton and Canoa. The Sacaton rest area is
8 complete, and working on finalizing the Canoa rest area. The
9 Ashton Company is the contractor here with a contract amount of
10 \$4.3 million. It's about 95 percent complete. Hoping to
11 complete this in spring of this year.

12 Upcoming, we have two big upcoming projects that
13 -- that are going to be hitting the street for construction very
14 soon. The Ruthrauff Road TI, just south of Ina, is expected to
15 advertise this spring. It's going to be a new diamond
16 interchange with a bridge over the railroad as well, very
17 similar to the Ina TI. We're going to procure using this A plus
18 B bidding method to incentivize the contractor to complete this
19 in a shorter time frame. So basically, the contractor's not
20 only going to bid the contract unit construction bid item
21 prices. They're going to bid time as well. We -- we will not
22 be doing any ramp closures on Ruthrauff until Ina Road is
23 complete, and we're on task for that.

24 The other big project in the Southcentral
25 District, it's important to both the district as well as

1 southern Arizona, is the SR-189 International Border Crossing to
2 Grand Avenue project. This is going to be a design-build
3 project. We've already selected AECOM as the general
4 engineering consultant, and we will be advertising for project
5 teams this spring, where that will be teams of both contractors
6 and engineers.

7 This -- this concludes the district's report, and
8 I'll be happy to answer any questions.

9 CHAIRMAN CUTHBERTSON: Any questions?

10 I'd like to thank the work that you do. You
11 know, as a board member for this district, I could take a lot of
12 phone calls if you weren't doing the good job that you were
13 doing. So it's a tribute to your listening process. Obviously,
14 they never -- no one's ever happy with the project that doesn't
15 get funded, but they're happy with the listening and the attempt
16 to be responsive to the constituents. So I thank you for that.

17 MR. MOSEKE: Thank you, Mr. Chair. Mr. Lane has
18 a great team here in Southcentral.

19 VICE CHAIR HAMMOND: All right. Moving on to the
20 consent agenda. Does any board member want any item removed
21 from the consent agenda as presented?

22 Hearing none, is there a motion to approve the
23 consent agenda as presented?

24 MR. STRATTON: So moved.

25 MR. THOMPSON: Second.

1 VICE CHAIR HAMMOND: Okay. Moved by Board Member
2 Stratton, seconded by Board Member Thompson. Any discussion?

3 All in favor?

4 BOARD MEMBERS: Aye.

5 CHAIRMAN CUTHBERTSON: Opposed? Hearing none, we
6 pass the consent agenda.

7 Now we'll move on to the financial report.
8 Kristine Ward, our favorite part of the board meeting.

9 MS. WARD: I knew it. I knew it all along.

10 VICE CHAIR HAMMOND: Just be careful.

11 MS. WARD: I just had to ignore --

12 VICE CHAIR HAMMOND: I got stuff on you. I got
13 stuff on you, Kristine.

14 MS. WARD: You do. You have material.

15 VICE CHAIR HAMMOND: Okay. All right.

16 MS. WARD: So back away.

17 Okay. So in terms of where we are overall -- the
18 overall report is very brief today. We haven't got a ton to
19 report in change, but we're running a little bit ahead of
20 forecast on Highway User Revenue Fund. We were running a little
21 bit more ahead of forecast last month, but we're coming back
22 into that target zone with about \$125 million collected in
23 February. Still little bit below forecast. And year to date,
24 we just topped a billion dollars.

25 So moving on, on RARF, we're right within

1 forecast, and I've got nothing exciting to report there at all.

2 So in terms of -- I thought I'd give you -- you
3 know, federal aid, we got our remaining funds for the balance of
4 the federal fiscal year. We're very appreciative of that. I
5 should give you a brief report on where we are. If you'll
6 recall back in January, you authorized us to proceed with a bond
7 issue, particularly in -- specifically, a GAN issue, Grant
8 Anticipation Note issue, to the tune of \$75 million. We
9 completed our calls with the rating agencies last week. Yep.
10 It was about last week. And we have received our ratings back,
11 and all of our ratings were maintained, and we're at the double
12 A status, so we're very happy about that.

