

**STATE TRANSPORTATION BOARD MEETING
IN PERSON WITH OPTIONAL TELEPHONIC/WEBEX ATTENDANCE
9:00am, June 17, 2022
San Carlos Apache Tribe
Building 3A, San Carlos Avenue
San Carlos, Arizona 85550**

Call to Order

Board Chairman Thompson called the State Transportation Board Meeting to order at 9:00 a.m.

Pledge

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

Roll Call by Floyd Roehrich, Jr.

A quorum of the State Transportation Board was present. **In attendance (in person):** Chairman Thompson, Vice Chairman Knight, Board Member Maxwell, Board Member Daniels, Board Member Searle, Board Member Stratton. **In attendance (via WebEx):** Board Member Meck. There were approximately 60 members of the public in the audience on-line and approximately 15 members of the public in the audience in person.

Opening Remarks

Chairman Thompson 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 MEETING

REPORTER'S TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS

BOARD MEETING

VIA WEBEX AND IN PERSON AT:

SAN CARLOS APACHE TRIBE
Building 3A, San Carlos Avenue
San Carlos, Arizona 85550

June 17, 2022
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 ELECTRONIC PROCEEDINGS, ADOT
2 - STATE TRANSPORTATION BOARD, was reported from electronic media
3 by TERESA A. WATSON, Registered Merit Reporter and a Certified
4 Reporter in and for the State of Arizona.

5

6 PARTICIPANTS:

7 Board Members:

8 Jesse Thompson, Chairman
9 Gary Knight, Vice Chairman
10 Ted Maxwell, Board Member
11 Jenn Daniels, Board Member
12 Richard Searle, Board Member
13 Jackie Meck, Board Member (via Webex)
14 Steve Stratton, Board Member

15

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:

In-Person Speakers

John Antonio, Junior, San Carlos Apache Tribe
Councilmember..... 5

Alton Joe Shepherd, Supervisor, Apache County..... 6

Christian Price, Mayor, City of Maricopa..... 8

Virtual and Telephonic Speakers

Jennifer Thompson, Controller/Townsite Manager,
Freeport-McMoRan Bagdad..... 10

AGENDA ITEMS

Item 1 - Director's Report/Legislative Update,
John Halikowski, ADOT Director..... 12

Item 2 - District Engineer's Report, Todd Emery, Southeast
District Administrator..... 15

Item 3 - Consent Agenda..... 24

Item 4 - Financial Report, Kristine Ward, Chief Financial
Officer..... 26

Item 5 - Final Approval of the FY 2023-2027 Five-Year
Transportation Facilities Construction Program..... 30

Item 6 - Multimodal Planning Division Report, Paul Patane,
Division Director, Multimodal Planning Division.... 48

Item 7 - Priority Planning Advisory Committee (PPAC),
Paul Patane, Division Director, Multimodal Planning
Division 55

Item 8 - State Engineer's Report, Greg Byres, Deputy
Director of Transportation/State Engineer..... 58

Item 9 - Construction Contracts, Greg Byres, Deputy
Director of Transportation/State Engineer..... 62

Item 10 - Suggestions..... 79

1 (Beginning of excerpt.)

2 CHAIRMAN THOMPSON: Now we'll go to call -- go to
3 the call to the audience. Again, let me repeat what
4 (inaudible).

5 Everyone will be muted when they call in to the
6 meeting. When your name is called to provide your comment, you
7 will indicate your presence by virtually raising your hand using
8 your phone keypad or through the Webex application. The Webex
9 host will guide you through the unmuting and muting process
10 following the instructions included within the meeting agenda.

11 If you are in person, there is an opportunity for
12 members of the public to discuss items of interest with the
13 Board. Please, again, let me repeat, fill out your request for
14 public input form and give it to the Board Secretary if you wish
15 to address the Board.

16 In the interest of time, I'd like to remind
17 everyone that there will be a three-minute time limit for our
18 meeting imposed. (Inaudible) all your concerns are noted
19 (inaudible). I know there's a lot (inaudible) may have, but if
20 you can keep it down to three minutes, we would really, really
21 appreciate it.

22 So with that, I'd like to hand this part over to
23 Floyd (inaudible) the people that (inaudible) here in the
24 audience (inaudible).

25 Floyd.

1 MR. ROEHRICH: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

2 We will start with the members who are present,
3 and our first speaker is Councilmember John Antonio, San Carlos
4 Apache Tribe Councilmember.

5 MR. ANTONIO: Good morning on behalf of the San
6 Carlos Apache Tribe. We have a lot of problems, a lot of issues
7 on this reservation, and we made more presentation before the
8 Arizona Transportation Board last night in our meeting, and some
9 of the issues that we talked about was issues on State Highway
10 70.

11 I'm pretty sure you traveled on Highway 70 to get
12 here this morning, and as soon as you get off -- as soon as you
13 got of Highway 70, you take -- it used to be Highway 77. And
14 that highway was turned over to BIA, and then from BIA to the
15 tribe, and that's how the tribe accepted that road. And it's
16 not a well maintained road. I'm pretty sure you noticed that.
17 You hit every bump (inaudible) if the tribe made a mistake. We
18 accepted that road (inaudible). So it's kind of difficult for
19 us to apply for federal grants. Until we get that (inaudible)
20 and then we'll be (inaudible) that road will be (inaudible)
21 federal grants, and that's our future plan.

22 (Inaudible), but the last time we talked about
23 (inaudible) point on Highway 70 (inaudible), which is the old
24 (inaudible) the Apache Gold Casino, casino entrance,
25 streetlight, and this is mainly for safety. We are requesting

1 an improvement at the airport -- airport road in Cutter,
2 Arizona, and then a frontage road at (inaudible). (Inaudible)
3 is the community that's located just west of Apache Gold Casino
4 on the south end of Highway 70, and (inaudible) high school,
5 residential area. There's a -- numerous turnoffs, because the
6 residential area west of the high school (inaudible). You know,
7 we have built a lot of homes in that area, and we have a master
8 plan to develop the area just west of the high school. So that
9 area is to be in the future (inaudible) master plan (inaudible)
10 we have land up through there that we can develop (inaudible).
11 So a lot of improvement that needs to be made.

12 MR. ROEHRICH: So, Mr. Councilman, that's three
13 minutes. If you could, finish your comments, please.

14 CHAIRMAN THOMPSON: Thank you, John.

15 MR. ANTONIO: Okay. Appreciate it.

16 CHAIRMAN THOMPSON: (Inaudible.)

17 MR. ROEHRICH: Our next speaker is Mr. Alton Joe
18 Shepherd. Mr. Shepherd.

19 MR. SHEPHERD: Thank you. Hello. (Speaking
20 Native language.) I bring greetings from northeastern Arizona.
21 As some of you remember, I've been, you know, following the
22 Board this year quite often of late, and certainly I just wanted
23 to speak upon the -- you know, the five-year approval that's
24 coming up for the -- for our transportation plan.

25 And so, again, I just wanted to continue to

1 advocate on some of these things. You know, I understand our
2 leadership here on the tribal nations. I've been the tribal
3 council leader for our nation, you know, for the Navajo Nation,
4 one of the largest tribes, and there is -- and I also can confer
5 with you guys, you know, that the money's just not there to do
6 our infrastructure, and just whatever we prioritize, you know,
7 comes to play, and hopefully we will find some solutions at the
8 federal level, all the way to the state level and to the local
9 level.

10 Certainly, Querino Bridge, again, it's ADOT
11 structure number 08071. The last time I came before the Board,
12 I initially gave you some background on it. Built in 1939 as
13 part of the original Route 66. Currently, ever since they built
14 the new interstate that has been transitioned over to ADOT, ADOT
15 gave the County the right-of-way and that -- those access on it.
16 It's located right with (inaudible) Arizona, right around
17 Milemarker 346 on I-40, and the last time I came here, I was
18 explaining that some of these -- the road -- that the
19 infrastructure sufficient rating is less than 20, and as far as
20 the safety rating is also only at 23 tons. That was back in
21 2011.

22 And certainly, just recently, we did have an
23 accident on the interstate where DPS rediverted a lot of those
24 40-ton semi trucks to go across, you know, this single bridge.
25 So I'm hoping that the inspection will, you know, suffice some

1 need for it, and also, later on down the road with the
2 Bipartisan Infrastructure Law that we can continue to work
3 together to see what we can do, because there's just not enough
4 money to do it, and there's some discretionary moneys that could
5 help out.

6 So again, I just ask for technical assistance
7 with -- from ADOT and the staff. I commend them wholeheartedly.
8 I appreciate what they're doing and, you know, make them --
9 making the Board -- easy on you guys to make these decisions,
10 because that really drives, you know, the priorities. So thank
11 you.

12 CHAIRMAN THOMPSON: (Inaudible.) Thank you.
13 Floyd?

14 MR. ROEHRICH: The next speaker is Mayor
15 Christian Price. Mr. Price.

16 MR. PRICE: Thank you very much, Chairman, board
17 members. I just wanted to stop in here today to get -- keep you
18 informed of things that are happening in the City of Maricopa
19 and surrounding areas.

20 First of all, thank you very much for your
21 service and for your great staff. Had the opportunity to meet
22 with Director Halikowski and Floyd and Steve Boschen here this
23 week as we were trying to solve issues that are pertaining to
24 State Route 238. It is on the west side of Maricopa. And they
25 were very helpful.

1 I think we're going to get these issues solved,
2 and that's very beneficial to us as we are dealing with this
3 corridor. And I just wanted to inform you that, you know,
4 should the numbers play out, we are also looking to take
5 possession of that corridor, which would relieve the State and
6 ADOT of having to maintain that into the future. But again,
7 we've got to get to that point, and so I just want to inform you
8 that that's something that we're working on.

9 Last but not least here, I wanted to let you know
10 that MAG, through the Transportation Policy Committee, has
11 recently approved the 347 scoping study that's been in process
12 for almost three years. We certainly appreciate the Gila River
13 Indian Community and Ak-Chin Indian Community and all of the
14 stakeholders that are involved from Maricopa County to Pinal
15 County to the City of Maricopa and ADOT and so many others.

16 And so with that scoping study comes the plan by
17 which you can start to put forward the options of how to fix
18 this road, and this is a big deal, obviously, for the city of
19 Maricopa. You guys will be in the city of Maricopa come
20 September. We're looking forward to hosting you. And so I hope
21 you come during rush hour. Then you get to see the fun that is
22 sitting on the 347. I think one of the -- Tim Strow at MAG
23 recently said it's kind of like sitting on the I-17 on a holiday
24 weekend but a little bit worse. So just so you know what you're
25 getting yourselves into, so please come early.

1 And then last but not least, I just wanted to
2 inform you that I will be stepping down as mayor here at the end
3 of this month, and the reason is is I've been asked to be the
4 president and the CEO of the Maricopa Economic Development
5 Alliance. Now, lest you think you're getting rid of me, my job
6 title basically says to keep coming to all of these meetings and
7 bugging you guys on behalf of the corporations and the citizens
8 of Maricopa.

9 So transportation is my true love, and so it's
10 been an honor and a pleasure to serve with you as an elected
11 official, but at this time I will see you next month, but not as
12 an elected official anymore. So thank you very much for your
13 time and service. We appreciate it.

14 CHAIRMAN THOMPSON: Thank you, Mayor Price.

15 Floyd, next.

16 MR. ROEHRICH: Our next speaker, Mr. Chairman, is
17 online, and then there's only one online speaker that requested
18 to speak.

19 So Ms. Jennifer Thompson, please raise your hand.

20 WEBEX HOST: Ms. Thompson, your line is requested
21 to be unmuted.

22 MS. THOMPSON: (Inaudible.) Can you hear me
23 okay?

24 MR. ROEHRICH: Yes, ma'am. We can.

25 WEBEX HOST: Yes, ma'am.

1 MS. THOMPSON: All right. I'm Jennifer Thompson.
2 I've spoken several times before. I'm the controller and
3 townsite utilizes manager for Freeport-McMoRan Bagdad, a copper
4 mine located in Yavapai County, about 60 miles northwest of
5 Wickenburg.

6 First of all, I'd like to thank the Board, also
7 Director Halikowski and the ADOT team for the investments made
8 for improvements on US-93. We'd like to express our support for
9 the US-93 improvements included in the Five-Year Transportation
10 Facilities Construction Program that you're reviewing today.

11 Specifically, addressing the parts that are
12 currently two-lane highway that are -- that are due to be
13 reconstructed (inaudible) divided highway. Many of our Freeport
14 team members and their families travel this road, and more than
15 100 commercial trucks use this road on a daily basis.

16 As we evaluate the potential for an expansion
17 project that would double the size of our operation, we would
18 add 800 employees and contractors and double commercial
19 shipping. Safety on US-93 is a primary concern.

