

**STATE TRANSPORTATION BOARD STUDY SESSION  
TELEPHONIC/VIDEO MEETING  
9:00 a.m., June 3, 2021  
NO MEMBERS OF THE PUBLIC WILL BE ALLOWED TO ATTEND IN-PERSON**

**Call to Order**

Chairman Stratton called the State Transportation Board Study Session to order at 9:00 a.m.

**Pledge**

The Pledge of Allegiance was led by Floyd Roehrich, Jr., Executive Officer.

**Roll Call by Board Secretary Sherry Garcia**

A quorum of the State Transportation Board was present. **In attendance:** Chairman Stratton, Vice Chairman Thompson, Board Member Knight, Board Member Searle, Board Member Daniels, and Board Member Maxwell. Board Member Jackie Meck was not present. There were approximately 55 members of the public in the audience.

**Opening Remarks**

Chairman Stratton reminded members of the public, to keep their computer or phone muted during the meeting, unless called to speak during the Call to Audience.

**Title VI of the Civil Rights Act**

Floyd Roehrich, Jr., read the Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, as amended. Floyd, also reminded individuals to fill out survey cards, with link shown on the agenda.

**Call to the Audience**

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.

ARIZONA STATE TRANSPORTATION BOARD  
STATE TRANSPORTATION BOARD  
STUDY SESSION

REPORTER'S TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS

Webex Videoconference

June 3, 2021  
9:00 a.m.

REPORTED BY:

TERESA A. WATSON, RMR  
Certified Reporter  
Certificate No. 50876

Perfecta Reporting  
(602) 421-3602

PREPARED FOR:  
ADOT - STATE TRANSPORTATION BOARD

(Certified Copy)

1                   REPORTER'S TRANSCRIPT OF EXCERPT OF ELECTRONIC  
2 PROCEEDINGS, ADOT - STATE TRANSPORTATION BOARD STUDY SESSION,  
3 was reported from electronic media by TERESA A. WATSON,  
4 Registered Merit Reporter and a Certified Reporter in and for  
5 the State of Arizona.

6

7 PARTICIPANTS:

8 Board Members:

9

10                   Steven E. Stratton, Chairman  
11                   Jesse Thompson, Vice Chairman  
12                   Gary Knight, Board Member  
13                   Richard Searle, Board Member  
14                   Jenn Daniels, Board Member  
15                   Ted Maxwell, Board Member

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

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:
Kenneth Simpson (not present) .....	XX
Isaac Blake .....	5

AGENDA ITEMS

Item 1 - 2022 to 2026 Tentative Five-Year Transportation Facilities Construction Program	
Kristine Ward, Chief Financial Officer.....	9
Greg Byres, Multimodal Planning Division, Director.....	10
Item 2 - Overview of Ongoing International Border Activities, Mark Sanders.....	51

1 (Beginning of excerpt.)

2 CHAIRMAN STRATTON: We'll move on to call to the  
3 audience. Since this is a telephonic Webex conference meeting,  
4 everyone will be muted when they call in to the meeting. When  
5 your name is called to provide your comments, you will indicate  
6 your presence by virtually raising your hand using your phone  
7 keypad or through the Webex application. The Webex host will  
8 guide you through the unmuting and muting process following the  
9 instruction included with the meeting agenda.

10 And I'm going to remind you that this will be  
11 held to three minutes. And, Floyd, I'm asking you to stop it at  
12 three minutes. I know many of you just keep carrying on. We'd  
13 like to hear the comments. Let's give everybody the same fair  
14 shake.

15 So with that, Floyd, would you call the first  
16 speaker?

17 MR. ROEHRICH: Yes, sir, Mr. Chairman. The first  
18 speaker we received a request from was Mr. Kenneth Simpson.

19 Mr. Simpson, please raise your hand and the host  
20 will unmute you.

21 WEBEX HOST: Floyd, I'm not seeing a hand raised  
22 at this time.

23 MR. ROEHRICH: Okay. We'll go on to the second  
24 request we received, and maybe Mr. Simpson will come on in a few  
25 minutes.

1                   DIRECTOR HALIKOWSKI: Hey, Floyd, before you do  
2 that, maybe people don't know how to raise their hand on this  
3 one. Maybe the host could just explain how to raise the hand  
4 (indiscernible).

5                   MR. ROEHRICH: So Kristi, did you hear that? The  
6 Director was asking if the public may not know how to raise  
7 their hand. Could you quick review how to raise the hand with  
8 -- for the public, make sure that they understand that?

9                   WEBEX HOST: Yes. Absolutely.

10                  So if you are a call-in-only user, you're going  
11 to want to press star three on your phone. That will give us  
12 that raised hand signal. If you are joining through a Webex  
13 application, you should see a raise hand icon at the bottom  
14 right of your participant list or underneath the participant  
15 panel at the bottom of your screen. It is a little hand icon.  
16 So if you just click that, it will give us that hand raised.  
17 Again, if you are a call-in-only user, you need to press star  
18 three on your phone and that will give us the raised hand  
19 signal.

20                  DIRECTOR HALIKOWSKI: Thank you.

21                  MR. ROEHRICH: Thank you, Kristi.

22                  Why don't we go to the second one, and then we'll  
23 see if Mr. Simpson does raise his hand here.

24                  Our second request came from Mr. Isaac Blake.

25                  Mr. Blake, will you please raise your hand?

1 WEBEX HOST: Mr. Blake, you are unmuted.

2 MR. BLAKE: Thank you. Just to confirm, you can  
3 hear me correctly?

4 MR. ROEHRICH: Yes.

5 WEBEX HOST: Yes.

6 MR. BLAKE: Okay. Getting right to it, and first  
7 and foremost, thank you for this opportunity.

8 My comments today are regarding the five-year  
9 plan will focus on two areas: Public safety and missed  
10 opportunities. While many of the comments apply statewide, I  
11 will be focusing on State Route 87 between Phoenix and Payson,  
12 the designated evacuation route for the Valley and Rim Country.

13 While the proposed improvements in this section  
14 of State Route 87 are needed, the question is priority, and more  
15 importantly, what is missing?

16 Currently, for the 40 miles between Bush Highway  
17 and State Route 87, there is no infrastructure in place for  
18 communications. Whether it is a disabled vehicle or a fire,  
19 there is no way for the public to reach out to 911 or others.  
20 Could these fires have grown so large if infrastructure were in  
21 place to contact first responders earlier? Why should citizens  
22 have to drive from Payson to State Route 8- -- 188 only to find  
23 the bridge is closed, and they have to turn around the 17 miles  
24 and go back to Payson?

25 While the ADOT 511 app is good, it is not the

1 only answer. SRP has dark fiber to Roosevelt Dam. Sparklight  
2 has now dark fiber between Show Low and Payson. APS is working  
3 on extending fiber to Payson. So there's multiple opportunities  
4 to be leveraged here in order to start having communications  
5 along this roadway.

6 ADOT has long wanted to have overhead signs,  
7 cameras and other capabilities in this area. Where is that  
8 included in this plan? It's not. Going through the whole plan,  
9 there's nothing that discussed this. Most towns and cities have  
10 adopted a big (indiscernible) methodology so when a roadway is  
11 constructed or maintained, the various service providers can  
12 place their infrastructure for current and future needs. Where  
13 is the public-private partnership to enable federal and state  
14 rural broadband initiatives? It's not found in this plan in any  
15 part.

16 Another missed opportunity was with the Loop 202  
17 South Mountain Freeway. While the project was successful  
18 because the communications -- excuse me -- while the project was  
19 successful, it was not complete, because it didn't factor in the  
20 communications infrastructure, you know, which has led to  
21 cellular traffic not being available in sections of the Loop 202  
22 going around South Mountain, and more importantly, the 800  
23 megahertz radios used by first responders is not working in this  
24 area. Whether it be police officers, fire department or others,  
25 their radios stop working as they go around that bend. It



1 wasn't factored into the original Loop 202 plans. This is a  
2 public safety problem even today for both citizens and first  
3 responders, which MAG was notified shortly after the Loop 202  
4 South Mountain Freeway was opened.

5 ADOT also needs to factor in expanding 5G and  
6 broadband. So there's many opportunities for this to be  
7 included in your current plan and future one.

8 Thank you. I think that's three minutes on the  
9 nose.

10 CHAIRMAN STRATTON: Thank you, Mr. Blake.  
11 Floyd?

12 MR. ROEHRICH: I'll go back. The only other  
13 request you had received was Mr. Kenneth Simpson.

14 Mr. Simpson, if you are in the -- on the meeting,  
15 will you please raise your hand?

16 Mr. Chairman, I don't see a Mr. Simpson. He may  
17 either have not been able to come back or make it. So that will  
18 end call to the audience, unless we want to open -- unless you  
19 prefer to open it up later if he does show up, but for now, it  
20 looks like that's all we have.

21 CHAIRMAN STRATTON: Okay, Floyd. We'll close it  
22 for now, but if the gentleman shows up later, we may reopen.

23 Let's move on to Item 1, the 2022 to 2026  
24 Tentative Five-Year Transportation Facilities Construction  
25 Program overview, and this with Kristine Ward and Greg Byres.

1 MS. WARD: So good morning, board members. It's  
2 nice to be with you here today. I'm just going to give you a  
3 brief -- a brief report out, and then I'll turn it over to Greg.

4 So the tentative program being discussed today is  
5 based on revenue projections that we completed in September of  
6 2020, and you'll recall that was the -- those were the revenue  
7 estimates that were completed by the RAP panel which, you know,  
8 are the economists and transportation experts. So that was  
9 approximately nine months ago.

10 Since that time, we've been monitoring revenues  
11 closely, and in February, approximately, three months ago, just  
12 over three months ago, we -- when we noted that revenues had  
13 shown some -- you know, some steadiness in running above  
14 forecast, we added an additional \$80 million in one-time funds  
15 to the program. This board approved the use of those funds for  
16 the US-93 project as well as I-17. And the US-93 was a project  
17 that had previously been taken out of the program when we faced  
18 revenue reductions, and then we added that back in. And then  
19 I-17, we had additional costs. So that's what that 80 million  
20 was applied to.

21 In August, in this coming August, we will begin  
22 our reforecasting process again. But until then, we'll continue  
23 to monitor revenues closely, and as fiscally prudent, we will  
24 adjust the program. So the program before you today is based on  
25 those original estimates plus additional dollars that we have

1 added in as we have found them -- found it fiscally prudent to  
2 do so. With that, I would turn it over to Greg to run through  
3 the program unless you have any questions.

4 MR. BYRES: I'm not hearing anything. I'll go  
5 ahead and get going.

6 If we can go to the next slide, please.

7 So one of the biggest things that we've done with  
8 the five-year program is we've come up with some different  
9 initiatives in this five-year program that we haven't done in  
10 the past. One of the first things we did is we -- because of  
11 the changes that we've seen in cost of construction, as well as  
12 materials, we've seen an escalation that has been more than what  
13 we've accounted for in the past.

14 So what we have done is we have taken a look at  
15 all of the projects that are in the current program in fiscal  
16 year '22 and '23 and taken and looked at what the true costs of  
17 those projects is going to be, knowing where they're at in the  
18 program itself. So they may be into design. They may be just  
19 starting design, but at least we've got an idea at -- which is  
20 much better than the scoping that was done when they were put  
21 into the program.

22 We can take a look at those costs at the date of  
23 construction. So we did that on every single project that we  
24 have in the current program for FY '22 and '23. We have taken  
25 and adjusted those costs or those budget numbers in the program

1 for what you're going to see in the final program. That is  
2 different than what we had in the tentative program.

3 And, again, the rationale here is making sure  
4 that what's in the program is -- has true rationale, it's up-to-  
5 date, it's -- we're trying to avoid coming back to the Board  
6 over and over looking for increases in costs or changes. So  
7 this is one means of trying to break through that process or  
8 that cycle that we've been -- had in the past.

9 Next slide.

10 One of the other things that we did is we used  
11 the P2P process to bring projects into the program. Once  
12 projects are in the program, we're having to now look at a  
13 different way of prioritizing those projects. So what we've  
14 done is, again, we had another initiative where we tried to look  
15 at how can we prioritize those projects. What we came up with  
16 is basically a risk analysis on each of the projects for  
17 delivery. Since they're already in the program now, the biggest  
18 obstacle in trying to get a project delivered is the delivery  
19 process itself and everything that goes with it.

20 So what we did is we actually put together a risk  
21 analysis form, and we took and ran it through every single  
22 project, again, that we have in FY '22 and '23. The project  
23 managers for each of those projects are the ones that scored  
24 each of the projects. We then took that risk analysis, which is  
25 based on scope, schedule and budget, and weighted it so that we

1 have a true risk score that we can apply to each project. Now,  
2 that gives us a means for prioritization as we go through any  
3 changes that may be needed in the program itself.

