

ARIZONA STATE TRANSPORTATION BOARD**AMENDMENT 3/18/2025**

**STATE TRANSPORTATION BOARD
IN PERSON WITH OPTIONAL TELEPHONIC/WEBEX ATTENDANCE
BOARD MEETING
City of Yuma
One City Plaza
Yuma, Arizona 85364
9:00 a.m., Friday, March 21, 2025**

Telephonic Pursuant to A.R.S. Sec. 38-431.02, notice is hereby given to the members of the State Transportation Board and to the general public that the State Transportation Board will hold a board meeting open to the public on Friday, March 21, 2025, at 9:00 a.m. The Board may vote to go into Executive Session, which will not be open to the public. Members of the Transportation Board may attend in-person at One City Plaza, Yuma, AZ 85364 or by telephone or video conference call. The Board may modify the agenda order, if necessary.

Public Participation Members of the public who want to observe or participate in the Transportation Board meeting can either attend in person or access the meeting by using the WebEx meeting link at www.aztransportationboard.gov. Join the meeting as a participant and follow the instruction to use your telephone to enable audio. For members of the public attending in person, physical access to the meeting place begins at 8:00 a.m.

EXECUTIVE SESSION OF THE STATE TRANSPORTATION BOARD

Pursuant to A.R.S. 38-431.03 (A)(3), notice is hereby given to the members of the Arizona State Transportation Board and to the general public that the Board may meet in Executive Session for discussion or consultation for legal advice with legal counsel at its meeting on Friday, March 21, 2025. The Board may, at its discretion, recess and reconvene the Executive Session as needed, relating to any items on the agenda.

*****Amendment to the State Transportation Board Agenda is as follows:**

***Item 3: Consent Agenda
for action to approve Board meeting Minutes from September 20, 2024**

STATE TRANSPORTATION BOARD MEETING
9:00 a.m., Friday, September 20, 2024
Town of Sahuarita
375 W. Sahuarita Center Way
Sahuarita, Arizona 85629

Call to Order

Chairman Searle called the State Transportation Board meeting to order at 9:01 a.m.

Pledge

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

Roll Call by Board Secretary Linda Hogan

A quorum of the State Transportation Board was present. **In attendance:** Richard Searle, Ted Maxwell Sam Elters and Jamescita Peshlakai. Board Member Jenn Daniels and Board Member Jenny Howard and Board Member Jackie Meck participated via WebEx conference. **Absent:** None. There were approximately 34 members of the public in the audience and 58 on-line.

Opening Remarks

Chairman Richard Searle

Title VI of the Civil Rights Act

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

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

BOARD MEETING

REPORTER'S TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS

BOARD MEETING

VIA WEBEX AND IN PERSON AT:

TOWN OF SAHUARITA
375 West Sahuarita Center Way
Sahuarita, Arizona 85629

September 20, 2024
9:01 a.m.

REPORTED BY:
TERESA A. WATSON, RMR
Certified Reporter
Certificate No. 50876

Perfecta Reporting
(602) 421-3602

PREPARED FOR:
ADOT - STATE TRANSPORTATION BOARD

(Original)

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

6

7 PARTICIPANTS:

8 Board Members:

9 Richard Searle, Chairman
10 Jenn Daniels, Vice Chair (via WebEx)
11 Jackie Meck, Board Member (via WebEx)
12 Ted Maxwell, Board Member
13 Sam Elters, Board Member
14 Jenny Howard, Board Member (via WebEx)
15 Jamescita Peshlakai, Board Member

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

CALL TO THE AUDIENCE

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

SPEAKER:	PAGE:
<u>In-Person Speakers</u>	
Tom Murphy, Mayor of Sahuarita.....	5
Paul Ward, YMPO Temporary Executive Director.....	6
Joy Banks, Huachuca City Resident.....	8
<u>Telephonic/WebEx Speakers</u>	
Nancy Smith, Mayor of Maricopa.....	10
Ron Angerame, Maricopa Resident.....	13

AGENDA ITEMS

PAGE:

1		
2		
3	Item 1 - Director's Report, Floyd Roehrich, Jr.....	15
4	Legislative Update.....	XX
5	Item 2 - District Engineer's Report.....	XX
6	Item 3 - Consent Agenda.....	17
7	Item 4 - Financial Report, Kristine Ward, Chief Financial Officer.....	19
8	Item 5 - Multimodal Planning Division Report, Audra Merrick, Division Director, Multimodal Planning Division....	23
9	Item 6 - Priority Planning Advisory Committee (PPAC), Audra Merrick, Division Director, Multimodal Planning Division.....	25
10	Item 7 - AZ SMART Fund, Audra Merrick, Division Director, Multimodal Planning Division.....	45
11	Item 8 - State Engineer's Report, Gregory Byres, Deputy Director of Transportation/State Engineer.....	57
12	Item 9 - Construction Contracts, Gregory Byres, Deputy Director of Transportation/State Engineer.....	63
13	Item 10 - State Highway Route Turnback Process, Gregory Byres, Deputy Director of Transportation/State Engineer.....	86
14	Item 11 - Suggestions.....	106
15		
16		
17		
18		
19		
20		
21		
22		
23		
24		
25		

1 (Beginning of excerpt.)

2 CHAIRMAN SEARLE: Thank you. With that we'll now
3 move to the call to the audience. I believe we have a couple
4 remote and we have some here. Please note there is a
5 three-minute time limit. If you are calling in, you will be
6 muted until your name is called. I think the procedure is on
7 the web page. And, Mr. Roehrich, if you would call our first
8 speaker.

9 MR. ROEHRICH: Yes, sir. Mr. Chairman, we'll
10 start with the in-person speakers first. Our first speaker is
11 Mayor Tom Murphy. Mr. Mayor.

12 MAYOR MURPHY: Good morning, Chair, Vice Chair.
13 It feels a little weird, because usually I'm sitting up there
14 listening to people down here, but welcome to the beautiful town
15 of Sahuarita. Congratulations on your 50th birthday. We just
16 celebrated our 30th anniversary last -- this past Wednesday.
17 Thanks for Member Maxwell for attending.

18 I just wanted to say a couple words of
19 appreciation. Working with our town staff with ADOT staff has
20 been nothing but wonderful. A recent incident was we had cattle
21 on the roadways. Our town staff identified some fencing issues
22 that ADOT maintains. They immediately came out and fixed it.
23 That's the type of collaboration that we really appreciate. You
24 should be very proud of your staff.

25 As Board Member Maxwell mentioned, you know,

1 we're a growing community. We have always ongoing needs. One
2 of them, we talked a little bit about it earlier, but the
3 subsidence on Duvall Mine Road overpass. We are in touch with
4 ADOT staff, and we appreciate their willingness to work with us
5 within either the five-year capital plan or in the maintenance,
6 trying to do -- I know it's -- you know, everything's costly
7 nowadays, but just keeping that on the radar for us is much
8 appreciated.

9 So again, welcome to the great town of Sahuarita,
10 and thanks for your continued collaboration with us. And again,
11 most amazingly working with your ADOT staff. We really
12 appreciate it. Thank you.

13 CHAIRMAN SEARLE: Thank you, Mayor Murphy.

14 MR. ROEHRICH: So, Mr. Chairman, I just want to
15 notify you and the board members that Ms. Daniels has joined the
16 meeting. So you have a full complement today.

17 Our next speaker is Mr. Paul Ward. Mr. Ward.

18 MR. WARD: Thank you, Mr. Chairman, members of
19 the State Transportation Board. I guess I'll just use the first
20 two pages in this case. Just joking. I don't have that much.

21 My name is Paul Ward. I'm currently the
22 temporary executive director of the Yuma Metropolitan Planning
23 Organization. And why temporary, I hear you ask. Okay. I was
24 the director at YMPO for about seven years but managed to
25 retire. I escaped just over a year ago. Unfortunately, the new

1 director, a Crystal, Crystal Figueroa, who many of you may know,
2 decided that she wanted to, that's right, give birth. So I
3 basically came out of retirement, because although they've got
4 some excellent staff at YMPO, they don't have a huge amount of
5 experience. So I basically stepped up and said, okay, I'll do
6 it for a short while. So you'll probably see me for the best
7 part of the next two to three months.

8 Specifically, I'm here to reinforce the Yuma
9 region's support and need for funding to finish improvements to
10 US-95. Although 195 million, that's all, just a mere
11 195 million is needed to finish up the portion of US-95 that
12 serves the largest Yuma proving -- beg your pardon -- the
13 largest proving grounds in the nation, otherwise known as Yuma
14 Proving Grounds. We already have \$33 million in place for a
15 project which essentially will be ready to bid, literally will
16 be shovel ready by the end of this year. That particular
17 project needs about \$40 million to actually be fully funded.

18 And then we only have another five -- actually,
19 5.8 miles to finish off. That's a little bit more problematic.
20 That's probably going to need about 120. Once that happens,
21 essentially, we will finally have a resolution to what is called
22 the Yuma 500, which essentially is the traffic that goes up to
23 the Yuma Proving Grounds from the city of Yuma every single
24 morning, and it looks just like the Yuma 500 except I think
25 there are a few less left turns.

1 In this particular case, we already have -- that
2 project itself is already under design and will be ready for
3 funding within the five-year program. Unfortunately, the
4 five-year program does not contain any funds for that particular
5 phase. So although the previous phase, and actually, the most
6 important part of it only needs a mere \$40 million, in this
7 particular case, the larger phase, which would finish everything
8 off, that's still out there. So if I can see Kristine
9 afterwards and see if she can do your magic, I'd appreciate it.

10 I will be happy to keep you up-to-date with
11 regard to Crystal and if there's any information with regard to
12 her. Thank you, Mr. Chair.

13 CHAIRMAN SEARLE: Thank you, Mr. Ward.

14 MR. ROEHRICH: Our next speaker is Ms. Joy Banks.
15 Ms. Banks.

16 MS. BANKS: Good morning. I -- my name is Joy
17 Banks. I live in Cochise County. And when I found out that the
18 State Transportation Board was meeting in Sahuarita, which isn't
19 too far, I decided to just come and see you all. And this is a
20 big complex. It took me a while to find the actual town hall.
21 It's beautiful. I can't believe you're still a town and not a
22 city. That's probably coming soon.

23 But anyway, greetings, Chair and Vice Chair, and
24 I've been following the updates on the Douglas commercial port
25 of entry, which is scheduled to begin in 18 to 24 months, and

1 I've read articles in the paper about how ADOT was maybe
2 hesitating on some things and GSA, and there's so many moving
3 parts, but I talked to people at the County, and they reassured
4 me that this project is well organized, that there's meetings
5 every two weeks about it.

6 And I tell you what. The excitement is huge, at
7 least as far as I can see. It's going to change up Cochise
8 County's economy, I think, permanently, and for the better. We
9 suffer with water shortages in the Douglas and Willcox basins,
10 so I see this as an opportunity to create new industry that
11 maybe won't use hard on the aquifer as the current farming,
12 intensive farming that's going on there, but anyway, I'm just
13 excited about it, and I was reassured that ADOT has a very good
14 relationship with the country of Mexico. And so as the new
15 administration moves in there, I expect that it will continue to
16 be a good relationship. I'm certainly hoping so. It's very
17 exciting to consider the possibilities.

18 I was told by the development services that there
19 are refrigerated trucks that bypass Agua Prieta and Douglas
20 because there's not enough -- there's no refrigerated storage
21 there. So they go on to Nogales, and that's just exciting.
22 It's exciting to know that there's industries waiting to use
23 that port, and again, it is going to change up Cochise County
24 dramatically, and I look forward to it.

25 And I'm also running for Cochise County

1 supervisor, but that's not important right now. I just decided
2 to come because I really -- I enjoyed the things that I've
3 learned from ADOT. I was on the Sierra Vista Metropolitan
4 Planning Organization. I represented the Town of Huachuca City,
5 which is much smaller than your town, and it was a blast just to
6 get to know all the workings, how ADOT functions with other
7 agencies and local and regional, and I appreciate those
8 partnerships so much. Thank you. It's been a great honor to
9 speak here.

10 CHAIRMAN SEARLE: Thank you, Ms. Banks.

11 MR. ROEHRICH: Mr. Chairman, that's all the
12 in-person speakers. We -- the requests we have online, our
13 first speaker online is Mayor Nancy Smith. Mayor Smith, please
14 raise your hand.

15 CHAIRMAN SEARLE: (Inaudible.)

16 MR. ROEHRICH: She's there.

17 WEBEX HOST: (Inaudible.) You're now unmuted.

18 MAYOR SMITH: Are you able to hear me?

19 MR. ROEHRICH: Yes, Mayor, we can, but you're
20 very faint. Maybe if you could speak closer to your microphone,
21 but we can hear you.

22 MAYOR SMITH: Certainly. Does that help?

23 MR. ROEHRICH: Yes, ma'am.

24 MAYOR SMITH: Okay. Wonderful. Thank you for
25 the opportunity to speak today. My name is Nancy Smith. I'm

1 the mayor of the city of Maricopa, and I wanted just to share a
2 fun fact. I was just recently elected as the mayor for an
3 additional four years, so that means that I have a potential of
4 an additional 48 visits with you all throughout the next four
5 years. So I'm excited about that.

6 I'm here today to talk about two different
7 things. The first is that I decided I was going to start
8 sharing "Share the Name." On January 27th of 2022, Buford
9 Delaughter of Maricopa was killed in a crash on 347 at Casa
10 Blanca Road. I think that it's important to share the name
11 because I think we're all beginning to understand if we hadn't
12 before the dangerous road that State Route 347 is and how often
13 we lose a soul, which is always sad, because it affects the
14 residents of Maricopa, the family and friends of the person that
15 we lose, and so it's important to say Buford Delaughter of
16 Maricopa.

17 I first want to talk about the town hall in the
18 city of Maricopa that ADOT provided for us, and this was a town
19 hall to go over the review of the different designs that are
20 available and gather feedback, and I really appreciate this
21 opportunity to come to Maricopa and for that information to be
22 shared. I was really impressed and very proud of our city for
23 showing up. We actually filled a room not once, but twice. The
24 presentation had to be given twice because there were so many
25 people to come out and speak about the importance of the

1 projects on State Route 347.

2 After hearing a really great presentation -- it
3 was presented so well. I was impressed on how well it was
4 presented. It was pretty easy for most people in the room to
5 understand what ADOT was asking for, but in the short, I am in
6 favor of the two Florida T's at our two intersections as part of
7 the project. I think those two intersections need a design such
8 as the Florida T that will allow the most traffic to continue
9 moving.

10 And then I also added an opinion regarding adding
11 sensors at the intersections so that the signal -- signals need
12 to be triggered and not just operating for the sake of
13 operating. Oftentimes you approach those intersections and
14 there are no cars, and yet it has to stop traffic regardless.
15 So I'm in favor of putting sensors into those intersections for
16 less interruption of the northbound and southbound traffic.

17 And, of course, we always ask that ADOT look at
18 moving any of these projects sooner, because the sooner the
19 better, and the less names that I will have to speak. So thank
20 you very much for this opportunity.

21 CHAIRMAN SEARLE: Thank you, Mayor Smith.

22 MR. ROEHRICH: Our next speaker is Mr. Ron
23 Angerame. Mr. Angerame, please raise your hand.

24 WEBEX HOST: You are now unmuted. You may speak.
25 Oh, looks like you got muted again by accident. (Inaudible.)

1 You are now unmuted. You may speak.

2 MR. ANGERAME: Okay. Great. Thank you. Good
3 morning, ADOT board. Thank you for giving me the time to speak
4 this morning.

5 I'd like to begin by expressing my gratitude for
6 the Board for the recent town hall meeting in Maricopa. The
7 team you sent did an outstanding job of informing residents
8 about plans for State Route 347. The graphics and video
9 presented were first rate, making it easy for us to understand
10 the scope of the project. The event was so well attended that
11 your team had to give the presentation twice due to the room
12 being overfilled the first time.

13 I'm here today to address two key areas of
14 concern regarding State Route 347 future. First, the proposed
15 Mammoth Way intersection. While the Florida T style has been
16 promoted (inaudible) for the Casa Blanca intersection, the
17 Mammoth Road intersection is currently set only to receive the
18 improved standard T. After speaking with the traffic engineer,
19 I understand the logic. The traffic (inaudible) may be the
20 requirement for a standard T. However, given the large number
21 of rear-end collisions at this intersection, we strongly believe
22 that a safer and more effective choice would be to implement the
23 Florida T style design here as well, which would eliminate the
24 need for a traffic light, and in turn would reduce rear-end
25 collisions.

1 Second, the project timeline. As previously
2 mentioned, in the past decade there have been 2,524 accidents on
3 State Route 347, of which 35 were fatal, resulting in a loss of
4 43 lives. This means on average, four or five people lose their
5 lives each year. If we can accelerate the (inaudible) timeline
6 by even two years, this could potentially save eight to ten
7 lives. These aren't just numbers. They are fathers, mothers,
8 children, friends and neighbors who could still be with us if
9 the road was safer sooner.