20 Freeport Bagdad has a history of collaboration
21 and partnership with ADOT, and we look forward to partnering
22 again with you and the department to make these important
23 improvements and continue doing our part to support the
24 infrastructure needs of this region.

25 We also look forward to meeting with

1 Mr. Brosvitch (phonetic) and other ADOT team members at the end
2 of this month, and I appreciate the opportunity to talk to you
3 every month and your willingness to hear the concerns of the
4 public, and I thank you again for your time and hope you all
5 have a good weekend.

6 CHAIRMAN THOMPSON: Thank you for those comments.
7 Floyd?

8 MR. ROEHRICH: Mr. Chairman, that is all the
9 requests to speak that I received.

10 CHAIRMAN THOMPSON: Thank you for those comments
11 (inaudible) virtually and also the audience (inaudible) sharing
12 that everyone (inaudible) comments will be (inaudible) and that
13 we will be reminded of the comments you have made. So we do
14 appreciate that.

15 So now we will now move on to Item 1, director's
16 report, with John Halikowski.

17 MR. ROEHRICH: Mr. Chairman, John is online.

18 CHAIRMAN THOMPSON: Okay. John, we'll turn
19 (inaudible) over to you.

20 DIRECTOR HALIKOWSKI: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

21 So I'm going to combine some state issues with
22 the legislative report, and I'll start with the legislative
23 report, because there's not much to report there anyway right
24 now.

25 Today is the 159th day of the legislative

1 session. As of today, 306 bills have been sent to the Governor,
2 and the focus is most certainly on passing of the fiscal year
3 2023 budget before July 1. We do know from some budget
4 documents that were leaked a few weeks ago there are many
5 transportation projects being considered in the budget, and, you
6 know, I think we're getting calls as members are even looking at
7 adding some others in there.

8 So no bills have been dropped yet or drafted, and
9 it's too early to speculate on what the outcome of all these
10 projects are going to be as the budget process continues to
11 grind on. So that leaves the State Legislature.

12 I would like the Board to know that we are
13 working with our Congressional delegation, our senators right
14 now on Congressionally directed projects. And as you know, some
15 of these projects are directed to local entities for
16 transportation projects, and we've been working with them on
17 last year's and the upcoming next year's projects. So we'll be
18 communicating with our local partners as to some of the
19 requirements of either managing these on their own or if they're
20 asking ADOT to administer them.

21 The IIJA task force did meet last week. As
22 you'll recall, that is the -- the Governor-sponsored task force.
23 It mirrors what's going on at the national level by appointing a
24 chairman of the task force who is also the Governor's chief of
25 operations. A number of state agencies were present that are

1 affected by IIJA, ADOT being probably the most affected by the
2 bill. We also had some local representation in there and a fair
3 representation, good to fair from our tribal governments. Also,
4 FHWA was represented and some speakers from -- one speaker from
5 US DOT.

6 So the task force is focusing, as you might
7 expect, on infrastructure issues, but they're also focusing on
8 broadband, IIJA grant opportunities, national electric vehicle
9 initiatives. Lots of focus on tribal participation and
10 discussion about how IIJA funding is available to tribal
11 governments and how we might work together and participate along
12 those lines.

13 I believe Karla Petty, our FHWA administrator
14 here in Arizona, is on the call today. She was also one of the
15 main speakers at that task force gathering. So to wind that up,
16 we're working closely with FHWA, the Governor's office or other
17 affected state agencies, and we want to focus on our tribal
18 outreach to keep tribes informed, not only on road projects, but
19 also broadband and other areas that might be of interest to them
20 through the electric vehicle program since some of the
21 alternative fuel corridors being the interstates pass through
22 probably six tribal government territories.

23 So that's what we've been up to lately. As you
24 know, the last thing I guess I'll wind up with is the I-10 grant
25 that has been submitted now, as is the US-93 INFRA grant to

1 finish the widening up on 93, as we just heard from the speaker,
2 to take care of that safety problem.

3 So that is my report, Mr. Chairman. Thank you.

4 CHAIRMAN THOMPSON: (Inaudible.) Before we go to
5 Item B, I'd like to ask if any of the board members has any
6 questions for John.

7 There being none, John, do you want to go to Item
8 B, last minute items to report, if there's any?

9 DIRECTOR HALIKOWSKI: I don't have any at this
10 time. I'm counting on Mr. Byres to address some of the
11 questions and issues that were brought up last month from call
12 to the audience, as I've asked him to inform the Board on some
13 of the comments that were made and what ADOT's actions are. So
14 that's it, Mr. Chairman, for me.

15 CHAIRMAN THOMPSON: Thank you, John.

16 With that, let's move on to Item 2, district
17 engineer's report. Todd Emery, District Administrator,
18 Southeast District.

19 Good morning, Todd.

20 MR. EMERY: Good morning, Mr. Chair, and good
21 morning, members of the Board. It's a pleasure to be here with
22 you this morning.

23 Go ahead. Go to the next slide.

24 I'm real quick just going to go through with you
25 some of the things we're going -- working on here in the

1 Southeast District. I wanted to make mention of -- first that
2 we completed one of our significant projects here in the
3 district. That's the Pinto Creek Bridge on US-60, between Miami
4 and Superior. If you look, you can see what the old bridge was
5 on the left and --

6 MR. ROEHRICH: Are you sure about that? I
7 thought it was Miami? Is that -- Mr. Stratton, is that right?

8 MR. STRATTON: It depends on if you're local or
9 not. It is Miami (inaudible).

10 MR. EMERY: I guess I've been saying it wrong for
11 many decades then. Hope I didn't offend anybody by calling it
12 Miami. Miami.

13 All right. We're excited that that project's
14 completed and open for use.

15 Go ahead and go to the next slide.

16 Some current construction projects that we have
17 going on I wanted to make mention of. We're doing a chip seal
18 on State Route 188 from Milepost 232.7 to 235.7. This is a
19 maintenance project that we're working on, about \$584,000.

20 We're doing another chip seal on State Route 188
21 from Milepost 215 to 223.5. This is an SLI project for \$2.5
22 million.

23 In the City of Safford, we're continuing to work
24 on the 20th Avenue, Golf Course Road to Relation Street project,
25 which is a widening project, widening it to four lanes. This

1 project is currently 40 percent complete and is about a
2 \$4.4 million contract.

3 And on Mount Graham, State Route 366, from the
4 Coronado National Forest boundary to Grant Creek, we're
5 continuing to work on an emergency relief project to repair
6 flood damage on Mount Graham. It's about a \$6.3 million
7 project, and we're 73 percent complete.

8 On US-191, from Milepost 45.8 to 46.2, and 54.4
9 to 56.9, we're just starting to work on a micro seal project,
10 which is another SLI project for \$180,000.

11 And we're getting close to completing the State
12 Route 80 Pintek Ranch Road project there near Bisbee, which is a
13 rock fall mitigation project, and that contract's for about 2.8
14 million.

15 Go ahead and go to the next slide.

16 This just kind of shows you these two pictures.
17 The one on the left there is up on Mount Graham, showing you
18 some of the flood -- the flood damage repair work that's being
19 done, and on the right is the rock fall mitigation down on State
20 Route 80, near Bisbee.

21 Some upcoming projects that we have I wanted to
22 make sense of is the Gila County Tonto Creek Bridge and roadway
23 improvements. This is a brand-new bridge and roadway
24 improvements that are near Punkin Center. That project budget
25 is 23.9 million, and that project is currently advertised.

1 We have US-60 from El Camino Viejo to Milepost
2 217, essentially from the US-60/State Route 79 junction to
3 Superior. We're doing a mill and replace of the friction
4 course. That budget is at 7.1 million, and that project also is
5 currently advertised.

6 And here on the San Carlos Apache Reservation, we
7 have the US-70, Tribal Road 420 to Coolidge Dam Road project,
8 and we'll be working to mill and replace with a bonded overlay,
9 and doing some partial rehabilitation work on some spots out
10 there. That budget is at 7.6 million, and that project also is
11 currently advertised.

12 On US-191, in the Clifton area, from Tabletop
13 Road to Lower Eagle Creek Road, we will also be doing a mill and
14 replace of our friction course. That budget is at \$5 million,
15 and that project also is currently advertised.

16 And on State Route 80, on the Mule Pass Tunnel,
17 we'll be doing -- relighting that tunnel and doing some
18 restriping work, and that budget's at 5.7 million, and that
19 project should advertise this month.

20 MR. ROEHRICH: Todd, I'd like to go back for
21 one -- I apologize for interrupting, but Mr. Chairman and board
22 members, on the previous slide, when Todd was talking about
23 current projects, he called it an "SLI project." I want to make
24 sure that that's a separate line item, projects that are
25 specifically provided on the Legislature to go out and take

1 (inaudible) fair (inaudible) good before they degrade too far,
2 and I think a couple of other district engineers have been --
3 pointed out that, and (inaudible) wanted to make sure that you
4 all knew and the public knew that. We're taking those funds
5 that the Legislature gave us. We're putting them out and we're
6 getting the work done that is to improve our pavements where we
7 can (inaudible), and that's why it's an SLI project, but it's a
8 special project where we can get out there and improve those
9 pavements before they degrade to a point of poor condition.

10 MR. STRATTON: Mr. Chairman. Thank you.

11 CHAIRMAN THOMPSON: Member Stratton.

12 MR. STRATTON: I'd also like to make a comment
13 about the Tonto Creek Bridge. So it's showing in our program
14 that's actually a local (inaudible). There is no ADOT funding.
15 (Inaudible) state grant that was started early in my tenure with
16 Gila County, and one of the questions last night was: How long
17 does it take to do things? That's been in the works for over 30
18 years. So it's been quite a feat. Had a lot people drown in
19 that creek bed. If you asked how many deaths it takes,
20 (inaudible). I'm sure there's more.

21 So I want to make it clear that we're not using
22 ADOT funds (inaudible) highway system. We are administering the
23 program and (inaudible) to do so. Is that a correct statement,
24 Todd?

25 MR. EMERY: Well, Mr. Chair, Board Member

1 Stratton, correct. It's here because we'll be administering
2 that project.

3 MR. STRATTON: Thank you.

4 CHAIRMAN THOMPSON: Todd.

5 MR. EMERY: I also want to make mention, I have
6 it up there on State Route 88, Federal Highway Administration
7 Central Federal Lands Highway Division is getting close to being
8 able to move forward with a -- roadway improvements from State
9 Route 188 to the Apache Lake Marina. So that project -- again,
10 we're not administering that project, and the Federal Highway
11 Administration is funding that through our Federal Lands Access
12 Program, but I wanted to mention it as something significant
13 within our district that's getting ready to move forward soon.

14 Go ahead. Next slide.

15 Some current development projects that are a
16 little farther out but I wanted to make mention of.

17 On State Route 88, Fish Creek Hill to Apache Lake
18 Marina, this is the area that's currently closed. A DCR, a
19 design concept report, and an environmental overview is getting
20 ready to start to look at the -- what it will take to get that
21 road -- to get it open again, the area that's closed, and to
22 look at seeing what it would take to make it resilient against
23 future storm events that caused the closure that's there now.
24 And that currently is advertised for consultant services.

25 And on US-60, currently under design is the Queen

1 Creek Bridge, which we'll be replacing that bridge just east of
2 Superior. The current program amount is 40 million, and that
3 project is scheduled to advertise in February of 2020.

4 Along with that, on US-60, the Waterfall Canyon
5 Bridge, which is also a bridge replacement, programmed at
6 4.2 million, also scheduled to advertise in February 2023.

7 I wanted to mention these two because we are
8 planning to advertise these two projects at the same time
9 jointly as one project.

10 MR. STRATTON: Mr. Chairman. Thank you.

11 And that was going to be one of my questions, if
12 we were going to do that because of the traffic control
13 situation (inaudible). The traffic has to be stopped, and only
14 flat -- it's the only flat place there is. They'd do a lot
15 better if you had (inaudible), probably save money (inaudible).

16 MR. EMERY: Mr. Chair, Board Member Stratton,
17 absolutely that's correct. That's exactly why we're doing it,
18 to try to limit the impacts to the traveling public and take
19 care of that. It's better to do it all at once, because this is
20 going to be a challenging couple of projects.

21 MR. STRATTON: Mr. Chairman, (inaudible). I
22 would ask that we have a significant PR outreach with the mines.
23 I know that 50 percent or more from Freeport-McMoRan come from
24 the East Valley every day, and I understand now over at Pinto
25 Valley Mine it's over 70 percent (inaudible). So there is a

1 significant amount of traffic. I also assume (inaudible). Is
2 that correct?

3 MR. EMERY: Mr. Chair, Board Member Stratton, I
4 don't know if I'm prepared to answer that question yet.

5 MR. STRATTON: I would suggest that we follow our
6 normal procedure on Highway 60 as the weekends get pretty busy
7 (inaudible).

