STATE TRANSPORTATION BOARD MEETING MINUTES
9:00 a.m., Friday, July 21, 2017
Mohave County Board of Supervisors
Auditorium
700 W. Beale Street
Kingman, AZ 86402

Pledge
The Pledge of Allegiance was led by Chairwoman Deanna Beaver.

Roll call by Board Secretary Linda Priano
In attendance: Deanna Beaver, William Cuthbertson, Joe La Rue, Jack Sellers, Mike Hammond and Steve Stratton.

Absent: Jesse Thompson.

There were approximately 40 people in the audience.

Opening Remarks
Chairwoman Beaver thanked the city of Kingman and the Mohave County Board of Supervisors for their hospitality in hosting the board meeting in Kingman. She also thanked them for the dinner that they hosted at Calico's Restaurant adding that the location, food and networking opportunities were well received. Chairwoman Beaver provided a brief "history minute" on Route 66. She also recommended visiting the museum in the area.

Title VI of the Civil Rights Act
Floyd Roehrich reminded all attendees to fill out survey cards to assist our Civil Rights Department.

Call to the Audience:
The following members of the public addressed the Board:

1. Karen Flenniken, Mohave County Transportation Commission Vice Chair/Secretary for the Colorado River of Republican Women, re: asked the Board to reconsider building two new roundabouts on Highway 95 as many residents do not think this is a good idea.
2. Tom Brady, Mayor of Bullhead City, re: expressed his appreciation for the investment on SR 195. The Mayor also stated he has objections and concerns in regards to the roundabouts being planned for Highway 95. He urged the Board to consider local input before moving forward with the roundabouts.
3. W. Mark Clark, Mohave County Maintenance Division Manager, re: stated transportation needs continue to grow and resources need to be established. He discussed the possibilities of dedicating sales tax for growing transportation needs.
4. Steve Johnston, Arizona Airport Association, re: thanked the board for their support and work on the airports throughout the state.
5. Cathy Rosengrant, Mohave County Transportation Commission, District Four, re: is in favor of the I-40 /93 Traffic Interchange-Phase One due to current heavy traffic congestion and hopes this can get completed sooner rather than later.
6. Christian Price, Mayor of Maricopa, re: thanked the Board for their service and provided an update on the Pinal County RTA and ½ cent sales tax plan that will be on the ballot in November. He also discussed the Study of I-11 and congressional representative involvement. The Mayor also thanked the Board for the funding of the 347 Overpass and stated work is underway with a groundbreaking event scheduled to take place in October.
7. Kee Allen Begay, Jr., Apache County and member of Navajo Nation Council, re: asked for support on Highway 191, between Many Farms and Chinle. He explained with the increase of traffic due to tourism in the area (Grand Canyon, Canyon de Chelly, etc.) it shows great need for improvements. He asked the Board to consider his efforts and to consider focusing on this area.
8. Chris Bridges, CYMPO Administrator, re: discussed the CYMPO I-15 Resolution that was adopted and the Rural Transportation Summit taking place in October 25, 2017.
9. Duane Eitel, City Engineer, Casa Grande, re: discussed two I-15 Resolutions; one from Eloy and one from Casa Grande. He also thanked the Board and ADOT staff for approving and moving a project up for a pedestrian hybrid beacon in Casa Grande to curb pedestrian fatalities in that area.
10. Craig Brown, CYMPO Chairman, Yavapai County Supervisor, re: thanked the Board for their continued efforts and discussed a JPA Agreement between the city of Prescott, Yavapai County, Yavapai County Flood Control District and CYMPO. He requested they move forward with the design of Highway 69 in the Five Year Plan.
11. David Wessel, Flagstaff MPO Manager, re: requested the Fourth Street Bridges over I-40, (Agenda Item 8) be placed in the Five Year Plan. He also discussed the amount of funding the city will be providing to the project.
12. Barbara Pape, Local Resident, re: questioned why there is still not a signal at Corwin Drive/I-95. She also stated roundabouts would not be good for the traffic flow in this community and gave reasons why this design would not be fitting to the area.
13. Marc Montgomery, City of Maricopa, Media Publicist, re: stated how thankful he is of the way the Board and ADOT communicate with the public and local communities via Twitter, as well as on the digital highway boards. He suggested ADOT open an Instagram account. Mr. Montgomery also suggested giving a $1,000 fine to drivers who are driving too slow and spoke about the need to improve Highway 347.
14. Eva Corbett, Resident of Bullhead City, re: stated the roads in Mohave County are very bad, especially Highway 95 and said it is an embarrassment. She urged the Board to fix the roads instead of installing roundabouts.