10 Normally, when we think of (inaudible), we think
11 of first responders. Firefighters, police officers, paramedics,
12 ordinary people who (inaudible) everything and save lives.
13 Today we need the ADOT team to be the heroes for our Maricopa
14 community by finding a way to shorten this timeline.

15 If any of you are Star Trek fans, you'll know
16 what I mean when I say, we need Scotty. The shields are down.
17 The (inaudible) are offline, and the warp engines are on, yet
18 somehow Scotty pulls off a miracle. (Inaudible) the ship in
19 record time and saves the lives of the crew. In this case, we
20 need ADOT to be like Scotty, working against the odds, pulling
21 off a miracle and saving the lives of Maricopa commuters.

22 Thank you again for your time and consideration.
23 Together I believe we can make State Route 347 a safer road for
24 all of us. Thank you.

25 CHAIRMAN SEARLE: Thank you for your comments,

1 Ron. And if we were doing Star Trek, we could just beam people
2 from Maricopa to Phoenix. So with that, we'll now move -- is
3 that all --

4 MR. ROEHRICH: Mr. Chairman, those are all the
5 requests to speak.

6 CHAIRMAN SEARLE: All right. I will go ahead and
7 close the call to the audience and move on to Item Number 1,
8 which is our director's report. And I believe, Mr. Roehrich,
9 you're going to present that this morning?

10 MR. ROEHRICH: Yes, Mr. Chairman and Board
11 Members. First off, the director does send her apologies. She
12 is out of town attending a national meeting, but she did ask me
13 to address a couple of things.

14 First off, the AZ SMART, you know, that is a
15 significant funding source for a lot of the locals as they look
16 to navigate all the federal grant opportunities. With the
17 recent legislation passed, we have been monitoring and analyzing
18 the changes to our program. Staff has been collaborating a lot
19 with, you know, the Attorney General's office, Governor's
20 office, reviewing the legislation. We will come back in October
21 and present to the Board the recommended changes based upon the
22 new legislation for that program moving forward. We are using
23 the existing program until we can get through and implement this
24 new program, but we will bring it to you in October so we can
25 move along into what new legislation requires.

1 The second item she wanted to show was a little
2 video that was created by our communications creative services
3 team that looked at just some of the aspects of ADOT celebrating
4 its 50th anniversary as a DOT. We've obviously been around a
5 lot longer than that, but we transitioned from a highway
6 department to department of transportation 50 years ago. So
7 (inaudible), if you could, would you please play that video?

8 (Video played.)

9 MR. ROEHRICH: So 50 years, it's been quite a
10 journey, not only for those three gentlemen there, people I've
11 had the pleasure of working with in my career -- and I'm the
12 young guy with only 33 years, so I've a long ways to go, but
13 it's -- really it was kind of reflective of the spirit that all
14 our employees are, you know, showing as far as their job and the
15 spirit that we have working with the transportation board over
16 that time. A lot has been accomplished as a state. We've
17 really grown up as a state, and we've done it together, our
18 staff and the transportation board. So kudos to everybody for
19 that. It's been a wonderful little event to acknowledge this
20 year being the 50th year.

21 That was all that -- I'm sorry.

22 CHAIRMAN SEARLE: I'm curious. Did we do that
23 video before or after the Legislature approved (inaudible)?

24 MR. ROEHRICH: We -- probably about the same
25 time. They rolled it out afterwards, so we figure we're going

1 to be around for some period of time. Anyway, two to eight
2 years, but yeah, we're lucky that was the full eight years.

3 Mr. Chairman, that is all the director had, and
4 there's no legislative report. We're obviously waiting for the
5 session to kick off here after the first of the year. So as we
6 get closer to that, there will continue to be updates and then
7 we'll get to the session, but no updates and no last minute
8 items. That's it for the director's report.

9 CHAIRMAN SEARLE: All right. Thank you.

10 Are there any questions for Mr. Roehrich at this
11 time?

12 Ms. Daniels? Mr. Meck? Ms. Howard? Any
13 questions? Hearing none.

14 We'll go ahead and move on to -- well, we're
15 going to forego Item 2. There is no district report this
16 morning. So we'll move right to Item Number 3, which is the
17 consent agenda, and I would ask if there's any item that any
18 board member would like removed.

19 MR. ROEHRICH: So, Mr. Chairman, I did just want
20 to point out by the agenda we had a couple changes to the
21 consent agenda, make sure that we have that on record. One of
22 them, we're removing 3E, which was a right-of-way resolution.
23 That is being removed from the agenda for this meeting.

24 Additional -- some issues came up, and our
25 right-of-way folks ran into that. It's going to require us to

1 do further coordination. That will come back at a future
2 meeting.

3 In addition, Item 3H was a consent construction
4 contract. In coordination with the City of Kingman, there's
5 some issues that came up that are going to change the status of
6 that, and Mr. Byres will present that when he presents
7 construction contract Item 9.

8 So those are removed from the consent agenda.
9 One completely, one is just moved to later on in the meeting to
10 Item 9. Item 9.

11 CHAIRMAN SEARLE: Thank you for the clarification
12 on that, and so if there's no requests to remove anything, I
13 would entertain a motion to approve the consent agenda as
14 amended.

15 MR. MAXWELL: Mr. Chair, I move we approve the
16 consent agenda as amended.

17 MR. ELTERS: I second that, Mr. Chairman.

18 CHAIRMAN SEARLE: All right. I have a motion by
19 Mr. Maxwell and a second by Mr. Elters.

20 As there is no discussion, I'm going to ask --
21 since we do have three remotely, I'm going to ask if there's
22 any opposition to the motion. Hearing no opposition.

23 All those in favor say aye.

24 BOARD MEMBERS: Aye.

25 CHAIRMAN SEARLE: Chair votes aye. Consent

1 agenda passes unanimously.

2 We'll now move on to Item Number 4, which is our
3 financial report. Ms. Ward.

4 MS. WARD: Well, good morning. It was a
5 beautiful drive down. This is a beautiful little town.

6 So if we could -- do I have control here?

7 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: There is a clicker right
8 there.

9 MS. WARD: I do. Thank you very much.

10 All right. So we'll start off with the Highway
11 User Revenue Fund. We just a little out of target range. 1.5
12 percent behind target with about 286 million collected year to
13 date. About 146, I think, for the month. We've had moderate
14 declines in all of our categories except for VLT, and VLT had a
15 crazy month. If you look at -- this represents the individual
16 revenue categories that flow into the Highway User Revenue Fund,
17 and you will see 15.8 percent growth year over year for vehicle
18 license tax. I don't know if there was a big sale. I don't
19 know what drove that, but I will tell you that we have dug into
20 VLT numbers going back ten years to see what kind of erratic
21 nature we might have there just to make sure we haven't got
22 anything going -- funky going on there. So in terms of the
23 month of August, we were 2.5 percent over last year. We were
24 right on forecast.

25 Going on to the Regional Area Road Fund, again,

1 we're a little behind with our first month of revenues coming in
2 for the Regional Area Road Fund. We had a first month of
3 actuals with collections of about \$61.4 million. Again, a
4 little behind forecast. You can see the individual categories
5 here. Nothing significant to speak of. Nothing like that very
6 unusual -- or that unusual VLT number we saw on HURF. Nothing
7 like that in RARF.

8 So with regards to our federal aid program, I
9 just wanted to let the Board know we are coming to the end of
10 the federal fiscal year. We have just concluded our final
11 transaction, and for this federal fiscal year, we -- the team
12 obligated 1 billion 31 million dollars this year. Understand
13 with the passage of IIJA, we have now hit record numbers that we
14 are obligating.

15 I want to say a deep thanks to the FMS team,
16 particularly the Program and Project and Finance Group that's
17 led by Elise Maza. They are wizards when it comes to federal
18 funding, and actually, you really need to be a wizard.

19 And if I may, lastly, sirs, before I ask for --
20 you know, open it up for any questions you might have, we
21 have -- the person that has been doing my slides and
22 presentations for probably seven plus years now is leaving, and
23 I am -- I am shedding tears. Not only -- her name is Jacqueline
24 Aarons Cook (phonetic). This is her last day. She has done an
25 exceptional job. She is exceptionally good to work with, easy

1 to work with, bright, and she absolutely drives results, and I
2 am just very appreciative for the time I've had to work with
3 her.

4 With that, it concludes my presentation, and I'd
5 be happy to take any questions.

6 CHAIRMAN SEARLE: Okay. Any questions for
7 Ms. Ward at this time?

8 Ms. Daniels, any questions?

9 VICE CHAIR DANIELS: None from me. Thanks.

10 CHAIRMAN SEARLE: All right. Ms. Howard?

11 MS. HOWARD: No (inaudible).

12 CHAIRMAN SEARLE: Mr. Meck?

13 All right. I've got one question for you,
14 Kristine. Just, you know, you came down here. You ought to
15 have to answer a question for me. I know it's early in the --
16 in the budget year, but with this -- this makes two months that
17 we've seen the HURF moneys under. Have we done any checking
18 into the ideas why that may be underperforming?

19 MS. WARD: Mr. Chairman, you know what I think it
20 is, and we've been trying to modulate for this, and I think
21 we've -- we've got some ideas, but if you -- if I were to show
22 you a full fiscal year and that target range, what you see is
23 that we are a little -- we run a little -- a lag behind in the
24 early months, and then we come right into forecast. Last year,
25 I think we were off in total by, like, .3 percent. It was crazy

1 accurate.

2 The -- where we struggle with the accuracies is
3 in the flowing of that -- of that overall annual forecast. So
4 we might have an annual forecast of \$1.8 billion, but the
5 question is what month will that -- will that \$1.8 billion, what
6 portion will come in each month?

7 One of things we struggle with, and that's why I
8 just did this request, I'm, like, get me ten years of VLT data,
9 because this is -- these numbers are erratic. I want to see if
10 we've got something going on with our system. Have we got
11 something going on our forecasts? And I'll tell you my first
12 glance at those this morning, and I just got them this morning,
13 VLT data is very erratic, and I -- and ten years of data, that's
14 what it -- that's what I'm seeing.

15 I really think where we -- where we struggle is
16 not in our annual forecasting. It's getting the placement in
17 the individual months of how much revenue of that annual
18 forecast will come in in that individual month. So, sir, I'm
19 sorry I don't have a -- I wish I knew exactly what it was.

20 CHAIRMAN SEARLE: (Inaudible) put you on the spot
21 in here.

22 MS. WARD: Oh, no worries. No. It's a fair
23 question. Thank you.

24 CHAIRMAN SEARLE: All right. Very good.

25 MS. WARD: You have a wonderful day, everybody.

1 CHAIRMAN SEARLE: All right. Thank you very
2 much, Ms. Ward.

3 And now move on to Item Number 5. Multimodal
4 Planning Division report. Audra Merrick.

5 MS. MERRICK: All sorts of contraptions up here.

6 CHAIRMAN SEARLE: It looks like you'll be doing
7 Items 5, 6 and 7. So --

8 MS. MERRICK: Yeah.

9 CHAIRMAN SEARLE: -- get yourself comfortable.

10 MS. MERRICK: Kind of an (inaudible).

11 So good morning, Chairman, members of the Board.
12 My name is Audra Merrick. I'm the multimodal planning director,
13 and yes, I'll be presenting Items 5, 6 and 7 to you today.
14 Looks like I have the clicker, too.

15 So first I have the tribal transportation update.
16 So currently, some good news. We have three of our tribes live
17 in our TraCS system, and as a reminder, the TraCS system is just
18 the primary tool used to capture our crash data. So it's
19 automatically uploaded to us. So that's good news. And then we
20 have three tribes that have expressed an interest in our -- in
21 the onboarding process as well. And then we're also having
22 further dialogue and continuing with some of our other tribal
23 police departments to help encourage them to get on board with
24 the TraCS system. So that's some good news for the weekend.

25 For the northern regional activities, we have

1 ADOT staff meeting with the Navajo Nation and their director
2 this -- that was this week, on Wednesday, and having some
3 discussions on GIS information and crash data and really just
4 sharing information. And then today we have a roadside safety
5 assessment kickoff meeting with the Navajo Nation Gap Chapter up
6 on US-89, which is north of Flagstaff. And then we do have a
7 November 14th ADOT Hopi partnership meeting coming up, and we'll
8 give you further details on that when it approaches.

9 And then our southern regional activities. On
10 the -- August 15th of this year, we had a partnering meeting
11 reconvening the ADOT San Carlos Apache partnership, after four
12 years. Our last partnership meeting with them was actually in
13 March of 2020, which was the start of COVID. And then moving
14 forward, we plan to meet quarterly, with the next meeting
15 tentatively scheduled for November. It was a great opportunity
16 to foster those relationships and share information with that
17 group.

18 So that does complete the tribal transportation
19 update, and I'm happy to take any questions.

20 CHAIRMAN SEARLE: Okay. Any questions for
21 Ms. Merrick at this time?

22 UNIDENTIFIED BOARD MEMBER: I have no questions,
23 but thank you for the update (inaudible).

24 CHAIRMAN SEARLE: Any remote? Hearing none.

25 I guess that's Item 5. Move to Item 6.

1 MS. MERRICK: Great. So thank you, Chair,
2 members of the Board. Moving on to Item Number 6, which is the
3 PPAC requested actions.

4 For the Board's -- I keep forgetting I'm
5 operating the slides. My apology. For the Board's
6 consideration, I present the proposed changes to the fiscal year
7 '25-'29 Statewide Transportation Facilities Construction
8 Program. Today I'm requesting this be done in two proposed
9 motions, the first being the roadway map or the roadway project,
10 which is the first map that you're seeing here, and the second
11 being the aviation projects together, which will be the second
12 map.

13 So first I do ask for a motion of the Board for
14 the new roadway project, Item 6A as shown in your agenda packet.

15 CHAIRMAN SEARLE: Is -- and this is a MAG
16 project. Are there any questions on 6A?

17 All right. Having no questions on 6A, I'd
18 entertain a motion.

19 MS. PESHAKAI: Mr. Chair, I move that we approve
20 Item 6A.

21 CHAIRMAN SEARLE: I have a motion by
22 Ms. Peshlakai and a second by?

23 MR. ELTERS: Second.

24 CHAIRMAN SEARLE: Mr. Elters. Thank you very
25 much.

1 Is there -- I have a motion and a second. Is
2 there any questions on Item 6A? Hearing no questions.

3 All those in favor of the item say -- well --

4 MR. ROEHRICH: You --

5 CHAIRMAN SEARLE: Back up, back up, back up. I'm
6 going to ask for any opposition because of our three remote
7 participants. Is there any opposition to Item 6A? Hearing no
8 opposition.

9 All those in favor say aye.

10 BOARD MEMBERS: Aye.

11 CHAIRMAN SEARLE: Chair votes aye. Item 6A
12 passes unanimously.

13 MS. MERRICK: Thank you.

14 CHAIRMAN SEARLE: Now we get to talk about
15 airports.

16 MS. MERRICK: Yes. Thank you, Chair, members of
17 the Board. Second, I ask for a motion of the aviation projects,
18 Items 6B through 6N, as in Nancy, as shown in your agenda
19 packet.

20 CHAIRMAN SEARLE: Actually, before we move for a
21 motion, is there any discussion or questions on Items 6B through
22 6N? And actually, I've got a few questions.

23 MS. MERRICK: I figured that.

24 MR. MAXWELL: Mr. Chairman, could I -- I've got
25 one (inaudible).

1 CHAIRMAN SEARLE: Go ahead.

2 MR. MAXWELL: I was curious on some, because,
3 like, the Bullhead project. The only change really is lack
4 of -- looks like now the federal government's got to fully fund
5 that project, and so we no longer have a state share?

6 MS. MERRICK: Which number is that one?

7 MR. MAXWELL: That's 6C.

8 MS. MERRICK: 6E?

9 MR. MAXWELL: (Inaudible) they're not doing the
10 project. So the total amount of the FAA's share is still -- has
11 not come to fruition. So it looks like (inaudible) so I guess
12 I'm kind of working why the total amount (inaudible) is still
13 listed on the item.

14 MS. MERRICK: Which item, please?

15 MR. MAXWELL: 6C?

16 MS. MERRICK: 6C? Is that correct?

17 MR. ROEHRICH: Correct.

18 MS. MERRICK: All right. Laughlin/Bullhead.

19 MR. MAXWELL: Yes.

20 MS. MERRICK: Okay.

21 MR. MAXWELL: Yeah. It's just -- I guess I'm
22 trying to figure out what is -- it looks like the project is
23 still going forward. It's 100 percent funded now by the federal
24 government, but we still have to remove it out of our SIP, which
25 is just not (inaudible) the State's not funding any of it?