13 So basically, next step for that issue is that we
14 go to the market on the 26th, and everything is proceeding
15 exactly on schedule. And now we just need to hope that nothing
16 tumultuous happens in the market or along those lines. That --
17 let's see -- concludes my report.

18 Oh, oh, if I may, Mr. Chair, I forgot one
19 little -- little item. May I add on? I'm not sure you're
20 giving me a good look there. Oh, I can?

21 VICE CHAIR HAMMOND: Go ahead.

22 MS. WARD: Okay. So you might have received an
23 email that contained the -- a link, a very arduous link to get
24 to the preliminary official statement. That is the statement
25 that we put out for investors to review in order to -- to see

1 whether they want to invest in these bonds. That was a bit of
2 an accident. You weren't supposed to get that distribution. We
3 separate it -- usually I talk to you first, and I say, Hey,
4 would you like this lovely, insomnia-resolving material sent to
5 you -- or I'll be providing it to you, and then it gets sent.
6 It actually -- you got an early email, so -- and it's a very
7 difficult email to open. So now I am letting you know that you
8 will be receiving this next week an email that is a simple link
9 to the preliminary official statement for your reading pleasure
10 about the upcoming bond issue. Read it at your leisure.

11 That concludes my report.

12 VICE CHAIR HAMMOND: Was there any questions?
13 Board Member Thompson.

14 MR. THOMPSON: Kristine --

15 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Can you turn your mic on.

16 MR. THOMPSON: Kristine, what do we foresee in
17 the future as far as Federal Highway Administration funding
18 concerned? Do we see any decrease in that?

19 MS. WARD: Mr. --

20 MR. THOMPSON: And I'm thinking that in one
21 sense, some way or another, will affect our budget.

22 MS. WARD: Mr. Chair, Mr. Thompson, so what we
23 are facing is that the FAST Act is going to expire in 2020. The
24 part -- and so what we have assumed in terms of revenues that
25 this program, the tentative program that you've been listening

1 -- has been being presented, what we have assumed in terms of
2 revenue levels in that tentative program is we have flatlined
3 those revenue levels, because we do not have -- we know we don't
4 have a long-term authorization.

5 But the part that gets a little more sad is the
6 fact that the Federal Highway Trust Fund is once again -- at the
7 end of the FAST Act will be in an upside down -- a deficit
8 position. So it once again will be incumbent upon Congress and
9 the President to -- to infuse either -- infuse that fund with
10 additional revenues, as they had been doing with -- for many,
11 many years now.

12 The problem, the underlying problem at the
13 federal level is the same underlying problem we have at the
14 state level, is that the revenue sources flowing into the
15 Federal Highway Trust Fund and the revenue sources flowing into
16 the Highway User Revenue Fund are deteriorating. That
17 underlying revenue infrastructure is deteriorating, and that is
18 what is driving so many of your very difficult conversations
19 here. We do not have adequate resources.

20 So Mr. Chair and Mr. Thompson, to your point,
21 we've assumed flat revenues. If the Congress does not infuse
22 those dollars, yes, you will be facing me coming back to you and
23 say, hey, we're going to have to reduce the program, if indeed
24 they reduce our -- our funding.

25 MR. THOMPSON: Okay. Thank you, Chair.

1 VICE CHAIR HAMMOND: Thank you, Michelle. No,
2 not Michelle.

3 MS. WARD: Thank you.

4 VICE CHAIR HAMMOND: Thank you, Ms. Ward.

5 Okay. Moving on to Agenda Item 5. Greg, you're
6 up again. We get another shot at you.

7 MR. BYRES: Mr. Chair, board members, I just got
8 a -- have a somewhat quick presentation here. What I'm going to
9 go through is what we're currently working on. We've already
10 started on the next program. So we've started our P2P process.
11 And with that, we started requesting projects to put into our
12 P2P. So we're accumulating those projects. We're taking them
13 from, like I said, before, all different areas as well as
14 projects that have been previously prioritized and didn't make
15 it into the program, we take and again run those through the
16 same process.