STATE TRANSPORTATION BOARD MEETING – JULY 21, 2017

INDEX

PAGE

ITEM 1: DISTRICT ENGINEER'S REPORT (Alvin Stump) 3

ITEM 2: DIRECTOR'S REPORT (Floyd Roehrich, Jr.) 6

ITEM 3: CONSENT AGENDA 6

ACTION TAKEN
MOTION TO APPROVE CONSENT AGENDA....6

ITEM 4: LEGISLATIVE REPORT (Floyd Roehrich, Jr.) 6

ITEM 5: FINANCIAL REPORT (Kristine Ward) 10

ITEM 6: MULTIMODAL PLANNING DIVISION REPORT (Greg Byres) 14

ITEM 7: PRIORITY PLANNING ADVISORY COMMITTEE (PPAC) (Greg Byres)....22

ACTION TAKEN
MOTION TO APPROVE PROJECT MODIFICATIONS ITEMS 7a through 7b....24

ITEM 8: PROJECT MODIFICATIONS TO THE FY2018-2022 FIVE YEAR TRANSPORTATION FACILITIES CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM (Dallas Hammit)....25

ITEM 9: STATE ENGINEER'S REPORT (Dallas Hammit) 43

ITEM 10: CONSTRUCTION CONTRACTS (Dallas Hammit) 51

ACTION TAKEN
MOTION TO APPROVE ITEM 10a....53
MOTION TO REJECT ITEM 10b 53
MOTION TO APPROVE ITEM 10c....54
MOTION TO REJECT ITEM 10d 59
MOTION TO APPROVE ITEM 10e....59
MOTION TO POSTPONE ITEM 10f 61
MOTION TO POSTPONE ITEM 10g....63
MOTION TO APPROVE ITEM 10h 63
MOTION TO APPROVE ITEM 10i....64
MOTION TO APPROVE ITEM 10j 65
MOTION TO APPROVE ITEM 10k....66

ITEM 11: SUGGESTIONS....68

(Beginning of excerpt.)

CHAIRWOMAN BEAVER: Okay. We'll now move on to the district engineer's report. Alvin Stump.

MR. STUMP: Well, good morning, Madam Chair and Board. Just a quick district update. Right now on I-40, we have several projects going on between Seligman and Kingman. Most of them are -- are bridge projects. We do have one rock fall project within the Willows area, and later this fall, we will have a pavement pres. going on in that same area.

And then on 93, we are just finishing up a pavement preservation and shoulder widening project up north from Milepost 17 to 28.

And then south of I-40, we do have a drainage project as well as another bridge rehab project just getting started.

One of our focus areas is on 95 in the Bullhead City area to look at improving safety. Part of it is looking at access management, and another part of it is trying to identify a parallel corridor to relieve some of the traffic volumes off of 95. As far as the study area, we've been working on ideas for the -- the past few months, and we will be presenting these concepts and proposed solutions to the public this fall, and also, we will be pursuing HSIP funding for certain areas.

And then about 10 years ago, Mohave County conducted a design concept report to look at a parallel corridor

known as the Vanderslice study -- or corridor. And so what we're looking at now is to do another study to see how we can maybe phase that in in smaller, more affordable segments. The estimate was a little over 40 million. So knowing that funding is tight, looking at how we can break that up over time.

Another safety project down in Lake Havasu, to construct a center raised median from Kiowa Avenue past the strip mall area. This project is moving along. It's scheduled for this fiscal year. We are adding a signal at the far end to help with the left turn volumes.

And as far as over here, the West Kingman interchange, we are looking forward to that going as -- as we talked about last night, there's several times when traffic backs all the way up to the 68 interchange, and so right now, in fiscal year '18, we have 5 million for design, and then in '20 we have 10 million set aside for the right-of-way. And then in the development program, we -- we have 55 million for the construction of it. And this is just the phase one, the Phoenix to Vegas segment. The Vegas to California would be at a future date.