1 MS. MERRICK: Correct. So usually we do provide
2 a state match for that.

3 MR. MAXWELL: Uh-huh.

4 MS. MERRICK: However, with that particular
5 funding element, FAA is approving it 100 percent. So we do get
6 our state match back.

7 MR. ROEHRICH: Yeah. So Mr. Chairman,
8 Mr. Maxwell, that what happened. You approved this previously
9 with the State match.

10 MR. MAXWELL: Correct.

11 MR. ROEHRICH: But now that the bids are 100
12 percent, we're approving to take that money, our -- basically,
13 our matching coming back into our pot that can be used for other
14 projects. So that's really what we're actioning here, is just
15 taking the state match, which was 75,000. By approving it now
16 with no match, that money will go back into our pot.

17 MR. MAXWELL: And SIP is our investment plan or
18 what is -- I mean, it's obviously --

19 MR. ROEHRICH: It's a capital improvement plan by
20 the Mohave County Airport Authority.

21 MR. MAXWELL: No, I understand. Well, I'll talk
22 to you about it later. I'm just wondering why it's then coming
23 out of the plan. It's still getting done. The only difference
24 is we're not funding it, so I'm not sure (inaudible).

25 CHAIRMAN SEARLE: It's the change in the plan,

1 because this was initially approved with us coming in with
2 \$75,000, and we're no longer having to --

3 MR. MAXWELL: I understand. It just says
4 (inaudible). So I'll talk about it later. It's just some of
5 the language on some of these...

6 MR. ROEHRICH: I'm -- now that I read it, I could
7 see that -- it should be changed. Again, because we're
8 (inaudible), we're moving it out of our improvement plan because
9 it's an FAA 100 percent funded. It goes directly to the -- to
10 the airport. We're no longer involved, basically.

11 MR. MAXWELL: Okay. Thank you.

12 CHAIRMAN SEARLE: Any other questions from board
13 members?

14 MS. HOWARD: Chair, this is Jenny. I do have a
15 quick question for Audra.

16 CHAIRMAN SEARLE: Yeah.

17 MS. HOWARD: So on Items 6D, E and F, it looks as
18 though FAA either pulled the funding possibly or was it grant
19 funding? Because that looks to be the reason that these
20 projects aren't moving forward.

21 MS. MERRICK: Yeah. So what happens is the FAA
22 gives -- we have a tentative list of projects from the FAA that
23 we receive in May. In June when we come to the Board for our
24 five-year plan, we utilize that project information, but FAA
25 doesn't approve their projects and finalize their list until

1 generally October. There are some projects here today where
2 those airports were notified earlier that those projects are not
3 moving forward, even though that list hasn't been completely
4 finalized yet.

5 MS. HOWARD: Okay. Thank you.

6 MS. MERRICK: Sure.

7 CHAIRMAN SEARLE: And kind of building on that
8 that question, Ms. Merrick, these -- several of these projects
9 that are being removed is because that, A, did not come up with
10 the funding, and I guess the challenges I've got is there are --
11 they took it away from these infrastructure projects on these
12 airports, but it looks like they're adding it to the planning
13 process for the Scottsdale airport. They were asking -- they
14 were throwing in another -- they're going from a \$750,000
15 project for the plan to a million dollars.

16 I would -- I guess the question that I've got,
17 I -- that kind of gives me a little bit of heartburn that we're
18 moving money from infrastructure into planning. Not that
19 planning isn't important. I just -- sometimes I wonder at the
20 cost of it.

21 If we needed not to do -- approve these changes,
22 how would this affect anything? If this transportation board
23 said, no, we don't like these changes. Not that they're
24 significant, but...

25 MS. HOWARD: Yeah. So for the -- for the FAA

1 funding, the FAA funding goes directly to the airports. We
2 typically just supply match money.

3 CHAIRMAN SEARLE: All right. So --

4 MS. MERRICK: And so I would venture to guess if
5 we're not supplying that match money that there would be another
6 needs that would need to be find to fully fund that project.

7 CHAIRMAN SEARLE: Okay.

8 MR. ROEHRICH: Well, Mr. Chairman, I think what
9 would end up happening is if the State doesn't apply the match
10 and the local airport still wants the funds, they're going to
11 have to come up with the match out of their budget or from --
12 you know, if they're a municipal city, from the city. That
13 means it's coming from someplace else, or they would have to
14 turn back then the federal funds and not take the federal funds.
15 I think it's important to remember that aviation is a
16 significant part of, you know, our economy as well. So
17 (inaudible) of these projects still a pretty good value.

18 CHAIRMAN SEARLE: I know the value -- I wouldn't
19 disagree with that (inaudible). I guess sometimes I question
20 priorities, and, you know, I just -- I see this planning project
21 on 6N going from 750,000 to a million dollars (inaudible) the
22 master plan for the Scottsdale airport while we're dropping
23 infrastructure issues on these other airports. I just -- as a
24 board member, I struggle with that (inaudible).

25 MR. MAXWELL: Mr. Chair.

1 CHAIRMAN SEARLE: Yes. Mr. Maxwell.

2 MR. MAXWELL: Mr. Chair, I'd like to add, too, as
3 a pilot, I can tell you, it's same -- I have the same concern.
4 The projects that we're losing are at Safford and Pinal County,
5 we're -- the small projects that the federal government's
6 decided not to do are in the smaller communities. Those smaller
7 airports need the funds more than anything to support the
8 numerous private pilots (inaudible) that use those airports, but
9 then they -- you know, they've gone from what I thought was a
10 pretty (inaudible) number, 750,000, to do a master plan in
11 Scottsdale. They've now gone to a million dollars, and
12 (inaudible) for the federal government's another \$230,000, which
13 could have funded --

14 CHAIRMAN SEARLE: Several of --

15 MR. MAXWELL: Several of those projects.

16 So I guess that's just -- that's just a concern.
17 I think what we're hearing, it's not questioning what we should
18 do (inaudible) I understand the matching, I guess, that it's
19 important that the State Aviation Fund (inaudible) manages ADOT
20 (inaudible) the State Transportation Board, supports those
21 airports, and those are important to support.

22 I will just -- maybe the issue's with the FAA,
23 how they determine where they put money in. Maybe if we get any
24 input to when they make those changes or get something that
25 literally comes down from that day and said this is what it's

1 going to be. And I know all the airports are fighting for their
2 own needs, but the large ones do have more sway. There's far
3 more smaller airports around this (inaudible) we use. So thank
4 you, Mr. Chair. (Inaudible.)

5 MR. ROEHRICH: So, Mr. Chair, Mr. Maxwell, to
6 your point, which is a great point, by the way, I do think when
7 staff does something like this, we need to make sure that we
8 don't identify what the action is. In this case, FAA's not
9 funding this project, but we have to give a reason why. I think
10 we would want to know more specifics. You know, maybe this
11 project wasn't ready, maybe it needs to get (inaudible), maybe
12 they (inaudible) different funding sources. They're looking
13 for -- we just don't know, and I think we should know that
14 because of exactly what both of you gentlemen said. These are
15 important improvements, regardless of whether it's a big airport
16 or not a big airport or wherever it's at. So I think I'll
17 (inaudible) talk with staff, but they do put in something like
18 this, especially if they're eliminating a project, more
19 specifics on why that project is not eliminated or is not going
20 to be funded.

21 MS. MERRICK: So, Chairman, members of the Board,
22 we certainly can make that more clear on the forms, for sure.
23 Not a problem.

24 CHAIRMAN SEARLE: And so I -- I don't have any
25 problems with -- with the -- most of the changes. I would --

1 you know, just if you would entertain me this morning, I
2 would -- I would like to break this motion up into two pieces,
3 if we can. I would like to have a motion to approve PPAC
4 Airport Development Program 6B through 6M, and I would like to
5 deal with 6N by itself, if it's all right. So with that I would
6 entertain a motion to approve 6B through 6M.

7 MR. MAXWELL: Mr. Chair, I move we approve PPAC
8 recommendations 6B through 6M.

9 MR. ELTERS: I second.

10 CHAIRMAN SEARLE: All right. I have a motion by
11 Mr. Maxwell and a second by Mr. Elters.

12 Is there any other comments or discussion?

13 One of these projects that's -- the 6K is in my
14 district, and, actually, I have no problem with it. It is -- it
15 is a changing of funding, and it's a -- it's to remove the
16 project, and I have no problem with the removal. It's -- I
17 questioned (inaudible) in the first place, but...

18 With that said, is there any opposition to the
19 motion 6 -- to approve 6B through 6M? Hearing no opposition.

20 All those in favor say aye.

21 BOARD MEMBER: Aye.

22 CHAIRMAN SEARLE: Chair votes aye. Motion
23 approved.

24 Now I'll entertain an motion for Item 6N.

25 Mr. Maxwell?

1 MR. MAXWELL: Chair, I move that we approve
2 Item 6N.

3 CHAIRMAN SEARLE: For purposes of
4 discussion, I have a motion. Can I have a second?

5 MR. ELTERS: I second, Mr. Chair.

6 CHAIRMAN SEARLE: So for discussion we have a --
7 I have a second --

8 VICE CHAIR DANIELS: I could not hear the motion.
9 Can you repeat it, please?

10 MR. ROEHRICH: The motion is to approve PPAC
11 Airport Development Program 6N, as in Nancy.

12 VICE CHAIR DANIELS: Thank you.

13 CHAIRMAN SEARLE: All right. I do have a motion
14 and a second and, you know, I realized this is only a change in
15 our program amount of approximately is \$11,000, but I just have
16 a problem with spending a million dollars on an update for a
17 plan when they let these other things go. So just so you know,
18 I'm going to vote no on this item.

19 Is there any other discussion?

20 MR. ELTERS: Mr. Chairman, I have a question. Is
21 the intent here to ask staff to come back with further
22 information and clarification for the next board meeting so we
23 have a better understanding and we make a conscientious effort
24 to -- for -- on it after we receive the info, or are we just
25 voting no or yes as a final disposition?

1 CHAIRMAN SEARLE: So my position is if the final
2 position -- if Scottsdale wants to move forward with their
3 master plan, they can come up with the \$44,000 additional
4 funding.

5 MR. ELTERS: I always like to have (inaudible) to
6 make an informed decision, so I ask just so I get myself to a
7 point where I can really look in good conscience. I don't know
8 if this project is needed or not. I don't know anything about
9 it (inaudible) was just shared here. Sounds like Mr. Byres is
10 trying to maybe provide something for -- to help us with that
11 discussion, so I would (inaudible).

12 CHAIRMAN SEARLE: Okay. And we can always table
13 this as well. I'm not sure how it would procedurally work, but
14 the -- my (inaudible) procedure is a little weak on this, Mr. --

15 MR. ROEHRICH: Well, if you don't want to answer
16 now, you can just postpone it, table it, but I would ask that
17 you do a motion to postpone it to get further clarification or
18 answers.

19 CHAIRMAN SEARLE: All right.

20 MR. ROEHRICH: If that's -- if you don't
21 (inaudible).

22 CHAIRMAN SEARLE: All right. Thank you.

23 MR. MAXWELL: Mr. Chair?

24 (Inaudible) so I yield back.

25 CHAIRMAN SEARLE: Okay. Mr. Byres.

1 MR. BYRES: Thank you, Mr. Chair, Board Members.
2 I wanted to express the importance of what a master plan is with
3 an airport. That is the basis document in which all federal
4 funding is utilized. So unless that document is complete and
5 up-to-date, they cannot receive any federal dollars off of it.
6 So it's an extremely important document to any airport, because
7 it is the basis for any funding, and those projects that are
8 identified in that are prioritized, and they have to be done in
9 priority. So it's an extremely important document to each one
10 of those airports. I just wanted to express what the document's
11 for.

12 MR. MAXWELL: (Inaudible) aware of how important
13 the planning process is for the airports, having, you know, gone
14 through this process in my previous role. I've got to actually
15 help do the update for multiple airports in Cochise County, and
16 I will tell you I'm just amazed at the cost or the reason why
17 they cost as much as they do, and I think my position is not so
18 much not the need for the airport master plan. It's more of an
19 opposition to the inflated costs, because I believe,
20 Ms. Merrick, you told me that the previous plan cost \$500,000
21 ten years ago. So we're talking basically a double in the cost
22 to update the master plan in ten years.

23 MS. MERRICK: Correct. It was done in 2015.
24 Yeah. Correct.

25 CHAIRMAN SEARLE: So -- and I'm -- this is, I

1 guess -- this is more of an issue I have with the -- with the
2 cost of the planning process and, you know, I'm only going to be
3 here for another couple of months and, you know, this is my last
4 shot (inaudible) made it a point for all (inaudible) the cost of
5 these plans are.

6 MR. ELTERS: Mr. Chairman.

7 VICE CHAIR DANIELS: (Inaudible.) One sec.

8 CHAIRMAN SEARLE: Ms. Daniels, is that you?

9 VICE CHAIR DANIELS: Yeah. Sorry. I didn't mean
10 to interrupt Board Member Elters, so I can go after him.

11 CHAIRMAN SEARLE: Okay. Mr. Elters.

12 MR. ELTERS: Thank you. I -- so I guess my
13 follow-up question would be, reflecting on what you said, and I
14 understand the importance of the planning process and what Greg
15 just stated, is -- are you basically saying that this updated
16 effort is at risk or will not be completed as this (inaudible)
17 44K is not provided through this action that the Board is
18 contemplating in this moment? Because that's really -- what I'm
19 hearing from the Chairman and my fellow board members is it's
20 really a matter of cost. The (inaudible). That message is
21 clear to us. It's really the match is what it boils down to,
22 and will this update be set back and not completed if the
23 funding is (inaudible)?

24 CHAIRMAN SEARLE: And (inaudible) on that as
25 well, Mr. Elters, we've already approved 33,000 for a match. So

1 if by chance we did not approve the 44,000, we're still approved
2 33,000. So the difference is actually about \$11,000. And, you
3 know, I realize this is -- this is peanuts in the whole slew of
4 ADOT funding, but I guess this is just my attempt to making a
5 point. That's all.

6 Mr. Byres, you can answer the question.

7 MR. BYRES: Mr. Chairman, Board Members, the
8 statement I made earlier is I just wanted to make sure everyone
9 understood the importance of the document. As far as the
10 payment for it, this decision is 100 percent your decision. So
11 the document itself is extremely important to the airport. It
12 will get done one way or the other.

13 VICE CHAIR DANIELS: Chairman, if I may.

14 CHAIRMAN SEARLE: Yes. Ms. Daniels.

15 VICE CHAIR DANIELS: Thank you. Appreciate it.

16 I've got (inaudible) and advocate for Central
17 District for just a moment, and having sat on an airport
18 authority board for many years, recognizing the constraints and
19 challenges that airports have -- I know we all have our lens
20 with which we see these things, but I almost feel like having
21 this conversation has cost us almost as much as the amount of
22 money we're trying to save here at this point. Everything has
23 doubled. I pay double for the price of bread. I pay double --
24 and if you think about when this was a (inaudible) RFP, it was
25 probably 12 years ago, not ten, and therefore, I would really

1 like us to just move forward.

2 So doing this, I, of course, appreciate your
3 perspective, and we do always have to keep costs in mind, but
4 this is the nature of the world in which we operate where the
5 consultants' fees and the price for these types of studies, not
6 to mention the very shifts in what's happened near the
7 Scottsdale airport as well, just a tremendous amount of change
8 has occurred, including the sale of massive amounts of State
9 land in that area. So I really do feel like let's just -- let's
10 just moved forward. I am supportive of this -- of this agenda
11 item.

12 CHAIRMAN SEARLE: So are you calling for the
13 question?

14 VICE CHAIR DANIELS: Yes, sir.

15 CHAIRMAN SEARLE: All right. Thank you.

16 We'll go ahead and call for the question. As we
17 have remote participants, is there any opposition? And,
18 Mr. Roehrich, if there is, I don't know if a poll (inaudible).

19 MR. ROEHRICH: I was just going to say given the
20 nature of this, I was thinking maybe we should do a poll.

21 CHAIRMAN SEARLE: Well, we can poll it, but let's
22 see if there's any other opposition besides myself.

23 Is there any opposition to the motion 6N?

24 MS. PESHAKAI: Mr. Chair.

25 CHAIRMAN SEARLE: Yes. Ms. Peshlakai.

1 MS. PESHAKAI: Thank you, Mr. Chair.

2 I support your opposition, because I think
3 Scottsdale is one of the, if not the most affluent community in
4 the state of Arizona, and there is a huge geographic area around
5 Maricopa County that does need these funds, and it is a drop in
6 the bucket, I guess, for the community of Scottsdale, but for
7 some of these other rural transportation projects that need
8 funding, this is -- this amount of money would be critical.