4 Next slide.

5 So since we did the evaluation for budget costs  
6 on each of the projects in '22 and '23, and we prioritized those  
7 projects as well, we have to maintain fiscal restraint or  
8 constraint each year of the program. So what we've done is  
9 knowing what our budgets are for each year, in some cases we had  
10 escalation of costs. In some cases we had reductions in cost.  
11 So we had to take and adjust the program to maintain that fiscal  
12 constraint.

13 So using the priorities that we -- or that we  
14 came up with using that risk analysis, we took and if we needed  
15 to slide a project back because it had a very high risk of being  
16 developed in the year that it was originally programmed in, we  
17 did so. If we could advance a project due to low risk, we did  
18 so, still holding intact the fiscal constraint for each year.

19 So this is a -- not a significant change, but it  
20 is a fairly big change compared to what we've done in the past  
21 between the tentative program and the final program that we're  
22 going to be presenting come the next board meeting for approval.

23 So I wanted everybody to understand exactly what  
24 we're doing. These are new initiatives, and again, the whole  
25 purpose of this is trying to, one, bring each project up to a

1 current budget, and also being able to prioritize those projects  
2 so that they're -- they're in the program where they need to be  
3 for delivery as well as maintaining fiscal constraint.

4 Next slide.

5 So as we went through this whole process, what we  
6 found was -- and this slide looks like it got a little messed up  
7 on the formatting -- we had 156 projects that we evaluated. 78  
8 have no change. I believe that -- yeah, 78 have no change. 48  
9 have an increase or decrease, that being about 50 percent of the  
10 projects. Or I'm sorry. 78 of the projects had no change,  
11 which is 50 percent. 48 have a change in either funding or --  
12 increase or decrease, which is 31 percent. We had 16 new  
13 projects, which accounts for about 10 percent, and we had 14  
14 projects that moved years. And so as we go forward here, we're  
15 going to go through into detail about what projects moved, what  
16 projects changed costs and so forth. So I'm going to have Bret  
17 Anderson go through each one of those as we proceed through  
18 this.

19 So next slide, and Bret, if you can go ahead and  
20 take over. If you can unmute, Bret, please. He has his hand  
21 up.

22 WEBEX HOST: Bret, you are now a panelist. You  
23 can mute and unmute yourself.

24 MR. ANDERSON: All right. Can you hear me now?  
25 Are we good?

1 MR. BYRES: Yes.

2 MR. ANDERSON: Excellent. All right. Thank you,  
3 Greg, and board members.

4 So what you see before you today is, again, just  
5 a -- these are changes to the programs that have happened since  
6 we -- since you approved this in -- in February. So what you  
7 have here is a handful of projects that changed. The dollar  
8 amount increased or decreased. The majority of these projects  
9 had a project increase, and -- so yeah. These are the projects  
10 that are changed dollar amounts. If you want me to talk about  
11 any one of these, I would gladly do that, pull that information  
12 up, but these are, again, as Greg said, adjusted through our new  
13 process that we've talked about, with project managers updating  
14 the costs and getting our information updated where needed.

15 So if it's -- so the one that decreased on this  
16 slide is the Prescott Lakes/Frontier Village Parkway project.  
17 That project they moved the utilities out to FY '23. Looks like  
18 some things have shifted on the slide, it looks like.

19 So go ahead and go to the next slide, Rhett, if  
20 you would, please.

21 Again, what you see here is these project changes  
22 and costs. The Queen Creek Bridge, that was an increase and  
23 moved to '23. And I apologize for this slide. It looks like  
24 it's -- it's a little bit all over the place the way that it's  
25 presented here. It was not that way when we submitted it, but

1 it is what it is.

2 So the decrease in the South Fork Santa Maria  
3 River project, that's down to 392. I believe that's in FY '23.  
4 And the statewide truck parking, we programmed some money to get  
5 started with some design on that, and they needed 300,000. So  
6 it decreased from 7 million down to 6.7 in '23. It was  
7 7 million.

8 I'd have to go look and the figure the slides  
9 out. So go to the next slide, please, Rhett.

10 CHAIRMAN STRATTON: Bret.

11 MR. ANDERSON: Sure. Go ahead.

12 CHAIRMAN STRATTON: I have a question. Did you  
13 say Queen Creek was moved to 2030?

14 MR. ANDERSON: Sorry. 2023.

15 CHAIRMAN STRATTON: Okay. Thank you.

16 MR. ANDERSON: It moved -- yeah. If it -- yeah.  
17 2023. It's moved to a line with another bridge project in the  
18 area so that we could get a good -- good prices on bridge  
19 building.

20 CHAIRMAN STRATTON: That is fine. Thank you.

21 MR. ANDERSON: Yeah. Good -- thank you for the  
22 question, Mr. Chair.

23 So, again, these are project increases, the  
24 original amounts, and we'll have to figure out what's going on  
25 with those -- with those slides.



1                   Go ahead. Next slide there, Rhett.

2                   MR. ROEHRICH: So Greg -- Greg and Bret, this is  
3 Floyd. Real quick I want to break in. I don't know what  
4 happened formatting wise, but what I would want the board  
5 members to know, we will get this corrected. We'll make sure  
6 that the numbers and the years line up, and then we will resend  
7 them a copy, and when we post it to the Board's website for the  
8 public, we will post a corrected version. So will your team be  
9 able to do that?

10                  MR. ANDERSON: Yes. Yes, Floyd. We will take  
11 care of that, make sure that it's correct, and we'll get it  
12 updated correctly. So yeah.

13                  MR. ROEHRICH: Okay. Thank you.

14                  MR. ANDERSON: So on that slide, we have there is  
15 -- so what we have on this one is the last two projects down at  
16 the bottom of the page. Those -- the SR-1- -- hold on one  
17 second. Yes. The last -- wow. Those really...

18                  Go to the next slide, Rhett. Let me see what's  
19 on the next slide, please.

20                  Okay. So this is a list of new projects into the  
21 program, and what -- so that first project there is Colorado  
22 River Bridge. It's a joint venture with Caltrans on our -- and  
23 ADOT's cost is \$5 million in FY '22.

24                  The next project is the Scaddan Wash to Plomosa.  
25 That is a project that came in through our P2P process, and

1 that's in F- -- the design starts in '22. The construction is  
2 in FY '24. The I-10 truck parking availability, that is a grant  
3 program with Texas, New Mexico and California, and we'll be  
4 getting \$2.85 million (indiscernible) we'll be getting some  
5 money -- we're getting some as a grant with Caltrans, and we'll  
6 get about 1.4 million in grant --

7 MR. ROEHRICH: Greg, Bret.

8 MR. ANDERSON: Yeah.

9 MR. ROEHRICH: Greg, this is Floyd. Rhett feels  
10 that there was a conversion problem. He has taken the file now.  
11 He is going to run a correction and pull it back up, because  
12 quite frankly, it is so difficult to follow along what you're  
13 presenting.

14 MR. ANDERSON: Yeah.

15 MR. ROEHRICH: What you're saying and what the  
16 screen shows are not lining up at all. So --

17 MR. ANDERSON: Understood.

18 MR. ROEHRICH: Just give us a minute and see if  
19 Rhett can get the alignment fixed up, and then, Bret, when you  
20 and Greg -- when you come back to present it, make sure that  
21 you're being pretty descriptive so we can follow along what  
22 project you're on, the year, the impact of what it is, because  
23 you're going pretty fast --

24 MR. ANDERSON: Yep.

25 MR. ROEHRICH: -- and it's difficult to make that

1 connection.

2 MR. ANDERSON: Understood. So we go right back  
3 to the beginning.

4 CHAIRMAN STRATTON: Thank you, Floyd.

5 MR. ROEHRICH: It was the -- actually, it was the  
6 Director, Chairman Stratton. He was in here and he was giving a  
7 me a hard time. He was threatening me to get it fixed or to  
8 leave. I couldn't take it anymore, Mr. Chairman.

9 CHAIRMAN STRATTON: Well, thank you, John, then.

10 DIRECTOR HALIKOWSKI: Sorry about this. It won't  
11 happen again.

12 MR. ANDERSON: All right. Are we -- are we good?  
13 I think that's looks good on the screen? I had pulled up  
14 something that I had on another screen in my office. So I am  
15 able to see what you see now, and I will talk to what you see on  
16 the screen.

17 So what you see here is the first of the few  
18 projects that are first of the 48 projects have a funding  
19 increase or decrease. If it has a decrease, board members, it  
20 shows up in the highlighted point. That's the only thing  
21 that -- the change. Otherwise, it was an increase in the  
22 program.

23 That first project, the original programmed  
24 amount was \$437,000, which is the Bowie to New Mexico state  
25 line. It's a pavement pres. project. It is now \$726,000. Just

1 updated costs to reflect the market change and any updates that  
2 needed to be done.

3 The -- again, go back, please. I don't want to  
4 go too fast with all of these.

5 Most of these projects had cost increases due to,  
6 again, materials being updated, maybe some scope -- scope change  
7 and getting things dialed in and getting the estimate updated,  
8 as Greg stated, to get those things ready to go to advertise.  
9 The Gila River Bridge on SR-79 had an increase of about  
10 \$6.8 million and various other projects there. If there's  
11 anyone individually in there, I would gladly discuss if anybody  
12 needs to talk about those individual projects.

13 Most of these are just --

14 MR. MAXWELL: Mr. Chair, Bret, this is Ted  
15 Maxwell. I've got one quick question on one of the projects,  
16 and it's -- some of it's because I'm the new guy, and I just  
17 want to learn a little bit here.

18 CHAIRMAN STRATTON: Go ahead, Ted.

19 MR. MAXWELL: Thank you, Mr. Chair. Bret, so for  
20 example, on the Dunlap Avenue/Deer Valley Road, I mean, you --  
21 it's more than a double from the original amount in the program.  
22 Can you just give me a quick explanation of why we'd have that  
23 significant of an increase from year to year? I mean, I note  
24 there are -- obviously the material costs are going up, too, but  
25 that one jumps off the screen at me.

1 MR. ANDERSON: Yes. Mr. Chair, Mr. Maxwell,  
2 absolutely. This is part -- so this -- the reason this project  
3 jumped up so dramatically is that we had this program -- this  
4 project in the program, and the design was going, but then we  
5 were able to get some pavement life extension projects that came  
6 in, and so we decided to make sure that we -- it just -- but it  
7 was woefully underprogrammed from the beginning. So this  
8 \$30 million pulls it in to -- to the right scope and the right  
9 limits on the project. So that's why you see a significant  
10 increase in that project.

11 MR. MAXWELL: Okay. Thank you.

12 MR. ANDERSON: You bet.

13 DIRECTOR HALIKOWSKI: (Indiscernible.)

14 MR. ROEHRICH: (Indiscernible.)

15 DIRECTOR HALIKOWSKI: Mr. Maxwell, the short  
16 answer is we had a scope change in this project, and so I think  
17 as Bret's trying to explain, we brought in additional work and  
18 additional features to that. So that's the short answer.

19 MR. MAXWELL: Thank you, Floyd.

20 DIRECTOR HALIKOWSKI: Thank you.

21 MR. ROEHRICH: That was the Director. Yes, sir.

22 CHAIRMAN STRATTON: Go ahead, Bret.

23 MR. ANDERSON: All right. Thank you, Mr. Chair.

24 Moving -- we can go to the next slide, if you'd  
25 like, Rhett.

1                   So what you see on this slide here is, again,  
2 just some project updates. You'll see a significant change  
3 again on the US-60 to Queen Creek Bridge. That original program  
4 amount was \$30 million. By moving it out to 2023 to align with  
5 the -- I believe it's the Waterfall Canyon Bridge structure, and  
6 then there were some increases in costs. We had to increase  
7 that project to \$40 million, and that's out in FY '23.

8                   The two projects that decreased in funding from  
9 the original program is the South Fork Santa Maria River to  
10 SR-71, south of Wickieup on US-93 that reduced down. They  
11 changed the -- they reduced the scope and changed the amounts  
12 they needed. And then again, I was talking about the statewide  
13 truck parking. They needed \$300,000 in '21 to get started on  
14 some things, and we reduced that project in 2022. It was \$7  
15 million. It's now 6.7.

16                   Moving on to the next slide if there's no  
17 questions.

18                   Again, all of these things that you see here are  
19 project cost increase, and then due to some of the project cost  
20 increase and the funding in '22, we had to move these projects  
21 -- well, we'll talk about the projects that moved on a couple --  
22 on the last slide on some of the (indiscernible) slides there.

23                   So these are just all project cost increase. A  
24 big one there --

25                   MR. ROEHRICH: Bret.

1 MR. ANDERSON: Yes.

2 MR. ROEHRICH: Bret, this is Floyd.

3 Is there anything specific about a cost increase  
4 that sticks out? Combining the project, changing the scope, or  
5 these were just all re-evaluations of the original cost estimate  
6 and then accounting for the increase in costs that we're seeing?