And then two other interchanges of interest are the Rancho Santa Fe TI and the Kingman Crossing TI. The one on the right is the Rancho Santa Fe, which connects to the airport area. This will support the industrial development in that area as well as remove the truck traffic in that area from -- from

Andy Devine as well. And then to the left is the -- the Kingman Crossing interchange, which will provide access to the hospital as well as the property in that area, which is suitable for commercial retail. So we have recently been meeting with the City and stakeholders to discuss partnerships and possible funding strategies. So that's something we're going to continue to do and see what we can work out.

So that's -- that's all I have. Do you have any questions?

CHAIRWOMAN BEAVER: Alvin, I was wondering if you could just clarify for me. I was of the understanding that where the Kingman Crossing TI is at that maybe the City had also put some drainage in or something. That wasn't anything that was addressed yesterday. I was just wondering if you could elaborate on that.

MR. STUMP: The -- I'm sorry. The drainage?

CHAIRWOMAN BEAVER: Was there some type of infrastructure that the City of Kingman had done sometime back maybe?

MR. STUMP: Oh, yeah. There was one -- there's one easement that we were talking about maybe some of that easement could go back to the City.

CHAIRWOMAN BEAVER: Thank you.

MR. STUMP: So that would be another discussion.

CHAIRWOMAN BEAVER: Does anyone have anything

additional?

Thank you.

MR. STUMP: All right. Thank you.

CHAIRWOMAN BEAVER: Now we'll move on to the director's report.

MR. ROEHRICH: Good morning, Madam Chair, members of the Board. The director sends his regrets. He had a conflict today. He could not be here.

He had no final issues to report. If there are issues that you want the director to address at a future meeting, please let me know and we'll make sure to get them on the agenda and prepared for him to present. Thank you.

CHAIRWOMAN BEAVER: Thank you.

We'll move on now to the consent agenda. Do we have a motion to approve the consent agenda as presented?

MR. LA RUE: So moved.

MR. HAMMOND: Second.

CHAIRWOMAN BEAVER: It's motioned by Board Member La Rue, seconded by Board Member Hammond to approve the consent agenda as presented.

All those in favor?

BOARD MEMBERS: Aye.

CHAIRWOMAN BEAVER: All those opposed? The motion carries.

Move on now to the legislative report.

Mr. Roehrich.

MR. ROEHRICH: Thank you, Madam Chair.

This is kind of the quiet time with the -- especially at the state level as well as federal level. There wasn't a lot to report, but there are a couple of things.

From the ADOT Omnibus Bill, there was a provision made for ADOT to start negotiating with the Federal Highway Administration to take over the certification of the NEPA process, the National Environmental Protection Act process. That is ongoing. We've been coordinating with Federal Highways. They're conducting a session out with us later this year. We're on track that we think by, basically, next summer, we should be able to move forward, get self-certified to conduct the NEPA process as a state, as a state lead agency. So that is -- is ongoing.

And at the national level, a couple little things. Recently, the administration has removed all the funding out of the program for TIGER grants, but they have started to look at other FASTLANE grants as well as a new criteria for an INFRA grant, which is the Infrastructure For Rebuilding America grant. So again, we're targeting key strategic corridors and key strategic improvements that we can go after these grants and still have the opportunity to -- to bring that funding into the program, which would then hopefully help us to address any other additional needs that are moving

forward.

Recently, the Federal Highway Administration came out with new guidance on the use of variable message boards for advertising as part of some of the states who have been looking at opportunities to generate revenue to help with -- with the costs associated with their transportation initiatives. We have looked at putting advertisement on overhead signs and other programs. That has been rejected by the Federal Highway Administration. So we're back looking at what opportunities may be available.

At that time, Madam Chair, that's kind of the basic update of what we have. And as we continue to monitor what's going on locally as well as nationally, we'll be able to provide more updates as we see things start breaking loose, especially if Congress and the administration do address any transportation issues later this year.

MR. LA RUE: Madam Chair.

CHAIRWOMAN BEAVER: Yes. Board Member La Rue.

MR. LA RUE: Can we ask a question?

CHAIRWOMAN BEAVER: Sure.