8 MR. EMERY: What I would say is we are
9 coordinating very closely with the Town of Superior,
10 recreational users and other stakeholders, because we want to
11 make sure everyone's informed and try to limit the impacts as
12 much as possible.

13 MR. STRATTON: Thank you. And (inaudible) the
14 City of Globe and Miami, San Carlos Apache Tribe (inaudible).
15 Thank you.

16 MR. EMERY: On US-70, here on the San Carlos
17 Apache Reservation, we're going to be doing a scour retrofit
18 project on a box culvert there just east of Bylas, in that area,
19 and then that current program is at \$1 million and should
20 advertise in January of 2023.

21 The last project that I wanted to mention was the
22 Douglas port of entry connector road. Design concept report,
23 environmental assessment, is currently scheduled to advertise
24 for consultant services either this month or next month. So I
25 know that's -- that's a very big, high profile project, and

1 we're coordinating very closely with the federal government,
2 City of Douglas, Cochise County and other stakeholders on that,
3 on that project.

4 I just wanted to make mention and show the Board
5 that currently this is the proposed location for that port of
6 entry, and the connector road is looking at falling in alignment
7 along what's called James Ranch Road. So we'll be working very
8 closely and working on that one very passionately, so...

9 CHAIRMAN THOMPSON: Thank you, Todd. We
10 certainly do appreciate all your efforts in getting these
11 projects done.

12 (Inaudible.)

13 MR. SEARLE: (Inaudible.)

14 CHAIRMAN THOMPSON: Okay. Board Member Searle.

15 MR. SEARLE: Thank you for that last little bit.
16 That connector road is -- it is an important issue, and I'm glad
17 to see that the DCR is going to (inaudible), and I think
18 (inaudible) a point that I'd like to bring out to the Board is
19 that proposed connector road on James Ranch Road, Cochise County
20 is going to buy the right-of-way and (inaudible) to the State.
21 So, I mean, that is -- that's a contribution that the County's
22 going to do. The land involved is what the City has donated,
23 and so it is a (inaudible) in there, and I'm glad to see this
24 DCR going forward, because it is going to happen. So with
25 that...

1 Going back to the SR-80, the Mule Pass Tunnel, I
2 understand we're dropping a lane going -- it's three lanes now.
3 It's going to be (inaudible) two lanes. Has there been very
4 much community pushback on that?

5 MR. EMERY: Mr. Chair, Board Member Searle, I
6 have heard some issues from some of the -- or some of the --
7 questions from the community. I can't say there's been a
8 significant amount, but there has been some. Yes.

9 MR. SEARLE: Okay. Thank you.

10 CHAIRMAN THOMPSON: Thank you, Board Member.
11 Thank you, Board Member Searle.

12 Does any other board member have any questions
13 for Todd?

14 CHAIRMAN THOMPSON: Let's move on to the next
15 item, Item 3, consent agenda. Does any board member want an item
16 removed from the consent agenda? (Inaudible) know that we don't
17 have the minutes from the last meeting, but they will be
18 included when it's completed.

19 So with that, Board Member Searle.

20 MR. SEARLE: Just for clarification, which of the
21 construction contracts are in the consent agenda? It's kind of
22 hard to tell from the agenda (inaudible) which ones are in
23 (inaudible).

24 MR. ROEHRICH: So, Mr. Chairman, Board Member
25 Searle, the consent agenda contracts are in Item 3. So it's 3F,

1 3G, 3H --

2 MR. SEARLE: So any of the (inaudible) 9 items
3 are not the consent agenda?

4 MR. ROEHRICH: That's correct. Anything in the 9
5 will be separate contracts that the state engineer will present
6 individually, because they need justification, because they're
7 outside the criteria set for consent agenda inclusion.

8 MR. SEARLE: Very good. That answered my
9 question.

10 CHAIRMAN THOMPSON: Maybe clarify a little more
11 when these particular projects (inaudible) consent agenda.
12 Maybe (inaudible).

13 MR. ROEHRICH: So, Mr. Chairman, I can do that,
14 because we post it as part of the agenda. On the construction
15 contracts, any bid that is no more than 15 percent under the
16 State estimate or 10 percent over the State estimate, any bid
17 that falls within that criteria will be consent agenda.
18 Realizing that we -- that, you know, bids are not an exact
19 science, that we will get some flexibility within the bidding
20 process, and we have the additional funds to justify slight
21 adjustments. 15 percent under or 10 percent over. That's the
22 window. Any bid that falls outside of that comes forward to the
23 Board for individual justification, like the state engineer, as
24 to make sure that we have evaluated them and we still feel that
25 it is a responsive and responsible bid so staff can recommend

1 whatever the disposition, award, reject all bids, defer, you
2 know, all those actions that we have used given the specific
3 incident.

4 MR. SEARLE: Jesse, I'll make the motion to
5 approve the consent agenda.

6 MR. MAXWELL: Second.

7 CHAIRMAN THOMPSON: There's a motion by Member
8 Searle and also a second by Board Member Maxwell to approve the
9 consent as presented.

10 All in favor say aye.

11 BOARD MEMBERS: Aye.

12 CHAIRMAN THOMPSON: Any opposed?

13 Floyd, conduct roll call vote for board members
14 attending remotely.

15 MR. ROEHRICH: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

16 For the record, all members present voted aye,
17 and now we'll go to Board Member Meck. How say you vote?

18 MR. MECK: Aye.

19 MR. ROEHRICH: Thank you.

20 Mr. Chairman, the motion masses.

21 CHAIRMAN THOMPSON: The motion carries. Motion
22 carries for approving the consent items.

23 We will now move on to the financial report with
24 Kristine Ward, (inaudible) report for information and discussion
25 only.

1 Kristine.

2 MS. WARD: Good morning, board members. It's a
3 pleasure to speak with you this morning.

4 Rhett, if you can take me to the next slide.

5 I'm sorry. Did someone ask me something?

6 MR. ROEHRICH: Yes. Yes. Where's all the money?

7 MS. WARD: Oh, well, that's an old question
8 people ask all the time. I'm sorry. I think I was getting some
9 feedback. Very sorry there.

10 One more slide back, Rhett. We need to go to
11 that one back. One more back. There we go. Perfect.

12 So board members, again, good morning. What we
13 are looking at is in FY 2022, we are -- while we are running
14 5.4 percent above FY '21's revenues, we are running behind our
15 forecast by about 2.8 percent. Now, what that means in impact
16 to the Board, what does that -- to the -- to the program --
17 excuse me -- impact to the program is that means that about
18 \$16 million that we counted on to feed into the program is not
19 there. The way we will compensate for that is that's why we
20 keep operating threshold balances in order to deal with slight
21 variations in between our forecasts and our actuals.

22 The biggest impact that -- the biggest single
23 component that is impacting us running behind forecast is VLT.
24 Last year -- and we can go to the next slide, Rhett. Last year,
25 you know, we experienced very aggressive growth in VLT that

1 equated to 16.5 percent growth. We set a number of VLT records
2 last year, and our forecast this year was actually -- is
3 actually only 3 percent growth, knowing that we were coming off
4 of that very high growth year. Even so, even though we kept
5 that forecast very low, we are experiencing -- we're still
6 experiencing growth under forecast.

7 So what this slide depicts is what we saw for the
8 month of May. You know, what I've just reported to you on is
9 our year-to-date, our total year-to-date forecast. What this
10 slide shows you is what happened in the month of May, and if you
11 look at VLT there, you'll see that VLT was not -- in the month
12 of May, revenues from VLT in the month of May are 9.2 percent --
13 9.2 percent behind '21 and 10 percent behind our forecast for
14 '22. So just thought I'd give you some background as to why
15 we're running -- why we're running behind in the major component
16 that's contributing there. Nonetheless, we're safe. We've --
17 we -- I don't believe we have any -- we don't have to make any
18 changes based on where we are right now.

19 If we could move on to the next slide, Rhett.
20 I'd appreciate it.

21 Well, this slide tells a different tale. Looks a
22 little different than the one from HURF. As we move on here to
23 Regional Area Road Fund, year to date we've collected about
24 \$550 million, and we are 20 -- yeah, you heard it -- 20 percent
25 above FY '21, and we are 4.6 above forecast, or about

1 \$24 million. We have got strong growth in all categories.
2 Retail, 17 percent above FY '21. Contracting, 21 percent above
3 '21. Restaurant and bar, a stunning 35 percent above '21. So
4 we are -- RARF is just moving right along, and all those sources
5 feeding into RARF have just got very strong growth.

6 Rhett, if you could go to the next slide.

7 This again -- this slide provides you the detail
8 on the individual categories, and you can see those tremendous
9 growth rates, and it's specifically for the month of April. You
10 can see those growth rates in those major categories, and they
11 are just -- they are -- they are a little breathtaking. You
12 might notice that the other category down at the very bottom
13 there, even though it represents a teeny-tiny overall portion of
14 the revenues flowing in, the reason you see the volatility
15 there, and you always will, is because that's where we capture
16 things like if the Department of Revenue does audits or
17 something and suddenly get -- we get an influx of funding. So
18 you can't really predict -- I can't predict when they're going
19 to be doing audits and what's going to be realized from those
20 audits.

21 That concludes RARF. Let's go on to the next
22 slide, if we could, Rhett.

23 The Federal Aid Program. So normally, I would
24 now move into providing you an update on IIJA and what we --
25 what new did we learn since the -- since last month when I

1 reported to you. Well, there are no slides here because we
2 don't have any further information with regards to the fed aid
3 program. We are still -- in terms of the -- the infrastructure
4 bill, we haven't got any new information to report, and so
5 that's why I haven't -- I'm not providing anything here. We're
6 still awaiting guidance from FHWA on the Protect Act, the
7 Protect Program, excuse me, and so that -- that's all I have
8 there.

9 Nothing to report on the debt program or cash
10 management. Cash management has -- you know, we're earning an
11 abysmal little return of, like, .29 percent or something on
12 our -- on our investments there, but -- so there's nothing
13 really to report there either.

14 That concludes my presentation, and I would be
15 happy to take any questions.

16 CHAIRMAN THOMPSON: With that does any board
17 member have any questions for Kristine?

18 Hearing none. Kristine -- so thank you,
19 Kristine.

20 MS. WARD: Thank you, sir. Thank you, board
21 members.

22 CHAIRMAN THOMPSON: We will now move on to
23 item -- Agenda Item 5, with Paul and Steve, for discussion,
24 possible action.

25 So Paul.

1 MR. PATANE: Good morning to Mr. Chair, board
2 members. Paul Patane, Multimodal Planning Division.

3 So today I'll be talking about the five-year
4 program, a little bit of the background. Then I'll present to
5 you the final five-year program, the MAG final program, the PAG
6 final program, along with the airport's final program numbers
7 and the next steps in the process.

8 Next slide, please.

9 So quick summary of the background. As you know,
10 we approved the tentative five-year program in February. We
11 recently had our public hearing in May of '22. Then we had our
12 board study session in June, and we're here today for the
13 approval of the five-year program. Then July 1st, the new
14 fiscal year begins.

15 So a summary of the total dollars within this
16 year -- or the proposed five-year program. The blue is the
17 statewide dollars, the red are the MAG dollars, and in the green
18 are the PAG dollars. And this is the total dollars within the
19 program from 2023 to 2027, and you see the dip in 2024, and
20 that's due to the -- and as you all may recall, we got the
21 additional 400 million this year from Governor's budget. So
22 that's why there's a little dip in there. Otherwise, it's a
23 progressive increase throughout the fiscal years.

24 Next slide, please.

25 So for the total, the program including MAG and

1 PAG, for preservation, we have 40.7 percent of the dollars in
2 modernization. We have 52 percent in expansion, and real quick,
3 that's a little over 6 percent in modernization for the state.

4 So this is for Greater Arizona, the breakdown of
5 the funding. That \$400 million is there in FY '23. As you can
6 see it, in 2024, we have a little over \$804 million. The '26,
7 there's -- those -- we're up to 925. In 2027, we're close to
8 960 million in the program. Again, the green is preservation,
9 the red modernization, and the purple is project development,
10 and the yellow is planning, along with the expansion in blue.

11 Next slide, please.

12 So a breakdown of that in the pie chart. There
13 for preservation (inaudible) to 74 percent. We have 13.3
14 percent in expansion, and 17.7 -- or 12.7 percent in
15 modernization. So --

16 CHAIRMAN THOMPSON: Board Member Searle.

17 MR. SEARLE: Paul, I have a quick question.

18 MR. PATANE: Yes.

19 MR. SEARLE: Can you go back to that previous
20 slide? On the map you've got different marks, the red marks and
21 the green marks and -- for the location of the (inaudible)
22 projects that are in the five-year plan; is that correct?

23 MR. PATANE: Correct. That's the intent of the
24 map.

25 MR. SEARLE: I notice that there's -- the

1 replacement of the Cochise overpass on 191 has been on the
2 five-year plan, and without going through the plan, is it still
3 in there? Because it's not highlighted. There's no mark on
4 there for that.