17 We are looking at changes to our P2P program.
18 We're doing lessons learned from last year as well as looking at
19 ways that we can possibly improve it. So we're currently
20 working on that.

21 And then I've got a couple of ongoing planning
22 studies that I want to go through with you. The first one is
23 our I-10, 210 DCR, our design concept report that we're working
24 on. This kind of gives you an idea of what we're talking about.
25 It runs from I-19 to Kolb Road on I-10. It also includes a

1 connector of 210 that comes into I-10 from the intersection of
2 Golf Links.

3 So as of right now, that project -- what brought
4 that project about was the lack of roadway options in the
5 downtown area. The interchanges have poor operational
6 performance. There's a lot of -- high crash rate. Projected
7 I-10 traffic growth over the next 25 years, as well as a high
8 percentage of travel on I-10 for local trips rather than through
9 traffic.

10 So a couple of different alternatives that have
11 been presented include the designate Alvernon Way as SR-210 from
12 Golf Links to I-10 and provide four travel lanes in each
13 direction, add a new system interchange to provide access from
14 210 onto I-10, add up to two lanes in each direction on I-10
15 from the I-10/I-19 interchange to Alvernon Way, and add up to
16 four lanes in each direction on I-10 from Alvernon Way to Kolb
17 Road.

18 Another alternative we have is designating
19 Alvernon Way as SR-210 from Golf Links, adding a new system
20 interchange to provide access to 210, add up to two lanes in
21 each direction on I-10, as well as from I-10 to I-19 interchange
22 on Alvernon Way. And modify I-10 from Alvernon Way to Kolb Road
23 to serve as a collector-distributor roadway, adding up to four
24 lanes in each direction.

25 So this is kind of an idea of what that

1 collector-distributor roadway is. It's basically the frontage
2 roads along that section, just as we have frontage roads on the
3 northern section of I-10.

4 The project schedule, right now we're looking
5 at -- all the data collection's been completed. The alternative
6 evaluation has been done. We've got the draft DCR that's coming
7 out this spring, with the final DCR coming out this summer. So
8 that's the schedule of what we've got for that.

9 The next project is the Sonoran Corridor. This
10 is a tier one EIS study, environmental impact study, that we're
11 working on, which is basically the first part of the NEPA
12 process that we go through. This kind of gives you an idea of
13 the studies. It's basically the triangular section between I-10
14 and I-19, which encompasses the airport and the area around the
15 airport.

16 What we're looking at now is we've taken and --
17 taken all the alternatives, brought them down to basically three
18 alternatives. That shows the different routes and the different
19 connecting points on I-10 and I-19 as they pass through that
20 triangular section.

21 So with that, the key milestones, we've already
22 gone through the need and purpose, the evaluation methodology,
23 the comprehensive set of corridors, refined list of corridors.
24 We're now at a range of reasonable corridors, which is what
25 those three corridors are. There will be a corridor selection

1 report coming up next month, as well as the draft EIS statement,
2 which will be coming out in the fall of this year. And we're
3 working towards a-- after the public hearings, having the record
4 of decision in spring of 2020. So that's just kind of an idea
5 of what we got going on in this Tucson region.

6 So if you have any questions, I'll certainly
7 stand for those.

8 CHAIRMAN CUTHBERTSON: Any questions regarding
9 the Multimodal report?

10 Okay. We'll move on to Item 6. I might explain
11 to the audience that this is -- we discuss and act on these
12 items that are the recommended changes to the fiscal year
13 '19-2023 Statewide Transportation Facilities Construction
14 Program. So I guess we take it in a couple of tranches.

15 So Greg, go ahead.

16 MR. BYRES: Thank you, Mr. Board -- or Mr. Chair,
17 board members. With this I bring forth -- I'm breaking it into
18 three different items. It's project modifications, new projects
19 and airport projects. So with this, Item 6A and 6B are project
20 modifications, which we bring forth with a recommendation for
21 approval.