MR. LA RUE: So Floyd, with TIGER grants, you know, recently we've had a lot of success or some moderate success, and I think some of that success was really because the -- a lot of stakeholders came together and spoke as one voice and did not, you know, present competing projects and, you know,

confuse those that make the decisions. Now that it seems like TIGER grants are going away and we're getting in -- the table's being reset with, you know, something new, do you think we'll still have that consolidated stakeholders speaking with one voice concept, because that's seemed so successful before?

MR. ROEHRICH: Madam Chair, Mr. La Rue, I actually think it's going to be more critical that we build that in the future. Part of -- and we're still learning what this new INFRA grant, this Infrastructure For Rebuilding America grant -- the intent of that grant, from the basic information -- the limited information we got so far was more emphasis on taking existing local dollars and then the federal government enhancing or leveraging off of that.

So before when we were able to put together, like, some of the FASTLANE grant previously and TIGER grants previously, that we were able to be successful at, we usually had a match somewhere between 20 to 50 percent, closer to about that 20 percent of local funds, and then the rest would be federal funds.

They're really -- this administration now under this grant process is really looking at the locals bringing a greater percentage of funds, taking those funds and enhancing it with a portion of federal funds, but then using that to leverage into more infrastructure. So I think being able to target partnerships, especially -- let's take, for instance, Interstate

15, which people talked about. Can we work closer with Utah and Nevada on doing something on that to come together to target corridor improvements there? Along Interstate 10, you know, with MAG's input and the State Transportation Board's input and maybe some other local government input, could we start building a partnership that will show that we're bringing funds locally, and then, therefore, you, federal government, the funds you give really enhance this?

So I think it's going to be more critical that we do that. What I don't believe we really sat down and looked at is how competitive will that be for these other partners if they really -- everybody's got a great amount of need. How much are they going to be willing to partner with us, because they've got to bring more money into these? So strategically, I think the projects you go after really -- to be competitive, really have to show strong partnership, but they have to strong -- show a strong commitment to help fund.

MR. LA RUE: No. That's good information. So that could create the angst on a local level as they're trying to allocate to their highest and greatest need. So -- well, you know, keep us apprised. Thank you.

MR. ROEHRICH: Yes, sir.

CHAIRWOMAN BEAVER: If there's no further questions on that, we'll move on to the financial report.

Kristine. Welcome back, and you've got a smile

on your face. So is that good news?

MS. WARD: You know, I try to just come with a smile each time to keep you guessing the whole time.

Good morning, Madam Chair, Board members. My morning started out with sitting down with Mr. La Rue and Board Member Stratton, and one of the questions Mr. La Rue asked is: "Do you have good news for me -- for us today?" And I said, "Kind of." So --

MR. LA RUE: And luckily my breakfast was over by the time you said that, so...

MS. WARD: So in the spirit of "kind of," we have finished our FY '17. The FY '17 numbers are in, and we have eclipsed $1.4 billion in HURF revenues. That has been a long time coming, and the reason -- the 1.4 billion is the good news. The fact that that is only 1.7 percent higher than FY 2007 revenues is the part that makes it the kind of good news. Because we have just reached our 2000 level -- 2007 revenue in FY 2017. So...

And during that same period -- maybe I shouldn't have put all these little fascinating facts together -- but during that same period, we have experienced 10.7 -- over that same period, 10.7 percent of population growth, but personal income growth over that same period, also, 33 percent growth over that same period. So what we're basically coming down to is we are not seeing -- we are not seeing the growth that we

have experienced historically.

Oh, we went back a slide. Yes. We went back all the way to 2007. So let's catch back up.

So overall, our forecast, I'm sorry I can't give you more exciting news, but $1.4 billion is something to be thankful for. With regards to our forecast, we were pretty much on target. We were a little bit behind. .7 percent behind our forecasts, and we experienced about 3.6 growth on the year.

In the Regional Area Road Fund, we again topped -- crested over another number. We've gone over $400 million in Regional Area Road Fund revenues this year, with about 4.3 percent growth. We were just a -- just a little over forecast on that.