9 And I want to provide a story to all of you in my
10 lifetime. I used to be a security guard at the Tuba City
11 airport in Coconino County, and there was nights that we had
12 medical transports coming in, and I -- me, not anybody else --
13 had to run up and -- run from one part of the pavement for a
14 quarter of a mile lighting flares and putting them in a straight
15 line so that we could have a pilot land. And so these are --
16 the cost of the money that Scottsdale is asking for would buy a
17 lot of flares for the Tuba City area.

18 And then, also, in these areas, we're practically
19 putting up old-time kerosine lanterns to land these planes. So
20 these are real life situations that I know folks in Scottsdale
21 would think this is a -- we're talking about a third world
22 community, but this is in Arizona at an airport.

23 Thank you, Mr. Chair.

24 MR. MAXWELL: Mr. Chair, if I could.

25 CHAIRMAN SEARLE: Yes, Mr. Maxwell.

1 MR. MAXWELL: Since we're maybe kind of
2 discussing our votes, I'm going to be in concert with Member
3 Daniels on supporting this. I understand the -- I've got
4 problems with the million dollars for a master plan (inaudible)
5 ten years. That's -- but that part, the decision's out of
6 control. Our -- we're controlling the State Aviation Fund,
7 which is being used to fund this project and fund other master
8 plans at other airports as they come due (inaudible).

9 I'm obviously a huge (inaudible) huge supporter
10 of investments in our rural areas. There's -- when I flew into
11 the Winslow airport for the meeting up at Winslow, one of the
12 things you may recall I told the mayor and others, you're
13 missing an opportunity here. There are so many private pilots
14 that do things as simple as breakfast, lunch fly-ins, and
15 there's a lot of use for them. And, you know, Peshlakai just
16 explained the importance of rural airports when it comes to
17 public safety as well. So I'm a huge supporter there, but
18 again, on this situation, it's a federal program. It's
19 significant federal dollars are coming into it. It's a
20 requirement to keep the Scottsdale airport going forward, and
21 for the difference in value, since we've already approved
22 32,000, I'm going to be supportive (inaudible).

23 CHAIRMAN SEARLE: Okay.

24 MR. ELTERS: Mr. Chairman.

25 CHAIRMAN SEARLE: Mr. Elters.

1 MR. ELTERS: I, too, I guess will offer
2 (inaudible), and that is communities (inaudible) for these
3 dollars for their aviation needs. The City of Scottsdale is no
4 different. Planning (inaudible) for future additional funding,
5 and I don't see where and I'm not convinced that this is taking
6 away from rural Arizona. I also want to protect rural Arizona.
7 I'm not so sure that this is taking away from, and the dollar
8 amount is not significant. So I will too be supporting this as
9 well.

10 CHAIRMAN SEARLE: So (inaudible) just poll the
11 board members, Mr. Roehrich.

12 MR. ROEHRICH: Yes, sir. We'll start with Vice
13 Chair Daniels.

14 VICE CHAIR DANIELS: Aye.

15 MR. ROEHRICH: Member Maxwell.

16 MR. MAXWELL: Aye.

17 MR. ROEHRICH: Member Howard.

18 MS. HOWARD: Aye.

19 MR. ROEHRICH: Member Elters.

20 MR. ELTERS: Aye.

21 MR. ROEHRICH: Member Peshlakai.

22 MS. PESHAKAI: Nay.

23 MR. ROEHRICH: Member Meck.

24 MR. MECK: Aye.

25 MR. ROEHRICH: Chairman, the motion does pass the

1 five/two --

2 CHAIRMAN SEARLE: And put me down as a nay as
3 well.

4 MR. ROEHRICH: I'm sorry. I already took your
5 nay down. My apologies.

6 CHAIRMAN SEARLE: All right.

7 MR. ROEHRICH: But it's a five to two.

8 CHAIRMAN SEARLE: (Inaudible) votes.

9 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: (Inaudible.)

10 CHAIRMAN SEARLE: All right. And Jamescita, I
11 really appreciate the support.

12 MS. PESHAKAI: Yay.

13 CHAIRMAN SEARLE: Yay for rural Arizona. Okay.
14 All right.

15 MS. MERRICK: Well, that was fun.

16 CHAIRMAN SEARLE: That was --

17 MR. ROEHRICH: For your first meeting, you're --

18 MS. MERRICK: Yeah.

19 MR. ROEHRICH: -- you're really getting baptized.

20 MS. MERRICK: This is wonderful.

21 CHAIRMAN SEARLE: Well, welcome to the
22 Transportation Board.

23 MS. MERRICK: Thank you.

24 MR. ROEHRICH: See what you can do on Item, 7.

25 CHAIRMAN SEARLE: Item 6 passes five to two, and

1 I believe that takes us to Item Number 7. Ms. Merrick.

2 MS. MERRICK: Well, thank you for the great
3 discussion today. It's been interesting. Oops. Want to go
4 back.

5 Okay. So thank you, Mr. Chair, members of the
6 Board. Today we have two AZ SMART applications on the agenda
7 for board discussion and possible action. This is a slide you
8 see every month, which serves as a reminder of the eligible
9 uses.

10 And this month's applications are associated with
11 the Railroad Crossing Elimination Program and then the RAISE
12 grant program.

13 So the first application we have for you today is
14 the City of Casa Grande. The City's requesting 4,375,000 for
15 design of engineering services. The purpose of the project is
16 reconstruct Burris Lane from an existing two-lane road facility
17 with no railroad crossing to a four-lane median divided roadway
18 with a bridge that spans over the Union Pacific tracks. This
19 includes some intersection reconstruction as well. The project
20 limits are Clayton Road to the south, to Kortsen Road on the
21 north end. The City does intend to pursue the Railroad Crossing
22 Elimination Grant Program for construction in the 2026 round.

23 And then the second application we have today is
24 for the Town of Taylor. The City's requesting 1,150,000 for
25 design of engineering services. The project will improve the

1 connection between the town of Taylor and the town of Snowflake
2 by improving Centennial Boulevard at a small, little element
3 there of 7th Street. Along the length of this route, the
4 project will add wider shoulders, add multi use paths or
5 sidewalks, along with replacing a low water crossing with a
6 precast structure up there on that 7th Street leg. It will
7 install a roundabout and realign an intersection. The Town
8 intends to pursue the RAISE grant for the construction in the
9 2026 round.

10 So in summary, both Casa Grande and Taylor
11 applications are eligible. The total requested design amount is
12 5,525,000, with zero requested match.

13 And so with that, I would like to pause for a
14 moment and just really congratulate the City of Douglas on award
15 of a \$23.5 million RAISE grant. This is great news, and
16 congratulations to the city. This does, however, create a third
17 item for us today, which is the rescission of the design and
18 engineering service award to the City of Douglas. So the Board
19 awarded \$214,000 for design and other engineering services in
20 April. Prior to --

21 CHAIRMAN SEARLE: Ms. Merrick, can you --

22 MS. MERRICK: I'm sorry.

23 CHAIRMAN SEARLE: -- remind us what the Douglas
24 grant was for? I mean, what this funding is -- this isn't
25 associated with the port, is it, or is this --

1 MS. MERRICK: No, it is not.

2 CHAIRMAN SEARLE: Okay.

3 MS. MERRICK: No. I do have the name of the
4 project here. It is Avenue G, 2nd Street to 14th Street.

5 CHAIRMAN SEARLE: Okay. Thank you.

6 MS. MERRICK: Uh-huh.

7 So I was mentioning the Board did award 214,000
8 for the design of engineering services back in April. Prior to
9 submitting the Arizona SMART application, they also applied for
10 the RAISE grant and were successful, which is fantastic, and
11 they did get the award, like I had mentioned, of the
12 \$23.5 million.

13 The RAISE scope of work for design is the same as
14 the scope of work for the AZ SMART design of engineering service
15 award. So the program guidelines approved by the Board when the
16 program began required that if an applicant is awarded AZ SMART
17 funds and later receives funding from another source for that
18 work that the AZ SMART award will be vacated and rescinded by
19 the Board. So this rescission -- this rescission will return
20 \$214,000 back to the munis over K category. We have notified
21 the city, and they are okay with the 214,000 recission.

22 Moving on to this slide, I believe you see this
23 slide every month as well. This is the cumulative financial
24 activity in the fund. As of August 31st, which is the last
25 available data to date, if you look at the top of the slide in

1 the Total Revenue section, this shows the interest earnings to
2 date in each category of the fund, which is approximately
3 \$855,000.

4 In the middle of the slide, the yellow
5 highlighted line shows the available for awards amount in each
6 category. This is the amount available for award today if we
7 account for all previous activity. We've added a note regarding
8 the munis over 10 category showing that 1,113,613 will be
9 available after rescinding the Douglas award.

10 So clearly there's not enough money in the muni
11 over 10 category to approve the full 4.375 requested by Casa
12 Grande. We have made the City aware of this, and they are
13 willing to accept less funding.

14 Finally, at the bottom of the slide, the Pending
15 Requests section reflects this month's application requests and
16 shows the amount that will be left in each category if the Board
17 chooses to proceed with today's application requests. Awarding
18 the full 1.113 million to Casa Grande, after the action's taken,
19 obviously, will zero out the munis over 10 category.

20 So for -- finally, for the possible actions today
21 for the Board's consideration, there are these actions here that
22 are shown. The first is the motion to rescind the 419 design
23 award to the City of Douglas for the Avenue G, 2nd Street, 14th
24 Street, in the amount of the 214,000. They were successful in
25 receiving a RAISE grant, which incorporates the same scope as

1 the other AZ SMART application. As a result, the SMART award is
2 no longer needed and can be returned in the munis over 10
3 category. This action will increase the amount available for
4 the Casa Grande request from the 899,613 to the 1,113,613.

5 The second consideration is approval of the City
6 of Casa Grande application for the reconstruction of Burris
7 Road, Clayton Road to Kortsen, up to 899,613 that is available
8 in the munis over 10 category. This amount is prior to the
9 above motion. Please note that the Board may choose up to award
10 up to 1,113,613 to the City of Casa Grande instead of the 899
11 figure shown, provided the above motion happens prior.

12 And then the last one is approval of the
13 1,150,000 for the Town of Taylor application for the Centennial
14 Boulevard improvements.

15 CHAIRMAN SEARLE: Ms. Merrick, would you give us
16 the math again? If we add the 214 to the 899, that comes to how
17 much again?

18 MS. MERRICK: 1,113,613.

19 MR. ELTERS: Mr. Chairman, question.

20 CHAIRMAN SEARLE: Yes.

21 MR. ELTERS: If I understand this correctly, the
22 first order of business would be to motion to rescind the 214 to
23 the City of Douglas and add it to the -- to the existing amount
24 of 899, and with that said, the total amount would be 1,113,000,
25 and in that case, if I understand it correctly, both

1 applications from the City of Casa Grande and the Town of Taylor
2 exceed the available amount. Am I misunderstanding something or
3 is that --

4 CHAIRMAN SEARLE: No. I believe there is
5 sufficient to do the Town of Taylor.

6 MS. MERRICK: Yeah. The Town of Taylor, there's
7 sufficient funds to award the amount that they have requested.
8 It's the munis over 10 category. So when we all walked in the
9 door this morning, our account balance was 899,613. You can
10 increase an available balance and make it available to the Casa
11 Grande if you do that rescission action first of 214,000, in
12 which case your new balance for munis over 10 is 1,113,613. You
13 can award up to that amount.

14 MR. MAXWELL: Mr. Chair.

15 CHAIRMAN SEARLE: Mr. Maxwell.

16 MR. MAXWELL: If I could, I'd like to move that
17 we rescind the 4/19/24 design award to the City of Douglas for
18 Avenue G, 2nd Street to 14th Street in the amount of 214,000,
19 and approval of 1.150 -- 1.150 million for the Town of Taylor
20 application for Centennial (inaudible) further talk of Casa
21 Grande (inaudible) after we pass both of those.

22 CHAIRMAN SEARLE: All right. So I have a motion
23 by Mr. Maxwell to rescind the Arizona SMART Fund application for
24 Douglas, and also in that same motion to approve the Arizona
25 SMART application for the Town of Taylor in the amount requested

1 by the applicant. Do I have a second for the motion?

2 MR. ELTERS: I second that motion.

3 MS. HOWARD: I'll second it. I do have a quick
4 question, sir, if I could.

5 CHAIRMAN SEARLE: Okay. And Ms. Howard.

6 MS. HOWARD: So -- and I know I've asked this
7 question before, I apologize, but will -- if we award Casa
8 Grande, they're not able to re-apply for a period of time,
9 correct?

10 CHAIRMAN SEARLE: Ms. Merrick?

11 MS. MERRICK: I know they can re-apply. Do --
12 Iqbal, do you happen to know if there's the time frame when they
13 can re-apply by? I know we have Lisa on the phone as well.

14 MR. ROEHRICH: That's a good question. I thought
15 there was -- we've allowed other people to re-apply. I think
16 the City of Phoenix did it, but I don't remember if there was a
17 time frame. That's a good point.

18 MS. MERRICK: Yeah. I know -- they can re-apply.
19 That I do know. I don't know what the time frame is for that,
20 if there is one.

21 MS. HOWARD: Okay. That was my main question.

22 So --

23 (Speaking simultaneously.)

24 MR. ROEHRICH: Well, and that's --

25 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: (Inaudible.)

1 MR. ROEHRICH: -- will be rebalanced. We have
2 the ability --

3 MS. MERRICK: Correct.

4 MR. ROEHRICH: The Board will have the ability to
5 rebalance. Whether they choose to do that or not would be the
6 Board's issue.

7 CHAIRMAN SEARLE: Right.

8 MR. ROEHRICH: I am a little -- I'm a little
9 cautious about combining these motions just because they --
10 they're in different pots. They're different entities. I
11 really think if we could rescind the motion for the Douglas
12 first and then address Taylor and Casa Grande, if that's the
13 order, I would --

14 MR. MAXWELL: Mr. Chair, I will amend my motion
15 just to deal with the rescinding of the Casa Grande SMART grant.

16 CHAIRMAN SEARLE: All right.

17 MR. MAXWELL: (Inaudible.)

18 CHAIRMAN SEARLE: Mr. Maxwell is changing his
19 motion to just address the rescission of the Arizona SMART Fund
20 application for Douglas. Mr. Elters, you second that. Are you
21 okay with the --

22 MR. ELTERS: Yes, Mr. Chairman.

23 CHAIRMAN SEARLE: All right. So all right. With
24 that said, if there is no other questions, I'm going to go ahead
25 and call for the vote to rescind the Arizona SMART Fund

1 application for Douglas. Is there any opposition to the motion?

2 Hearing no opposition.

3 All those in favor say aye.

4 BOARD MEMBERS: Aye.

5 CHAIRMAN SEARLE: Chair votes aye. It passes
6 unanimously.

7 Now, if we can --

8 MR. MAXWELL: Mr. Chair, I'll move that we
9 approve the 1.15 million SMART grant fund application to the
10 Town of Taylor.

11 CHAIRMAN SEARLE: I have a motion for Mr. Maxwell
12 to approve the Arizona SMART fund application to the Town of
13 Taylor in the amount requested by the applicant. Mr. Maxwell --
14 do I have a second?

15 (Speaking simultaneously.)

16 MS. PESHAKAI: I second, Mr. Chair.

17 CHAIRMAN SEARLE: Ms. Peshlakai.

18 MS. PESHAKAI: Yes. Yes, Mr. Chairman. I
19 second the motion.

20 CHAIRMAN SEARLE: Okay. I had a couple online
21 that were trying to do it, but since you're here, we're going to
22 give it to you. So Ms. Peshlakai is the second.

23 MR. ROEHRICH: So, Mr. Chairman, before you call,
24 there is a -- well, Lisa Danka had her hand up. I don't know if
25 from the staff perspective -- Lisa, is there something you need

1 to clarify? I guess not. I don't see or hear anything. She
2 doesn't...

3 CHAIRMAN SEARLE: All right. With that said, is
4 there any opposition to the motion? Hearing no opposition.

5 All those in favor say aye.

6 BOARD MEMBERS: Aye.

7 CHAIRMAN SEARLE: Chair votes aye, and the
8 Arizona SMART Fund application for the Town of Taylor for 1.150
9 is approved.

10 Now let's deal with Casa Grande. Mr. Maxwell.

11 MR. MAXWELL: Mr. Chair, I appreciate you
12 separating these, because Casa Grande (inaudible) definitely
13 worthy of discussion. I think it's a great project. I think
14 it's a great piece of the SMART Fund. With the new program
15 changes coming, we going to have opportunities to -- we've
16 already kind of mentioned it today, redistribute some of the
17 money from some of the different categories. So I -- my
18 question was really one for staff, and that is how much trouble
19 are we in if we were to approve one that would overspend in one
20 category if we even do that, and is there a time limit on this
21 Casa Grande (inaudible) would be better off having them delay it
22 so that they don't -- we don't get into them having to re-apply,
23 just delay it until we get --

24 CHAIRMAN SEARLE: Funding?

25 MR. MAXWELL: The funding -- get the rules in

1 place that allow us to be (inaudible) we talked about it
2 (inaudible) where we just did an equal percentage to all the
3 categories. There were some, the munis over 10 is the one that
4 was going fastest. (Inaudible) with needs that are mostly in
5 need of these funds. So I just -- I just -- that's the question
6 I have for you, Floyd, is can we approve it --

7 (Speaking simultaneously.)