7 MR. ANDERSON: Mr. Chair, Floyd, yes, those are  
8 the re-evaluations of everything by the project managers and  
9 significant cost increases to projects that happened in the area  
10 and materials change and contingency updates, things that needed  
11 to be updated for the project.

12 MR. HAMMIT: Mr. Chairman, if I may. This is  
13 Dallas.

14 CHAIRMAN STRATTON: Yes. Go ahead.

15 MR. HAMMIT: A couple of those -- one of the  
16 things that you will see is as we originally scoped those  
17 projects, these are pavement preservation projects. The  
18 original scope may have been a mill and replacement two to three  
19 inches. After we did some additional design, we found that we  
20 needed a greater treatment, and that also is why some of those  
21 costs have increased. So it isn't that we lengthened the  
22 projects. It's just we found that we needed a more substantial  
23 reconstruction than we had originally estimated.

24 CHAIRMAN STRATTON: Dallas, have the prices also  
25 been adjusted for the increase in oil and fuel?

1 MR. HAMMIT: Mr. Chair, that is also correct.  
2 You know, we've seen our prices go up, as well as labor and  
3 other things that are driving our total construction prices up.

4 CHAIRMAN STRATTON: Thank you.

5 MR. ANDERSON: Thank you, Dallas.

6 MR. KNIGHT: Mr. Chair, this is Board Member  
7 Knight.

8 CHAIRMAN STRATTON: Go ahead, Gary.

9 MR. KNIGHT: Don't you feel that it -- when you  
10 move these programs farther, these projects farther out in the  
11 program, they're even more susceptible to the prices going up as  
12 we proceed to the next five-year plan. So these numbers are --  
13 they might be good today, but when you move it out to another  
14 year, chances are they're going to go up again; is that correct?

15 MR. BYRES: So if I can answer that, Board Member  
16 Knight, Mr. Chairman. One of the things that we did as a  
17 double-check before we moved these projects back is if it was a  
18 pavement pres. project, we actually ran that project back  
19 through our pavement management system to see whether or not  
20 there was going -- how big a risk we were going to run on is the  
21 degradation of that project going to be substantial if we move  
22 it back a year. So in some of these cases what we found out is,  
23 yes, it may be. So, therefore, we took care of that potential  
24 cost in the degradation, but normally, if that was the case, we  
25 didn't move that project. So -- so we are taking that into



1 account.

2 Now, there is a cost difference, just an  
3 inflation by itself in moving a project back a year. You're  
4 absolutely right with that. But if the project had a -- was a  
5 high risk to start with, by moving it back, we're actually just  
6 bettering the program rather than having to move it back midyear  
7 when we find out we can't deliver it. So by doing the risk  
8 analysis that we've done, we're actually (inaudible) be  
9 prevented in looking at those projects and moving those back.

10 MR. KNIGHT: Thank you very much, Greg.

11 MR. ANDERSON: So that being said, so Mr. Chair  
12 and members of the Board and Greg, so that being said, with this  
13 we can move to the next slide.

14 Again, what you see here is these are just  
15 projects that have funding increase and decrease. We'll get to  
16 a slide that has the projects that actually moved years, and  
17 thank you for that question, Mr. Knight. So we will discuss  
18 that in a later slide here.

19 What you see here are two projects down at the  
20 bottom. They did decrease in funding. The original programmed  
21 amount was \$3 million. It is now down to 2.25. And then the  
22 I-17, the SR-169, the TI underpass, it was originally programmed  
23 at 4.5 million. It is now \$4 million in '23. And I believe it  
24 stayed in '23. All these projects stayed in those years that  
25 they have programmed amounts. Again, just significant, this

1 cost increases and getting the construction updated with the  
2 market and the way things are going in today's world.

3 MR. SEARLE: Chairman Stratton.

4 CHAIRMAN STRATTON: Go ahead, Richard.

5 MR. SEARLE: You know, it's my sense of humor  
6 that's kicking in right here. I'm looking at this "north of  
7 Nothing" on US-95, and it went from 21 million to 29 million.  
8 That's more than nothing.

9 MR. ANDERSON: Point taken, Mr. Searle. That's a  
10 good one.

11 Let's move on to the next --

12 MR. ROEHRICH: Hold on, Bret. Why did it go up  
13 the \$8 million? I mean, I do think there was a question in  
14 there. Again, for that stretch of road on US-95, it did go up  
15 pretty substantially. Is there any specific reason or is it  
16 just re-evaluation of the construction costs?

17 MR. ANDERSON: Mr. Chair and Mr. Knight and --  
18 Mr. -- and Floyd, this -- these were just the re-evaluation of  
19 the construction costs with what's been updated and how things  
20 are going in the market today. That's the cost -- that's the  
21 reason for most of these cost increases.

22 CHAIRMAN STRATTON: Are there any other questions  
23 at this point?

24 MR. SEARLE: Chairman Stratton, I guess just a  
25 clarification. Going through these slides where we show any

1 funding increase and decrease, the projects that have no  
2 changes, they're not on any of these slides, are they?

3 MR. ANDERSON: Correct.

4 MR. SEARLE: Thank you.

5 MR. ANDERSON: Mr. Searle. Mr. Chair,  
6 Mr. Searle, yeah. The 50 percent of the projects that had no  
7 changes were -- we are not highlighting them. They are as they  
8 were in the original program.

9 MR. SEARLE: Perfect. Thank you.

10 MR. ANDERSON: Thank you.

11 Rhett, let's go to the next slide.

12 All right. So here's -- these are the -- these  
13 are the new projects that are coming in to the 2022 to 2026  
14 program. A couple to highlight out again. The I-8 project.  
15 It's a joint agreement with Caltrans, where ADOT pays 50  
16 percent, Caltrans pays 50 percent, and this is our -- this is  
17 our 50 percent, that \$5 million in 2022.

18 The number two project on there, the I-10 Scaddan  
19 Wash to Plomosa is our P2P -- it came from through our P2P  
20 project. This year we were able to get four P2P projects for  
21 the FY '24. That's the construction amounts we're -- that are  
22 there, and we've put the construction amount in '24, and the  
23 design goes in '22.

24 Any questions for the P2P projects?

25 CHAIRMAN STRATTON: Any questions for Bret?

1 MR. MAXWELL: Mr. Chair, this is Ted Maxwell.

2 CHAIRMAN STRATTON: Ted.

3 MR. MAXWELL: Mr. Chair, Bret, I just -- again,  
4 being the new guy, can you clarify what P2P is?

5 MR. ANDERSON: Oh, absolutely, Mr. -- Mr. Chair,  
6 Mr. Maxwell, P2P is our process where we evaluate all the  
7 projects, pavement, bridge, expansion, and it's a planning to  
8 programming is what that talked about, and I think when we do a  
9 -- an update and a briefing for all the new board members, we  
10 will go over that extensively. And then we'll have that process  
11 coming up quite -- you'll be heavily involved with that process  
12 down the road. We'll let you know exactly how that all comes  
13 together. So thanks for the question.

14 MR. MAXWELL: All right. Thank you, Mr. Chair.  
15 Thank you, Bret. I'll hold some of the questions knowing I'll  
16 get thoroughly inundated eventually.

17 MR. ANDERSON: Yes.

18 So Mr. Chair, Board, the next couple of -- the  
19 next project we have there is the I-10 truck parking  
20 availability. Again, this is a joint agreement with Caltrans,  
21 New Mexico and Texas, coming through Arizona. What we're going  
22 to do there is put some fiber optics in to allow trucks to let  
23 them know what parking spaces are available in two parking --  
24 two rest areas in Arizona, and they'll be doing that. The  
25 design will be coming in, and then the construction is in '23.

1 I-17 is getting some broadband up to Anthem Way.  
2 Getting that dialed in.

3 Those next two projects, I-17 and I-40, they came  
4 in from our P2P. And again, I'd just like to reiterate on those  
5 planning to programming projects, they have gone through the  
6 full pre-scoping. So these numbers are -- have been vetted  
7 through our scoping team, and these numbers should be good to  
8 go. That included the inflation numbers for FY '24. They've  
9 inflated those numbers to hopefully reflect what the costs may  
10 be in 2024 if everything holds true.

11 The next project is that SR-80 Mule Pass Tunnel  
12 lighting project. We had some -- they're going to do some  
13 shoulder and lighting in the Mule Pass Tunnel and to get that --  
14 the lighting updated in there.

15 The SR-88, the Tomahawk Road to Buffalo Road,  
16 that is an emergency relief slope stabilization project that  
17 will be coming in. The design's been in in '21, and they're  
18 finishing -- and the construction will come in in 2022 at 1.9  
19 million.

20 And you'll see several minor pavement  
21 preservation projects on here. These are preservation type  
22 treatments that go on our pavements to help them last a little  
23 bit longer, and the design came in in '21, and these are the  
24 construction amounts for those five or six projects. Yeah.  
25 Five projects that are coming in. And they come out of -- they

1 have a subprogram, and we can talk more, Mr. Chair and  
2 Mr. Maxwell and those that are new about a subprogram and how  
3 those things come about and what those are drawn for.

4 You also see here, too, is additional design  
5 money for the SR-260 Lion Springs section. Last year, I  
6 believe, we started out and put -- and maybe it was FY '20 that  
7 we did \$5 million for the Lion Springs design, and they need an  
8 additional \$2 million to finish up the design, and that's going  
9 to be showing up in FY '22.

10 CHAIRMAN STRATTON: Bret, is that because we are  
11 changing the alignment a little bit so we don't have to acquire  
12 so much property?

13 MR. BYRES: So if I can answer that for you,  
14 Mr. Chairman, there's -- there are several things that are  
15 happening on the Lion Springs. One is we're looking at the  
16 different alignments. We're looking at potential right-of-way  
17 acquisitions as well, but we're also looking at different  
18 alternatives to try and reduce the right-of-way and reduce the  
19 cost.

20 One of the other big things that has occurred is  
21 we're looking at fairly extensive expenditures for  
22 environmental. We're finding a lot of cultural issues along  
23 those alignments as well. So we're having to dig a little bit  
24 deeper into those, which is fairly expensive.

25 CHAIRMAN STRATTON: Thank you.

1 MR. ANDERSON: Thank you, Greg.

2 And so then moving on, again, you see the SR-260,  
3 the minor pavement pres. project, the 1.6 million. Our -- the  
4 US-60 Vicksburg Road to 272, that's a P2P project. Then those  
5 next three are minor pavement pres. projects and the last  
6 project on this page is the \$300,000 to do some designing for  
7 the US-191 Cochise railroad overpass. That's the freight funding  
8 that reduced the -- that amount in FY '22.

9 Those -- that's all I have for the new projects.  
10 So this is -- these projects are brand-new to the program. You  
11 did not see those projects in the original tentative program  
12 that you approved in February. These are new projects that you  
13 will be approving or hope to approve in the June meeting. So  
14 these are the changes that have been incorporated since the  
15 February meeting.

16 So Rhett, go to the next slide and we can talk  
17 about the projects that have moved years.

18 So with some of the increase in these project  
19 costs, they -- there was some -- in order to stay fiscally  
20 constrained, we needed to move things around, and these are the  
21 effects of that. So the first project, the I-8 west of Aztec at  
22 County Line, that project moved from '23 to '24 at \$21 million.

23 And again, all of these projects were evaluated  
24 with the risk assessment tool that Greg mentioned that we talked  
25 to our project managers, and they gave us feedback, and these

1 are the projects that had moved fiscal years.

2 The I-19 project, those projects that are  
3 highlighted in that turquoise color, those projects were able to  
4 move up years. So that I-19 Valencia Road to SR-86, it was able  
5 to move from '23 up to '22. So good for that neck of the woods  
6 to getting a project moved up, and then we're always happy to  
7 move projects up if we have the ability to do that.

8 The SR-69/Prescott Lakes Parkway project, that  
9 had to move to '23. They had some right-of-way issues that  
10 they're working on and trying to get that taken care of, and  
11 they will not be -- they would not be able to deliver that  
12 project in '22. So we felt it was the best interest -- the team  
13 felt that it was good to move it to '23.