Moving on to the -- I have nothing to report on the federal aid program, but I am happy to report that a couple of board meetings ago you authorized us to proceed with a grant anticipation note issue of $76 million. That is right on schedule. Next week we will be presenting to the rating agencies, Standard & Poor's, Moody's and Fitch. So that is -- that is moving right along. And we will be going to market with those bonds at the end of August, 29th, 30th, 31st time period.

With that -- oh, Aviation Fund, just a brief report on that. That has -- we have finally gotten that fund under control, I would say, and we -- the deferred payments, all but one has been made, and we are making payments on that

remaining, and we are now once again in the process of authorizing projects again, which I believe Greg will speak to in the MPD.

So with that, if you have any questions, I would be happy to answer them.

CHAIRWOMAN BEAVER: Thank you. Do we have any questions?

Board Member Stratton.

MR. STRATTON: As you spoke about the -- we're starting to fund again, I believe there was two projects today.

MS. WARD: Uh-huh. Yes, sir.

MR. STRATTON: Were those two that were on the list that we had to shelve a couple years ago? I think there was 20-some projects that we had to take off the books and not fund because we didn't have the money after the Legislature took the balance out. Are these two projects from that list, or are these two that are brand-new and were not on that old list that we got rid of?

MS. WARD: Chairman -- Chairwoman Beaver and Board Member Stratton, I do not have the answer to that. I'm going to defer to Greg, and hopefully I just deferred to him a question he knows the answer to. But I apologize. I do not know the answer to that.

MR. STRATTON: Okay. Thank you.

MS. WARD: Is there anything further? Thank you.

CHAIRWOMAN BEAVER: We'll move now on to Multimodal Planning Division report. Greg.

MR. BYRES: Madam Chair, Board members, I have a hard time with the multimodal, too. So it's a -- an excuse for the cough. I'm trying to get over a cold, and it's been taking me awhile.

We have a couple of items. On aviation, again, we're going ahead and approving projects coming through for the grants. The two that we have on for today are --

MR. LA RUE: I hate to cut in, but I'm confused. Are we on Item 6 or Item 7?

MR. BYRES: I was just trying to answer the question that was asked previously.

CHAIRWOMAN BEAVER: We're still on Item 6.

MR. LA RUE: And you're going to allow the answer to the question that really relates to Item 7?

CHAIRWOMAN BEAVER: Are you wanting to kind of merge the two together? Is that what you're trying to do?

MR. BYRES: I can just keep that off until the next item.

MR. LA RUE: I just wanted to make sure we were all clear on what we were on, but I defer to the Chair.

CHAIRWOMAN BEAVER: Okay. We'll just go ahead and hold off on that until we get to Item 7 unless we --

MR. BYRES: That's fine.

CHAIRWOMAN BEAVER: -- unless we kind of just --

MR. BYRES: Aviation's part of the multimodal. So that's why I was going through what we're doing as part of multimodal.

MR. LA RUE: That's fine. So...

CHAIRWOMAN BEAVER: Well, if there's no objection, I think maybe we should just go ahead make it inclusive, all in --

MR. BYRES: That's fine.

CHAIRWOMAN BEAVER: -- one, and we can go ahead and just identify Items 6 and 7, that we're kind of merging them together, and you can give your report, and then we can go ahead and either take action or not take action on item -- the part that has to do with Item 7.

MR. BYRES: Madam Chair, that's fine. I'll just go ahead and go through.

The first item that I had on the list was aviation. So we are proceeding now with disbursing funds for the federal, state, local program, and the two projects that we currently have that are being approved through the PPAC are -- are part of that grant program. Those are not projects that have been delayed. Those are projects that are coming through, the federal grants were granted, and we're providing the match for those projects. So...

MR. STRATTON: Madam Chair.

CHAIRWOMAN BEAVER: Board Member Stratton.

MR. STRATTON: I believe when it was recommended to postpone the 20-plus projects, whatever the number was, one of the questions I had at that time was would the people that were on that list that we had to postpone have any preferential treatment or come back on the list when we have the funds. And that was going to be discussed with finance and the aviation department, and I don't believe we ever truly sorted that out. And I'm just wondering if those people that we delayed now can start applying again, or were these on the list, or where are we at?

MR. BYRES: Board Member Stratton, Chairman, what we currently have is three grant programs. So what's being funded currently is the federal, state, local program. The state local program as well as the asphalt pavement management program, those two are not being funded, but they'll be coming back online in 2019 and 2020 respectively.