5 MR. PATANE: So that's -- 191? I could read --
6 (inaudible) program. I could look, but I don't have it right
7 off the bat, but I could follow up (inaudible).

8 MR. SEARLE: You know, the last time we
9 discussed, it was in there, and I was kind of curious if it's
10 been dropped or not.

11 MR. PATANE: We'll have the answer before you
12 leave, sir.

13 MR. SEARLE: Okay. (Inaudible.)

14 MR. PATANE: Oh, okay. Can do.

15 CHAIRMAN THOMPSON: (Inaudible) the meetings that
16 we have (inaudible) meeting agenda (inaudible).

17 MR. PATANE: Yes. So Board Member Searle, yes,
18 it is in the program.

19 MR. SEARLE: All right. Thank you.

20 MR. PATANE: It's for construction in FY '24, and
21 design should be already started.

22 MR. SEARLE: That was my understanding. I just
23 didn't see it on the map.

24 MR. PATANE: Okay.

25 CHAIRMAN THOMPSON: (Inaudible.)

1 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Yes.

2 MR. PATANE: So on this slide here, the intent is
3 to show our commitment to preservation. Our long range plan,
4 our target for preservation was 300 -- or is 320 million on our
5 current long range plan. As you can see, we're exceeding that
6 pretty much throughout each of the program -- program years.

7 So just highlight some of our expansion projects
8 in FY '23. We have a total of a little over 660 million. We
9 have the Prescott Lakes project, the Anthem Way on I-17, the
10 Gila River Bridge on I-10, along with the 400 million for the
11 I-10 -- the 202 to 387.

12 Next slide, please.

13 And for the -- we call it "the gap project."
14 This is from the 202 to 387. You know, we not only applied for
15 the Mega grant, okay, and still we have to be planning if we're
16 not successful with the -- with the Mega grant, and so between
17 the (inaudible) funding and what's in the (inaudible) statewide
18 program, there's close to \$640 million, and so we're currently
19 working on what we're calling a plan -- plan B, because we still
20 have to deliver these projects in this quarter, because this
21 quarter is a top priority for us, and so we're -- (inaudible)
22 we'll be bringing it to the Board if we're unsuccessful with the
23 Mega grant list of projects how we'll move forward building --
24 trying to build out this corridor.

25 MR. STRATTON: Mr. Chairman.

1 CHAIRMAN THOMPSON: Steve.

2 MR. STRATTON: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

3 Paul, many of the projects that we have in the
4 budget are coming from the Legislature, I-17 and I-10,
5 (inaudible) projects. With the current inflation that we've
6 had, is there a need to go back to the Legislature for the
7 projects that (inaudible)?

8 MR. PATANE: Well, I think we're all aware of how
9 costs are really increasing more than we ever anticipated, and I
10 don't -- I would -- I don't know if we will need to go back. We
11 may have to, but that's a decision, I think, the director would
12 probably be best to answer.

13 MR. ROEHRICH: So, Mr. Chairman, Board Member
14 Stratton, on I-17, that project's already under contract, and it
15 has already the funding set with it. The funding that -- in
16 here is the next year of the funding that goes in to pay that.
17 So that project would (inaudible) that's already been set under
18 contract.

19 Interstate 10, the Interstate 10 project estimate
20 that we have (inaudible) include the estimate that went in for
21 the -- the grant. That was updated to today's cost.

22 (Inaudible) and let's say we don't get the grant or we get the
23 grant and then we have to move it out another year or two.

24 (Inaudible) have to address that.

25 And as far as then going back to the Legislature,

1 we will have to decide can the program pick that up to keep the
2 project going, or do we take the risk of going back to the
3 Legislature and delaying it even further to (inaudible)
4 additional funding to have to go through their budget process.
5 So that's an analysis that -- I see the state engineer came up
6 here, so I am done talking.

7 MR. STRATTON: (Inaudible.) Some of these
8 projects the Legislature came up with were not in our priority
9 list, and if they don't (inaudible) significant amount of money
10 to accomplish that (inaudible), then it would impact the
11 projects that we want to do (inaudible) and that's what I'm
12 (inaudible).

13 MR. BYRES: So if I may, Mr. Chairman, Board
14 Member Stratton, working through the Governor's office, we have
15 gone back to the Legislature, looking at projects that were --
16 that came through last year's Legislature for us to work on, and
17 we have re-estimated those projects, those costs, and you're
18 absolutely right, those have escalated up, and we're working
19 with the Legislature and through the Governor's office to take
20 and get those additional dollars to complete that project.
21 That's going through the Legislature right now. Whether or not
22 that gets approved is a different story, but yes, we are
23 addressing it through the -- through the Legislature.

24 MR. STRATTON: (Inaudible) it gets to the point
25 that the Legislature does not give us additional money, and it

1 starts to impact our (inaudible), I believe the administration
2 can bring it to the Board to discuss it at that point. Thank
3 you.

4 CHAIRMAN THOMPSON: Thank you, (inaudible) Board
5 Member Stratton. (Inaudible) previously as well, maybe in a
6 different way of making their presentation (inaudible).

7 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Okay. We good? Okay.

8 MR. PATANE: Next slide, please. Thank you.

9 Okay. We want too far. So in FY '24, these are
10 some of our expansion projects. The I-40/US-93 West Kingman TI.
11 It's currently estimated at 145 million, and we have US-93, Cane
12 Springs, that's a little over 80.6 million. Then we have
13 additional -- on US-93, additional 21 million, then some more --
14 20 million, then some more -- 20 million for the I-10 bridge
15 road to -- 287.

16 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: 387.

17 MR. PATANE: 387.

18 Then on FY '25, we're showing 30 million for I-10
19 at Riggs Road to 387.

20 Next slide, please.

21 In FY '26, on SR-260 Lion Springs, we're showing
22 \$190 million there. Then for the expansion of US-93, there's an
23 additional 43 million for the Vista Royale section.

24 And in 2027 we're showing one expansion project
25 on US-93 Big Jim Wash at \$70 million.

1 Next slide.

2 So this is the MAG regional freeway system for
3 FY '23 to FY '25, showing various projects throughout the
4 regional freeway system.

5 Next slide, please.

6 And the Pima County for the PAG area, (inaudible)
7 projects, I-10 Ruthrauff, the Irvington TI and these other --
8 new traffic interchanges, I-10 and Country Club 202 and SR-210
9 and I-10 traffic interchanges.

10 Next slide.

11 So for Airport Capital Improvement Program, we
12 have the federal/state/local match program at 5.6 million, the
13 state/local program at 11.1 million. We have the Airport
14 Pavement Management System at 5 million, and then state planning
15 services, a little over \$1 million, for a total for the airport
16 program of 22,750,000.

17 So there -- our six- to ten-year program. This
18 is focusing on expansion -- I mean, preservation and
19 modernization. There's no expansion shown in the outlying years
20 for our long range plan.

21 Okay. Next slide.

22 Just wrapping up on the comments we received on
23 the tentative program, the latest update, we received 442
24 comments. A little over 336 were online survey response, and 81
25 emailed comments, 1 phone call, and 23 comments were presented

1 at the May 20, 2022, public hearing. Some of the major areas of
2 concern was the US-60/Grand Avenue, the I-10, you know, Phoenix
3 to Casa Grande, the SR -- State Route 88 Apache Trail, the
4 widen/improve safety on SR-347, and I-10 within Pima County and
5 I-17, and widen and improve also US-93.

6 So these are some of the items we're working on
7 in response to some of these comments. We -- we're working with
8 MAG on the US-60/Grand Avenue, widening the I-10 Phoenix to Casa
9 Grande.

10 There is funding in the program, but as far as
11 State Route -- State Route 80, Apache Trail, we're in the
12 process of design concept is -- report is out on the street. We
13 should be issuing a notice to proceed in July with the
14 consultant starting soon after that. Then the SR-347 in
15 Maricopa, we're working with MAG on this one as well.

16 Then the I-10 and the Pima County, there's
17 programmed -- funding currently in the programs for the TIs
18 mentioned earlier, and we added some funding to the I-17/Anthem
19 Way to Cordes Junction, programmed in FY '23, and then the
20 dollars still in the program for the US-93.

21 So the next steps. Today we're here for approval
22 of the 2023-2027 Five-Year Transportation Construction Program,
23 then July 1 is when the new fiscal year starts. So we're here
24 today, we request the approval.

25 CHAIRMAN THOMPSON: (Inaudible) --

1 MR. SEARLE: Chairman, I'll make a motion to
2 approve.

3 CHAIRMAN THOMPSON: There's a motion to approve
4 the five-year plan as presented. Motioned by Board Member
5 Searle. Second?

6 MR. KNIGHT: Second.

7 MR. STRATTON: I'll second, and I'd like to
8 discussion (inaudible).

9 CHAIRMAN THOMPSON: Okay. Second by Gary, and
10 we'll take time for discussion. So Steve.

11 MR. STRATTON: Thank you.

12 First of all, I'd like to comment that I really
13 am pleased to see ADOT going back and finishing some of the
14 projects that we started decades ago, that being especially
15 Highway 260 to Lion Springs project, and Highway 93 was one of
16 the most dangerous highways in America. I see we have multiple
17 widening projects on 93. How many miles (inaudible)?

18 MR. PATANE: So after -- upon -- if we're
19 successful with the projects in the program, there will be close
20 to 22 miles left to widening, which is north of Wikieup.

21 MR. STRATTON: And do we have -- are they on the
22 project in the six- to ten-year plan?

23 MR. PATANE: I would have to double-check with
24 Mr. Trent (phonetic).

25 MR. STRATTON: I see Greg shaking his head.

1 MR. PATANE: Okay.

2 MR. STRATTON: So (inaudible).

3 MR. PATANE: So board chairman, if I may, what
4 our plan is, as you know, we also applied for the INFRA and the
5 Mega grant -- or the INFRA grant for the US-93 project, and if
6 we're successful with that grant application, then we can kind
7 of reshuffle the deck and look at putting some of those dollars
8 back on -- into other areas of US-93.

9 MR. STRATTON: Great. Thank you.

10 CHAIRMAN THOMPSON: Thank you, Steve.

11 I guess I do have one question (inaudible). Are
12 there any other projects (inaudible) situation at Lion Springs,
13 those that have been on the priority list for a long time that
14 we need to at least (inaudible) getting them funded?

15 MR. PATANE: None currently surface to my mind as
16 far as projects, additional expansion projects, but, you know,
17 through the P2P program, prioritization, those projects will go
18 through the rankings.

19 MR. ROEHRICH: So, Mr. Chairman, board members, I
20 think the thing to remember as we look out past this five-year
21 program, you can see, as Paul had identified, there's not a lot
22 of expansion after the five-year program, and that's really due
23 to two things.

24 One is our long range plan, because we're doing
25 the update, which is going to kick off this year and through

1 next year. What are (inaudible) priority and look at some of
2 the different corridors and transportation needs. That's a
3 requirement every five years to make sure we are going down the
4 correct path.

5 The second thing is what is the revenue situation
6 going to be like? Again, in this five-year program, we've been
7 able to bring some of those expansion back, because they are
8 necessary improvements, and all our projects (inaudible) develop
9 a whole lot of (inaudible) projects. When they get in the
10 program, it's going to be dependent upon as we get -- as we keep
11 developing these five-year programs year after year, what's our
12 revenue situation going to be like and does it still need the
13 priority needs as set in our long range plan?

14 CHAIRMAN THOMPSON: Thank you, Floyd, for
15 (inaudible).

16 Ted.

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

18 Kind of to reiterate some of what we see, we are
19 at a really critical path right now when it comes to
20 transportation funding in this state, because we have Maricopa
21 Transit -- Transportation Authority (inaudible) if it's going to
22 go forward (inaudible) be authorized, and as well in 2026 that
23 the Pima County Regional Transportation Authority (inaudible).
24 We've got two of the largest counties facing their
25 transportation issues, as well as Pinal appears to be heading

1 back now to trying to establish their own transportation
2 authorities.

3 So when we look out in the future, we see that
4 there's very limited moneys expended on expansion. That's
5 because through these (inaudible) is where a lot of the
6 authorization comes for that expansion. So there's a lot of
7 decisions that are going to have to be made by the voters of the
8 state to determine how much they want put back in, and that to
9 me is really the driving force. You saw (inaudible) a lot of
10 conversation last night even on, you know (inaudible) some
11 opportunities for expansion (inaudible) those three initiatives
12 pass (inaudible) they will create expansion in those areas, then
13 (inaudible).

14 Thank you, Mr. Chair.

15 CHAIRMAN THOMPSON: Greg.

16 MR. BYRES: Mr. Chairman, board members, one of
17 the things I'd kind of like to bring up is the plan as it's
18 being presented today is fiscally constrained. Everything in
19 there works just as it needs to.