14 Moving on. Again, a lot of these projects just  
15 moved years to maintain that fiscal constraint.

16 Bridge -- it's a combination of bridge projects  
17 and pavement projects.

18 With that, I think that's all the things that I  
19 had, Greg. If there's any questions, I'll be glad to take them.

20 CHAIRMAN STRATTON: Are there any questions from  
21 the Board?

22 MR. HAMMIT: Mr. Chair, this is Dallas. Can I  
23 make one more comment?

24 CHAIRMAN STRATTON: Absolutely.

25 MR. HAMMIT: If we go back one slide on the new



1 projects. I don't want anyone to think we all of a sudden found  
2 a bunch of new money. These were in a subprogram as a lump sum,  
3 and one of the things we've really worked to do is be more  
4 transparent instead of just having a subprogram with, you know,  
5 a pot of money. We wanted to line item those out so the Board  
6 and the public are very aware of what's being planned. So those  
7 projects came out of those subprograms, being in mine -- in  
8 preservation, our safety, our other subprograms. So instead of  
9 just having a lump system, and then we come to the Board later  
10 in the year to ask you to fund it, we wanted to line item those  
11 out so we're more transparent as we move forward.

12 DIRECTOR HALIKOWSKI: Hey, Dallas, so thank you  
13 for pointing that out. Given that Mr. Maxwell is somewhat new  
14 to the Board, I don't know if you just want to briefly describe  
15 what a subprogram is versus the overall five-year program.

16 MR. HAMMIT: Yes. Mr. Chair, Director, in a  
17 five-year program, as you go through there, you will see a large  
18 part of it is specific projects, give you a route, location, but  
19 in other places, as you go down, we have pots of money for -- we  
20 call them subprograms. A preservation subprogram.

21 Our pavement preservation program is over five  
22 years. We have a -- designated so much money, but in the first  
23 two years of the program, we want to specifically lay out what  
24 projects we're going to do. We don't do that all the way  
25 through the program, mainly because priorities change. Road

1 conditions, where one project we think is going to last four  
2 years, it needs improvements immediately. One that we thought  
3 we were going to have to do something earlier, we can push it  
4 back a year.

5                   So we give ourselves some flexibility, but we  
6 want the Board and the public to see what we're doing for at  
7 least the next two to three years in the program, and we take  
8 that out of the subprogram, and then actually what we call line  
9 item. We put it into a specific line item into the program, and  
10 we have that for pavements, bridges, safety projects and a  
11 number of other things that we can go through as needed.

12                   DIRECTOR HALIKOWSKI: Thank you, Dallas.

13                   MR. MAXWELL: Thank you for that explanation.

14                   CHAIRMAN STRATTON: (Indiscernible.)

15                   VICE CHAIR THOMPSON: Chairman.

16                   CHAIRMAN STRATTON: Yes. Go ahead.

17                   VICE CHAIR THOMPSON: Chairman.

18                   CHAIRMAN STRATTON: Yes.

19                   VICE CHAIR THOMPSON: I do have a question.

20 Bret, by moving these projects around, how does that -- the  
21 funding for this -- these project this year and maybe the  
22 following year impact the funding that are available for those  
23 two years?

24                   DIRECTOR HALIKOWSKI: Maybe Greg (indiscernible).

25                   MR. ANDERSON: So that's a great question.

1 MR. BYRES: So, Bret, if I can answer that,  
2 please.

3 MR. ANDERSON: Go ahead, Greg. Yeah.

4 MR. BYRES: So as we move these through the  
5 program, Mr. Chairman, Board Member Thompson, as you've seen me  
6 present our program, we have designated funding for each year.  
7 So what we're doing is in so -- in re-evaluating the costs of  
8 the projects, we're having to slide things back and forth to  
9 maintain a balance in each one of those years. So we're not  
10 moving or changing the dollar values that's available in each of  
11 those years. All we're doing is balancing the projects out and  
12 the costs of those projects within the different years.

13 So there's -- we're not moving money at all.  
14 What we're doing is sliding the projects to maintain the  
15 balances. So if we -- if we slide some projects back one year  
16 and advance a couple of projects, it takes and helps balance out  
17 each of the different years within the five-year program.

18 VICE CHAIR THOMPSON: Chairman, thank you very  
19 much. And I don't have -- I can't see the list of projects that  
20 they have there because of my location. So I'd like to see if I  
21 can get the hard copies mailed over to me so I can review them  
22 before the next board meeting. I'd really appreciate that,  
23 Chairman.

24 CHAIRMAN STRATTON: Absolutely. They'll take  
25 care of that, Jesse.

1 MR. ROEHRICH: Yeah. Mr. Chairman, Mr. Thompson,  
2 this is Floyd. Hard copies will be mailed to you.

3 VICE CHAIR THOMPSON: Thank you very much.

4 MR. BYRES: And Rhett, if we can go down two  
5 slides, please.

6 So since we're now at the end of our comment  
7 period, I wanted to go through the different comments that we  
8 have that we've received during our five-year program comment  
9 period.

10 One of efforts that we've had -- or we've had  
11 several efforts in trying to make sure that the public  
12 involvement has occurred. We've had several news releases.  
13 We've had social media promotions. Our website's available.  
14 We've done multiple things in order to make sure that the  
15 tentative program as well as the information that we've  
16 presented to the Board has gone out and people have the ability  
17 to take and comment on it.

18 So to date, we've received 925 online survey  
19 comments, 72 emails, 4 mailed comments, 4 phone comments, and  
20 actually, it's more than that, because we received some just  
21 even yesterday, and several verbal comments that were made at  
22 the public hearings. So we've received, like I said, a  
23 multitude of comments.

24 As a comparison, with the number of comments we  
25 received this year, even though we're all virtual, we've

1 received right at a little over 1,000 comments. Last year,  
2 total, we had 77 comments. So it's a substantial difference in  
3 the number of comments that we've received, and obviously our  
4 virtual abilities to be able to receive those comments are  
5 working, and it seems more people are more willing to provide  
6 those comments on -- in a virtual format.

7 So next slide, please.

8 So we take and categorized several of these  
9 comments, and I wanted to go through to make sure that if people  
10 see these comments or at least your knowledge of these comments  
11 and what's going on with them. So I'd like to kind of go  
12 through these. I won't get into a lot of detail, but at least  
13 let you know what's going -- what the comments were and how  
14 they're being addressed.

15 So the themes that we have -- and I think I got  
16 like 20-some themes here, so I'll go through it fairly quickly.  
17 Need for highway improvements throughout the state to address  
18 travel needs, support continued rapid growth and economic  
19 development.

20 One of the things to remember here is major  
21 growth areas that we have within the state, and it's occurring  
22 across the state, but the major ones are Maricopa County and  
23 Pima Counties. Those two counties have their MPOs as well as  
24 RTAs that take and have their own funding abilities, as well as  
25 their own planning and programming within their jurisdictions.

1           So the State -- what you see in the five-year  
2 program is mostly all -- or actually, the program itself is all  
3 Greater Arizona. We do include in the program MAG's program and  
4 PAG's program. And so, consequently, those two MPOs take and do  
5 their own planning and programming. ADOT does do the  
6 construction and maintenance of the facilities, but they do the  
7 planning and programming with oversight from ADOT, and we  
8 include those programs within our overall ADOT program.

9           Request to add signals at the I-10 Jackrabbit  
10 Trail interchange and safety and traffic. We've received 2- --  
11 662 comments by itself about this one TI. So ADOT's TSMO is  
12 currently looking at a short-term solution for that interchange,  
13 but it's going to require additional work and a long-term  
14 solution. There's -- it's a fairly confined TI. So there's  
15 some right-of-way acquisition and so forth that's going to have  
16 to occur.

17           One of the big things here is there is a  
18 tremendous amount of growth that's occurring out in that area,  
19 so this -- we're kind of playing a little bit of catch-up here  
20 on this TI, but we need a true long-term solution here. So our  
21 TSMO group is starting to look at that so that we can start  
22 addressing those needs and those concerns.

23           Need to widen I-10 between Phoenix and Casa  
24 Grande and south of Tucson. So, of course, we've got the  
25 ongoing design concept report on I-10 that runs from the 202 to

1 387, and we also have included in this program is the I-10 Gila  
2 River Bridge, so -- which is part of that corridor. So that's  
3 ongoing. We are working on that.

4           Need to further widen I-10 in the West Valley.  
5 That's part of Maricopa County. So, again, it falls within the  
6 MAG region. They are looking at that.

7           DIRECTOR HALIKOWSKI: Hey, Greg.

8           MR. BYRES: Yes.

9           DIRECTOR HALIKOWSKI: So Mr. Chairman, board  
10 members, I just see up there that ADOT currently has no  
11 expansion plans for I-10 west of Maricopa County, and while that  
12 is a true statement, it's not that we haven't studied the  
13 interstate system in Arizona through our Key Commerce Corridors  
14 initiative. And we looked at each of the interstates and what  
15 it would take to modernize them up to 2020 standards, and that  
16 was about a five-year effort of meeting with various business  
17 communities and stakeholders. Unfortunately, the amount that we  
18 would need to bring all of our interstates up to modernization  
19 and other Key Commerce Corridors is about a billion dollars a  
20 year over the next 20 years, and no one was interested in  
21 funding that.

22           So I just want to be clear that ADOT has long  
23 been looking at what we need to do to modernize the interstates,  
24 because there are economic rivers, if you will, to Mexico, to  
25 the ports at Long Beach, in San Diego, and then to all the

1 points north and east. So I just don't want you to think we  
2 haven't looked at this. It's just economically not feasible at  
3 this point. Thank you.

4 CHAIRMAN STRATTON: John, this -- I guess I have  
5 a comment and then I have a question for you. You know, we're  
6 running into the same problem we have is our funding issue, and  
7 we're still --

8 DIRECTOR HALIKOWSKI: Yeah.

9 CHAIRMAN STRATTON: -- dealing with funding that  
10 started in 1992, and we're at the same rate or -- rate/price  
11 today that -- as we were in '92, and I don't think there's  
12 anybody in the world right now that could run their home or a  
13 business on what they made in 1992 and keep it to current  
14 standards. So something has to break down the line somewhere.  
15 And the Legislature --

16 DIRECTOR HALIKOWSKI: Yeah.

17 CHAIRMAN STRATTON: -- has been helping us with  
18 certain projects through the past two or three years, but I  
19 believe they pulled the \$50 million from the I-10 from the GRIC  
20 bridge this year. I thought it was funded, and the last thing I  
21 heard is it did not. Can you elaborate on that for me?

22 DIRECTOR HALIKOWSKI: Yeah. So let me just lay a  
23 little groundwork for the Board and then we'll answer your  
24 question.

25 So understand that we're actually on I-10 between



1 Phoenix and Casa Grande looking at three distinct issues or  
2 projects, if you will. We have the I-10 widening from State  
3 Route 387 to Loop 202 that we're working heavily with MAG on,  
4 and I believe MAG has put 50 million into that project or  
5 intends to.

6 Then you have the second piece, which is the I-10  
7 Gila River Bridge project that Greg was just talking about, and  
8 that's funded at 50 million in the five-year program, and  
9 another 33 million that was allocated from some increases we  
10 have seen in revenues and also by some federal COVID moneys this  
11 year that Governor Ducey shipped over for the bridge. And then  
12 the third piece we're looking at is SR-347 TI with I-10, and  
13 that project's just over 30 million.

14 So, you know, then you have the 10 widening of  
15 the entire facility, and to try and make policymakers aware of  
16 what's happening, we formed a partnership with MAG and the Gila  
17 River Indian Community, and all three of our organizations  
18 signed on to a letter to our Congressional delegation asking for  
19 \$1 billion out of whatever the transportation program is that's  
20 going to come out of Congress that's being negotiated. And we  
21 would look at \$1 billion that would cover the widening of I-10  
22 from Phoenix to Casa Grande, and then, of course, at State Route  
23 347 widening, we were asked to look at that all the way from  
24 Maricopa to the Maricopa side, and then I believe some  
25 improvements to Highway 87 and 89 on Gila River.

1                   So the three government entities have formed  
2 together, and we are trying to work with Congress and the  
3 Legislature as a partnership for these improvements.

4                   Now, where we were yesterday was Congressman  
5 Stanton paid a visit, and Dallas and I and our FHWA  
6 administrator for Arizona, Karla Petty, we went on a field trip  
7 and toured the I-10 area and some of these projects at 347 and  
8 the bridge.

9                   So at this point, the Gila River Bridge, I  
10 believe, is funded. There's another 50 million that Senator  
11 Shope in the Arizona Legislature is trying to negotiate and put  
12 in for I-10. We don't have an immediate project this year to  
13 spend that money on, but the Legislature has made that exempt  
14 from the (indiscernible) of appropriation. So if that  
15 50 million stays in the state budget, we will be applying that  
16 in the future to the I-10 widening.

17                   Dallas, I don't know if you have anything else  
18 you want to add. You were in heavy conversation yesterday with  
19 Governor Lewis and Congressman Stanton on the ride.

20                   MR. HAMMIT: Thank you, Director.

21                   The one thing I would add, Mr. Chair, is if that  
22 50 million comes through, if you remember right, two years ago  
23 the Legislature made available \$10 million for the corridor that  
24 we could get design going early. We do have design going from  
25 the Gila River Bridge south to 387. There's two designers

1 working on two different projects that can be broken up,  
2 depending on how much money becomes available. So if we get  
3 that \$50 million, we're already started on the design and could  
4 deliver that in approximately a year from now, once we have NEPA  
5 completed for the corridor, and then we get the additional  
6 funds.