8 MR. MAXWELL: -- go negative, or does that --
9 because we know we've got the funds overall. We just don't have
10 them in those categories, or do we need to wait until we can
11 reappropriate it?

12 MS. MERRICK: My understanding is the answer is
13 no, you can't spend into the other pots of money under the old
14 program. And I would like to remind everybody that the City of
15 Casa Grande is okay with the reduced amount.

16 CHAIRMAN SEARLE: They're aware of the funding
17 challenges.

18 MS. MERRICK: Correct. Yes.

19 MR. ROEHRICH: So, Mr. Chairman, (inaudible) what
20 Lisa just said to me is the statute allows (inaudible) does
21 allow them to re-apply, but given the time frame, if you approve
22 the 1.13 million today that's available and they want to
23 re-apply again, it's going to be -- have to be when there's
24 funds in that pot and under the new program, because we will be
25 changing over to the new program because of the statute sometime

1 probably in October like (inaudible) when we present it to you.
2 So it might change just a little bit, but there's nothing
3 precluding them from asking again in the future.

4 CHAIRMAN SEARLE: So the -- really, the way I
5 understand the issue right now is -- and for the question
6 whether this should be delayed, if they delay it, they're making
7 more funds, but they may have to jump through more hoops. So
8 that might be a --

9 MR. ROEHRICH: And, Mr. Chairman, the other point
10 to make is delaying it -- they need to get their application in.
11 They will use this as the match now. They'll figure out how the
12 rest of the money is, which probably means they're going to have
13 to come up with the funds, but that they can ask to get
14 reimbursed in the future and come back for those funds. I think
15 delaying action on this may impact their ability to submit their
16 grant application.

17 CHAIRMAN SEARLE: I think that answers the
18 question.

19 All right. So do I have a motion for this yet?
20 I would entertain a motion.

21 MS. HOWARD: Mr. Chair, I'll move that we approve
22 the grant application for Casa Grande in the amount of
23 \$1,113,613.

24 CHAIRMAN SEARLE: All right. Thank you,
25 Ms. Howard. I have a motion from Ms. Howard. And do I have a

1 second?

2 MS. PESHAKAI: I second that, Mr. Chair.

3 CHAIRMAN SEARLE: All right. I have a second by
4 Ms. Peshlakai to approve the Arizona SMART Fund application for
5 the City of Casa Grande in the amount of \$1,113,613.

6 All right. If there's no other discussion, all
7 those in -- is there any opposition to the motion? Hearing no
8 opposition.

9 All those in favor say aye.

10 BOARD MEMBERS: Aye.

11 CHAIRMAN SEARLE: Chair votes aye. Item passes
12 unanimously.

13 All right.

14 MS. MERRICK: Thank you,

15 CHAIRMAN SEARLE: Thank you, Ms. Merrick.

16 We'll see if you make next month's meeting --

17 MS. MERRICK: It's been lively one, and I
18 appreciate it. Thank you.

19 CHAIRMAN SEARLE: Let's move to Item Number 8,
20 Mr. Byres. Our state engineer's report.

21 MR. BYRES: Thank you Mr. Chairman, Board
22 Members. To start off, Item Number 8, we have 96 projects under
23 construction worth \$2.4 billion. Twelve of those projects have
24 been finalized in August, worth 43.1 million. Fiscal year to
25 date, we have 24 projects that have been finalized, and we'll

1 kind of go through what we've got for projects across the state.

2 We'll start with Southcentral District, and since
3 we are in the Southcentral District and I'm going to talk about
4 Southcentral District, I'd like to introduce you to the new
5 district administrator for Southcentral District, Anthony
6 Casselman is here, if you want stand up and introduce yourself.

7 MR. ROEHRICH: So you will be going back and
8 forth for the legislative report as well? (Inaudible.)

9 MR. CASSELMAN: To be fair, probably we could
10 give a legislative, but I won't. Yeah. Mr. Chairman, Board
11 Members, most of you already know me. Anthony Casselman,
12 previously of the ADOT Government Relations office. Just
13 started this week on Monday as the district administrator for
14 the Southcentral District. Excited to be working with you in a
15 different capacity. So thank you.

16 CHAIRMAN SEARLE: All right. And I'm glad you
17 brought Jeremy with you, so -- in case there's any questions.

18 MR. BYRES: So --

19 MR. ROEHRICH: You've done an admirable job as
20 you've looked to (inaudible). So thank you, Jeremy. Admirable
21 (inaudible).

22 MR. BYRES: So in Southcentral District, we've
23 got several projects. We've got a project on SR-87 and Skousen.
24 That's a new traffic signal. That is currently ongoing into
25 construction. We have the I-10 widening, Ina to Ruthrauff.

1 That is also under construction. It's about 60 percent complete
2 to date. We have the I-10, Country Club to Kino. That's a
3 design-build project. That is just now getting going into the
4 design portion. We also have I-19 at Irvington TI, which is in
5 final design at this time.

6 CHAIRMAN SEARLE: Mr. Byres, before we go --
7 leave the district, and Mr. Moore is here, can you give a update
8 on that bridge at Saint David? It's seems to be taking a lot
9 longer than initially thought.

10 MR. BYRES: Do you want to give an update on
11 that?

12 MR. MOORE: Mr. Chair, members of the Board, so
13 yes. We -- you know, we've had some hiccups and some challenges
14 on that project. We're working with the contractor to navigate
15 those challenges, and we'll hopefully have that thing open by
16 November.

17 CHAIRMAN SEARLE: We're now looking at November?

18 MR. MOORE: That is correct.

19 CHAIRMAN SEARLE: All right.

20 MR. MOORE: So that is -- that's what their
21 schedule shows, and we should have it done by then.

22 CHAIRMAN SEARLE: All right. Thank you.

23 MR. MOORE: Uh-huh.

24 MR. BYRES: So the next district we have is
25 Northcentral District. Several projects going on there. We

1 have the US-89 and North Lake Powell Boulevard roundabout. That
2 construction will start in about the next couple of months or so
3 with completion scheduled for 2025. We have SR-89A
4 erosion/sediment control. This project is repairing and
5 improving drainage facilities, and we're looking at having it
6 completed later on this fall. We also have the SR-260 shoulder
7 widening, which is Rim to Gibson Road. The project's
8 approximately 60 percent complete to date.

9 The next one is the Southwest District. For it
10 we've got a multitude of projects. I'm just going to go through
11 a few of them. We have several I-10 pavement pres. projects
12 that are either in construction or getting ready to kick off.
13 We have the US-60 Vicksburg SR-72, which is a pavement
14 preservation project as well. It's about 88 percent complete.
15 Getting close. We also have a pavement preservation project on
16 I-8. That project is about 95 percent complete. It's getting
17 ready to just wrap up. We also have another project on US-95,
18 which is the Aberdeen to Castle Dome Mine Road, which is a
19 pavement preservation project. They're just kind of getting
20 going on it. They're about 20 percent complete to date. Those
21 are the major projects that we have there.

22 Next one is the Southeast District. This one
23 we've got a couple different projects. We have the Pinal Creek
24 Bridge and Cottonwood Street in the city of Globe. This project
25 is currently about 87 percent complete. We also have the Reay

1 Lane, 8th Street pavement preservation project. That project is
2 currently in the design process. We also have the Armory Road
3 to US-70, which is a pavement preservation project that just
4 kicked off here not too long ago. It's about 8 percent
5 complete.

6 The next one we have is the Northwest District
7 with a couple -- three different projects on it. The big one is
8 the West Kingman TI. On that one, they're actually at the point
9 of doing quite a bit of rock removal, as well as working on some
10 of the shafts and piers for some of the bridges. We also have
11 Needle Mountain TI, Lake Havasu TI, which is a pavement rehab
12 project. On that one they're just getting ready to pave some of
13 the crossovers. And Centennial Wash Bridge, the drill shaft
14 piers are completed, getting ready to do the columns on that
15 project.

16 Northeast District, we have the Coyote Wash
17 Bridge. That project is about 70 percent complete. We also
18 have the Pinta to McCarrel pavement preservation project. That
19 project is about 35 percent complete. We also have the SR-347
20 project, Taylor to Rodeo Road in Snowflake. On that project,
21 the scope of the project is still being determined. Right now
22 the installation of curtain -- sidewalk as well as some
23 northbound lanes and some sidewalk that are going to be done.
24 Groundbreaking was actually intended for this past week, so I
25 guess it just kicked off. So US-191, the Little Colorado Bridge

1 to Cemetery Road is also getting ready to finish up some paving.
2 They were supposed to be paving all this past week to try and
3 get the majority of that done.

4 In the Central District, we have a multitude of
5 projects. On I-17, we have the diamond grinding and deck joint
6 replacements. That project's about 25 percent complete. That's
7 a project that has had the weekend closures, for anyone that's
8 wondering about that one. SR-101, the Pima freeway, we're
9 looking at that one is -- it's going -- it's going to have some
10 long-term ramp closures on it. What we're doing is converting
11 the configuration of bridge and some other work on that project.
12 The SR-101 Agua Fria, the partnering and preconstruction meeting
13 has been scheduled for that to get ready to kick that project
14 off.

15 SR-303, US-60, work's complete at the top of the
16 northbound off ramp, and they're widening at the bottom. That
17 one's to increase capacity coming off of the 303 onto the 60.
18 The SR-202, that one at this point in time, they're doing the
19 friction course removal and work zone has been set. So they're
20 getting ready to start doing some -- a multitude of work on that
21 project.

22 The US-60X work is ongoing with the median,
23 signal lighting work is starting. Box culvert construction is
24 also started on that project. And then the I-10 Gila River
25 Bridge is under the -- we're finishing up the last of the data

1 recovery as well as working on the abutments and the piers for
2 that project as well.

3 So that is pretty much all the items that we have
4 for Item 8.

5 CHAIRMAN SEARLE: Before -- okay. Any questions
6 for Mr. Byres on his construction report? Ms. Daniels?
7 Ms. Howard? Mr. Meck? All right.

8 MR. BYRES: So we'll go ahead and go on with
9 Item 9, new construction contracts. You can see here from the
10 list we've got several to go through today, but we had several
11 on the consent agenda as well, and so thank you very much for
12 approval of the consent agenda.

13 To date, we're -- this is -- we're looking at
14 about 24 percent over what we were looking for. That's into the
15 contingencies. The big kicker that we're going be making up for
16 the rest of the year was the Kino project. That was that 32
17 percent over. So it will take us a little while to kind of get
18 that zeroed out, but hopefully we can.

19 So we have Item 9A for it. This is the climbing
20 lane on I-10, SR-90. The -- for this one, we had three bidders.
21 The low bid was \$2,074,914. The State's estimate was
22 \$2,524,175, a difference of \$449,260, or 17.8 percent under the
23 engineer's estimate.

24 One of the biggest things that we saw on this one
25 was the contractor is going to be able to utilize his own

1 equipment and so forth for the project. Also, he has a project
2 nearby on this one, so his mobilization was very low. One of
3 the other things we saw was the cost for excavation and grading
4 was much lower than what we had anticipated for production
5 rates. Also, the cost of asphalt was a little bit lower as
6 they're planning on doing recycled asphalt into their mix
7 design.

8 After analysis of the low bid, it was determined
9 to be a responsive and responsible bid, and we recommend award
10 to FNF Construction, Inc.

11 CHAIRMAN SEARLE: If the Board would allow me,
12 this is my district, and this is a project that I've been
13 bird-dogging for the last five years. And actually, it's been
14 needed for about 20 years, and so it's really good to see it.
15 So I'm going to make a motion to approve Item 9A to FNF
16 Construction as presented.

17 MR. ELTERS: Second.

18 CHAIRMAN SEARLE: And, Mr. Elters, thank you for
19 the second.

20 And with that, is there any opposition to the
21 motion? Hearing no opposition.

22 All those in favor say aye.

23 BOARD MEMBERS: Aye.

24 CHAIRMAN SEARLE: Chair votes aye. Item passes
25 unanimously.

1 MR. BYRES: The next item we have is Item 9B.
2 This is a lighting and sidewalk project. We had one bidder on
3 this project. The low bid was \$1,751,516. The State's estimate
4 was \$1,554,188, a difference of \$197,328 over the engineer's
5 statement, or 12.7 percent.

6 One of the biggest items that we had on this was
7 the cost of the conduit pull boxes was more than what we had
8 estimated. The other item is that the production rates on this
9 project are much lower than what we had anticipated, and
10 consequently, traffic control is going to have to be in place
11 for a little bit longer than what we had anticipated, driving
12 the cost up slightly.

13 So after analysis of the low bid, the bid was
14 determined to be responsive and responsible, and we recommend
15 award to Show Low Construction, Inc.

16 CHAIRMAN SEARLE: Okay. Any questions on this
17 item?

18 MR. MAXWELL: Mr. Chair, I got one question.

19 CHAIRMAN SEARLE: Mr. Maxwell, a question.

20 MR. MAXWELL: Thank you, Mr. Chair. It's my
21 usual question on a situation like this. One bidder. Any idea
22 why we only have one person? Is it the location?

23 MR. BYRES: This is a fairly remote area, and it
24 seems to be a trend when we're doing lighting and sidewalk work
25 to not attract a lot of bidders.

1 MR. MAXWELL: All right. Thank you. Thank you,
2 Mr. Chair.

3 CHAIRMAN SEARLE: A motion?

4 MS. PESHAKAI: Yes. Thank you, Mr. Chair. I
5 move that we approve the contract.

6 CHAIRMAN SEARLE: 9B to Show Low Construction.

7 MS. PESHAKAI: 9B to Show Low Construction.

8 CHAIRMAN SEARLE: As presented. Thank you. I
9 have a motion by Ms. Peshlakai.

10 MS. PESHAKAI: Thank you, Mr. Chair.

11 CHAIRMAN SEARLE: A second? It was your
12 district. I thought you ought to be able to (inaudible.)

13 MS. PESHAKAI: Thank you.

14 MR. ELTERS: I'll second it.

15 CHAIRMAN SEARLE: Mr. Elters, thank you for the
16 second. Is there any questions? Ms. Daniels? Ms. Howard?
17 Mr. Meck?

18 MR. MECK: No questions.

19 CHAIRMAN SEARLE: All right. With that, is there
20 any opposition to the motion? Hearing no opposition.

21 All those in favor say aye.

22 BOARD MEMBERS: Aye.

23 CHAIRMAN SEARLE: The chair votes aye. Item 9B
24 passes unanimously.

25 MR. BYRES: Thank you.

1 We'll go on to Item 9C. This is a pavement
2 rehabilitation project on SR-86. For this project we had four
3 bidders. The low bid was \$8,888,889. The State's estimate was
4 \$13,699,808, a difference of \$4,810,919, or 35.1 percent under
5 the engineer's estimate.

6 One of the biggest changes that we saw on this
7 was the cost of the roadway grading. We were originally
8 proposing or had estimated that quite a bit of excess material
9 would be generated with this project. The contractor has said
10 that they can utilize that material, and so consequently, the
11 haul is next to nothing for them for this project. So there's a
12 tremendous savings in that. The other thing is, is they will be
13 using their own equipment and their own plant for the work that
14 is being utilized for the project.

15 After review and analysis of the low bid, it was
16 determined to be a responsive and responsible bid, and we
17 recommend award to Fisher Sand & Gravel Company.

18 MR. MAXWELL: Mr. Chair.

19 CHAIRMAN SEARLE: I believe this is your
20 district, Mr. Maxwell.

21 MR. MAXWELL: It is, and since we've been talking
22 about the (inaudible) of money that we were going to need, this
23 gives us an opportunity in District 2 to get back some of that
24 (inaudible) with this bid. So I move that we approve Item 9C
25 and award the contract to Fisher Sand & Gravel.

1 CHAIRMAN SEARLE: All right. I have a motion by
2 Mr. Maxwell. And a second, please?

3 MS. PESHLAKAI: I second that motion.

4 CHAIRMAN SEARLE: All right. I have a second
5 from Ms. Peshlakai. Is there any other questions or comments
6 before I call for the vote? Hearing none.

7 Is there any opposition to the motion? Hearing
8 no opposition.

9 All those in favor say aye.

10 BOARD MEMBERS: Aye.

11 CHAIRMAN SEARLE: The chair votes aye. Item 9C
12 passes unanimously.

13 9D, Mr. Byres.