20 The one thing to remember is that right now we're
21 going through an inflationary period that is almost
22 unprecedented. Right now we're looking at construction costs
23 somewhere in the neighborhood of 38 percent increases, just in
24 the last six months, and it's not slowing down.

25 I was at a WASHTO conference last week where we

1 discussed this at length. Arizona's one of the highest states
2 as far as inflation rates in the western United States. It's
3 generally somewhere in the neighborhood of 16 to 20 percent in
4 most other states, but we are extreme at 38 percent.

5 (Inaudible.) One of the those reasons is because Arizona, along
6 with inflation going on, we also have a thriving economy, which
7 is driving that inflation rate up.

8 As far as construction's concerned, because
9 there's a massive amount of private development that's
10 occurring, and it's -- and it's drawing on all of the different
11 construction industries as well as the consulting industries.
12 So consequently, that's one of the reasons why we're seeing it
13 very high.

14 If this continues on, there's going to have to be
15 adjustments made, just like we have been doing in the past, but
16 they may be on a little larger scale than what we've seen in the
17 past. So just kind of a heads up, more than anything else as we
18 go forward. There's absolutely nothing wrong with this plan as
19 it goes forward today. It is fully fiscally constrained. So it
20 works perfect as it sits right now, but just a heads up.

21 DIRECTOR HALIKOWSKI: So, Mr. Chairman, if I
22 could ask Greg to address one other issue, every -- everybody
23 has said so far it's correct, but there's a (inaudible) that
24 goes long term, and outside of Pima and Maricopa Counties, we
25 don't have a tax base to support another half cent sales tax for

1 the rest of Arizona.

2 And, Greg, if you would, one of the long-term
3 things we have to look at is a revenue stream that is adequate
4 to meet our pavement preservation and maintenance needs, because
5 my office has been fielding increasing calls from people about
6 pavement conditions on the state highway system, but also about
7 litter and other aesthetics that the public is saying that they
8 want. So, Greg, if you want to talk about that a little bit as
9 we move out into the plan, that definitely is a concern to have
10 adequate revenue stream for preservation and maintenance.

11 MR. BYRES: So, Director, Chairman, board
12 members, right now, we're sitting at a point where we have
13 roughly about \$2.8 billion worth of deferred preservation work
14 on our -- on our road -- on our highways for pavement and bridge
15 both. That's a huge gap to take and try and make up. So --
16 especially with the funding that we currently have. So without
17 some means of being able to try and jump that gap and bring it
18 back to where it needs to be, along with -- because we -- of
19 that gap, we currently have accelerating degradation of our
20 pavements. So the longer it goes on, the faster they degrade,
21 the bigger this gap gets. So it's a never-ending cycle that
22 we've got, unless we can break it with additional funding. So
23 that's where we're at. That's the situation that we're dealing
24 with, and it doesn't get better with time without a change in
25 revenue or funding as we go through.

1 DIRECTOR HALIKOWSKI: So unfortunately, with gas
2 approaching \$6 a gallon, the public is paying more, but the tax
3 that comes to ADOT for road maintenance remains flat. And I
4 certainly am not advocating for a tax increase, and now is not a
5 good time anyway, as the public is really being hammered not
6 just by inflation on other issues, but also on just their
7 everyday need for fuel to get their work done.

8 Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

9 CHAIRMAN THOMPSON: Thank you for those -- for
10 the explanation. (Inaudible.) Gary.

11 VICE CHAIR KNIGHT: It seems to me that right now
12 the earmarks are driving our expansion considerably, as opposed
13 to the normal funding that we would be using for expansion and
14 modernization, which we don't have. So it's -- that's all going
15 to (inaudible) preservation. So hopefully -- and that's a big
16 question mark -- is how long these -- this earmark revenue is
17 going to continue. If it continues into the future, then great.
18 If it doesn't, then we're going to take a hit on our expansion,
19 but until then -- and what I'd really like is the fact that with
20 the earmarks, as soon as we find out from the Legislature at the
21 end of this month exactly how much transportation money is in
22 their budget and how much -- where they've appropriated it, then
23 we'll be able to adjust the five-year plan as needed.

24 So what we've got here now, as Greg said, is
25 fiscally responsible, and we have -- we know where the money's

1 coming from for that, but at the end of the month, we're going
2 to have some more money, I hope, and it looks like -- and we'll
3 have to figure out what kind of changes we need to make, so...
4 Thank you, Mr. Chair.

5 CHAIRMAN THOMPSON: Any comment to that, either
6 Floyd, John or Paul? (Inaudible.)

7 MR. ROEHRICH: I just want the Board To be
8 cautious, because many of the bills that we've seen for federal
9 earmarks are directed Congressional spending, as they're now
10 called, are not necessarily on the state highway system.
11 They're local projects. So there will be a mixture of those,
12 but rest assured that a number of them are not on the system.
13 So we will adjust the plan accordingly, but right now, what that
14 amount or where those funds are going to go from the state
15 Legislature, since we haven't had -- seen a bill drafted, it's
16 still a pretty big toss-up. Thank you.

17 CHAIRMAN THOMPSON: Again, (inaudible) approval
18 for the five-year program?

19 MR. ROEHRICH: So, Mr. Chairman, the motion was
20 made by Board Member Searle. It was seconded by Board Member
21 Knight. The Board's now been having a discussion. When the
22 discussion is done, I would ask you to vote.

23 CHAIRMAN THOMPSON: Any further discussion?
24 There being none, all in favor say aye.

25 BOARD MEMBERS: Aye.

1 CHAIRMAN THOMPSON: Any opposed?

2 Floyd, conduct roll call vote for board members
3 attending remotely.

4 MR. ROEHRICH: Board Member Meck.

5 MR. MECK: Aye.

6 MR. ROEHRICH: Thank you, sir.

7 Chairman, the motion passes.

8 CHAIRMAN THOMPSON: Thank you very much, board
9 members, for approving the budget plan as presented.

10 We will move on to Item 7. Is it Item 7?

11 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: 6.

12 CHAIRMAN THOMPSON: Item 6. Multimodal report.
13 Paul.

14 MR. PATANE: Mr. Chairman, board members, just to
15 give you an update on what's happening in the Multimodal
16 Planning Division.

17 MR. ROEHRICH: Rhett, it's the presentation of
18 (inaudible) the PPAC maps. It should be Item 6.

19 MR. PATANE: There you go.

20 MR. ROEHRICH: Thank you.

21 MR. PATANE: So three areas I'll cover is the
22 tribal transportation update, give you a little update on some
23 planning activities and just highlight the 2021 Arizona Aviation
24 Economic Impact Study. I provided the link, which you may have
25 interest in looking at.

1 So as far as the tribal outreach activities and
2 coordination on new projects, last month the -- we worked
3 with -- our tribal liaisons worked with our project managers
4 on -- there's definitely going to be a lot of tribal outreach on
5 the electronic vehicle infrastructure deployment plan, and also
6 there was some outreach related to Arizona Statewide Rest Area
7 Study.

8 And so in early June our outreach communication
9 was sent out to tribal transportation staff to notify them of
10 the project start-ups. I signed numerous letters, you know,
11 letting them know and requesting their participation in these
12 upcoming studies. There will be follow-up. Tribal consultation
13 efforts will be conducted if requested by the tribes on the
14 lands that may be impacted. Then our liaisons also participate
15 on the technical advisory committees, making sure that the
16 tribal areas' concerns are brought up.

17 And, you know, our tribal liaisons don't
18 (inaudible) when we have studies. You know, they do numerous
19 activities as far as even (inaudible) operations, reaching out
20 to the districts and with tribal concerns. Last month I know we
21 went up -- some of us went up to Chinle, Many Farms to address
22 the concerns being expressed by those communities. Then
23 recently, too, on -- even after project level -- we're doing
24 outreach -- you know, we have a couple pavement preservation
25 projects where -- one on State Route 264 and SR-73 where our

1 communications staff is working with the tribal liaisons to
2 reach out to those communities to make sure we understand the
3 impacts of the project and seek any input that they may have.

4 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Excuse me, Chair.

5 CHAIRMAN THOMPSON: (Inaudible.)

6 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Mr. Chair, Paul.

7 MR. PATANE: Yes, sir.

8 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Before you go on, you
9 mentioned specifically the (inaudible) you have (inaudible) to
10 talk about Many Farms. We've heard about those concerns a lot.
11 Is there anything you could tell us came out of that discussion?

12 MR. PATANE: I think (inaudible), but some of the
13 concerns that they had were on, like, intersection, bus
14 pullouts, those type of areas were -- they're asking for, you
15 know, help. Many Farms, they want us to (inaudible)
16 similar-type project that's happening to the south, to expand
17 further to the north, and so we're looking at, you know,
18 maybe -- if it would qualify for safety funds, because I know
19 that the current project on US-191 did qualify for some safety
20 funding. So we're working with our traffic safety section to
21 see if there's additional -- if there's -- if we would evaluate
22 the crash data, would that project qualify for safety
23 (inaudible).

24 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Thank you. Was BIA
25 involved in that conversation as well? I was just trying to --

1 MR. PATANE: I wasn't sure if they were at the
2 meeting, Chairman Thompson, the one that you attended. Was BIA
3 there as well -- BIA there?

4 CHAIRMAN THOMPSON: I believe that only the
5 counties and the tribal officials, local chapter officials, and
6 I don't recall any BIA people being there, but I think they did
7 have an interest on the right-of-ways of the roads there, but --
8 and (inaudible) explanation of the project (inaudible) being
9 submitted, they were quite satisfied with it and (inaudible) let
10 them know that (inaudible) will be coming (inaudible).

11 MR. PATANE: (Inaudible), you know, what the
12 concerns are, that way -- I know there's going to be many
13 opportunities in the future with all the potential grants that
14 are available, and so we want to be a partner and do what we can
15 to make them successful.

16 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Okay. Thank you, Paul.
17 Thank you. Appreciate it.

18 MR. PATANE: So the next item now relates to
19 tribal transportation updates, was the 2022 virtual public
20 involvement. We worked with New Mexico, Louisiana and Oklahoma.
21 It was kind of a peer exchange on how the virtual public
22 involvement is working. Okay? And so they're looking to
23 Arizona and to -- for some of our ideas. You know, the USDOT,
24 FHWA, the Volpe Center organized the peer exchange for the DOTs.
25 So they can present and strategize on using the public and, you

1 know, the virtual public involvement tool a little more,
2 because, you know, as we all know, it is -- it does work, but it
3 also -- you know, being in person does matter as well. So
4 there's a balance there that we have to find that works.

5 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: (Inaudible.)

6 MR. PATANE: So just -- as mentioned earlier, the
7 Long Range Transportation Plan is due for an update. We'll be
8 kicking this off. We do have a consultant on board, so things
9 will be happening. I'll be bringing regular updates to the
10 Board as this study -- this long range plan comes together. So
11 we'll -- you know, we'll have broad stakeholder involvement,
12 public meetings, and we're -- you can get input from all the
13 areas across the state, but look forward to working with the
14 Board on building this program (inaudible) setting the vision
15 for Arizona as it relates to transportation.

16 Then our freight plan is on its way too. This is
17 required to be completed every four years, and we're working
18 with the Freight Advisory Committee next week. We'll be
19 considering project priorities with the various stakeholders and
20 leave next week.

21 Then just real quick, I wanted to -- I came
22 across -- this got forwarded to me earlier in the week. I just
23 wanted to share some of the information from the 2021 Arizona
24 Aviation Economic Impact Study. So some of the highlights there
25 are some of the Arizona airports' economic impact from 2019.

1 (Inaudible) look at airport business activities
2 as far as airport administration, airport tenant business and
3 some capital improvement projects within the airports, as you
4 can see, it impacts is over 386,000 jobs, you know, 20.4 million
5 in earnings and economic activity up to \$59.4 billion. So just
6 your continual support on the airport program is very much
7 appreciated. And I provided the link, and we can send the link
8 to the Board if you want to get into details of the executive
9 summary and all the studies and look at all the different
10 airports, but just wanted to share that this is available for
11 your -- for your review if you wish.

12 VICE CHAIR KNIGHT: Mr. Chairman.

13 CHAIRMAN THOMPSON: Gary.

14 VICE CHAIR KNIGHT: Paul, do we have any idea of
15 any numbers on -- as far as the airports, how their current
16 economic situation is compared to pre-COVID (inaudible)?

17 MR. PATANE: I would have to go look into the
18 weeds of the study. You know, I can -- you know, because the
19 way the study is broken down by individual airport, so we can --
20 if your interested, I can follow up, Board Member Knight,
21 (inaudible).

22 VICE CHAIR KNIGHT: You think it's coming -- you
23 think it's coming back rather rapidly (inaudible)?

24 MR. PATANE: Well, I mean, because the
25 information was from 2019, and it -- those numbers were, you

1 know, pre-COVID.