22 MR. STRATTON: Move to approve.

23 VICE CHAIR HAMMOND: Board Member Stratton moves
24 to approve. Do I hear a second?

25 MR. ELTERS: I second.

1 VICE CHAIR HAMMOND: Board Member Elters seconds.
2 Any discussion?

3 Hearing none, all in favor.

4 BOARD MEMBERS: Aye.

5 VICE CHAIR HAMMOND: Opposed?

6 Okay. Items C to F.

7 MR. BYRES: Yes. Items C to F are new projects,
8 and again, we bring that forward with a recommendation for
9 approval.

10 MR. KNIGHT: Mr. Chair.

11 VICE CHAIR HAMMOND: Board Member Knight.

12 MR. KNIGHT: I do have one -- one question, Greg.
13 So where is the funding coming from for these new projects?

14 MR. BYRES: Where the funding is coming from, I'm
15 going to actually have Kristine or -- or --

16 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: (Inaudible.)

17 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: (Inaudible.)

18 MR. BYRES: Yeah. It's coming through our --
19 through the contingencies?

20 (Speaking simultaneously.)

21 MS. WARD: Excuse me. So what comes before you
22 every month is when you look in the five-year program, you will
23 see subprograms, and there is a -- a set of money associated
24 with each of those subprograms. As those projects are
25 identified, associated with that particular subprogram, the

1 project comes before you, and that's where the money comes from.
2 It's already been established in a budget, in an overall,
3 controlled, fiscally-constrained program.

4 Does that -- does that make sense?

5 MR. ELTERS: Thank you.

6 MR. THOMPSON: Chairman, I would move for
7 approval.

8 MR. KNIGHT: Second.

9 VICE CHAIR HAMMOND: Board Member Thompson moves
10 for approval. Board Member Knight seconds. More discussion?

11 All in favor?

12 BOARD MEMBERS: Aye.

13 VICE CHAIR HAMMOND: Opposed?

14 Items G and H, 6G and H.

15 MR. BYRES: Yes. G and H are airport projects,
16 and with that, we bring this forward with a recommendation for
17 approval.

18 MR. THOMPSON: Again, I would move for approval.

19 VICE CHAIR HAMMOND: Board Member Thompson moves
20 for approval.

21 MR. STRATTON: Second.

22 VICE CHAIR HAMMOND: Board Member Stratton
23 seconds. No discussion?

24 All in favor?

25 BOARD MEMBERS: Aye.

1 VICE CHAIR HAMMOND: All right. Moving to agenda
2 Item 7, state engineer's report, information and discussion
3 only.

4 MR. HAMMIT: Good morning, Mr. Chair, members.
5 Currently, ADOT, we have 95 projects under construction totaling
6 about \$1.8 billion. In February we closed four projects
7 totaling 11.3 million, and year to date we have finalized 73
8 projects.

9 A quick note. In the state engineer's report and
10 then following up to Member Knight's questions, a couple -- in
11 -- we have a couple of subprograms, one for minor preservation.
12 That's the majority of that -- the last question. Each year
13 in -- you'll find it in the program. It's about \$16 million,
14 and these are for more immediate needs. They pop up. We don't
15 plan them way out ahead, because we know things are going to
16 happen where we have to have the ability to react very quickly.
17 So that's where those come from.

18 And in the future time, Mr. Byres brought it up,
19 but I think it's important to know in the last two years of the
20 program, our preservation, there's 170-plus million in one year
21 and \$200 million in the fifth year -- fourth and fifth year of
22 the program that have not been programmed. So it's not a little
23 bit of money. It's quite a bit of money that's still out there
24 to be programmed.

25 What happens if we program too far out on our

1 pavements, we hit a winter and things -- priorities change. So
2 we try to maintain three years, and then the fourth and fifth
3 gives us some flexibilities to react.

4 So -- any questions from the state engineer's
5 report?

6 VICE CHAIR HAMMOND: Thank you.

7 Okay. Moving on to Item 8, construction
8 contracts.

9 MR. HAMMIT: Mr. Chair, members, thank you for
10 approving the three projects in the consent agenda. We do have
11 five projects that require justification. And one thing you'll
12 see, and I'm sure most of you missed it, that we were well over
13 -- I'm joking -- the estimate on these, and as we go through
14 them, you'll see that there's some unique projects here that we
15 -- we are working on, especially three of the bridges that we
16 missed some of the estimate. But we are 20 -- almost 26 percent
17 over the engineer's estimate in this, and part of that is the
18 uniqueness of those projects. Part of it is the market. It's
19 just really tough, especially on the labor pool. But we'll go
20 into those more if it pleases the Chair.