7           So we're not starting at ground zero. We're  
8 already underway with design, and what we've told our designers  
9 is they need to be flexible, and if money becomes available, we  
10 tweak that design based -- we scope for the dollars we get, not  
11 just saying, well, we have a \$100 million project. We can't do  
12 it unless we get \$100 million. We scope it to the money that  
13 becomes available. So it may take two projects to get the  
14 project -- the whole thing done.

15           DIRECTOR HALIKOWSKI: And we've been in contact  
16 with all of our delegation, because as you know, they were all  
17 given some amount of money for potential earmarks, and  
18 Congressman Stanton (inaudible) he sits on the House of  
19 Representatives Transportation and Infrastructure. He's  
20 promised 5 million of his support of federal funds with the  
21 projects on the 347 interchange.

22           So we're continuing to work with policymakers,  
23 and especially our partners in MAG and the GRIC to try and keep  
24 this thing moving, but again, as Dallas says, there's studies  
25 and work that need to be done before we fully engage in the

1 widening. But that doesn't mean there aren't improvements that  
2 we can't make in the meantime.

3 I hope that answers your question, Mr. Chairman.  
4 If not, we can do that, so...

5 CHAIRMAN STRATTON: No. That helps, John. I  
6 thank you very much. And Dallas, thank you.

7 DIRECTOR HALIKOWSKI: Any other questions, board  
8 members? I know this has been a hot topic. Not sure if others  
9 have questions, Mr. Chairman, on 10.

10 CHAIRMAN STRATTON: Do any other board members  
11 have questions or (inaudible)?

12 DIRECTOR HALIKOWSKI: So I -- just in closing,  
13 you know, we're trying to make sense of the hash that's coming  
14 out of Congress and the news every day on infrastructure, and I  
15 think generally everybody's aware the President's proposed a  
16 large plan, and you know, the Republican caucus has come back  
17 with a much more slimmed-down plan. The two big, major stopping  
18 points are, you know, how much is going to be spent and how do  
19 you define infrastructure? So they'll continue to wrangle that  
20 out.

21 And then, you know, at the State Legislature,  
22 they're recessed until June 10, and from what I can tell,  
23 there's about three different factions over there on the budget:  
24 Those are support the budget as it is and those that want to  
25 pass that budget with amendments to the (indiscernible) for

1 communities, and then you've got another group of folks over  
2 there who feel the budget is too big and want to remove some of  
3 the spending. We don't know what that looked like and if that  
4 will target any of the transportation projects that are in the  
5 current proposed budget by leadership. So that's kind of a  
6 thumbnail where we are, Mr. Chair.

7 CHAIRMAN STRATTON: Thank you, John. Any other  
8 questions?

9 MS. DANIELS: Mr. Chairman.

10 CHAIRMAN STRATTON: Yes. Go ahead, Jenn.

11 MS. DANIELS: Yes. This is Jenn Daniels. Thank  
12 you. I appreciate that.

13 We've obviously received quite a few emails on  
14 various projects. I'm sure each board member has been pulled in  
15 to different rooms and others, and it has occurred to me that  
16 perhaps with some of our shuffling of the prioritization in  
17 trying to fit different projects in, we haven't communicated in  
18 -- as much as we probably need to with our stakeholders, and as  
19 we've, you know, moved and shuffled -- and I -- and I understand  
20 the fiscal constraints that we're under and why we need to do  
21 things like that.

22 So I was hoping -- and maybe this document  
23 already exists -- but if there's either been an increase or a  
24 decrease and/or if the project has stayed the same, cost has  
25 stayed the same, and then if we've reprioritized within our

1 five-year plan, is there a document that denotes all of those  
2 components and why we're -- sort of the message behind what  
3 we're doing here so that we can share that with stakeholders and  
4 help them understand why something may have been moved out of  
5 the five-year plan, why something was changed in -- from a  
6 timing standpoint? Is that -- does a document like that exist?  
7 And if so, can we get copies of that to share with our  
8 stakeholders?

9 MR. BYRES: So Mr. Chairman, Board Member  
10 Daniels, what we can do -- we don't have a document like that  
11 right now, but basically, the slides that you've seen, we have a  
12 huge spreadsheet that actually goes through each one of these  
13 and documents all of that. We can certainly put together  
14 something like that and produce that with this information that  
15 we have within the slide program that we're presenting today.

16 MS. DANIELS: I think that would be a helpful  
17 document or tool for all of us as board members to use, but also  
18 to share with all of the county supervisors, to share with all  
19 the planning agencies, to share with mayors and councils and  
20 legislators, because I think they get a little off kilter on  
21 occasion.

22 Sorry for the interruption.

23 CHAIRMAN STRATTON: Thank you, Jenn.

24 Any other questions? Hearing none, Greg, you  
25 want to proceed, please?

1           MR. BYRES: Thank you very much. If we can go to  
2 the next slide.

3           So other comments that we received. One is  
4 within -- need for widening of SR-347 between I-10 and Maricopa.  
5 The Director had just mentioned that. MAG is currently working  
6 on a planning document for this section so that we can have  
7 actual information on pursuing such a project.

8           Again, that falls within the MAG region. Need to  
9 widen US-93 to Kingman and build the US-93/I-40 West Kingman  
10 interchange. A portion of that segment is currently in the  
11 tentative program. Both the West Kingman TI and the gap project  
12 for US-93 are included in the program.

13           Need to widen US-95 in Yuma. A portion of this  
14 segment is currently in the tentative program. In fact, it was  
15 listed in the projects that we just showed where we move -- a  
16 portion of that project from '26 up to '22. So that -- that's  
17 in the current program. Or not the current program, but the  
18 tentative program to be approved.

19           Need to put the SR-260 widening project on Lion  
20 Springs back into the five-year program. We have spoken about  
21 that earlier, about the design costs and the challenges that  
22 we're seeing within that. So that's one of the things that  
23 we're working on and need additional funding to keep going.

24           Need to advance SR-30 corridor between Loop 303  
25 and Loop 202. Again, this is a MAG region consideration. I

1 believe they're looking at -- looking at this within the Prop  
2 400 extension as that goes forward.

3           Need to advance I-11 corridor. So we're  
4 currently trying to finish up the tier I study. That should be  
5 completed within the fall of this year. There is no funding at  
6 this point in time identified for a tier II study along any  
7 section of the corridor, but like I said, the tier I is being  
8 completed come this fall.

9           Need to advance the North-South corridor. Again,  
10 this tier I study will be completed this fall as well, and  
11 there's no funding identified at this point in time for a tier  
12 II study. I do understand that in the budget proposals there  
13 was some money being projected for that, but (audio  
14 interruption) --

15           DIRECTOR HALIKOWSKI: Greg, Greg. Hey, Greg, you  
16 cut out there for a minute. The last thing I heard was some  
17 money in the budget proposals for tier II on North-South. I  
18 think there's 5 million in there, but then I couldn't hear you  
19 afterwards.

20           MR. BYRES: So I'm sorry. Can you hear better  
21 now?

22           DIRECTOR HALIKOWSKI: Yes.

23           MR. BYRES: So for the North-South corridor, like  
24 I said, there's a potential of \$5 million that was part of the  
25 budget proposal, but until the budget is passed, we will know



1 exactly whether or not there's going to be any funding for that.

2 And then the last item we had is need for equity  
3 in the program statewide between rural and urban areas.

4 Improvements focused in Maricopa County. Maricopa County and  
5 Greater Arizona are generally funded through separate means.

6 Maricopa County has its own funding sources through their RTA  
7 with differing priorities. So again, Maricopa County, or MAG,  
8 takes and does their own planning and programming with oversight  
9 from ADOT, but their funding sources are separate from those for  
10 Greater Arizona. That --

11 CHAIRMAN STRATTON: Greg --

12 MR. BYRES: Yes.

13 CHAIRMAN STRATTON: Greg, can I interrupt you  
14 right there for a minute? We have several new board members.  
15 Could you explain the Casa Grande accords to them and the  
16 distribution of money?

17 MR. BYRES: Yes, I can.

18 So the Casa Grande accords take and distribute  
19 the funding for federal funds across the state. So Greater  
20 Arizona, which is everything outside of Maricopa County and Pima  
21 County, gets 50 percent. The MAG region, which is Maricopa  
22 County, gets 37 percent, and the PAG region, which is Pima  
23 County, gets 13 percent of the funds that come through those  
24 federal appropriated funds for highway use.

25 So I hope that's clear.

1 CHAIRMAN STRATTON: Thank you, Greg.

2 MR. BYRES: And again, that -- this hits the main  
3 themes that we saw in the comments that came through to date. I  
4 just want to make sure that the Board as well as anyone else  
5 sees that we are looking at and addressing these comments within  
6 the tentative program.

7 Thank you. That was all -- that's the end of my  
8 presentation, if you have any other questions.

9 CHAIRMAN STRATTON: Thank you, Greg.

10 Do any of the board members have any questions  
11 for Greg or Kristine concerning the five-year plan?

12 MR. SEARLE: Chairman Stratton, you know, I  
13 realize -- and this -- I know -- I'm not sure when to do the  
14 timing on an ask like this, because I know as each one of us  
15 board members, we probably have projects we'd like to see.

16 In these comments that were received in the  
17 tentative program, what wasn't addressed was the comments that  
18 we received from SEAGO and the City of Douglas in regards of  
19 help our DCR for the second commercial port. And I know Mark  
20 Sanders is going to be talking about that in a minute on this  
21 agenda, and I don't know if this is a good time to talk about it  
22 now, but I really would like to see a new project would be the  
23 DCR for that commercial -- second commercial port. We can  
24 discuss it later or we can do it now. I -- it's your call.

25 DIRECTOR HALIKOWSKI: Mr. Chair.

1                   CHAIRMAN STRATTON: Go ahead.

2                   DIRECTOR HALIKOWSKI: Mr. Chairman, just to -- I  
3 think, you know, we're leading into that discussion, and Mark's  
4 going to talk about, you know, the two-port solution we're  
5 looking at in Douglas. But realize if it takes two to tango on  
6 here, and actually three because we've got the federal  
7 government and GSA involved as to whether or not they're going  
8 to continue to place money for the port of the Douglas side.

9                   Of course, we're working with Sonora and the  
10 Mexican federal government, as Mark will talk about, but those  
11 things, you know, tend to speed up and slow down depending on  
12 what's happening federally in Mexico.

13                   The part that ADOT is also very concerned and  
14 working about is the connector road. And, you know, we estimate  
15 that project probably more at around 25 to 30 million, because  
16 we're going to have to build a TI into the state highway. So  
17 there's a number of issues, and we are involved in working -- as  
18 you know, on the Arizona-Mexico Commission, I chair the -- or  
19 co-chair the Transportation and Infrastructure Committee with  
20 Secretary Ricardo Martinez from Mexico. So, Mark, if you would,  
21 I think we can answer Chairman -- or Board Member Searle's  
22 questions as we go through.

23                   CHAIRMAN STRATTON: I was going to suggest and I  
24 agree with you. Let's listen to the next discussion, and I  
25 think that would be a more appropriate place to ask your

1 question.

2 MR. SEARLE: Thank you, Mr. Chair. Sorry.

3 DIRECTOR HALIKOWSKI: Sorry to jump ahead of you  
4 there, Mr. Chair.

5 CHAIRMAN STRATTON: No. At any time. The  
6 members need to ask the questions, and we'll get answers one  
7 place or another.

8 Are there any other comments for Kristine or  
9 Greg?

10 Okay. Hearing none, we'll move on to Item 2, the  
11 overview of ongoing international border activities for  
12 information and discussion only, and this is Mark Sanders.

13 Mark.

14 MR. SANDERS: Thank you. Yes. Thank you,  
15 Chairman Stratton, members of the Board, Director Halikowski.  
16 It's a pleasure to be with all of you today to talk about our  
17 international programs in our department.

18 We were actually a very small team directed by  
19 the Director himself, supervised by Floyd Roehrich, and also a  
20 valuable member, who is Luis Ramirez, the President of Ramirez  
21 Advisors, who helps us out with a wide array of issues on the  
22 border and political help as well. He's on this panel as well  
23 to help me out with any questions as need.

24 Next slide, please, Rhett.

25 Okay. In order to discuss a port of entry, I

1 think it's very important that we appreciate the importance of  
2 the commerce and the flow of goods and service that's we receive  
3 from Mexico.

4 ADOT partnering with the Mexican Ministry of  
5 Communications and Transport and the Sonoran Department of  
6 Infrastructure and urban Development to conduct a one-of-a-kind  
7 study that looked at transportation infrastructure along the MX  
8 15 from Mexico City to Nogales, and the other ports of entry  
9 being Douglas and San Luis.