2 VICE CHAIR KNIGHT: Yeah. All right. Thank you
3 (inaudible).

4 CHAIRMAN THOMPSON: Thank you, Gary.
5 Ms. Daniels.

6 MS. DANIELS: Thank you.

7 On that note -- that's a great question, Board
8 Member Knight -- there have been several articles that are
9 showing that all of our flight status is actually above
10 pre-pandemic rates. So (inaudible) as well, and there are
11 (inaudible) that are tracking (inaudible). So that's
12 (inaudible) capacity.

13 One thing to note, though, is that they are still
14 having work force issues, and I think that's just something
15 we're going to have to be paying attention to as (inaudible)
16 that our work force is our biggest challenge right now and
17 ensuring we have the right people in the right spots.

18 VICE CHAIR KNIGHT: Thank you, Board Member
19 Daniels.

20 I only have to look at Yuma's -- Yuma's airport,
21 and it's coming back and it's getting stronger. It hasn't
22 quite -- we have haven't quite reached the pre-pandemic levels,
23 but I -- I'm happy to hear that (inaudible) probably do so as
24 well. So it looks like --

25 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: It's coming back.

1 CHAIRMAN THOMPSON: Thank you, Gary.

2 Any board member have any questions?

3 Maybe -- maybe at the next meeting on the tribal
4 issues (inaudible) funding (inaudible).

5 MR. PATANE: You bet. You bet, because our --
6 our senior division administrator/airport engineer recently met
7 with -- focusing on airports and within the tribal communities.
8 So we'll -- we'll bring those projects to show at the next
9 meeting.

10 CHAIRMAN THOMPSON: If there are no other
11 questions for Paul, we'll go to the next item. We will move on
12 to Item 7, PPAC items. So Paul.

13 MR. PATANE: So, Chairman Thompson, board
14 members, for your consideration, changes to the FY 2022-2026
15 Statewide Transportation Facilities Construction Program, I'd
16 like to present the five project modifications, Items 7A through
17 7E, for your consideration.

18 CHAIRMAN THOMPSON: (Inaudible.)

19 MR. STRATTON: Mr. Chairman, the conversation has
20 been (inaudible) miscommunication on something going on with
21 Item 7E (inaudible) being pulled from this agenda, that staff
22 (inaudible) City of Globe and then bring it back next month.

23 CHAIRMAN THOMPSON: Do we have a motion approve
24 7A (inaudible) --

25 MR. STRATTON: Motion to approve all but 7E.

1 CHAIRMAN THOMPSON: Motion?

2 MR. SEARLE: (Inaudible). I'll second it.

3 CHAIRMAN THOMPSON: There's a motion by Board
4 Member Stratton and second by Searle to approve Items 7A through
5 7D. Any discussion on that and (inaudible) leave out 7E? Any
6 discussion?

7 All in favor say aye.

8 BOARD MEMBERS: Aye.

9 CHAIRMAN THOMPSON: Opposed?

10 There being none.

11 Floyd, roll call.

12 MR. ROEHRICH: Mr. Meck.

13 MR. MECK: Aye.

14 MR. ROEHRICH: Thank you, Chairman. Motion
15 passed.

16 CHAIRMAN THOMPSON: Motion carried, and we heard
17 from the board member (inaudible) 7E back (inaudible)
18 discussion.

19 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: (Inaudible.)

20 MR. PATANE: Okay. Thank you.

21 CHAIRMAN THOMPSON: Let's go on to the next --

22 MR. ROEHRICH: (Inaudible.)

23 MR. PATANE: Hold on a second. One more.

24 CHAIRMAN THOMPSON: (Inaudible.)

25 MR. PATANE: Chairman Thompson, yes. Yes, sir.

1 Chairman Thompson, board matters -- board members, for your
2 consideration, I'd like to present changes to the FY 2022-2026
3 Statewide Transportation Facilities Construction Program. There
4 are three new projects requesting your consideration for
5 Items 7F through 7H.

6 CHAIRMAN THOMPSON: Do we have a motion by any
7 board members?

8 VICE CHAIR KNIGHT: So moved.

9 MR. STRATTON: Second.

10 CHAIRMAN THOMPSON: Motion by Gary. Second by
11 Steve.

12 Any discussion?

13 MR. MAXWELL: Mr. Chairman?

14 CHAIRMAN THOMPSON: Ted.

15 MR. MAXWELL: Just (inaudible). So there's that
16 G and H (inaudible) the reason that it was eliminated and why
17 it's coming back now?

18 MR. PATANE: Well, these are -- we fund these
19 positions, they're a -- I believe they -- (inaudible) we fund
20 the position with dollars, that way they can be dedicated to our
21 projects, to the ADOT projects -- ADOT work. So ADOT work comes
22 in, you know, there's staff that's -- that we fund to take care
23 of the meetings that we have for ADOT projects.

24 MR. MAXWELL: Okay. Thank you. (Inaudible.)

25 CHAIRMAN THOMPSON: (Inaudible.)

1 Board member? Gary, second. Motion by board --
2 Gary and second by?

3 MR. ROEHRICH: Second -- the second was by Board
4 Member Stratton.

5 CHAIRMAN THOMPSON: Board Member Stratton.

6 All in favor say aye.

7 BOARD MEMBERS: Aye.

8 CHAIRMAN THOMPSON: Any opposed?

9 Floyd, conduct roll call.

10 MR. ROEHRICH: Yeah. Certainly, Mr. Chairman.

11 (Inaudible) turn your microphone on.

12 So Board Member Meck.

13 MR. MECK: Aye.

14 MR. ROEHRICH: Thank you.

15 Chairman and the Board, the motion passes.

16 CHAIRMAN THOMPSON: The motion carries. Thank
17 you, Board.

18 (Inaudible) Item 8, state engineer's report with
19 Greg Byres, information and discussion only.

20 Greg.

21 MR. BYRES: Thank you, Mr. Chairman, board
22 members. Excuse me.

23 I would like to -- before I start off with some
24 of these items that I had, I would like to address some of the
25 items that came up at our last board meeting. We had a very

1 active discussion with a lot of participants, and so I kind of
2 wanted to follow up on where we're at that we're actually doing
3 some work with.

4 The first item I'd like to bring up, this had to
5 do with some bridges and roadways within Navajo County. With
6 that, at this point in time, we are currently -- we sought out
7 and have received information from Federal Highway on specific
8 tribal set-asides that are available in a multitude of different
9 discretionary grant programs.

10 So what we're in the process of doing right now
11 is trying to follow up on those. We are going to be working
12 with our tribal liaisons to bring them up to snuff, as well as
13 providing them information to be able to get out to all of the
14 different tribes so that that -- they can apply for those tribal
15 set-asides on tribal roadways or bridges, any kind of
16 infrastructure improvements that they have.

17 It's -- there's a tremendous amount of money that
18 is available through IIJA that are tribal set-asides, but it
19 isn't a clean, easy way to apply for those. So we're working to
20 try and narrow that down and pass that information along to all
21 of the different tribes to be able to apply. So that's an
22 ongoing enterprise that we're trying to work on.

23 One of the other items that came up was
24 improvements at SR-69. These were pavement improvements. We do
25 have a subprogram and the five-year program that was just

1 approved that we can start looking to see where priorities lie
2 in projects across the state, and we'll certainly look at SR-69
3 as one of those that we can take and utilize funds out of that
4 subprogram for those kinds of improvements.

5 The 191 project from Many Farms or south of Many
6 Farms and into Many Farms was brought up. Paul kind of already
7 addressed that, and we are working with the -- our liaisons as
8 well as with our TSMO unit to try and see whether or not we can
9 use HSIP or safety funds to fund that additional last three
10 miles.

11 Let's see here. We do have -- we had several
12 comments that came out on the US-89/Lake Powell Boulevard
13 roundabout. At this point in time, our district engineer, our
14 district administrator is working on that, that this is -- this
15 is going through, that the district, as that -- that role
16 sounded a little bit further with the locals. We'll start
17 trying to address that, see if we can't get that into -- already
18 in our P2P program, but with additional information, we can take
19 and work it through the prioritization. And that P2P process is
20 getting ready to kick off. We're doing it earlier this year, so
21 it's going to work out really slick to be able to help that
22 community out and trying to get that project prioritized a
23 little bit higher.

24 The next item I had was safety concerns on 264
25 and 87. Again, those -- our tribal liaisons are working on

1 that.

2 We had issues on I-40, potholes and rough
3 pavement and so forth, ranging from Kingman through to Lake
4 Havasu City. Just -- I went through the program to see exactly
5 what we have for that. At this point in time, we have over
6 \$90 million scheduled in the -- or the program that was just
7 approved for projects within that stretch. So there's three
8 separate projects totaling out to over \$90 million. So it is
9 getting addressed (inaudible) with those projects.

10 We also have -- let's see here -- a -- Winslow to
11 Lindberg corridor, questions that were asked, but that -- so one
12 of the things that we're looking at here is some potential for
13 discretionary funds for that project. That would be one that we
14 may be able to look at through either a local project or one
15 that would be (inaudible) with ADOT support to be able to push
16 that through. There's several new discretionary programs out
17 there that we may be able to work with for that project as well.

18 One of the other items I -- we had, excuse me, we
19 had a TI, US-60 and 163rd in Surprise. That one, we're working
20 through MAG with that to see where they're prioritizing that
21 project. Again, programming goes through MAG for that
22 particular (inaudible) item (inaudible) to their attention.

23 And the last item that we have was US-93. Again,
24 in the program we have the three projects on US-93 that -- that
25 are -- were just approved. We also have those as part of our --

1 one of the grants that just went through on the grant
2 application. So we'll find out in October whether or not we
3 are -- that becomes positive or not.

4 So those are the comments -- those aren't all of
5 the comments that we got at the last meeting, but the ones that
6 we've been able to address today, so...

7 CHAIRMAN THOMPSON: Thank you, Greg. (Inaudible)
8 forefront (inaudible) proposed (inaudible). So we can
9 (inaudible). Thank you, Greg.

10 MR. BYRES: You bet.

11 To continue on with Item 8, just so you're aware,
12 we've got 95 projects under construction right now. We're at a
13 little over \$2 billion. Seven projects were finalized in the
14 month of May. We're at \$94.1 million, and fiscal year to date,
15 we have completed 74 projects. They've been finalized. With
16 that, that concludes the state engineer's report.

17 CHAIRMAN THOMPSON: Does any board member have
18 any questions for Greg?

19 There being none, moving on to Item 9,
20 construction contracts, for discussion and possible action.

21 Greg.

22 MR. BYRES: Thank you, Mr. Chairman, and thank
23 you, Board, for approving Items 3F through 3J previously.

24 We will start off with Item 9A if we can. This
25 is a pavement preservation project. This is I-40 to East Ash

1 Fork TI to Devil Dog Road. This particular project, when bid,
2 had two bidders. It had a low bid of \$7,981,960. The State's
3 estimate was \$7,221,155, a difference of \$760,805, or 10.5
4 percent.

5 The reason for the additional -- or the overage
6 that we saw was the cost of the asphalt binder as well as the
7 emulsified asphalt. Again, costs are escalating at an enormous
8 rate, so there was a big difference there. One of the other
9 items was -- in talking to the low bidder were the production
10 rates, as well as the staffing requirements that were necessary
11 for the traffic control on this project. So -- and as well as
12 costs for mobilization. All of those contributed to the
13 slightly higher cost. We did, also, after analyzing the bid, it
14 is a responsive and responsible bid, and we recommend award to
15 FNF Constructions, Inc.

16 CHAIRMAN THOMPSON: (Inaudible) the Board? I
17 need a motion.

18 MS. DANIELS: So moved.

19 MR. STRATTON: Second.

20 CHAIRMAN THOMPSON: Ms. Daniels, motion. Second
21 by Board Member Stratton. Any discussion?

22 All in favor say aye.

23 BOARD MEMBERS: Aye.

24 CHAIRMAN THOMPSON: Any opposed?

25 Floyd, conduct roll call.

1 MR. ROEHRICH: Board Member Meck?

2 MR. MECK: Aye.

3 MR. ROEHRICH: Chairman, the motion passes.

4 CHAIRMAN THOMPSON: Motion carries.

5 Item 9B. Greg.

6 MR. BYRES: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

7 This is a pavement preservation project on I-40.
8 Perkins Valley to Holbrook. The low bid was \$6,120,000. The
9 State's estimate was \$5,419,117, a difference of \$700,884, or
10 12.9 percent.

11 After looking at the bid, turns out that the
12 production rate for milling is less than estimated for this
13 project just due to the configuration of the project itself, as
14 well as the cost of asphalt binder. Again, the escalation is
15 occurring at a very high rate.

16 One of the other items on this is trucking costs
17 are much higher than what we have anticipated due the shortage
18 of local trucks for the project, and then, of course, also,
19 mobilization was a little bit higher as well. After analyzing
20 the bid, it is a responsive and responsible bid, and we
21 recommend award to Sunland Asphalt and Construction, LLC.