21 Item 8A, this is a project on I-40 near Belmont
22 and -- Belmont is where you enter Camp Navajo. So this is a
23 bridge reconstruction, and it's very critical that once we start
24 that, we get done very quickly. We can't have that bridge
25 closed for an extended period of time. We are using a precast

1 deck elements on this. This is the first time we've done this
2 type. Maybe not the first, but we don't do it very often. I
3 bet we haven't done it more than three times. And it will be
4 put in in nine precast segments.

5 Our plan is to have the bridge closed less than
6 two weeks. To have that speed, it takes some special equipment.
7 We have some slabs that are 60 feet long. So there's a crane
8 that costs quite a bit of money. So as we looked at the
9 price -- let me go through the bid amount. The low bid was
10 5,850,000. The State's estimate was \$5,026,209. It was over
11 the State's estimate by 823,791, or 16.4 percent. Where we saw
12 it was just -- had higher than expected prices in that precast
13 deck, and a lot of it is the tight time frame that they have to
14 work in. We underestimated that.

15 There were three bidders, and one thing that I
16 went and looked at after I reviewed it, since it was so much
17 more than our estimate, how far apart were bid number one and
18 two, and they were 1.3 percent apart. So we did get a good bid.
19 We were just underestimating. So the department has reviewed
20 the bid and believes it is a responsive and responsible bid and
21 would recommend award to Fisher Sand & Gravel, doing business as
22 Southwest Asphalt Paving.

23 MR. THOMPSON: Chairman, I would move for
24 approval.

25 MR. KNIGHT: Second.

1 VICE CHAIR HAMMOND: We have a motion for
2 approval from Board Member Thompson, and a second from Board
3 Member Knight to approve Item 8A, Fisher Sand & Gravel Company,
4 d/b/a Southwest Asphalt Paving. Any more discussions?

5 All in favor?

6 BOARD MEMBERS: Aye.

7 VICE CHAIR HAMMOND: Opposed?

8 Item 8B.

9 MR. HAMMIT: Thank you, Mr. Chair.

10 On this project is another bridge replacement on
11 I-40 near Meteor City. The low bid was \$5,588,004. The State's
12 estimate was \$3,738,716. It was over the State's estimate by
13 \$1,849,288, or 49.5 percent. As we dug into this, we saw higher
14 than expected pricing in a number of areas. The geosynthetic
15 soil reinforcement or abutment and aggregates.

16 So I dug in further, and I went and talked to the
17 low bidder. Their labor prices on this project are really what
18 set that apart. And as we -- when the contractor builds their
19 program, they have to bid it in items, but then they have to
20 build it with materials, labor and equipment.

21 The workforce is not there in this location, and
22 so it has to come in. And what they're finding is in the cities
23 such as Flagstaff, there's enough work that workers don't have
24 to leave to go travel down I-40 and work remotely. They have
25 trouble finding workers. So their labor costs were higher than

1 expected. Again, there were five bidders on this project. 2.6
2 percent difference between one and two. The department has
3 reviewed the bids and believes it is a responsive and
4 responsible bid and would recommend award to FNF Construction,
5 Inc.

6 VICE CHAIR HAMMOND: Any questions?

7 MR. KNIGHT: Mr. Chair, so moved.

8 VICE CHAIR HAMMOND: Motioned by Board Member
9 Knight. Do I hear a second?

10 MR. ELTERS: Second.

11 VICE CHAIR HAMMOND: Seconded by Board Member
12 Elters. So we have a motion and a second to award Board Item 8B
13 to FNF Construction, Inc., as presented. All in favor?