10 The study includes an economic analysis of  
11 various of opportunity for cluster developments, new investments  
12 and job creation. Because of emphasis on economic impact, we  
13 identified key commodities that use a corridor, primary  
14 production clusters, and looked at various scenarios for freight  
15 flows.

16 Key supply chains are in fresh produce, mining,  
17 automotive, aerospace and electronics manufacturing. Sinaloa  
18 and Sonora are the main states that use this corridor.

19 Transportation costs are actually lower when  
20 shippers choose to cross through Arizona than going directly to  
21 Texas from these states. For an example, a product originating  
22 in Culiacan, Sinaloa destined for U.S. consumers is nine hours  
23 shorter and \$930 cheaper going to Nogales rather than the  
24 borders in Texas.

25 When Director Halikowski was in Mexico years ago,

1 and he can talk about this later, he noticed that all the focus  
2 and emphasis was commerce leaving Mexico and going directly to  
3 Texas, bypassing Arizona. The reason for this is because Texas  
4 has spent a great amount of money in marketing and studies to  
5 provide data to Mexico. At this point the Director instructed  
6 us to conduct our own study, analyzing the clusters and the  
7 opportunities for Arizona. It has obviously paid off, but I do  
8 want to stress that the Director always sees the ports of  
9 entries as a system. Every port of entry in Arizona has great  
10 value for the flow of commerce.

11 Next slide, please.

12 The study also put forward some recommendations  
13 for how to improve the competitiveness of the corridor, several  
14 of which ADOT has already been in the process of implementing,  
15 such as the Border Liaison Unit, which I will cover later; a  
16 \$134 million investment to modernize State Route 189 Nogales,  
17 the final connector road from the Federal Highway 15 in Mexico  
18 to our interstates, and the (indiscernible) border initiative,  
19 which I will also talk about later as well.

20 The Mexican government has also invested  
21 \$1.8 billion in modernizing its portion of the corridor,  
22 resulting in time savings, enhanced road safety and opening  
23 opportunities for investments along this corridor. As a result  
24 of several of these initiatives, wait times for commercial  
25 trucks crossing the Arizona border are measured in minutes

1 instead of hours. Time is (indiscernible) as we all know.

2 DIRECTOR HALIKOWSKI: Mark.

3 MR. SANDERS: Yes.

4 DIRECTOR HALIKOWSKI: Mr. Chairman, I just want  
5 to thank the Board at this point. Getting SR-189 finished,  
6 which will be happening pretty soon, is a huge accomplishment  
7 for Arizona, and the Board was a willing partner all the way  
8 through. Biggest rural project we've ever done in Arizona, and  
9 it really is a game changer.

10 So I just want to give a shout out to the Board  
11 for particular sticking with us and supporting that project.  
12 You know, hopefully at some point what we're going to see is  
13 economic clusters in northwestern Mexico and southeastern  
14 Arizona that are going to be transporting goods and services  
15 back and back and forth. We estimate that before a product is  
16 finished, it could cross the border up to four times, and that's  
17 commerce and economy for everybody.

18 So thank you, Mark. Sorry to interrupt.

19 MR. SANDERS: Mr. Chairman, I would also like to  
20 echo his sentiments and also point out that Mexico is very  
21 impressed with this project and very eager for it to open.

22 CHAIRMAN STRATTON: I was going to save my  
23 comment on that until the end, but I think it would be more  
24 appropriate now. For the new board members, all of this came  
25 about when -- my first or second year on the Board, and it was

1 quite an investment, and we did (audio interruption) looking and  
2 studying, and I have to agree with both of you that it's been a  
3 tremendous project, and it has helped out, and it makes the  
4 commerce much better and much quicker. So I appreciate the  
5 staff bringing that to the Board and having the foresight to do  
6 so. So thank you.

7 MR. SANDERS: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

8 I also want to add that companies are looking to  
9 cross their products through Arizona over California, New Mexico  
10 and Texas, which results in our data we are -- we gathered  
11 through this study that I'm speaking of. The total northbound  
12 trucking in Arizona grew 2 percent. That is in despite of a  
13 pandemic situation that we went through last year. The  
14 marketing improvements on the corridor is in conjunction with  
15 State's strategic outreach and establishing of new trade offices  
16 in Chihuahua and Guanajuato.

17 Next slide, please, Rhett.

18 I just want to point out to the Board, please,  
19 Mr. Chairman, I have a high level description of what's going  
20 on, the ports of entry. So I do encourage the board members to  
21 chime in and ask questions, please, if it's more into the  
22 detail, in the weeds.

23 ADOT engages with stakeholders in Arizona's  
24 border communities to identify our regional transportation needs  
25 that facilitate the flow and people to the ports of entry and



1 local communities.

2 The three priority projects at this point is San  
3 Luis Rio Colorado I, Deconcini Nogales and the Douglas two port  
4 solution.

5 The San Luis I port of entry is very outdated,  
6 overburdened and heavily congested. San Luis I is the main  
7 pedestrian crossing for seasonal agricultural workers in Yuma  
8 County.

9 The modernization of this project entails tearing  
10 down the existing facility to build an expanded state-of-the-art  
11 campus for U.S. Customs and Border Patrol. The San Luis I Port  
12 of Entry is a high priority project for CBP due to the  
13 inefficient work environment for their officers. Even though  
14 San Luis I is a non-commercial port, the wait times for  
15 pedestrian crossings is unprecedented, negatively impacting  
16 sales tax revenues for the City of San Luis.

17 Currently, Congress has allocated 152.4 million  
18 in fiscal year 2020 for the spending package, but we need an  
19 additional 90 million to complete the project. And as the  
20 Director mentioned before, we have had this funding. We're  
21 looking to get the 90 million.

22 We're having a really complicated time from  
23 Mexico to work in conjunction with us to seek funding and allow  
24 this project to happen. The diagram you see on the right is the  
25 ideal situation for a perfect flow in this port of entry, and I

1 would ask Luis Ramirez, who's been in -- very in touch with the  
2 mayor in San Luis Rio Colorado in the federal government down  
3 there to add a little bit of what's happening, funding on the  
4 Mexican side.

5 MR. RAMIREZ: Mark, thank you very much,  
6 Mr. Chairman and members of the Board. Good morning. Luis  
7 Ramirez.

8 What I wanted to highlight is that the -- if you  
9 look at the pink arrow right on the side of -- on the right  
10 image, the image on the right side, I should say, that is a new  
11 designation for the southbound vehicular traffic. Currently,  
12 where all those little blue arrows are located, that is  
13 northbound traffic. In the center of the image, which you  
14 cannot see in this -- in this one photograph, there is the  
15 southbound traffic kind of like in that dotted gray arrow line.

16 What we're proposing is the relocation of  
17 southbound traffic, what is in an area that is called --  
18 designated as Archibald Morelos, Archibald Avenue and Morelos  
19 Avenue on the Mexican side.

20 That would greatly impact safety. It greatly  
21 impacts throughput of vehicular traffic. This would also  
22 eliminate the need for pedestrians to cross between the lanes of  
23 cars to get to the pedestrian southbound lanes. There's a  
24 number of advantages associated with this new re-alignment of  
25 southbound vehicular traffic.

1           The challenge that we're having is that on the  
2 Mexican side, while the investment is minimal, relatively  
3 speaking, we're talking about anywhere between 3 to 5 million  
4 dollars. The Mexican federal government has yet to designate  
5 funding necessary, one, for the studies required, and two, for  
6 the actual construction.

7           We've been working with the state of Sonora and  
8 the municipality of San Luis Rio Colorado along with the Greater  
9 Gila Port Authority, with the City of San Luis, Yuma County, a  
10 number of other stakeholders. We've actually submitted an  
11 application for the North American development backed for a  
12 \$150,000 technical assistance grant that would pay for the  
13 studies on the Mexican side. We're hoping to get some type of  
14 an indication if that grant is going to be awarded by the end of  
15 next week.

16           The challenge that we have is that unless the  
17 studies are done and Mexico commits the funding, the realignment  
18 of southbound traffic becomes very challenging, and CBP, or  
19 Customs and Border Protection, and the General Services  
20 Administration are saying that unless they see that investment  
21 and commitment by the Mexican side, they will not have a choice  
22 but to continue to use the current location of southbound  
23 traffic, as I said, is by that dotted gray line, kind of in the  
24 middle of the image. That would really minimize the potential  
25 of this -- you know, \$250 million investment by the U.S.

1 government.

2           So we continue to fight. We continue to advocate  
3 for the funding that needs to come on the Mexican side. We're  
4 actually going to be holding another binational technical  
5 meeting focused on Arizona's ports of entry on June 10th, which  
6 is three to five days from now, in which we're asking the  
7 Mexican federal agencies to address this concern, and you will  
8 see we also have concerns in some of the other projects, but  
9 this -- because we've already have \$152 million in the bank,  
10 this is the number one priority right now in order to get the  
11 Mexican government to commit the necessary funding.

12           Mark, I don't know there's any additional  
13 questions on that.

14           MR. ANDERSON: Not on my end, Mr. Ramirez. I  
15 don't know if -- Mr. Chair, if the Board has any questions on  
16 this project.

17           DIRECTOR HALIKOWSKI: Mark --

18           CHAIRMAN STRATTON: Did any board member have a  
19 question?

20           DIRECTOR HALIKOWSKI: Mr. Chair, for the board  
21 members that don't know Luis, I met him about 13 years ago when  
22 I became director, and he's been a long-term consultant for  
23 ADOT, not only with Sonora, but with the Mexican federal  
24 government and our own Congress. So a lot of these things that  
25 we're talking about today that are accomplishments would not

1 have been possible without Luis' guidance and his perseverance  
2 through these.

3 So I will say if you ever want to know what true  
4 exhaustion is, travel to Mexico City with Luis, and you'll be  
5 meeting dignitaries from 8:00 in the morning until midnight and  
6 then --

7 MR. RAMIREZ: Yeah.

8 DIRECTOR HALIKOWSKI: -- start all over again.  
9 So I just wanted to put his comments into context for the Board  
10 that he's a long-time trusted consultant for us on these issues.

11 MR. RAMIREZ: Thank you, Director.

12 CHAIRMAN STRATTON: Thank you, Director.

13 Mr. Searle, would you like to ask any more  
14 questions about the Douglas port at this time?

15 MR. SEARLE: (Inaudible.)

16 DIRECTOR HALIKOWSKI: I think we're going to come  
17 up to the Douglas port --

18 MR. ANDERSON: Yes, sir.

19 DIRECTOR HALIKOWSKI: -- (indiscernible.)

20 MR. SEARLE: Okay. Very good.

21 DIRECTOR HALIKOWSKI: I think Douglas is on the  
22 list here. Just the key thing to remember about this, this is  
23 critical for the economy, being in Yuma, because we have so many  
24 workers trying to cross every day and go home at night, and then  
25 you have thousands of people literally, you know, waiting in

1 line, whether they're cars, pedestrians, and in cases we've been  
2 asked to provide more bicycle parking. So this is critical for  
3 the economy. We need to keep working with the Mexican  
4 government to make this happen so that GSA doesn't pull the  
5 funding.

6 MR. ANDERSON: Yes. Mr. Chair, members of the  
7 Board -- sorry to interrupt -- literally, they start standing in  
8 line at 1:30 in the morning to be able to cross the border and  
9 go to work the next morning.

10 MR. KNIGHT: Mr. Chair, this is Board Member  
11 Knight.

12 CHAIRMAN STRATTON: Understood. Go ahead, Gary.

13 MR. KNIGHT: I too would like to thank Luis for  
14 all the work he's (indiscernible) with this -- this port, we've  
15 worked on it for -- we've been working for years to try to get  
16 this port expanded and modernized, and finally got the lion's  
17 share of the money that it will take, but this is really a very  
18 important project, not just for Yuma County, not just for -- but  
19 also for the entire state and the nation, because the  
20 agricultural workers that have to get across the border to work  
21 in our fields and actually do the labor that gets the lettuce  
22 and other vegetables to the rest of the nation during the winter  
23 months is just -- you have to see it to believe it.

24 But it -- it's so important that this -- this  
25 port be expanded and allow a much shorter wait time for

1 pedestrians and cars to get through and come across instead of  
2 having to wait hours to get across just so they can go to work,  
3 and then do the same thing all over again the next day. So it's  
4 very, very -- as the Director had mentioned, it's critical.  
5 It's very important.

6 CHAIRMAN STRATTON: And I agree with you, Gary.  
7 Director Halikowski, if I recall correctly, one  
8 of the major obstacles we had with Texas was the wait at our  
9 border was so much longer and not as efficient. That was one of  
10 the things, the modernization and some of the policies that were  
11 instituted and different things changed at that port of entry  
12 that helped that. Am I remembering that correctly?