14 MR. BYRES: So Item 9D is rumble strips on SR-89.
15 We had one bidder on this project. The low bid was \$384,444.
16 The State's estimate was \$292,495, a difference of \$91,950, or
17 31.4 percent over the engineer's estimate.

18 One of the biggest items that we had seen on this
19 is the cost for mobilization as well as per diem for the workers
20 during the course of the project. This is in a very remote
21 area, and so consequently, bringing in the equipment and the
22 personnel were going to cost a little bit more than what we had
23 determined.

24 With the analysis of the low bid, it was
25 determined to be a responsive and responsible bid, and we

1 recommend award to Hawk Contracting, Inc. -- LLC.

2 CHAIRMAN SEARLE: All right. Any questions?

3 Hearing no questions.

4 Is there a motion to award Item 9D to Hawk
5 Contracting, LLC?

6 MR. ELTERS: Mr. Chairman, I move to award
7 Item 9D to Hawk Contracting, LLC.

8 CHAIRMAN SEARLE: I have a motion by Mr. Elters.
9 Is there a second?

10 MS. PESHAKAI: I second, Mr. Chair.

11 CHAIRMAN SEARLE: A second by Ms. Peshlakai. If
12 there's no other discussion, is there any opposition to the
13 motion? Hearing no opposition.

14 All those in favor say aye.

15 BOARD MEMBERS: Aye.

16 CHAIRMAN SEARLE: Chair votes aye. Item 9D
17 passes unanimously.

18 MR. BYRES: Item 9E is our next one. This is a
19 left turn lane on SR-89. For this project, we had three
20 bidders. The low bid was \$1,141,059. The State's estimate was
21 \$1,576,509, a difference of \$435,450, or 27.6 percent under the
22 engineer's estimate.

23 For this one, what we saw was a reduced price in
24 both the aggregate base and the asphalt as well as the friction
25 course for the project. That was pretty much the largest

1 difference. The low bidder has their own pit and -- or will be
2 hauling waste as well as the product at basically half the rate
3 of what we were looking at.

4 The -- after analysis of the low bid, the bid was
5 determined to be responsive and responsible, and we recommend
6 award to Asphalt Paving & Supply, Inc.

7 CHAIRMAN SEARLE: All right. Do I have any
8 discussion or any questions on the Item 9E? Hearing none.

9 I would entertain a motion.

10 MR. ELTERS: Mr. Chairman.

11 CHAIRMAN SEARLE: Mr. Elters.

12 MR. ELTERS: I move to award Item 9E to Asphalt
13 Paving & Supply, Inc.

14 MR. MAXWELL: Second.

15 CHAIRMAN SEARLE: I have a motion by Mr. Elters
16 and a second by Mr. Maxwell. If there's no other discussion or
17 questions, is there any opposition to the motion? Hearing no
18 opposition.

19 All those in favor say aye.

20 BOARD MEMBERS: Aye.

21 CHAIRMAN SEARLE: Chair votes aye. Item 9E
22 passes unanimously.

23 MR. BYRES: Next item is Item 9F. This is
24 putting in barrier protection at our port of entries. For this
25 we had two bidders. The low bid was \$3,377,733. The State's

1 estimate was \$1,870,570, a difference of \$1,507,163, or 80.6
2 percent over the engineer's estimate.

3 This project is considerably different than a lot
4 of other projects that we do. One is it is spread all over the
5 state with five different locations. This is also a different
6 kind of work as what we're doing is putting in barrier walls
7 within the existing ports of entry to help protect the
8 facilities that we have there. That's not something our
9 engineers normally do or estimate. So the mobilization costs as
10 well as the materials costs at the different areas were
11 considerably different than what we had seen. And to be
12 perfectly honest with you, I was really glad to see that we at
13 least had two bidders for this project.

14 After review and analysis of the low bid, the bid
15 was determined to be responsive and responsible, and we
16 recommend award to Hawk Contracting, LLC.

17 CHAIRMAN SEARLE: And this project is basically
18 to keep people from driving into our structures.

19 MR. BYRES: If a truck loses their brakes on this
20 way in to a port, this would give a barrier before it impacted
21 any of our buildings or facilities where we have personnel.

22 CHAIRMAN SEARLE: And I think that has happened.

23 MR. BYRES: Yes, it has.

24 CHAIRMAN SEARLE: Okay. Any questions or
25 comments or Item 9F?

1 I would entertain a motion.

2 MR. ELTERS: Mr. Chairman.

3 CHAIRMAN SEARLE: Thank you, Mr. Elters, for
4 standing up and carrying the weight on these this morning. I
5 appreciate it.

6 MR. ELTERS: (Inaudible) when I saw 80 percent
7 over estimate initially, it caught my eye, but hearing Greg
8 explain the reasons and looking at the map to see where these
9 five ports of entries are located and how they're scattered
10 across the state and the (inaudible) of this project, that is
11 understandable. So with that said, I move to award 9F to Hawk
12 Contracting, LLC.

13 CHAIRMAN SEARLE: Can I have a second?

14 MS. PESHAKAI: Mr. Chair, I second.

15 CHAIRMAN SEARLE: I have a second by
16 Ms. Peshlakai.

17 And I understand with this additional work on our
18 ports, I know there's been discussion about at the Sanders port,
19 and this gives us another reason to stay at Sanders, I guess.

20 MR. BYRES: It does. This actually kind of moves
21 us in that direction.

22 CHAIRMAN SEARLE: Yeah. All right. So very
23 good. If there's no other discussion or questions --

24 MR. MAXWELL: Mr. Chair, just a quick comment.

25 CHAIRMAN SEARLE: Okay.

1 MR. MAXWELL: Yeah. This is why I appreciate --
2 I'm glad you were grateful there was at least two bidders,
3 because both bidders were in relatively the same range. I mean,
4 it was -- one was obviously much higher -- not much, but higher
5 than the -- still in the same -- same first number --

6 MR. BYRES: Yeah.

7 MR. MAXWELL: -- which is good to see, and that's
8 the challenge I think we've got is when we see a single bidder,
9 sometimes it's rough to know, you know, are we getting fleeced
10 or is this (inaudible), but both of these were in the same
11 window, so I appreciate, you know, the department continuing to
12 strive and work on -- to really encourage bidding, and it's
13 predominantly in the remote areas that we run into problems.

14 CHAIRMAN SEARLE: All right. I do have a motion,
15 and I do have a second. If there's no other discussion or
16 questions, is there any opposition to the motion? Hearing no
17 opposition.

18 All those in favor say aye.

19 BOARD MEMBERS: Aye.

20 CHAIRMAN SEARLE: Chair votes aye. Sounds like
21 it's unanimous.

22 We'll now move on to Item 9G.

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

24 9G is an item for installing solar lightning in
25 the town of Eagar. We had five bidders on this project. The

1 low bid was \$824,481. The State's estimate was \$1,410,110, a
2 difference of \$585,629, or 41.5 percent under the engineer's
3 estimate.

4 After reviewing the five bids, what we found was
5 there was a -- we were overly conservative on our -- what we saw
6 for the installation, specifically parts of the -- I'll do this.
7 The low bidder indicated the cost of the item is significantly
8 lower than the State's estimate on several of the combination
9 units that we -- are specified.

10 And as such, after review of the analysis and of
11 the low bid, the bid is determined to be responsive and
12 responsible, and we recommend award to Show Low Construction,
13 Inc.

14 CHAIRMAN SEARLE: All right. This is the second
15 contractor, Show Low Construction. All right. Any questions
16 from Mr. Byres on this item? Hearing none.

17 Mr. Elters, would you like to give me a motion
18 here?

19 MR. ELTERS: I will -- I'll defer to
20 Ms. Peshlakai.

21 MS. PESHAKAI: Thank you --

22 CHAIRMAN SEARLE: All right.

23 MS. PESHAKAI: -- Mr. Chairman and Member
24 Elters.

25 Mr. Chair, I move that the Item 9G that we

1 approve the contract to --

2 CHAIRMAN SEARLE: Show Low Construction.

3 MS. PESHAKAI: -- Show Low Construction.

4 MR. ELTERS: I second.

5 CHAIRMAN SEARLE: All right. I have a motion by
6 Ms. Peshlakai and a second by Mr. Elters. And if there is no
7 other discussion or questions, is there any opposition to the
8 motion? Hearing no opposition.

9 All those in favor say aye.

10 BOARD MEMBERS: Aye.

11 CHAIRMAN SEARLE: Chair votes aye. And Item 9G
12 is unanimous.

13 Before we go to the next item, Mr. Byres just a
14 reminder, we'll need to go back and look at Item 3H before we're
15 done.

16 MR. BYRES: Okay.

17 CHAIRMAN SEARLE: I have that on my agenda here.
18 So let -- we can finish --

19 MR. BYRES: We'll finish these up.

20 CHAIRMAN SEARLE: -- these items. I just -- make
21 sure we do the --

22 MR. ROEHRICH: I was waiting -- I was waiting to
23 get -- do 9, and then we'll get the one that was pulled out of
24 consent.

25 CHAIRMAN SEARLE: Yeah. All right.

1 MR. BYRES: So Item 9H is a multi use path in the
2 city of Peoria. We had five bidders on this project. The low
3 bid is \$3,667,000. The State's estimate was \$3,241,917, a
4 difference of \$425,083, or 13.1 percent over the engineer's
5 estimate.

6 The biggest item that we saw on this was there is
7 a steel truss bridge that is part of this, and the cost of that
8 prefabricated bridge came in at twice what we had estimated,
9 which makes up for almost the exact amount that it's over.

10 So -- but after looking at it and seeing that we
11 had five bidders that were relatively close, we did find the bid
12 to be responsive and responsible, and we recommend award to J.
13 Banicki Construction, Inc.

14 CHAIRMAN SEARLE: All right. Any questions for
15 Mr. Byres on this project? Hearing no questions.

16 Ms. Daniels, would you like to make a motion on
17 this item?

18 VICE CHAIR DANIELS: So moved.

19 CHAIRMAN SEARLE: All right. Thank you. I have
20 a motion by Ms. Daniels to approve to award 9H to J. Banicki
21 Construction, Inc., as presented. Can I have a second?

22 Mr. Meck, would you like to second this item?

23 MR. MECK: Jackie Meck. Second.

24 CHAIRMAN SEARLE: All right. Thank you. I have
25 a motion by Ms. Daniels and a second by Mr. Meck.

1 If there's no other questions or discussion, is
2 there any opposition to the motion? Hearing no opposition.

3 All those -- all members in favor say aye.

4 BOARD MEMBERS: Aye.

5 CHAIRMAN SEARLE: Chair votes aye. 9H passes
6 unanimately.

7 MR. BYRES: So the next item we have is Item 9I.
8 This is a broadband installation on I-40 from the California
9 state line to Flagstaff. On this particular one, it's a little
10 bit different. We have a operator developer that is in --
11 running our broadband. As a part of that contract, they have a
12 construction clause as well that they can -- we can ask them to
13 give us a cost for construction. If we don't agree with it, if
14 it's excessive or anything, we can put it out for bid.

15 We asked them to do that on this particular
16 project. They gave us a cost. It was much higher than what we
17 had expected it to be. They went back, looked at their costs
18 again. They dropped it down, brought it well within the 10
19 percent that we were looking for.

20 So consequently, we're -- we went with this
21 rather than putting it out for an open bid. One of the biggest
22 reasons for that is because we wanted to maintain the continuity
23 between the construction and the operation for this facility.
24 So that's kind of the background of where this is coming from.

25 So in this particular case, it's not necessarily

1 a bid. It was a negotiated cost that we did come up with for
2 this. So the target that we had placed initially before we did
3 anything was that 10 percent. If it was over that 10 percent,
4 we were going to put it out for bid -- an open bid. They did
5 drop it within that 7.7 percent.

6 CHAIRMAN SEARLE: And if I can, this is 100
7 percent (inaudible); is that correct?

8 MR. BYRES: That's correct. So -- and the
9 operator and developer for this is eX². So we are asking just
10 for an award for this, and that is the recommendation for our
11 award.

12 CHAIRMAN SEARLE: Thank you, Mr. Byres.

13 Any questions from Mr. Byres on this particular
14 item? Hearing none.

15 I would entertain a motion to award Item 9I to
16 eX².

17 MS. PESHAKAI: Mr. Chair.

18 CHAIRMAN SEARLE: Yes.

19 MS. PESHAKAI: I move that we approve Item 9I to
20 be award to eX --

21 CHAIRMAN SEARLE: Squared.

22 MS. PESHAKAI: Squared.

23 CHAIRMAN SEARLE: I guess that's how they
24 pronounce that.

25 MR. BYRES: Yeah.

1 MS. PESHAKAI: Thank you, Mr. Chair.

2 CHAIRMAN SEARLE: All right. Ms. Peshlakai,
3 thank you. And a second?

4 MR. MAXWELL: Second.

5 CHAIRMAN SEARLE: Mr. Maxwell, thank you for
6 waking up. Appreciate that.

7 Okay. So I have a motion by Ms. Peshlakai and a
8 second by Mr. Maxwell. If there's no other discussion or
9 questions, is there any opposition to the motion? Hearing no
10 opposition.

11 All those in favor say aye.

12 BOARD MEMBERS: Aye.

13 CHAIRMAN SEARLE: Chair votes aye. Item 9I
14 passes unanimously.

15 MR. BYRES: So the next item --

16 CHAIRMAN SEARLE: Is there a 9J?

17 MR. ROEHRICH: Yes.

18 MR. BYRES: Yes. The next item we have is --

19 MR. ROEHRICH: Item 9J was added by --

20 CHAIRMAN SEARLE: I was going to go back to --

21 MR. MAXWELL: That was going to be 9J.

22 CHAIRMAN SEARLE: Oh, we do have 9J. Okay.

23 MR. BYRES: Yes.

24 CHAIRMAN SEARLE: That's -- this is the
25 amendment, correct? Okay.

1 MR. BYRES: Correct. This was 3H. So on the
2 original.

3 MR. MAXWELL: No, this was (inaudible).

4 MR. ROEHRICH: No. This was -- 3H is a
5 separate --

6 MR. BYRES: I'm sorry. I'm sorry. 3H is a
7 different one. You're right.

8 MR. ROEHRICH: Yeah. You still have to go back
9 and do 3H. It was earlier in your presentation.

10 MR. BYRES: Okay.

11 MR. ROEHRICH: 3J is a completely separate
12 project.

13 MR. BYRES: You're right.

14 MR. ROEHRICH: They're both in the city of
15 Phoenix --

16 MR. BYRES: Yep. So --

17 MR. ROEHRICH: But 9J is a separate project.

18 MR. BYRES: Correct. So --

19 CHAIRMAN SEARLE: This was -- this was a part of
20 the amended agenda?

21 MR. ROEHRICH: Yes, sir. It was, along with
22 moving the other one out of the consent.

23 CHAIRMAN SEARLE: Correct. Are we all on the
24 same page now, Mr. Byres?

25 MR. BYRES: We are now.

1 So this is a new traffic interchange on I-40,
2 Rancho Sante Fe. For this we had five bidders. The low bid was
3 \$43,950,205. The State's estimate was \$39,463,099, a difference
4 of \$4,487,106, or 11.4 percent over the engineer's estimate.

5 One of the biggest items that we saw on this was
6 excavation, which is basically about a \$2 million difference
7 that we had seen just in the production rates alone because of
8 the configuration of the project itself. We also saw,
9 basically, a lot of double hauling in this particular case in
10 order to construct the bridge or the entire interchange itself.
11 There was also costs of the Portland cement concrete paving were
12 much higher than we had anticipated. Also some of -- some much
13 lower production rates in both the paving. The traffic control
14 also extends because of the lower production rates.

15 But after reviewing everything, particularly
16 reviewing the low bid, the bid was responsive and responsible,
17 and we recommend award to Pulice Construction, Inc.

18 CHAIRMAN SEARLE: Mr. Maxwell, I think they heard
19 about your savings on your project, but that's --

20 MR. MAXWELL: Yeah. Mr. Chair, you're absolutely
21 correct (inaudible) looking at the (inaudible) of this one, I
22 just think it's important for those who maybe don't go into that
23 kind of detail, this is what makes the bid -- the estimation
24 process so difficult, because there was five bids on this that
25 ranged basically just under 44 million to just over 58 million

1 on those bids. That's -- and that's a huge difference. So when
2 we give you a hard time about the estimating, it's not really,
3 you know, a criticism. We know it's a tough thing to estimate
4 properly, but it does bring up the idea of having contingency
5 funds available.

6 CHAIRMAN SEARLE: And, Mr. Elters, I think this
7 is your district. (Inaudible).

8 MR. ELTERS: Mr. Chairman, yes. And furthermore,
9 if you'd indulge me, (inaudible) and I were standing on I-40
10 near this location (inaudible) then State Transportation Board
11 at this project. We called it Rattlesnake TI at that time, and
12 it was (inaudible) a partnership between ADOT, the County and
13 the City of Kingman. And I told the Board then that was an
14 important project and it was needed. So it's ironic that more
15 than 20 years ago, and (inaudible) how long it takes (inaudible)
16 a project (inaudible).