14 BOARD MEMBERS: Aye.

15 VICE CHAIR HAMMOND: Opposed?

16 Okay. Item 8C.

17 MR. HAMMIT: Thank you, Mr. Chair.

18 Another bridge deck replacement. Again, near
19 I-40 -- actually, it's on the spur in Winslow area. The low bid
20 was \$2,307,867. The State's estimate was \$1,493,223. It was
21 over the States's estimate by \$814,645, or 54.6 percent. We saw
22 higher than expected pricing in the concrete items, the
23 mobilization and the barrier. In this one, again, the labor was
24 part of it, but also, it is over the railroad, and some of the
25 requirements, we underestimated what it takes to work over the

1 railroad. There's special forming. We didn't take that into
2 account in our estimate. And it is a two-season job. There
3 were four bidders on the job. It was 3.5 percent between the
4 first and second bidder. We have as the department reviewed the
5 bid and believe it is a responsive and responsible bid and would
6 recommend award to Vastco, Inc.

7 VICE CHAIR HAMMOND: Dallas, to a question
8 earlier. I mean, you've answered this many times. Where do
9 these extra moneys come from?

10 MR. HAMMIT: Mr. Chair, we have a contingency
11 that as projects come in high or low, but as we're going, we
12 will have to look to see are those contingent dollars available?
13 Have there been other funds that come in? And then as a last
14 resort, we will start, to keep our program constrained, removing
15 projects. We are looking at our balances and seeing if we have
16 to do that.

17 VICE CHAIR HAMMOND: Thank you.

18 Do I hear a motion or a question?

19 MR. THOMPSON: I'd like to move for approval.

20 VICE CHAIR HAMMOND: Okay. We have a motion from
21 Board Member Thompson.

22 MR. ELTERS: Second.

23 VICE CHAIR HAMMOND: Okay. I'll give you this
24 one, Sam. Board Member Elters as a second. So we have a motion
25 and a second to approve Item 8C to Vastco, Inc. More

1 discussion?

2 All in favor?

3 BOARD MEMBERS: Aye.

4 VICE CHAIR HAMMOND: Opposed?

5 Item 8D.

6 MR. HAMMIT: Thank you, Mr. Chair.

7 This is an intersection improvement on US-60 in
8 the City of Claypool. The low bid was \$992,288. The State's
9 estimate was \$782,769. It was over the States's estimate by
10 \$209,519, or 26.8 percent. Pretty much all of it was in the
11 asphalt pricing. I did break that down a little more than just
12 the asphalt. We saw about a 25 percent higher bid for the
13 material, 50 percent more for the placement, and that would be
14 the labor that we saw, and then where we -- we missed the
15 material is going to come in from the metropolitan area, the
16 Phoenix area. We saw prices twice as expensive for the haul
17 than we had anticipated. There were only two bidders on this,
18 but we have reviewed the bid, and the department believes it is
19 a responsive and responsible bid and would recommend award to
20 Hatch Construction Paving, Inc.

21 MR. STRATTON: Move to approve.

22 VICE CHAIR HAMMOND: Board Member Stratton has
23 moved to approval -- for the approval.

24 MR. KNIGHT: Second.

25 VICE CHAIR HAMMOND: We'll give this one to you,

1 Board Member Knight.

2 So we have a motion and a second to award Item 8A
3 to Hatch Construction and Paving, Inc. All in favor?

4 BOARD MEMBERS: Aye.

5 VICE CHAIR HAMMOND: Opposed?

6 Item 8E.

7 MR. HAMMIT: Thank you, Mr. Chair.

8 This project is in the Phoenix metro area. It is
9 putting some -- some signing throughout the area and some
10 lighting. The low bid was \$2,098,798. The State's estimate was
11 \$1,499,817. It was over the State's estimate by \$598,981, or
12 39.9 percent. We saw higher than expected pricing in our
13 structures, our sign assembly, and the panels. And really, as
14 we talked to the contractors doing the work, it has to be done
15 at night. And it goes throughout the city, and we didn't
16 account for that constant modes in our pricing as well as we
17 should have, because you have a location here and there's
18 multiple locations throughout the metropolitan area. We had two
19 bidders on this project. The department has reviewed the bid
20 and believes it is a responsive and responsible bid and would
21 recommend award to Roadway Electric, LLC.