13 DIRECTOR HALIKOWSKI: There were issues raised by  
14 business folks in the Yuma area that ADOT was being too strict  
15 on truck safety, and I think there was probably some confusion  
16 there between the roles of ADOT and DPS as to who or what was  
17 being more strict, but regardless of that, the perception was  
18 out there among the Mexican industrial community that it was  
19 quicker to go to Mexicali than it was to stop and then go  
20 through the Yuma border, San Luis Port of Entry.

21 And so we had this issue not only there, but in  
22 Nogales, and so we took a detailed study into this and learned a  
23 couple of things, and one was that we needed to standardize our  
24 inspection criteria across all of our ports of entry, especially  
25 the international.

1           But the key to this also was going to the source  
2 and making sure those trucks didn't have any safety violations  
3 that would stop them in the first place, and that's when our  
4 enforcement compliance division established the Border Liaison  
5 Unit, and prior to COVID, we were regularly going into Mexico  
6 and holding seminars with Mexican trucking companies, individual  
7 truckers, and we showed them and put them through a course to  
8 understand and what Arizona and U.S. safety requirements are to  
9 come into the country. Then we established an internet  
10 (indiscernible) use of WhatsApp, so if they had safety  
11 questions, they could send us a picture of the equipment on the  
12 truck, and we would let them know whether it was going to pass  
13 before they got there.

14           Long story short, we are now seeing traffic  
15 flowing more through our ports and not going to Mexicali,  
16 because our wait times for inspections and what we're looking  
17 for and because of the communications have significantly  
18 decreased, and we've been doing some marketing with companies  
19 that had left us and had solely been going through Texas, and  
20 they're now saying, okay, we're going to come back and give  
21 Arizona another try.

22           So kudos to Mark and the work he's doing there  
23 and to the Border Liaison Unit. We're not going into Mexico and  
24 doing training right now, but we're doing virtual training with  
25 our Mexican counterparts, and we're going to be expanding. We



1 now have U.S. companies asking ADOT if we can come and provide  
2 training to their companies and drivers, also.

3 CHAIRMAN STRATTON: Thank you, John.

4 MR. SEARLE: Chairman Stratton.

5 CHAIRMAN STRATTON: Yes.

6 MR. SEARLE: The question I would have on the San  
7 Luis project is what -- what's ADOT's ask on this? I mean, what  
8 are -- what's -- if we're to modernize this port, what's ADOT's  
9 role on this?

10 DIRECTOR HALIKOWSKI: So Mr. Chairman and Board  
11 Member Searle, we really are a convener, if you will. As I  
12 said, I sit on the Transportation Committee with the Arizona-  
13 Mexico Commission. We're on the Binational Border and Bridges  
14 Committee, and, of course, we talk to our Congressional  
15 delegation.

16 So when you look at this, you have to have a  
17 partnership between both federal governments and the state of  
18 Sonora, their government and ours, because we have to, once GSA  
19 decides to build the port, make sure that we're providing the  
20 appropriate connections to it, or otherwise, we're just starting  
21 another bottleneck.

22 So we worked in conjunction these folks, and then  
23 often -- you know, I just got a letter from San Luis yesterday  
24 that I forwarded on to Luis and Mark. They're asking our  
25 support for a federal grant, I believe to modernize Cesar Chavez

1 Avenue for traffic that's coming through the port, into San  
2 Luis, so that they're not congesting their downtown to where you  
3 can't get to it. So this is the dance, basically, that has to  
4 go on among several government entities, the stakeholders at the  
5 ports. And what we've done at ADOT is actually just function  
6 largely as a place where you can come and gather, and we can  
7 start hammering these problems out.

8 MR. SEARLE: Understood, and I appreciate that  
9 role. I was just looking at any infrastructure needs that ADOT  
10 would have to come into play at, and what I'm hearing right now  
11 is --

12 DIRECTOR HALIKOWSKI: (Indiscernible.)

13 MR. SEARLE: Really isn't anything identified at  
14 this time.

15 DIRECTOR HALIKOWSKI: I don't know about San  
16 Luis, but as I mentioned for Douglas, if that two-port solution  
17 comes in, ADOT will be working with the County to build a  
18 connector road to the state highway. It's about a six-mile road  
19 there, so...

20 MR. SEARLE: Understood, and that -- I understand  
21 the Douglas issue. I was just trying to get a better handle on  
22 the San Luis, but what I'm hearing is there's not a direct issue  
23 with San Luis or a direct ask with San Luis at this time.

24 DIRECTOR HALIKOWSKI: Mark or Luis? I don't  
25 recall.

1 MR. SANDERS: Chairman Stratton, Board Member  
2 Searle, there's indirect economic impact that we're seeing  
3 little by little right now in San Luis, and that is due to the  
4 great work that our team is doing on the border. We're seeing a  
5 large influx of factories starting to build in San Luis Colorado  
6 and using our ports of entry instead of the Calexico.

7 One of the complaints they're having is they're  
8 bringing crews to work with them, and their quality of life to  
9 cross through this border, to be able to go into San Luis, has  
10 been greatly affected. So in any direct manner -- in a --

11 DIRECTOR HALIKOWSKI: Mark -- Mark, he -- Mark,  
12 he just wanted to know if there's any direct ask for  
13 construction funds, I think.

14 MR. SANDERS: I -- Luis, I don't think so. We're  
15 not doing that, are we? We're just being a facilitator like the  
16 Director said.

17 MR. SEARLE: That's exactly --

18 MR. RAMIREZ: I would want to clarify that there  
19 have been some investments made in the past. There were --

20 DIRECTOR HALIKOWSKI: Right.

21 MR. RAMIREZ: -- some improvements made to Main  
22 Street, which is the heart of downtown San Luis, and also, the  
23 Robert A. Vaughan Expressway or State Route 195 was built as a  
24 connect or road between San Luis II and I-8.

25 There was also improvements made between -- I

1 think it's Avenue B -- and Mr. Knight might correct me -- that  
2 connects the port of entry to the Robert A. Vaughan Expressway.

3           So we've -- the direct connectivity issues  
4 between the ports of entry and the federal highway system have  
5 been made. That's why we're in a position right now to say that  
6 for San Luis, something as specific San Luis I, ADOT has already  
7 made those investments in partnership with YMPO, with the City  
8 of San Luis, Yuma County, to make those improvements, which are  
9 necessary for the project.

10           What I do want to clarify, the Director  
11 indicated, there was a letter in which San Luis is asking for  
12 support on a grant to enhance the connectivity between San Luis  
13 I and San Luis II on Cesar Chavez Boulevard. So that is a  
14 request by the City of San Luis, and if I recall correctly, Vice  
15 Mayor Africa Luna-Carrasco, during the last ADOT trans- --  
16 excuse me -- transportation board meeting asked for that to be  
17 considered as part on the five-year plan.

18           CHAIRMAN STRATTON: Thank you, Luis. Thank you,  
19 Mark.

20           Are there any further questions at this point?

21           MR. KNIGHT: Yes. Director -- I mean, Chairman,  
22 this is Board Member Knight again.

23           Luis is exactly right, and we're also seeing into  
24 our port of entry II, which is our commercial port, we're seeing  
25 a larger influx of commercial vehicles. In fact, we've -- I sit

1 on the GYPA board, the Greater Yuma Port Authority, and we've  
2 got inquiries. Shippers are looking to come into Ensenada  
3 instead of Long Beach and truck their goods up and come through  
4 San Luis Port of Entry 2 rather than deal with California and  
5 the -- their transportation, Caltrans or whatever problem they  
6 have with the California -- additional requirements on their --  
7 the vehicles and -- and the long wait at Long Beach to get the  
8 ships unloaded.

9           Apparently, they don't have that problem in  
10 Ensenada, and so we're becoming much more attractive, and  
11 actually, San Luis, we don't compete with Douglas or Nogales.  
12 We compete with Calexico and Mexicali. We compete with  
13 California, and that's a plus for Arizona. The more -- the more  
14 commerce we can divert through Arizona from -- that would have  
15 come through California, the better it is for us. And our port  
16 of entry, too, is -- the commercial port is seeing a large  
17 increase in vehicles coming through the port at this time.

18           Thank you, Mr. Chair.

19           CHAIRMAN STRATTON: Thank you, Gary.

20           Mark, would you like to continue?

21           MR. SANDERS: Yes. Yes. Thank you,

22 Mr. Chairman.

23           Rhett, next slide, please.

24           Okay. The Douglas two port solution, the  
25 existing port of entry in Douglas that processes commercial and

1 non-commercial traffic is outdated, heavily congested and  
2 presents a great safety risk. The two port solution would  
3 entail the construction of a new state-of-the-art commercial  
4 port dedicated to the renovation -- with the renovation of the  
5 existing facilities at Castro, which would do the pedestrian  
6 side. So they would be separated and allowing these cars to  
7 travel freely without the hazard of going through town and  
8 alleviating congestion.

9           The two port solution will deliver improvements  
10 to travelers, the CBP personnel and surrounding communities by  
11 diverting commercial vehicles sometimes carrying mining material  
12 from traveling through population centers in Douglas and Agua  
13 Prieta, prevent the intermingling of commercial trucks with cars  
14 and pedestrians during peak crossing hours, and minimize the  
15 obstructions of cross-border traffic caused by overweight and  
16 oversize vehicles.

17           The estimated costs of the new commercial port of  
18 entry is \$175 million, and \$105 million for the modernization of  
19 the Raul Castro Port of Entry, for pedestrian and private  
20 vehicles.

21           I'll let Mr. Searle ask some questions. I just  
22 want to point out a couple things here. There is a connector  
23 road that was being discussed from the border of the new  
24 commercial proposed port of entry to the state route.

25           In order to do this connector road or to speak

1 about the potential for funding, we need to do a design concept  
2 report. It has been valued at about 500- to \$800,000 and  
3 includes an environmental impact study as well. But I would  
4 like at least to briefly describe why we're not having the same  
5 problem in Douglas that we're having in San Luis with the  
6 Mexican cooperation as far as connecting the two parts.

7 Luis.

8 MR. RAMIREZ: Thank you, Mark.

9 In February of 2020, the U.S. Department of State  
10 and the federal government of the United States sent a  
11 diplomatic note to Mexico confirming two things. One, that the  
12 only long-term solution for the current border crossing issues  
13 at Douglas was to build two ports. One, you know, modernizing  
14 the existing downtown crossing, and secondly, the new port that  
15 would be constructed five miles to the west at a location where  
16 the City of Douglas is donating 80 acres of land to the federal  
17 government that would be used to build this new facility.

18 The second thing that that diplomatic note  
19 included was the formal designation of the proposed location at  
20 a road called James Ranch Road. Currently, it's -- it really is  
21 just a designation of the road. The road doesn't really exist.  
22 It was a bit of a dirt road to some property, but it does not go  
23 all the way to the border.

24 We're -- we've been waiting for the Mexican  
25 government to respond to this diplomatic note. We've been

1 working very closely with the landowner on the Mexican side,  
2 literally on the other side of James Ranch Road, across the  
3 border. An individual owns all -- one individual owns all the  
4 land. So he's working with the Mexican government on two  
5 things: One, to donate the land, approximately 60 to 80 acres  
6 as well, for the construction of the inspection facilities, but  
7 also, the right-of-way approximately two miles from the border  
8 down to Highway 2, Mexico Highway 2. That is a federal highway.  
9 That -- it gives connectivity into all of Mexico. That process  
10 is underway. We're actually assisting by providing information  
11 to the landowner so the process on the Mexican side can move  
12 forward.

13 He's also proposing -- he's submitting -- or  
14 about to submit an unsolicited proposal to the Mexican  
15 government in which he would do a turnkey situation, design,  
16 build and maintain and operate both the inspection facilities as  
17 well as the road, as long as he gets a long-term concession.  
18 That's how they handle it in Mexico, and then he would charge a  
19 fee for the use of that facility.

20 That we think will really expedite the process on  
21 the Mexican side, because it's at no cost to the federal  
22 government. It would be done by private sector investment with  
23 a toll associated with either the road and/or the inspection  
24 facilities to pay the investors back.

25 So we are hopeful. We've been in constant



1 contact with the landowner and the Mexican federal government.  
2 So we're hoping to get some news and a possible response from  
3 the Mexican government on the U.S. Diplomatic note sometime in  
4 the next -- I'm going to say next 90 days or so. But in the  
5 meantime, the planning continues to move forward on everything  
6 associated with the new port of entry. In fact, the City of  
7 Douglas has created and convenes -- which ADOT is one of the  
8 principal participants -- a technical team looking at all the  
9 infrastructure issues associated with the port of entry. That's  
10 not just the road, but that's water, wastewater, data, natural  
11 gas. We're really looking at not just the needs of the port of  
12 entry, but all the associated commercial industrial development  
13 that would come along with the port of entry investment, as Mark  
14 indicated, as much as \$325 million over the next three to five  
15 years by the U.S. Federal government in the Douglas area.