17 I'm here recommending award of Item 9J to Pulice
18 Construction. It really does -- it's gives me an honor, and it
19 is rewarding to be sitting in this seat and recommending to the
20 Board.

21 And I will add one more thought. The funding for
22 this one is all city. So this additional amount is not
23 impacting the contingency for the State for ADOT (inaudible)
24 funding. So it ended up being funded by the City of Kingman as
25 opposed to (inaudible).

1 CHAIRMAN SEARLE: Thank you for that additional
2 information, and we've both got 20-year projects under there.

3 MR. MAXWELL: And with appreciation, I will
4 second that motion.

5 CHAIRMAN SEARLE: All right. A second by
6 Mr. Maxwell. Did you wake up? Very good.

7 All right. So -- all right. Is there any other
8 questions or comments on this particular item? Hearing none.

9 Is there any opposition to the motion? Hearing
10 no opposition.

11 All those in favor say aye.

12 BOARD MEMBERS: Aye.

13 CHAIRMAN SEARLE: Chair votes aye. Item 9J
14 passes unanimously.

15 Now let's go back to 3H.

16 MR. BYRES: So Item 3H are some street
17 improvements that we have for the city of Kingman. On this one,
18 unfortunately I don't have a whole lot of information. The low
19 bid was \$1,061,908. The State's estimate was \$1,006,481, a
20 difference of \$55,428, or 5.5 percent over the engineer's
21 estimate. And on this one, we are recommending award, not
22 postponement on this, if I'm correct.

23 CHAIRMAN SEARLE: Mr. Roehrich, do you want to
24 add on to this?

25 MR. ROEHRICH: Yeah. Mr. Chairman and Board

1 Members, this is the City -- again, a City of Kingman project.
2 At the time we put together the agenda and then opened the bids,
3 it was over the estimate. City of Kingman is going through
4 their process to determine that they have enough money to fund
5 the difference, because it is their project. Again, it's not
6 coming out of the program. It is a local government project.

7 Since the time we submitted the agenda and today,
8 they were able to find the funds. They were able to commit
9 those funds, and in fact, had provided those funds to the
10 department to cover this, which is why we're taking a
11 (inaudible) award if the project is ready to go, and it's fully
12 funded by the City.

13 CHAIRMAN SEARLE: Okay. We need to figure out
14 what Kingman's doing.

15 MR. MAXWELL: (Inaudible.)

16 MR. BYRES: It's their contractor.

17 MR. MAXWELL: I believe, Floyd, what you're
18 saying is the increase is fully funded by the City, because the
19 feds are paying 94.7 percent of this project.

20 MR. ROEHRICH: That is correct. Thank you for
21 the clarification. They have completely funded that.

22 CHAIRMAN SEARLE: All right. Very good. So any
23 other questions on this particular item?

24 All right. Mr. Elters would you like to make a
25 motion on this one?

1 MR. ELTERS: Mr. Chairman, that will be
2 delightful. I will be quiet at the next board meeting
3 (inaudible) today, but for now, I move to award Item 3H to as
4 recommended.

5 CHAIRMAN SEARLE: Do we have a -- do we -- we
6 don't have a contractor listed on this.

7 MR. BYRES: We're looking it up as we're
8 speaking.

9 MR. ROEHRICH: For clarity, we could just make
10 the motion to approve Item 3H as presented.

11 MR. BYRES: Yes.

12 MR. ROEHRICH: Well, the contractor will be as in
13 the bid documents.

14 CHAIRMAN SEARLE: Okay.

15 MR. BYRES: Per the low bidder.

16 CHAIRMAN SEARLE: Then if that's all right, I
17 have a motion to award Item 3H as presented by Mr. Elters, and I
18 have a second by Mr. Maxwell?

19 MR. MAXWELL: Second.

20 CHAIRMAN SEARLE: Yes. All right. If there's no
21 other questions or comments, is there any opposition to the
22 motion in front of us? Hearing no opposition.

23 All those in favor say aye.

24 BOARD MEMBERS: Aye.

25 CHAIRMAN SEARLE: Item 3H passes unanimously.

1 And I believe that is the end of our construction awards.

2 MR. BYRES: Yeah.

3 CHAIRMAN SEARLE: All right. Mr. Byres, thank
4 you for your help on this.

5 We'll move to Item Number 10. You know what,
6 should we take a -- do we want to take a quick break or do we
7 want to move on with Item 10? Item 10 is the state highway
8 route turnback process.

9 MR. ROEHRICH: Mr. Chair, that's your call.

10 CHAIRMAN SEARLE: All right. It's eleven
11 o'clock. If we could, let's move forward.

12 MR. BYRES: Okay. So I have -- Mr. Chairman, I
13 have a quick slideshow on this that I can go through, but I
14 would kind of like to know exactly what it is that you would
15 like to know about, because the presentation I have may not be
16 what you're looking for. So I can go through it, and then we
17 can kind of go from there if you'd like.

18 CHAIRMAN SEARLE: You know, I think the
19 discussion that we had here on the board, you know, we are
20 requested to take roads in. We have requests to take roads out.
21 We have challenges in maintaining what we have. So I think some
22 of the discussion is, is what should we be looking at as we look
23 at requests to bring roads into the system.

24 I think we should probably discuss how to
25 encourage local communities to take responsibility for some

1 roads that maybe we shouldn't be maintaining, and I think we
2 should also have the discussion as what happens to the point
3 when we can no longer afford to maintain everything that we
4 have. So it's kind of a broad spectrum look, and I think that
5 was my viewpoint as we brought this item forward.

6 MR. BYRES: So let me go through this slide deck,
7 because it's only six slides, but we have a 41-slide deck if
8 you'd like to go through it, but let's start with six.

9 CHAIRMAN SEARLE: Well, let's do that when
10 Ms. Daniels is chair.

11 MR. BYRES: So let's start off with transfers
12 from the state highway system to local roads or local systems.

13 Some of the reasons that we'd be transferring the
14 roads, the road serves primary local interests. The roadway
15 carries vehicles that are mostly local in nature. The roadway
16 function has changed and no longer provides higher capacity
17 continuity in the state highway system. A new highway bypass to
18 the city may be an -- or something has -- had occurred or is an
19 option, part of the state highway system, obviously for us to
20 turn it back, highway realignment leaves a remnant portion of
21 the state highway that is useful primarily for local access
22 only, or the highway no longer provides interstate, intrastate
23 or regional systems connectivity.

24 Probably the best --

25 CHAIRMAN SEARLE: Mr. Byres, on that -- on that

1 point.

2 MR. BYRES: Yes.

3 CHAIRMAN SEARLE: Those are all reasons why we
4 would do it. Is there any reason why the local communities
5 would want to do that?

6 MR. BYRES: So let me go to the next slide.

7 CHAIRMAN SEARLE: Okay.

8 MR. BYRES: So these are basically if we're going
9 to transfer from state to locals. So the other one was locals
10 to state. This is state to locals. There's -- this is
11 basically an outline of the policies that we have for being able
12 to do that.

13 One of the biggest obstacles in somebody trying
14 to turn a roadway over from their local system to the state
15 highway system is the requirement that we have for bringing
16 those roads up to a certain level so that the pavement surface
17 is usable and in a repairable condition so that no major
18 maintenance would be required for five years. So it's pretty
19 much basically have to completely resurface the roadway before
20 it gets turned over. That works both ways, whether we're giving
21 it to a local or a local's giving it to us. That's the way the
22 statute reads, but it does give options in there for some
23 negotiation.

24 One of the biggest options that we possibly have
25 that is the easiest for both the state to turn roads over or for

1 locals to turn roads over to the state is doing a trade. So if
2 we can do a swap for basically -- it doesn't necessarily have to
3 be the same lane miles, but it does have to be roughly, you
4 know, this -- within the realm of the same economic value.

5 So in so doing, that can be negotiated to the
6 point where it is a direct swap with no improvement to the
7 roadways or minimal improvement to the roadways, but that's a
8 negotiation that would occur between both. That negotiation
9 would have to be presented through the -- from the director,
10 through to the Board for approval before we could do anything.
11 That would -- this would -- is not a very simple process because
12 the right-of-ways have to be established. They have to be
13 surveyed. They have to be determined before either ones can go
14 back and forth, because this is basically a real estate trade as
15 well.

16 So there's a lot to it, but it's not on -- it's
17 not a -- something that we cannot do. Specifically, if a -- one
18 of the biggest reasons for doing these swaps in a lot of cases
19 is a roadway that at one point in time was a rural roadway has
20 now become an urbanized section due to the growth of the city or
21 a town or so forth. That is -- becomes very difficult for that
22 local community, because now the requirements that ADOT has to
23 maintain that road and in some cases maintain access along that
24 road becomes extremely cumbersome to that local community or
25 that local government. So there's a need to be able to swap

1 that over. Not only that, but that also becomes a burden on
2 ADOT, because generally, volumes increase. Now maintenance
3 comes up. Now there's a need for curb and gutter, sidewalk,
4 traffic signals, so forth. So that's the biggest reason for
5 ADOT to want to give that to local. Local has a lot of reasons
6 to want to accept that back into their system.

7 So that's probably the most common change that we
8 have, with the exception of one other common, and that is where
9 we have a very critical piece of infrastructure such as a port
10 of entry. I'm talking about Naco Highway where that is a fixed
11 port that has commercial traffic coming through it. It's coming
12 through a government-controlled port, going onto a county road,
13 which doesn't make a lot of sense, because it has to travel
14 through that county road to get to an interstate distribution
15 system. So in that case, that makes sense for that to also
16 become a state highway and potentially even -- might even become
17 part of the national highway system. So those are the two
18 primaries that we'd see for swaps or changes in ownership of
19 roadways.

20 CHAIRMAN SEARLE: Is there ways that -- you know,
21 you mentioned the urban -- the urbanization issue on some of
22 these highways, and is there -- and Ms. Daniels, I think you and
23 I had a conversation about this as well. Is there a way that we
24 can encourage some of this? Because, you know, the sidewalks
25 and the gutters and everything, these are normal issues that we

1 normally (inaudible) have to deal with without our highways, and
2 it adds additional expenses. Is there any reason? Is it just
3 policy that we take over these, or is there a liability issue
4 that we have to do this, or are we just being good neighbors
5 when we do this?

6 MR. BYRES: Well, in this particular case, we're
7 doing it two-fold. One is we're being good neighbors in trying
8 to turn those over, but the other thing is is that the more
9 urbanized that section becomes, the more expensive that section
10 becomes for maintenance, and not only that, but any kind of
11 improvements. So we only have X dollars to be able to spend on
12 our entire system. So if there's a roadway section that is an
13 extremely high maintenance that has a very high annual cost, if
14 there's a way that we can swap that out, we would certainly be
15 interested, especially if it will benefit the other party as
16 well.

17 CHAIRMAN SEARLE: Mr. Maxwell.

18 MR. MAXWELL: Mr. Chair, thank you. The Naco
19 Highway discussion when we were down in Cochise County, the
20 (inaudible) it's a very valid point coming out there. We're
21 expanding the operations down at the port, Douglas port.
22 There's going to be more traffic. It's going from (inaudible) a
23 federal point of entry (inaudible) federal government
24 (inaudible) then dropping it on a county highway that's now
25 going to get used hopefully -- hopefully for the community -- a

1 lot more. But we've seen (inaudible). We were talking about it
2 this morning, you know, meeting with the Town of Sahuarita. If
3 you look at the change in the quality of the roads, they've been
4 going down in the wrong direction, because it's due to lack of
5 funding as we take more roads on. We just can't continue
6 saying, oh, the State will take care of it, because we can't say
7 the feds will take care of it, because it's not happening.

8 And the farther you get away from the national
9 highway system, the roads go even worse on the slides we see
10 every -- you know, as we develop every five-year plan. But
11 (inaudible) 77, so when it comes in, you know, it's definitely a
12 state highway as it comes through (inaudible) and Safford and
13 works its way down, but then it takes (inaudible). And it's
14 still pretty barren up at the north, but as you get farther and
15 farther towards the city of Tucson, it becomes an urban road,
16 and that's what it is. It is -- and it's not a state highway --
17 it's definitely not fast. You know, once you hit Ina south, but
18 we can't just keep taking them on as a state because we're good
19 neighbors, because we don't have funds either.

20 So I think that's one of the reasons the chair
21 (inaudible) been asking about this one, because Naco Highway is
22 obviously an important thing there in consideration, but I guess
23 the question is I think we all kind of understand a lot of
24 rules, but what's the process to do? Do we have a process to
25 review while we go through -- how often do we review our state

1 highway system and see if all those highways still apply to be
2 on the state highway system, where they should go, and if
3 they're not under our purview, how do we -- I mean, no -- I
4 don't believe any cities (inaudible) say I wouldn't want to take
5 this road back from you. That's (inaudible).

6 CHAIRMAN SEARLE: (Inaudible.) That's true.
7 Bullhead City (inaudible).

8 MR. ELTERS: MR. Chairman.

9 MR. MAXWELL: Once again, Mr. Elters' district is
10 shining in this meeting.

11 MR. ELTERS: It's all (inaudible). Mr. Chairman,
12 thank you. (Inaudible.) I'm also aware of another example.
13 Bullhead City took back SR-95, and there was a reason for that.
14 Bullhead City wanted more flexibility related to access on that
15 corridor, wanted certain turn lanes and such, and it -- the
16 State has certain guidelines and criteria that became a
17 conflict, and ultimately, they said we'll take it back and we'll
18 have the flexibility to manage it as our needs dictate, which
19 made sense to them. And I think they received it (inaudible)
20 condition where it allows them a handful, if not ten years, to
21 plan ahead, because it will be a cost for them to maintain it
22 and operate it.

23 Kingman, on the other hand, is really not a whole
24 lot different, but -- outcome, but it was a different set of
25 conditions. I-40 (inaudible) years ago Andy Devine, which was

1 part of Route 66, was state highway, and at some point the City
2 of Kingman wanted to do certain things, wayfinding and put signs
3 up and to have more access, and the State could not accommodate
4 those requests, again consistent with state policies, and they
5 said, well, you know, we'll take it back. And they have, and as
6 they have had it for more than ten years, having worked for
7 them, and the State no longer has responsibility for it.

8 So with those two examples in mind and what we're
9 discussing here, I guess I would ask having heard Mr. Byres lay
10 out the statutes and the provisions, do we have an inventory of
11 what routes would be suitable with (inaudible) consider, and I
12 understand there might be some clear -- you know, based on the
13 two examples I gave, there might be some clear risk (inaudible)
14 and there might be some not so clear, some gray areas, but at
15 least we could start somewhere. And I don't know if we've --
16 you know, since the Board has requested this to be on the
17 agenda, I don't know if that exercise has been initiated or
18 (inaudible). Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

19 MR. BYRES: So Mr. --

20 CHAIRMAN SEARLE: What I might add to that is
21 it's not only the roads -- urban roads, but are there -- are
22 there rural roads that are more of a collector nature that maybe
23 should be considered to be turned over to counties or local
24 communities as well?

25 MS. PESHAKAI: Mr. Chair, I also have a

1 question.

2 CHAIRMAN SEARLE: Okay.

3 MS. PESHAKAI: Thank you, Mr. Chair.

4 Board, Mr. Byres, how would this impact roads on
5 tribal or federal areas, reserves? Would they not be considered
6 local, or because they're federal would they be considered
7 national? And I guess there would be differences between tribal
8 reservations and all that area.

9 I'm thinking specifically of one instance back in
10 2013 when there was a collapse of -- a catastrophic geological
11 collapse caused a failure in the rocks underneath Highway 89
12 going up to Page that caused the highway to collapse, and I'm
13 sure we're all old enough here to remember that if you were in
14 Arizona where they -- the Navajo Nation and the State
15 collaborated on turning a BIA or Navajo tribal route from a dirt
16 road into a paved road. And just to update folks now, it's been
17 11 years, and that highway is very much treated like the German
18 Autobahn. It's along this area, and there's -- that causes a
19 lot of problems because of our public safety and folks taking
20 shortcuts through there, but that's my question, Mr. Chair.

21 Thank you.

22 MR. BYRES: So, Mr. Chair, Board Members, on
23 tribal lands you basically have two different types of roads.
24 You have the tribal roadways themselves that the tribes actually
25 have, have obtained the right-of-way for those roadways, and

1 then we have BIA roads as well where BIA holds the right-of-way
2 for those roads.