22 VICE CHAIR HAMMOND: Is it going to die for lack
23 of a motion?

24 MR. ELTERS: I so move.

25 MR. KNIGHT: Second.

1 VICE CHAIR HAMMOND: Motion from Board Member
2 Elters, second from Board Member Knight to award Item 8E to
3 Roadway Electrical, LLC. All in favor?

4 MR. ELTERS: I have a question.

5 VICE CHAIR HAMMOND: We have a question.

6 MR. ELTERS: Just quickly, Dallas. Just the
7 items we approved today add up to a little over \$4 million above
8 what the State estimate was. So going back to Board Member
9 Hammond's question earlier related to the health of that
10 contingency fund, do you have a feel for how that is doing
11 today, what the balance is and how far are we going to go before
12 we hit the cliff?

13 MR. HAMMIT: I think our financial expert will
14 take that.

15 MS. WARD: Oh, that was good.

16 So as a matter of fact, it's -- so far you're up
17 to about \$4.3 million of overages, and the fund -- and I'm
18 sitting here with the fund and looking at it. And yes,
19 understand that before we even come to the Board with these
20 changes, they have already gone through a process where we have
21 evaluated the contingency fund, and like Dallas was saying, if
22 we end up finding that it goes beyond the contingency fund, then
23 we start looking as to where we can slow down projects on other
24 sides. So like subprograms, we start taking dollars,
25 unexpendable dollars from subprograms. We're not there. We're

1 good. But yeah, you're at 4.3 million bucks right now.

2 MR. ELTERS: Thank you.

3 MS. WARD: Thank you.

4 VICE CHAIR HAMMOND: Kristine, we're working you
5 overtime today.

6 MS. WARD: You are.

7 MR. HAMMIT: Mr. Chair, may I add one more thing?
8 As we program projects, it is an estimate of where we're at.
9 The engineer's estimate could be under that program amount, and
10 even though we go over the estimate, sometimes -- and I'd have
11 to go look at today's -- we're still within the program amount,
12 because of -- we don't just set the engineer's estimate at our
13 program amount. We try to estimate it as tight as possible.

14 So just because it goes over doesn't always mean
15 we're over the program amount. And we can do some more research
16 if you would like on that, but it's not always over the program
17 amount just because it went over the estimate that the State put
18 together for the construction.

19 MR. ELTERS: Thank you.

20 MR. HAMMIT: And that's all I had, Mr. Chairman.

21 CHAIRMAN CUTHBERTSON: Okay. I think we have a
22 motion and a second, right?

23 MR. ELTERS: Yes.

24 VICE CHAIR HAMMOND: Okay. All in favor?

25 BOARD MEMBERS: Aye.

1 VICE CHAIR HAMMOND: Opposed?

2 All right. That's the final agenda item under 8.
3 Agenda 9 -- Agenda Item 9. Are there any suggestions from the
4 Board?

5 MR. KNIGHT: For a future agenda item, I would
6 like to -- and I don't know whether it would be best to do it at
7 the regular meeting or at a study session, but I would like to
8 discuss the median crash barriers and for I-10 wherever the
9 accidents have been occurring. I mean, it's...

10 VICE CHAIR HAMMOND: I mean, it's certainly fine
11 with me. Does staff have any input on that at this point?

12 MR. ROEHRICH: Mr. Chair, Mr. Knight, we'll go
13 back and look at -- with the -- Dallas' team and look and
14 prepare exactly what it is we want to discuss or prepare to
15 present on that, remembering that we have litigation that we do
16 have to be careful about on how we address some of these issues
17 while in litigation, but as far as that topic, yes, we can
18 prepare something.

19 MR. KNIGHT: Thank you.

20 VICE CHAIR HAMMOND: Other board members? Any
21 comments at this point? Okay. Good.

22 (End of requested excerpt.)
23
24
25

Adjournment

A motion to adjourn the March 15, 2019 State Transportation Board meeting was made by Board Member Elters and seconded by Board Member Thompson. In a voice vote, the motion carried.

Meeting adjourned at 11:23 a.m. MST.



Jack Sellers, Chairman
State Transportation Board



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