At that point in time, any projects that have been delayed will come through. We are, in fact, requesting or suggesting to all of our airport entities to go ahead and apply for grants so that we can track those and have them -- have a list put together, so one, we can make sure that projects are hitting as quick as they possibly can once we do get funding, and two, to make sure that if we have projects that have gone from being a very minor project to becoming a major project,

because the funding wasn't there during that time, we need to know what's -- that that's happening so we can assist with that funding.

Yes.

MR. ROEHRICH: So Madam Chair, Mr. Stratton, if I could, I want to make sure I got this clear. The projects we deferred before were the projects that were only funded out of the State Aviation grants. The projects that have continued and the ones that are continuing today are grants that were approved by the federal government, and we're just providing the local match. So that State Aviation grant program and the Runway Management Program, that's what was deferred last time.

Those projects, when we bring that program forward in 2019, as Mr. Byres just said, then those projects are deferred before -- those locals, if they still want those projects in, they'll come in and then we'll start working on those. But that's a separate program than the ones we're asking to complete today. The ones today are the federal program, which they got approval from FAA and we just provide the local match. So the State grant program is the one that's still deferred.

MR. STRATTON: Okay. I appreciate the explanation, Floyd.

The only thing I would ask is those projects that were deferred, once we have the money, if those people that were

deferred could be contacted and notified that they could re-apply for grants.

MR. ROEHRICH: Madam Chair, Mr. Stratton, absolutely. And that's what we talked about last time when we did deferrals. The Board had asked for that, that guidance and consideration, and that's what we need to make sure that we're planning on that when we move forward. So I'll leave that to Greg and his team to take that.

MR. BYRES: Is that clear? We -- we'll be -- those projects were never -- they were deferred, but they've never been lost. So those projects are still on our books to -- and yes, they do have preferential treatment, per se.

MR. STRATTON: Thank you.

MR. LA RUE: Madam Chair, if I may.

CHAIRWOMAN BEAVER: Board Member La Rue.

MR. LA RUE: So I appreciate, Steve, you bringing that up, because that was my recollection as well, that when this program restarts, there is a dialogue back with the Board to say, Here is how we're restarting it. Here are our general policies. Here's the communication piece that's going out to all of the affected member agencies. And I at least had an expectation that there would be that conversation back with the Board on the restart of that -- that program.

CHAIRWOMAN BEAVER: So it sounds like what we're asking is to have that on a study session agenda at a future...

MR. ROEHRICH: Madam Chair, Mr. La Rue, absolutely. That's what I going to suggest, is we'll bring that at maybe even a regular session like this, have Greg and his team, as they're ready --

MR. BYRES: Yes, Floyd.

MR. ROEHRICH: -- outline the steps moving forward, the time line for that. So we'll bring back it to a for -- a future meeting.

CHAIRWOMAN BEAVER: Well, I -- because my recollection was a little bit different, too. It seemed to me that when we deferred those, you made contact, if I'm correct, with each of those agencies, and each of those agencies said there was some deficiency in their paperwork or something at the time is why those were actually deferred, because they weren't even at a point where they could -- am I wrong on that? Excuse me. I'm looking to Kristine, I guess.

MS. WARD: No, ma'am. The reasons for the deferrals were not a matter of paperwork. They were literally a matter of cash flow. And the point that I was kind of standing here to the decide, when we did that re-assessment of the fund, we looked at all of the projects that were in the program underway, those projects that were underway, and those projects that were programmed for the future.

And we took that -- and those were projects that this board had approved. We took those projects and we cash

flowed all of those projects. We built them all into the cash flow to see when we could start doing future additional programming. So nothing was -- we did not remove projects. We just delayed and elongated the time -- the time over which those projects -- we would be able to reimburse for those projects.

Does that make sense?

CHAIRWOMAN BEAVER: Yes, it does. And I don't know if -- for the other Board members, possibly, is there a way that we could get a copy of a list of those that were deferred?

MS. WARD: We can.

CHAIRWOMAN BEAVER: Okay.

MS. WARD: Those deferrals are all but one of those of the airports, all but one of the airports has been the deferrals have been paid --

CHAIRWOMAN BEAVER: Okay.