3 For the tribal roads, that's something we can
4 work with on those. That's just a matter of us working through
5 the tribal communities to be able to do something. The BIA
6 roadways, on the other hand, that's a whole different animal.
7 That's -- now we're dealing with federal government. One of the
8 biggest issues that we have with dealing with any kind of rural
9 roadways more than anything else is where do you stop, and what
10 is going to be taken into our system? We have to have what's
11 called logical termini at either end of those roadways, and so,
12 you know, when you get out on a lot of these rural roads, you're
13 talking about a lot of miles before you have an intersection
14 that you can call a terminal -- or an end termini.

15 So that's part of the issues that we have. It
16 might only be a little piece that somebody wants to give up or
17 that we would like to give away, but we have to actually extend
18 that out so that you had had logical termini on either end. So
19 that's -- when we get into the rural roads, that's part of the
20 biggest issue that we have, so...

21 CHAIRMAN SEARLE: I guess your slide right now
22 goes a little bit to Mr. Elters' question there. There has been
23 some (inaudible) low volume routes.

24 MR. BYRES: Yeah. So we did this low volume
25 roadway study back in 2017 with the intention of, okay, on our

1 system currently, what would be the roadways that we could
2 possibly turn over to someone else? So the low volume study was
3 done specifically to look at where we had segments that would be
4 the highest candidates for a turnback. So with this, we had
5 several segments that were identified. I think there are 22
6 routes. We actually came up with seven segments that would be
7 considered -- or I'm sorry -- five segments with moderate
8 potential, ten segments with very high recommendations for
9 transfer, and seven segments that were considered the least
10 likely candidates for removal from the state system. But this
11 study was done. It still holds true today. These routes really
12 haven't changed a whole lot from 2017.

13 CHAIRMAN SEARLE: Has there been any success in
14 turning these over?

15 DR. BEYER: No, there has not.

16 CHAIRMAN SEARLE: Is there any way to incentivize
17 this turnover?

18 MR. BYRES: Yes, there is, and that would be
19 through -- but the best incentive that we could possibly do is
20 do a swap. That would be the best way for us to incentivize
21 being able to do it.

22 MR. MAXWELL: I had a question. Was there any
23 attempt to transfer this or was this the study and we put on it
24 the shelf and there's been no --

25 MR. BYRES: We actually publicized this when it

1 was -- when it first came out. Did we do, like, a, hey, this is
2 you know, roadway for sale kind of thing? We didn't do anything
3 like that, but we did kind of present it out to the public for
4 any kind of interest. There wasn't a lot of interest. And
5 admittedly, the ten routes that we picked are not something that
6 somebody would really want to go pick up, so...

7 CHAIRMAN SEARLE: I've got some questions
8 (inaudible) go through the slide.

9 MR. ELTERS: I didn't want to get ahead of Greg
10 if he's got more slides to cover, so...

11 MR. BYRES: No. I -- we actually have several
12 roadways that we -- that are not low volume roadways that would
13 probably make a whole lot of sense to get rid of, and I don't
14 mean get rid of them for the purposes of just so that we're not
15 maintaining them, but specifically just for the same reason that
16 you had given about -- up in -- up in your district where it's
17 an urbanized section. We're now having to enforce something
18 that is basically, for all intents and purposes, is for a rural
19 road. It doesn't apply to an urbanized section, but that's the
20 standard that we have.

21 CHAIRMAN SEARLE: You know, as a representative
22 for District 3, which is Santa Cruz, Cochise and Greenlee
23 Counties, and the majority of those are rural roads, and there's
24 I guess you could say an equity issue, you know, because our
25 transportation needs are just as much, but when you see the cost

1 of doing -- improving 77, you know, Oracle Highway, you know, it
2 costs ten times as much.

3 So yeah, I don't know the answer to it other than
4 to maybe increase the restrictions on urban roads so it makes it
5 more favorable for cities to look at. (Inaudible.) You know,
6 there's -- as we go forward (inaudible) some of the reason for
7 the discussion this morning is because, you know, for years and
8 years we keep on saying, well, what are we going to do when we
9 can't afford to maintain all the roads that we have? And that's
10 going to lead to one of my questions is, is there a way that --
11 can we abandon a road?

12 MR. BYRES: We can as long as there is -- there's
13 no beneficial use to the public for that roadway. I don't know
14 how you ever have a roadway that doesn't have a beneficial use,
15 so...

16 CHAIRMAN SEARLE: Do we have the same ability to
17 use the primitive road standard that counties can?

18 MR. BYRES: It's not written into the statutes
19 that we have --

20 CHAIRMAN SEARLE: Okay.

21 MR. BYRES: -- right now. So no.

22 MR. ELTERS: Mr. Chairman.

23 CHAIRMAN SEARLE: Mr. Elters.

24 MR. ELTERS: Building on what Board Member
25 Maxwell asked, which was, you know, was the study completed and

1 then was there something done with it, was there an attempt to
2 dispose or discharge some of these segments, and understanding
3 that perhaps it's been a while, I don't know what year the study
4 was done, instead of just discussing it and using it as
5 unfinished business, I wonder if the Board would be interested
6 in asking to have the study updated, refreshed perhaps, and then
7 maybe to take -- to make more of a conscientious effort to
8 identify segments where it would be a win-win.

9 It would be a win for the department to kind of
10 not be responsible and have jurisdiction over it and have a
11 local entity be interested in it, and while we -- you know, if
12 we succeed in one segment, it would be better than what we have
13 now. So I'm just wondering if the Board would be interested in
14 updating the study and then literally making an attempt to
15 transfer those segments that continue to hold a merit and valid
16 reason for consideration.

17 CHAIRMAN SEARLE: You know, I think -- I think
18 that's a good point, but to build on Mr. Byres' comment that
19 about the only way to do this is through a swap. We'd also have
20 to look at which roads that we might want to take in.

21 MR. ELTERS: Mr. Chairman, forgive me, but the
22 (inaudible) that we used as an example up in the northwest,
23 District 6, (inaudible) was a swap.

24 CHAIRMAN SEARLE: Correct.

25 MR. ELTERS: So there are opportunities where,

1 again, the local community will see value. And I'm not
2 advocating that we force anything on anybody, but if there is a
3 win-win situation where they can see benefit to themselves in
4 getting control over a segment of highway and meets the logical
5 termini criteria that Mr. Byres spoke of, it may be worthwhile.

6 MR. MAXWELL: Mr. Chair, to -- there's a
7 consideration talked about by the City of Tucson about the
8 Highway 77, because they were looking at it for a possibility of
9 a roadway into six lanes to incorporate perhaps a (inaudible)
10 transit system on, but as (inaudible) that local termini was one
11 of the issues that they then decided it wasn't -- they weren't
12 even going to consider, because they wanted to use it to -- in
13 this one specific segment, but the local termini continued on
14 I-10, and they didn't want any of that. Now, and at the time,
15 we had just done construction down there, so everything was in
16 this pristine, good possibility. It turned out to be one
17 they're taking on.

18 I would love to see this refreshed, but I'd also
19 like to see if -- at some point in the future if the department
20 could do it is to try to identify those state highways that are
21 now truly in urban areas, where they're not functioning as state
22 highways anymore, and yet we've still got responsibility at that
23 level (inaudible) purposes it's not serving what its original
24 intent was, because the community's grown around it.

25 I think those roads need to be identified. I'm

1 not saying the cities are going to, you know, say, okay, we'll
2 take it, but I think it starts the negotiation process on both
3 sides. In your district, there was very specific growth in the
4 planning needs that they wanted. So they were more than willing
5 to step up and do it, but now a lot of these are already all
6 grown out. There's -- you know, the challenge now is handling
7 the traffic (inaudible).

8 CHAIRMAN SEARLE: And I think in my perspective,
9 Mr. Elters, you're looking at more of the urban issues, and you
10 know, I'm looking at more some of the rural issues, and which
11 is -- that's where the swap situation probably makes more sense
12 than it does in the urban issue.

13 I think as -- you know, looking at the map there,
14 and I do hate to put this on Santa Cruz County, but we've got a
15 state highway that goes down from Sonoyta to Parker Canyon Lake,
16 and it's -- it really should be a Santa Cruz County road, and
17 now they're not going to want to take on responsibility, but
18 there's got to be a way that we can have that discussion,
19 because... Anyhow, that's...

20 MR. BYRES: We can certainly take this particular
21 study, update it, but we can also open up the scope on this to
22 take and start looking at identifying urbanized areas as well.
23 And not only that, but we can start looking -- the underlying
24 governmental entity that would take on what you see on this map
25 almost exclusively would be counties. And so we could start

1 basically just looking as part of the study, we can get -- I
2 mean, it isn't like we have a hundred counties in the state of
3 Arizona. We could get with the counties and see if -- what
4 interests they have and where potential swaps might occur.

5 CHAIRMAN SEARLE: And the biggest challenge on
6 the county side is funding, like everything else, because in
7 cities and counties, they're all limited on the funding. They
8 only have so much money to go so far, and nobody's looking
9 (inaudible) for more responsibility. So we've got ways to
10 incentivize things, and whether it's through swaps or whether
11 it's -- that's the downside of it. We need to find a way of
12 incentivizing some of these things.

13 MR. BYRES: Well, I think the best thing that we
14 can possibly do is look at the use of the roadways, the traffic
15 that's on the roadways, and identify, okay, is that the traffic
16 that would be for locals, such as a county or something, or is
17 that traffic that is mostly affecting the state system or the
18 national system. Let's make sure that the ownership is matching
19 use of the roadways. I think that's probably the best way to be
20 able to look at it.

21 CHAIRMAN SEARLE: And that's a discussion --
22 that's probably something that we should look at every number of
23 years regardless. It's not -- things change, you know. I think
24 our system we're dealing with was put together 50, 60, 70 years
25 ago, and there's a lot of things that are different now.

1 MR. MAXWELL: And, Mr. Chair, to piggyback on
2 things change and change rapidly, and again, your -- you've got
3 the kind of rural perspective. I'm thinking a little bit more
4 of the urban, because there's decisions now that municipalities
5 are making on how so use their roads that have a direct impact
6 on that state highway, that state route, that is effectively
7 another urban road in that municipality, but, you know,
8 Mr. Byres, we've talked about some of the issues that they're
9 changing their roadway usages could impact the traffic flow on
10 the state highways. So do we -- do we get any say in that? So
11 it -- it hampers the municipality money as well as the -- our
12 ability, but I think that's one of the reasons Bullhead City saw
13 an opportunity and got ahead of it.

14 MR. BYRES: And we have -- in that -- within an
15 urban roadway section right now, we have one that we're working
16 on right now which is 60X. That one goes across multiple county
17 islands and different municipalities, so consequently, you know,
18 it was who's going to take it if we're going to -- if we're
19 going to give it away. Well, in this particular case, the
20 county stepped up. So when 60X is completed and finished, the
21 county will -- Maricopa County will take on that roadway, so...

22 CHAIRMAN SEARLE: Any other questions?
23 Ms. Howard? Ms. Daniels? Mr. Meck?

24 VICE CHAIR DANIELS: None for me right now. I
25 reserve (inaudible) later.

1 MR. MECK: None from me.

2 CHAIRMAN SEARLE: You know, I think one of the
3 concerns I've got is we've talked -- and I mentioned it
4 earlier, is the funding side of it. We're going to get to a
5 point where we can't -- we're going to have roads go back to
6 dirt, and I guess we do maintain some dirt roads at ADOT, so I
7 guess we could --

8 MR. BYRES: A couple.

9 CHAIRMAN SEARLE: We have a couple, so I mean,
10 it's not -- it's not unheard of, but I think it's actions like
11 that that will probably sooner or later (inaudible), because
12 apparently we cannot just abandon a road.

13 MR. BYRES: No. By statute, if there's any kind
14 of a beneficial use, we cannot abandon it.

15 CHAIRMAN SEARLE: Well, it sounds like we need to
16 take advantage (inaudible). If there are no other questions,
17 comments? All right. Thank you for the update on this item.

18 MR. BYRES: You bet. Thank you.

19 CHAIRMAN SEARLE: All right. Mr. Meck, are
20 you -- are you still with us?

21 MR. MECK: Yes, sir. I'm still with you.

22 CHAIRMAN SEARLE: All right. I understand that
23 you're going to go ahead and resign from our board.

24 MR. MECK: Yes, sir. That is correct.

25 CHAIRMAN SEARLE: Well, we really do appreciate

1 you spending this last several months with us after your turn
2 came up. Really had to enjoy getting to know you and work with
3 you. We're going to miss you, although we understand the
4 situation you're under.

5 MR. MECK: Yes, sir. As we get older, our
6 situation changes in (inaudible), so this is the best thing
7 for your board and as far as myself. So I appreciate all of
8 you taking the time, volunteering for doing this. This is not a
9 job that people take, and, you know, you don't sometimes get
10 thanked for what all you do, but thank goodness for the Board.

11 CHAIRMAN SEARLE: All right. Well, you've
12 already got your watch, so you're not getting any more gifts.

13 MR. MECK: That's perfectly okay. It's been an
14 honor to be on the Board and an honor and pleasure to meet
15 all of you. Thank you.

16 CHAIRMAN SEARLE: All right. Thank you for
17 your service, Mr. Meck, and we wish you well.

18 MR. MECK: Thank you very much. Same to all of
19 you. Bye.

20 CHAIRMAN SEARLE: All right. And any suggestions
21 for future agenda items?

22 MR. MAXWELL: Mr. Chairman, I have just one
23 question of staff. We heard a lot today in call to the audience
24 about the town halls, and thank you for putting those together,
25 taking the extra step and doing that. Did we by chance record

1 any of those town halls?

2 MR. ROEHRICH: Mr. Chairman, Mr. Maxwell, I do
3 not know if we recorded any of those. Anybody here who's been
4 out conducting those recording them? I don't know. I don't
5 know. I've never seen a recording. All our -- obviously all
6 the board meetings are all recorded, and we make the formal
7 minutes of those, because I don't know about any --

8 MR. MAXWELL: I was kind of just curious
9 (inaudible) would be (inaudible) go back and take a look at
10 that. Would be of mind just to go back and take a look at that.
11 You know, a lot of us have engaged with folks who have talked so
12 highly about SR-347, and they're advocates that have made sure
13 (inaudible).

14 And Mayor Smith said she's got, you know, 48 more
15 appearances with us, so (inaudible) get a copy of the slides
16 if you could distribute those to the members of the Board to see
17 what those (inaudible) briefed on the different options and
18 possibilities, because I know we've brought it up with board
19 members several times of that seems to be an area of concern,
20 especially with the safety record, that 347 goes -- and anybody
21 who's coming from Pima County driving out there knows how slow
22 traffic (inaudible) impacted in the morning rush hour, going on
23 right around that intersection.

24 MR. ROEHRICH: I will talk to our --
25 Mr. Chairman, Mr. Maxwell, I'll talk to our team that

1 conducted those, communications team and see what they have. If
2 they have a recording -- I'm sure if they have a presentation,
3 I've got slides. So I'll ask them for those, but I do not know
4 if they recorded those.

5 MR. MAXWELL: Thank you.

6 MR. ROEHRICH: I was usually watching a
7 football game or something.

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

9 CHAIRMAN SEARLE: Ms. Howard? Ms. Daniels?
10 Any comments before we adjourn?

11 MS. HOWARD: None here.

12 CHAIRMAN SEARLE: So, Mr. Chairman, before we
13 go --

14 MS. PESHAKAI: Yes. I just want to make sure
15 that I clarify the story about me lighting flares on the -- at
16 the airport in Tuba City, make sure that people don't think
17 it's now and part of my transportation duties. It was 35
18 years ago.

19 CHAIRMAN SEARLE: Well, (inaudible) years ago,
20 I think Mr. Thompson's last -- one of his last as chair, and I
21 don't remember seeing you at the (inaudible).

22 MS. PESHAKAI: Thank you, Mr. Chair.

23 CHAIRMAN SEARLE: All right. Our next meeting
24 will be in Prescott.

25 MR. ROEHRICH: Mr. Chair, it's October 13th,

1 but it's also in conjunction with the Rural Transportation
2 Summit, the 16th and the 17th. For those members who are
3 attending, if you've registered, please submit your receipt so
4 you can get reimbursed. And as well, make sure that you give us
5 all your receipts as you do normal meetings so we can make sure
6 to take care of any travel expenses.

7 CHAIRMAN SEARLE: Okay. And the November meeting
8 will be in Wickenburg, and thank you for the reminder. In
9 December, Sierra Vista. And so that's the end of the year.

10 Very good. If there's nothing else, I'm going
11 to adjourn this State Transportation Board meeting in
12 Sahuarita.

13 (Meeting adjourned at 11:47 a.m.)

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

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 110 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 17th day of March 2025.

 /s/ Teresa A. Watson

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

Adjournment

Chairman Richard Searle adjourned the State Transportation Board Meeting on September 20, 2024.

Meeting adjourned at 11:47a.m. PST.

Not Available for Signature

Richard Searle, Chairman
State Transportation Board

Not Available for Signature

Jennifer Toth, Director
Arizona Department of Transportation