22 MR. SEARLE: So moved.

23 CHAIRMAN THOMPSON: Motioned by Board Member
24 Searle.

25 VICE CHAIR KNIGHT: Second.

1 CHAIRMAN THOMPSON: Second by Board Member
2 Knight. Any discussion?

3 All in favor say aye.

4 BOARD MEMBERS: Aye.

5 CHAIRMAN THOMPSON: Any opposed?

6 Floyd, conduct roll call.

7 MR. ROEHRICH: Board Member Meck.

8 MR. MECK: Aye.

9 MR. ROEHRICH: Chairman, the motion passes.

10 CHAIRMAN THOMPSON: Motion carries.

11 (Inaudible) Item 9C.

12 MR. BYRES: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

13 This is another pavement pres. project, SR-87,
14 north of Rye to Indian Road. We had three bidders on this
15 project. The low bid was \$3,994,823. The State's estimate was
16 \$4,879,174. A difference of \$884,351, or 18.1 percent under the
17 engineer's estimate.

18 With this, we went the other way on our milling
19 production. We actually estimated higher than what the
20 contractor did. Asphalt and concrete friction course rates were
21 also estimated a little bit higher in the engineer's estimate,
22 and in this particular cost -- or case, we had a minimal amount
23 of mobilization as the contractor, the low bidder, has an -- a
24 project that is very, very close to where this one is occurring.
25 So, consequently, he was able to drop this mobilization cost

1 considerably. After analyzing the low bid, it is a responsive
2 and responsible bid, and we recommend award to Cactus Transport,
3 Inc.

4 CHAIRMAN THOMPSON: Is there a motion to award to
5 Item C -- 9C to Cactus Transport, LLC, as presented?

6 MR. STRATTON: So moved.

7 CHAIRMAN THOMPSON: Motion by Stratton.

8 VICE CHAIR KNIGHT: Second.

9 CHAIRMAN THOMPSON: Second by Knight. Any
10 discussion?

11 All in favor say aye.

12 BOARD MEMBERS: Aye.

13 CHAIRMAN THOMPSON: Any opposed?

14 Floyd, conduct roll call.

15 MR. ROEHRICH: Board Member Meck?

16 MR. MECK: Aye.

17 MR. ROEHRICH: Chairman, the motion passes.

18 CHAIRMAN THOMPSON: Motion carries.

19 Item 9D, Greg.

20 MR. BYRES: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

21 This was another pavement pres. project. This
22 was on US-191, from I-10 to Ten Ranch Road. We had four bidders
23 on this project. The low bid was \$3,336,797. State's estimate
24 was \$2,990,584, a difference of \$346,213, or 11.6 percent.

25 This project is located in an area that has

1 fairly extreme terrain, and as such, the delivery of the
2 materials as well as the production rates were slower than
3 anticipated in our engineer's estimate. The placement of
4 materials was also much slower than what we had anticipated.
5 After analyzing the low bid, it is a responsive and responsible
6 bid and recommend award to Cactus Transport, Inc.

7 CHAIRMAN THOMPSON: Is there a motion to award
8 Item 9B to Cactus Transport, Inc., as presented?

9 MR. SEARLE: (Inaudible.) Jesse, I'll make that
10 motion, but I would question whether this is an extreme area or
11 not.

12 CHAIRMAN THOMPSON: (Inaudible) motion. Second?
13 Do I hear a second to that?

14 VICE CHAIR KNIGHT: I do.

15 CHAIRMAN THOMPSON: Second by Board Member
16 Knight. Discussion? Searle.

17 MR. SEARLE: I just -- I'm just kind of curious
18 with the -- your description of this being an extreme area.
19 I -- it's far from extreme.

20 MR. BYRES: One of the -- one of the items that
21 the contractor brought up on this one is because of the curve --
22 curvatures that we've got as you're coming off the interstate,
23 it makes a couple of curves coming up through there, but what
24 his -- his explanation was is he's going to have, more than
25 anything else, more dollars in traffic control or traffic

1 management in doing that. That was his explanation.

2 MR. SEARLE: The project needs doing.

3 CHAIRMAN THOMPSON: All in favor, vote aye.

4 BOARD MEMBERS: Aye.

5 CHAIRMAN THOMPSON: Any opposed?

6 Floyd, conduct roll call.

7 MR. ROEHRICH: Board Member Meck.

8 MR. MECK: Aye.

9 MR. ROEHRICH: Chairman, the motion passes.

10 CHAIRMAN THOMPSON: The motion carries.

11 Item 9E.

12 MR. BYRES: Mr. Chairman, this is another
13 pavement rehabilitation project. This is on SR-260, Hon-Dah to
14 McNary. We had one bidder on this project. The low bid was
15 \$2,115,550. The engineer's estimate was \$1,880,976, a
16 difference of \$234,575, or 12.5 percent.

17 In talking to the low bidder, production rates
18 were a little bit slower due to the nature of the work, as well
19 as the spot repairs that had to be done as part of the work.
20 Cost of the asphalt binder as well as trucking were higher than
21 what was estimated as well. After analyzing the bid, this is a
22 responsive and responsible bid, and we recommend award to
23 Sunland Asphalt and Construction, LLC.

24 CHAIRMAN THOMPSON: Is there a motion to award
25 Item 9C to Sunland Asphalt and Construction, LLC, as presented?

1 MR. STRATTON: So moved.

2 CHAIRMAN THOMPSON: Motion by Knight.

3 MR. SEARLE: Second.

4 CHAIRMAN THOMPSON: Second by Searle. Any
5 discussion?

6 All in favor say aye.

7 BOARD MEMBERS: Aye.

8 CHAIRMAN THOMPSON: Any opposed?

9 Floyd, conduct roll call.

10 MR. ROEHRICH: Board Member Meck.

11 MR. MECK: Aye.

12 MR. ROEHRICH: Chairman, the motion passes.

13 CHAIRMAN THOMPSON: Motion carries.

14 Going on to Item 9F.

15 MR. BYRES: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

16 This next item is the installation of rumble
17 strips as well as stop signs. It's for the City of Coolidge.
18 We had one bidder for this project. The low bid was \$445,461.
19 The State's estimate was \$286,598, a difference of \$158,864, or
20 55.4 percent.

21 After discussions with the low bidder, one of the
22 items that was brought up is in order to accommodate the local
23 traffic per the specifications of the project, it's limited to
24 work within one-mile sections. As such, the traffic control as
25 well as the paving and -- reduction in production rates within

1 that one-mile section took and increased the cost considerably,
2 but after analyzing the bid, it is a responsive and responsible
3 bid, and we do recommend award to Pavement Marking, LLC.

4 CHAIRMAN THOMPSON: Is there a motion to award
5 Item 9F to Pavement Marking, LLC, as presented?

6 MR. STRATTON: So moved.

7 CHAIRMAN THOMPSON: Motion by Board Member
8 Stratton.

9 VICE CHAIR KNIGHT: Second.

10 CHAIRMAN THOMPSON: Second by Board Member
11 Knight. Any discussion?

12 All in favor say aye.

13 BOARD MEMBERS: Aye.

14 CHAIRMAN THOMPSON: Any opposed?

15 Floyd, conduct roll call?

16 MR. ROEHRICH: Board Member Meck.

17 MR. MECK: Aye.

18 MR. ROEHRICH: Chairman, the motion passes.

19 CHAIRMAN THOMPSON: Motion carries.

20 Item 9G. Greg.

21 MR. BYRES: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

22 This particular project is one that was brought
23 to the board last month and was -- we were -- requested
24 postponement. Since that time, the City of Cottonwood has come
25 up with the funding and has made it available to ADOT. The --

1 I'll go through this one more time. Just the low bid was for
2 \$828,823. The State's estimate was \$223,150, a difference of
3 \$605,672, or 271.4 percent.

4 Again, the City of Cottonwood wanted to continue
5 on with this and was able to come up with the additional
6 funding, as well as we have received that funding. So with
7 that, it was a responsive and responsible bid, and we recommend
8 award to Vastco, Inc.

9 CHAIRMAN THOMPSON: Is there a motion to award
10 Item 9G to Vastco, Inc., as presented?

11 VICE CHAIR KNIGHT: So moved.

12 CHAIRMAN THOMPSON: Board Member Knight, motion.

13 MR. STRATTON: Second.

14 CHAIRMAN THOMPSON: Board Member Stratton,
15 second.

16 Any discussion?

17 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Jesse. Greg, could you
18 remind us why there was such a vast difference between the
19 estimate (inaudible)?

20 MR. BYRES: So one of the big things was there
21 was a fairly big lag in the time that the engineer's estimate
22 was conducted before the bid letting itself. In that amount of
23 time, costs escalated tremendously, and we're talking -- it was
24 about six months from the time that the engineer's estimate was
25 prepared to the time of the bid. We saw more than, in this

1 particular case, 30 percent escalation.

2 Also, we had the engineer's estimate that was
3 performed at that time. We did miss a couple of the quantities
4 on it. So consequently, our estimate was lower than expected.

5 Now, on this we did have several bids. All of
6 the bids were within 5 percent, so that is indicative that the
7 bids themselves were accurate. So that leads us to the
8 recommendation.

9 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Thank you for the
10 explanation, and since the City wants to go forward, I think we
11 should (inaudible).

12 CHAIRMAN THOMPSON: All in favor vote aye.

13 BOARD MEMBERS: Aye.

14 CHAIRMAN THOMPSON: Any opposed?

15 Floyd, conduct roll call.

16 MR. ROEHRICH: Board Member Meck.

17 MR. MECK: Aye.

18 MR. ROEHRICH: Chairman, the motion passes.

19 CHAIRMAN THOMPSON: Motion carries.

20 Item 9H.

21 MR. BYRES: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

22 This project is a fence replacement project on
23 SR-177 from US-60 to SR-77. In this particular case, there was
24 two bidders. The low bid was in -- well, let me kind of back up
25 a little bit on this. The original low bidder had

1 irregularities in his DBE paperwork, which were required as part
2 of the bid documents. The issues were determined to be
3 considered material, and as such, it made the original low
4 bidder -- or I should say apparent low bidder ineligible for
5 award.

6 The second low bidder did have all his DBE
7 requirements, as well as all of the bid documentation accurate
8 and completely filled out. So consequently, we moved on to the
9 second bid.

10 We did wait. We did inform the original low
11 bidder. We did wait through the term period for him to take and
12 protest. There was no protest, so we are making a
13 recommendation. So I will go on to read.

14 The low bid for the project itself was
15 \$2,898,469. The State's estimate was \$2,740,560, a difference
16 of \$157,909, or 5.8 percent.

17 After going through the bids on this, it is a
18 responsive and responsible bid, and we recommend award to Show
19 Low Construction, Inc.

20 CHAIRMAN THOMPSON: Is there a motion to award
21 Item 9H to Show Low Construction, Inc., as presented?

22 MR. STRATTON: So moved with a question, please.

23 CHAIRMAN THOMPSON: Board Member Stratton,
24 motion.

25 VICE CHAIR KNIGHT: Second.

1 CHAIRMAN THOMPSON: Second by Board Member
2 Knight.

3 Discussion. Steve.

4 MR. STRATTON: Greg, since this was in the fire
5 area, are we receiving money back from the federal government?

6 MR. BYRES: That -- that's exactly what this is.

7 MR. STRATTON: Very good. Thank you.

8 CHAIRMAN THOMPSON: Any other questions? Searle?

9 MR. SEARLE: How much was the bid on this
10 project?

11 MR. BYRES: The delta difference between the
12 original or what was the apparent low bid and the low bid was
13 \$212,454.

14 MR. SEARLE: Okay. Are there any reasons given
15 why the low bid amount that we're looking at, justification for
16 the overestimate from the State (inaudible)?

17 MR. BYRES: At this point in time, the only thing
18 that we got from the second bidder, or what is the low bidder
19 that we're justifying here, was the cost difference in what we
20 saw as -- for material cost versus the material cost that the
21 low bidder had.

22 MR. SEARLE: I would just like to make a comment
23 that on a private sector project like this, it would probably be
24 under the State estimate. So I'm a little discouraged to see
25 that it's above the State estimate, because the State estimate

1 is very generous on this project. I'm assuming it's (inaudible)
2 on both sides of the highway, so it's about 70 miles
3 (inaudible), and this really should be done for about 2.3 here
4 or 2.4.

5 Thank you. You that was my question.

6 CHAIRMAN THOMPSON: Thank you, Greg.

7 (Inaudible) move on. All in favor say aye.