MS. WARD: -- as of June 30th. There's only one remaining deferral, and that is being paid out over time.

MR. ROEHRICH: Madam Chair, and -- and Kristine. I want to make sure (inaudible). She's not talking about the deferral payments. She's talking about new grants that were deferred. So you're talking about the grants that have been approved and the payments were being deferred, but because we did not have the cash flow, we had had, like, the '19 and '20 new grant requests, we deferred to new grants --

CHAIRWOMAN BEAVER: That's what I was talking

about.

MR. ROEHRICH: -- and that's the status I'm guessing you want the status on.

CHAIRWOMAN BEAVER: Yes.

MR. ROEHRICH: Where we're at when the new grants come back. And that's what Greg and his team need to pull together. And -- but it has to match Kristine's cash flow for the aviation grant, or again, it will not be a sustainable program.

MS. WARD: I apologize if I confused the matter at all.

CHAIRWOMAN BEAVER: No.

MR. ROEHRICH: I'm blaming Greg on this.

MS. WARD: Okay. We're going to let you carry it today.

MR. BYRES: Appreciate it.

CHAIRWOMAN BEAVER: We're straightened out now.

MR. ROEHRICH: There's no blame. This is no (inaudible). But we need to follow through as you'd asked. That is what you'd asked, and that's what staff will be prepared to do, and we'll get that on an agenda as soon as we can so we can give that update.

CHAIRWOMAN BEAVER: Okay. Thank you.

Does anyone have additional questions they would like to ask?

Okay. So are we now moving on -- do you have anything additional for the 6 part of the 6 and 7, or are we moving on to 7 where we can actually --

MR. BYRES: I did have a couple other items.

CHAIRWOMAN BEAVER: Okay.

MR. BYRES: In the transit forum that we have, we're currently issuing preliminary grant acceptance letters. We have our application in to the FTA. That went in this -- this month. We should be hearing back from the FTA on that grant so that we can take the preliminary grant acceptance letters that went out to approximately 80 to 90 providers. We can make those final. So as soon as we get that appropriation through FTA, then we can -- we'll start running through that, and that should be occurring within the next two months, so..

We also have a long range plan. We're in the process of developing a draft plan document, and we're looking at bringing that to the Board in September or October for your review. We also have the freight plan. The freight plan is currently in the final draft. We met with the freight plan steering committee last week and got their review and comments, and we're looking at trying to bring that to the Board in September for the final on that.

The other things that we have, we have the selected studies. You've heard Alvin talk about several studies that we're looking at. Those are internal studies. We made

those preliminary selections two weeks ago, and we'll finalize those next week. So we'll have all those statewide internal studies going for MPD. That's all I had on Item 6.

CHAIRWOMAN BEAVER: Thank you.

Does anyone have any additional questions on that portion?

Okay. We'll now move on to item -- the part under PPAC.

MR. BYRES: We have --

CHAIRWOMAN BEAVER: The staff presentation for PPAC recommendations of action to the Board, including consideration of changes of the FY 2017-2021 State Transportation Facilities Construction Program.

MR. ROEHRICH: Madam Chair, just before we start, I want to identify that there's a typo in the agenda. It's actually 2018 to 2022 is the program, not the '17 to '18. So we'd made that mistake, but Greg will talk to the -- I -- the projects he's talking to are reference to the 2018 to 2022 year.

CHAIRWOMAN BEAVER: Okay. And thank you for clarifying that, because I did go through, and the pages 126 and 27 do reflect the FY year 2018-2022, so...

MR. BYRES: Madam Chair, Board members, we have two projects. Both of these are airport projects. One of them is for the City of Lake Havasu. It is an electrical project that we're working at -- or looking at, and that is a

FAA-sponsored grant of $40,000. The sponsor is putting in 1964 [sic], and the State is putting in 1963 [sic], for a total of 43,927.

The second project we have is for Flagstaff airport. That project is a runway reconstruction project that has an FAA grant of $7,890,485. The sponsor is putting up $387,332, and the State's matching it with -- at $387,332, for a total of $8,665,149. Those are the two projects that we currently have up for your approval.

CHAIRWOMAN BEAVER: Do we have a motion to accept and approve the airport projects Items 7A and 7 B as presented?