16 MR. SEARLE: I think there's one other item to  
17 add to this conversation is that Cochise County has agreed to  
18 acquire the right-of-way on James Ranch Road to also facilitate  
19 this project.

20 MR. RAMIREZ: I should say that Cochise County  
21 has been a tremendous partner. In fact, they just completed the  
22 water and wastewater report that looks at all the water,  
23 wastewater infrastructure issues, not just for the port of  
24 entry, but for all the land in and around that area. A  
25 tremendous contribution by Cochise County, in addition to the

1 willingness or the commitment to acquire the right-of-way.

2 I should add that the General Services  
3 Administration has conducted the level one environmental and due  
4 diligence on the land that is to be donated by the City of  
5 Douglas in order to -- if -- essentially preparing the process  
6 for the formal donation by the City of Douglas. So both the  
7 City and Cochise County have been tremendous advocates in  
8 advancing this project.

9 MR. SEARLE: Then Chairman Stratton, Director  
10 Halikowski, my question is why don't we have something in our  
11 five-year plan acknowledging this project and -- you know, both  
12 the Governor supports it, our Congressional representation  
13 supports it. Cochise County supports it. Douglas supports it.  
14 Why don't we have something in our plan to support it as well?

15 DIRECTOR HALIKOWSKI: Am I unmuted?

16 CHAIRMAN STRATTON: Yes.

17 DIRECTOR HALIKOWSKI: Well, Mr. Chairman,  
18 Mr. Searle, I would say that what we've put into the plan or  
19 projects that are funded, and right now it may be premature  
20 since we don't know what's going to happen with the Mexican  
21 government and whether the port is going to move or not. So  
22 from our standpoint, you know, I think as you can tell by the  
23 investment ADOT has made into working with Mexico, we look at  
24 the ports system and certainly support the project if the ports  
25 move. But right -- but right now, it's prudent for us to do the

1 studies and have products that we can use, but to put money  
2 forward for a project that's not ready would not be appropriate  
3 at this point.

4 MR. SEARLE: So you would have to  
5 (indiscernible) --

6 MR. HAMMIT: Mr. Chairman, Director, can I add  
7 something?

8 MR. SEARLE: -- a design concept report for James  
9 Ranch Road then?

10 DIRECTOR HALIKOWSKI: Dallas, you were going to  
11 comment?

12 MR. HAMMIT: Yeah. Mr. Chairman, Director,  
13 Member Searle, we -- one of the pools of funding that is  
14 available to the department that is not in the five-year program  
15 are planning dollars, and there is planning dollars that come to  
16 the department. We developed a work plan that we submit to the  
17 Federal Highway Administration.

18 We do plan on putting the scoping, the DCR for  
19 that port in our next work plan for using planning dollars. So  
20 it won't be in the five-year program, but it is something that  
21 our planning division is going to move forward, and that will be  
22 something that is in our next work plan sent to FHWA for next  
23 year.

24 MR. SEARLE: All right. Thank you very much.  
25 That works for me.

1 CHAIRMAN STRATTON: Thank you.

2 DIRECTOR HALIKOWSKI: Thank you.

3 CHAIRMAN STRATTON: Mark.

4 MR. SANDERS: If there's no more questions,  
5 Mr. Chairman, we'll go to the next slide, Rhett.

6 Okay. The modernization of Nogales Deconcini.  
7 The Deconcini Port of Entry in downtown Nogales extends a wide  
8 array of safety and security risks for both CBP personnel and  
9 travelers. Primary lanes are within feet of the international  
10 border, restricting the ability for CBP to employ new  
11 technologies. The International Outfall Interceptor, which is a  
12 cross-border sewer pipeline and storm water tunnels run directly  
13 underneath the port.

14 So the port is often flooded during the summer  
15 monsoon seasons. And in recent years, drugs tunnels have been  
16 found underneath, which pose a risk to the structural integrity  
17 of the port facilities.

18 The Deconcini Port Entry no longer offers a safe  
19 working environment for the officers, the staff and the facility  
20 for the traveling public. According to GSA and CBP, the port is  
21 in desperate need of repairs, and it has exceeded its useful  
22 life. The last major renovation of the port was in 1990s.

23 So the local and regional stakeholders are  
24 urgently requesting that the General Services Administration,  
25 the U.S. Customs and Border Protection conduct a feasibility

1 study. The feasibility study will be a first step to kick off  
2 the modernization project. The study would identify long-term  
3 solutions, offer conceptual design and provide a cost estimate  
4 for this project.

5 The results of the feasibility study could be  
6 used by stakeholders to ask Congress to allocate federal funding  
7 to carry out this project. I would like to add we were at a  
8 binational meeting with the State Department recently, myself.  
9 The head of CBP basically told us that this is their highest  
10 risk port as far as safety is concerned.

11 And with that I'll leave it open to questions,  
12 Mr. Chairman.

13 CHAIRMAN STRATTON: Thank you, Mark. Thank you,  
14 Luis. I want to thank both of you for your hard work and  
15 commitment to these projects. It goes unnoticed and behind the  
16 scenes, but it's well appreciated.

17 Do we have any questions for either of these  
18 gentleman from the board members?

19 MR. SANDERS: Mr. Chair, if you don't mind, I had  
20 one more slide concerning infrastructure.

21 CHAIRMAN STRATTON: Okay. Go ahead.

22 MR. SANDERS: Rhett, next slide, please.

23 We spoke about this earlier. It's the State  
24 Route 189 infrastructure project. This project is extremely  
25 important for both sides of the border. As of right now, the

1 project is at about 75 percent completion. In the new year, the  
2 contractor will complete the individual flyover ramps and the  
3 combination bridge, the bridge which carries traffic over Frank  
4 Reed Road. The roundabout construction and roadway widening  
5 work should be complete by summer.

6           And that is the major update on this project.  
7 It's been a very great success of how far along this project has  
8 moved. It has gone very quickly considering all the different  
9 challenges we had, and one thing I want to report out that's  
10 very important, the community reached out to Luis and myself,  
11 and they thanked us and ADOT to keeping their economy alive  
12 during this construction and the pandemic. Their restaurants  
13 and their hotels were able to employ -- keep their employees  
14 with work, restaurants were open, and it was a great help, and  
15 we're proud of that as well.

16           CHAIRMAN STRATTON: Very good. Thank you.

17           MR. HAMMIT: Mr. Chair, may I add one thing real  
18 quick?

19           CHAIRMAN STRATTON: Sure.

20           MR. HAMMIT: This is Dallas.

21           One of the things I think we forget about this  
22 project, it is funding from multiple areas. We, of course, used  
23 some of our formula funds from Federal Highways. We also  
24 received a TIGER grant of \$25 million, and we also received  
25 General Fund dollars. So it wasn't just a project that came out

1 of our five-year program dollars. We got funding from two other  
2 locations that helped us make this project possible.

3 CHAIRMAN STRATTON: Point well made.

4 If I recall, too, Dallas, didn't we use an  
5 alternative delivery method to help expedite this project?

6 MR. HAMMIT: Mr. Chairman, yes, we did. We used  
7 our P3 method. At one point we thought there may be an  
8 opportunity for some additional revenues through an axle feet.  
9 That did not happen, but we did use a design/build to deliver  
10 this project.

11 DIRECTOR HALIKOWSKI: And to that point, you  
12 know, the City and the County are sharing in their revenues for  
13 the overweight permit fees. Within the border zone, we allow  
14 20,000 -- or I shouldn't say 10,300 pounds more on each truck  
15 coming over at a \$75 fee, and the City and County are  
16 contributing a portion of their fees for this project, also.

17 So I just want to -- you know, Mr. Chairman, when  
18 the Board talks about, you know, skin in the game, the Board,  
19 the federal government and the local governments have all  
20 stepped up to make this project come together.

21 CHAIRMAN STRATTON: Very good. Thank you, John.

22 Are there any questions for either of these  
23 gentleman or the staff?

24 Hearing none, I want to thank you, Mark, again  
25 for your work, and Luis, and the presentation. It's been most

1 enlightening.

2 MR. SANDERS: Thank you, sir.

3 MR. RAMIREZ: Thank you.

4 CHAIRMAN STRATTON: Are there any final questions  
5 or comments from board members or staff at this point?

6 MR. ROEHRICH: So Mr. Chairman, this is Floyd. A  
7 couple of quick things we need to wrap up at this part. A  
8 reminder that the next meeting is June 18th, and we are going to  
9 do a board member meeting in Phoenix, here at the ADOT admin.  
10 building, and we will simulcast a virtual Webex meeting for  
11 public and staff or board members who cannot make the trip. We  
12 will get information out on hotels, lodging, stuff like that to  
13 all the board members. So we'll have that for the June 18th  
14 meeting.

15 If you have an agenda item you want to add for  
16 that meeting, please let myself or Sherry know by next week,  
17 because that's when we'll put the agenda together.

18 And to Board Member Daniels' comments, I will  
19 work with Greg and we'll get the summary document he was going  
20 to put together on all the changes, however that document gets  
21 developed, and we'll get that sent out to the board members as  
22 soon as possible, and it will also post back to the Board's  
23 website so the public will have access to it. So that is a  
24 follow-up and move to working on that as we prepare for the June  
25 18th board meeting.



1                   And the June 18th -- just a reminder, the June  
2 18th board meeting will be when staff does make their final  
3 recommendation for adoption of the five-year program so we can  
4 complete it by the end of the month and get it submitted to the  
5 Governor. And then remember from then on we do -- every month  
6 we look at it. We make amendments to the -- to the program as  
7 necessary, because it is a working, live document.

8                   CHAIRMAN STRATTON: Thank you, Floyd.

9                   I need to ask. Do we need to go back and open  
10 public comment? Did that individual ever show up that we  
11 missed?

12                   WEBEX HOST: I do not see them on the list. We  
13 do have two call-in folks that we could ask if they've joined.

14                   MR. ROEHRICH: So Mr. Kevin Simpson, if you're  
15 one of the public participants, please raise your hand  
16 electronically, and then if you are here, we will open the call  
17 to the audience.

18                   You seeing anything, Kristi?

19                   WEBEX HOST: No, nothing's coming through.

20                   CHAIRMAN STRATTON: Very good. Is there a motion  
21 to adjourn the board meeting?

22                   MR. KNIGHT: Mr. Chair, before we adjourn, one  
23 comment to Floyd. On that report that you're going to come up  
24 with with Greg, I would prefer it electronically as opposed to a  
25 hard copy. Thank you.

1 MR. ROEHRICH: Yes, sir. Mr. Chairman,  
2 Mr. Knight, we will -- we'll make it available both ways.  
3 Absolutely.

4 CHAIRMAN STRATTON: Thank you.  
5 Any other comments from the Board?

6 MR. KNIGHT: Move to adjourn.

7 CHAIRMAN STRATTON: Do I have a second?

8 MR. SEARLE: Second.

9 CHAIRMAN STRATTON: Motion by Board Member  
10 Knight, a second by Board Member Searle.

11 All in favor say aye.

12 BOARD MEMBERS: Aye.

13 CHAIRMAN STRATTON: The meeting is adjourned.  
14 Thank you.

15 (Meeting adjourned at 11:10 a.m.)  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25

1 STATE OF ARIZONA )  
2 ) ss.  
3 COUNTY OF MARICOPA )

4 BE IT KNOWN that the foregoing proceedings were reported by  
5 me, TERESA A. WATSON, Registered Merit Reporter, Certified  
6 Reporter, Certificate No. 50876, State of Arizona, from an  
7 electronic recording and were reduced to written form under my  
8 direction; that the foregoing 81 pages constitute a true and  
9 accurate transcript of said electronic recording, all done to  
10 the best of my skill and ability.

11 I FURTHER CERTIFY that I am in no way related to any of the  
12 parties hereto, nor am I in any way interested in the outcome  
13 hereof.

14 DATED at Phoenix, Arizona, this 13th day of July 2021.

15

16

17

/s/ Teresa A. Watson

18

TERESA A. WATSON, RMR  
Certified Reporter  
Certificate No. 50876

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

**Adjournment**

***A motion to adjourn the June 3, 2021, State Transportation Study Session Meeting was made by Board Member Gary Knight and seconded by Board Member Board Member Richard Searle. In a voice vote, the motion carried.***

**Meeting adjourned at 11:10 a.m. PST.**

Not Available for Signature \_\_\_\_\_

Steven Stratton, Chairman  
State Transportation Board

Not Available for Signature \_\_\_\_\_

John S. Halikowski, Director  
Arizona Department of Transportation