8 BOARD MEMBERS: Aye.

9 CHAIRMAN THOMPSON: Opposed?

10 MR. SEARLE: Opposed.

11 CHAIRMAN THOMPSON: One opposed.

12 Floyd, conduct roll call.

13 MR. ROEHRICH: Board Member Meck.

14 MR. MECK: Aye.

15 CHAIRMAN THOMPSON: Chairman, the motion passes,
16 six-one.

17 CHAIRMAN THOMPSON: Motion carries.

18 Going to 9I. Greg.

19 MR. BYRES: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

20 This particular project is some ADA improvements
21 that are occurring along I-10, through Quartzsite as well as
22 right outside of Ehrenberg. This is part of indeterminate
23 delivery, indeterminate quantity project. This is actually
24 called Task 2. On this, it is specifically for sidewalks and
25 ADA improvements.

1 We had one bidder on this project. With that, it
2 was fairly accurate to the bids that we have foreseen. After
3 talking to the contractor, there was only some mobilization
4 differences that we'd seen because of the different sites, and
5 with that, we do determine it as a responsive and responsible
6 bid and recommend award to KAZ Construction, Inc.

7 CHAIRMAN THOMPSON: Is there a motion to award
8 Item 9I to KAZ Construction as it's presented?

9 VICE CHAIR KNIGHT: So moved, but I've got a
10 couple questions for Greg.

11 CHAIRMAN THOMPSON: Okay.

12 MR. MAXWELL: Second.

13 CHAIRMAN THOMPSON: Motion by Knight and second
14 by Maxwell. Gary.

15 VICE CHAIR KNIGHT: (Inaudible) answer my
16 question, because it states that it's in Yuma County, and it's
17 obviously La Paz County, and SR-95 is obviously (inaudible).
18 Those were my questions and -- it's guess because it's
19 (inaudible) too. I don't really -- let's go back to a
20 different -- but anyway, according to the map, the wording in
21 the description is all wrong.

22 MR. BYRES: So, Board Member Knight, so this is a
23 statewide contract, and as such, it's also broken down into
24 regions. This is occurs within what we call the Yuma region.
25 So, consequently, that's why it's called that.

1 As far as it being on 95, the initial project is
2 at 95 and I-10. So consequently, that's how it was labeled.

3 VICE CHAIR KNIGHT: Okay. It just sticks out to
4 me, because I know that I-10s not in Yuma County and -- at any
5 rate...

6 The other question, I -- when we received the
7 amendment to this and it said that (inaudible) DBE (inaudible)
8 was -- said 90.41 percent, is that true, or is it 9.41 percent?

9 MR. BYRES: No. That's -- Board Member Knight,
10 it is at 9 percent, because the -- it is a DBE that's doing the
11 work.

12 VICE CHAIR KNIGHT: Okay. Thank you. Thank you,
13 Mr. Chair.

14 CHAIRMAN THOMPSON: Any further discussion?

15 MR. SEARLE: Just a comment.

16 CHAIRMAN THOMPSON: (Inaudible.)

17 MR. SEARLE: Just a comment. Greg, I noticed in
18 looking at the contract and the agenda, and also looking at the
19 bids on this particular one, there was no description as to what
20 this project was, and that was -- I was just kind of curious
21 (inaudible). So in the future, let me -- it would be nice to be
22 able to tell exactly what we're doing, and this was the only one
23 that there wasn't any type of an explanation of what the project
24 was.

25 MR. BYRES: Mr. Chairman, Board Member Searle,

1 this is an IDIQ. It's a little bit different than what we --
2 what we normally do. However, each task does have to come
3 before the Board, because the overall IDIQ contract has not been
4 approved by the Board. So every time you do a task or -- this
5 comes through. So what I can do is in the future I'll make sure
6 that the actual IDIQ is identified as it comes through so that
7 (inaudible) --

8 MR. SEARLE: -- few weeks?

9 MR. BYRES: No.

10 MR. SEARLE: (Inaudible.)

11 MR. BYRES: Indeterminate -- indeterminate
12 delivery, indeterminate quantity is IDIQ.

13 MR. SEARLE: (Inaudible.) It was just a comment.

14 CHAIRMAN THOMPSON: Any further discussion?

15 All in favor say aye.

16 BOARD MEMBERS: Aye.

17 CHAIRMAN THOMPSON: Any opposed?

18 (Inaudible) conduct roll call.

19 MR. ROEHRICH: Board Member Meck.

20 MR. MECK: Aye.

21 MR. ROEHRICH: Mr. Chairman, the motion carries.

22 CHAIRMAN THOMPSON: The motion carries.

23 Board members, thank you for your participation

24 (inaudible) all these projects. We'll now be moving on to

25 Item -- Agenda Item 10.

1 In the future, I think if we have any questions
2 about any of these projects, I think it would be proper to
3 discuss it before it comes before the Board, because once it's
4 motioned and seconded, then it's kind of difficult to
5 (inaudible).

6 MR. ROEHRICH: So, Mr. Chairman, the -- once you
7 award the project, it is going to get put on that large
8 spreadsheet that we send you, which is the district construction
9 report, and it will be tracking percentages complete and costs
10 and other things that are on that. But at any time if a board
11 member wants to follow on any project, just let me know and
12 we'll make sure to -- to make sure that's agendaed. So whether
13 it's a planning document, stage engineer issue or whatever, we
14 can address that. All the Board has to do is ask.

15 CHAIRMAN THOMPSON: Okay. Thank you. That's
16 just a comment. Let's move on to Item 10. Suggestions. If
17 there's a board member (inaudible) suggest items they would like
18 to have placed on a future board meeting agenda. (Inaudible.)

19 MR. SEARLE: Jesse, I was -- I had a question
20 this morning. At this time of year, it gets hot, and it gets
21 hot quick. Is there any interest or is it possible to discuss
22 maybe moving of this meeting from nine o'clock to eight o'clock
23 session during the summer? And I'd just be (inaudible).

24 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: (Inaudible.)

25 MR. ROEHRICH: Please use your microphone so we

1 can capture the deliberation.

2 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Mr. Chair.

3 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Yeah, this is just a
4 question for future discussion.

5 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Mr. Chairman?

6 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: (Inaudible.) The next
7 meeting's in Holbrook, and because, you know, the later meeting
8 goes into the day, then (inaudible). So (inaudible) coming in
9 the night prior. There's no reason to wait until later
10 (inaudible) start (inaudible). (Inaudible.)

11 CHAIRMAN THOMPSON: (Inaudible.) This is
12 (inaudible) of an item that will be discussed in the future.

13 MR. ROEHRICH: So, Mr. Chairman, the statute says
14 that the board chairman sets the date/time of board meetings.
15 So we set the date and, you know, approved the time last year
16 for your tenure. I think because the statute says the chairman
17 sets the date and time, I think you can just say we're just
18 going to set this time, and that's how we will post it and
19 that's how we will prepare to move forward.

20 I would ask that, this is something, though, I
21 should consult with Michelle Kunzman, the Board's legal counsel,
22 just to verify that, but in my opinion, looking at the statute,
23 the board chairman sets the date and time of board meetings. So
24 I don't believe you need a motion. I just think you need to say
25 this is the date and time of the next meeting.

1 CHAIRMAN THOMPSON: Ms. Daniels.

2 MS. DANIELS: I'm an early bird, so I actually
3 don't mind that, but given some deference to our host cities, I
4 do think that they should have some input into start times.
5 When I was the mayor of Gilbert, I moved all the start times for
6 meetings a little bit later, because people needed to get their
7 kids to school and have other things. I know summer's a little
8 different, but people thanked me because they actually got to
9 get their own kids off to school or didn't have to drop them off
10 to early care. I thought I was going to ruin everyone's day.
11 So I just want to, like, add that element that I know that
12 everybody's very busy, but I would like us to have conversations
13 with our host cities in order to make sure that we're
14 accommodating their (inaudible).

15 VICE CHAIR KNIGHT: Mr. Chair.

16 CHAIRMAN THOMPSON: Gary.

17 VICE CHAIR KNIGHT: I'd just to add that, you
18 know, when we come in and the meeting starts, that's all well
19 and good, but their staff has to set this whole thing up, and I
20 know they're in here sometimes at least an hour, but usually
21 more. So now you've got -- now staff's going to have to come in
22 between 6:00 and 7:00 in the morning to get things ready for us
23 to have a meeting at 9:00 -- or at 8:00. They'd have to come in
24 an hour earlier than they normally do, which puts them in here
25 between 6:00 and 7:00 so we can start at 8:00, which, you know,

1 it's fine for -- if you're just looking at us coming in at 8:00,
2 but there are other people to consider such as the staff and our
3 audiovisual people that set all of this up and get it all ready
4 for the virtual part, which takes time.

5 And as Board Member Daniels mentioned, you also
6 have to consider the hosting -- the hosting agency, because
7 they're going to have to open up their facility now at least an
8 hour earlier than they would before. So it's -- it's not just
9 us, and it seems to me that it would be fine for us, but more
10 inconvenient for everybody else, but that's my take.

11 MR. ROEHRICH: Mr. Chairman, if I could also make
12 another point. The public attendance -- these are all for the
13 public also to be party to this, and as has been identified
14 here, I very much appreciate Board Member Daniels' and Board
15 Member Knight's consideration, because there are a lot of
16 parties involved on this, but the public as well.

17 And I'll just (inaudible) as staff, we want to
18 support what is the will of the Chairman and the Board, and if
19 we need to make adjustments, I think staff can, but it does
20 mean, as Mr. -- Board Member Knight had pointed out, but you
21 also -- as he said, consideration of the host cities and the
22 public. For instance, the community hosting us this time, their
23 personnel are off today. So they brought in IT people and other
24 people to help support us, came in on their off day to make this
25 happen, and some cities do that who are off Friday.

1 So whether it's earlier or later, we'll try to
2 accommodate the Board's will, but I think -- I appreciate the
3 discussion, because your board meetings affect a lot of other
4 people, not just the several members of the Board.

5 CHAIRMAN THOMPSON: Thank you. (Inaudible)
6 continue. (Inaudible.)

7 MR. ROEHRICH: So, Mr. Chairman, I have a couple
8 comments, if I could, and again, if other board members have
9 suggestions, please let me know.

10 Last month Board Member Maxwell identified
11 something to address, our tribal coordination with our tribal
12 partners and state, as well as the Bureau of Indian Affairs, and
13 after that meeting, Paul Patane came to me and said their tribal
14 team would like to put together a comprehensive presentation and
15 discussion on the whole tribal program so the Board gets
16 (inaudible) into that. He updates major activities, but they
17 would like to (inaudible) program, and actually have our tribal
18 liaison members here so the Board can see them.

19 So we're looking at that for the October 6th
20 study session, as a comprehensive overview of our whole tribal
21 program, to include our tribal liaison team, which is -- resides
22 in (inaudible). So that is being planned.

23 And then the second point I did want to make is
24 our next board meeting is July 15th. It will be in the City of
25 Holbrook. We've already started coordinating with them, and

1 we'll also, as has been the Board's practice, it will be in
2 person with the virtual option attendance.

3 CHAIRMAN THOMPSON: Okay. Thank you for that
4 additional information. We welcome (inaudible) Arizona. The
5 next meeting -- next meeting (inaudible).

6 (Inaudible) have difficulty. Some are saying
7 that I can just adjourn. (Inaudible.) Some say, no, you need
8 the motion. (Inaudible.)

9 MR. ROEHRICH: We've been advised that you need
10 the motion and a second, and then you can (inaudible)
11 adjournment.

12 CHAIRMAN THOMPSON: Okay. Is there a motion to
13 adjourn?

14 VICE CHAIR KNIGHT: Motion to adjourn.

15 MR. STRATTON: Second.

16 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Second.

17 CHAIRMAN THOMPSON: Motion by Gary Knight.
18 Second by Steve Stratton. Any discussion?

19 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: All in favor?

20 CHAIRMAN THOMPSON: All those in favor say aye.

21 BOARD MEMBERS: Aye.

22 CHAIRMAN THOMPSON: We don't need roll call?

23 MR. ROEHRICH: Board Member Meck.

24 MR. MECK: Aye.

25 MR. ROEHRICH: (Inaudible.)

- 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

(Meeting adjourned at 11:21 a.m.)

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

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

BE IT KNOWN that the foregoing proceedings were reported by me, TERESA A. WATSON, Registered Merit Reporter, Certified Reporter, Certificate No. 50876, State of Arizona, from an electronic recording and were reduced to written form under my direction; that the foregoing 85 pages constitute a true and accurate transcript of said electronic recording, all done to the best of my skill and ability.

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

DATED at Phoenix, Arizona, this 4th day of August 2022.

 /s/ Teresa A. Watson

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

Adjournment

A motion to adjourn the June 17, 2022, State Transportation Board meeting was made by Vice Chairman Gary Knight and seconded by Board Member Steve Stratton. In a voice vote, the motion carried.

Meeting adjourned at 11:21 a.m. PST.

Not Available for Signature_____

Jesse Thompson, Chairman
State Transportation Board

Not Available for Signature_____

John S. Halikowski, Director
Arizona Department of Transportation