MR. SELLERS: So moved.

MR. CUTHBERTSON: Second.

CHAIRWOMAN BEAVER: Motion by Board Member Sellers. Seconded by Board Member Cuthbertson.

If there's no additional discussion, all those in favor?

BOARD MEMBERS: Aye.

CHAIRWOMAN BEAVER: All those opposed? The motion carries.

MR. BYRES: Thank you.

CHAIRWOMAN BEAVER: Thank you.

We'll now move on to Item 8, which is the project modifications to the FY 2018-2022 Five-Year Transportation Facilities Construction Program. Dallas Hammit, please.

Thank you.

MR. HAMMIT: Good morning, Madam Chair. Lynn's going to get me on board here.

So I was asked to prepare an update on two projects that had discussion last month in Payson, and so I'm going to go through those. The first one is on State Route 69. This is in the city of Prescott. You can see the limits of the project on the screen, and I'm going to zoom in a little bit and show you. So if you know the area, there is a Wal-Mart as you're approaching from Prescott Valley into Prescott, and the car dealer, and then you go down a hill, past Lowe's, and into the Frontier Village.

That area we go from three lanes to two lanes back to three and sometimes more. It's a bottleneck. The locals have identified this as a concern and have come -- not just identified it. Come with money and said, "Hey, we'd like to work with the department to improve this."

So where are we at today? A scoping document was completed a couple of years ago. As the project developed over time, there will be some modifications to that scoping document, but they're fairly minor. The major elements of the scoping document will remain. As of last week, July 12th, we did complete a joint project agreement, a JPA that all areas signed. And as Chris mentioned, Chris Bridges, earlier, it has multiple signatures. And I'll probably forget somebody, but with NPO,

the County and the county flood control and the City of Prescott have all signed on to that agreement. It was executed July 12th.

With that, we have the opportunity to bring on a designer. We will go through ADOT's on call. Bring that in, and we should be able to have a designer on board by late October. One of the things that that will give us by the time we're in our next programming cycle, we will be at a point where we can get a good cost estimate exactly what this project will cost, and then we need to program. Right now we have a rough estimate from the scoping, but with those modifications, we're -- between two different folks that briefed me -- a couple million dollars different. So what this -- once we get going in design, we can get that -- we'll get to a 30 percent design and have good numbers that we could actually program very well.

Before I go to the Flagstaff project, any questions on this 69 project?

MR. STRATTON: Madam Chair.

CHAIRWOMAN BEAVER: Board Member Stratton.

MR. STRATTON: When you say you're a couple million dollars apart, what's the maximum it's looking like?

MR. HAMMIT: $10 million.

MR. STRATTON: And the locals are bringing how much?

MR. HAMMIT: Right now, only thing that the

locals have brought in, they've brought the full amount for the design. They're looking at future years. My understanding -- I don't know if Chris is still here. $1.2 million, two years of your -- he knows theirs better than I do. But we do not have an agreement started on the construction yet. Only on the development and design.

MR. BRIDGES: We currently have $650,000 programmed in fiscal year '20, and then we also have flexibility in fiscal years '21 and on that we could still move things around. If we needed additional funds, we could bring that back to our board and add another 650,000. So potentially another 1.3.

MR. STRATTON: So that would be a little over $2 million you would bring at that point?

MR. BRIDGES: Right. $1 million for the design, and potentially 1.3 for construction.

MR. STRATTON: And did your $10 million, Dallas, include design, or was that construction only?

MR. HAMMIT: I believe that was the complete project total. So it would be design and construction. Again, with the change in the scoping, there's not a detailed estimate, so a lot of it is gut feels from experts, but we haven't fully scoped the project that's being -- that will be designed. So we don't have exact numbers at this time.

MR. STRATTON: So going through this detail,

obviously, it's something that I'm assuming the state engineer's office agrees needs to be done since you're doing the scoping and you're looking into the project in detail?

MR. HAMMIT: This is a need that we can support. At the same time, there's lots of needs, and within the system, when we bring this into -- if we brought it into this program or any other, we're going to bump out another project that we felt was very -- that had a need as well. So we haven't prioritized it above some of the others. And I don't know if I'm answering your question, but if we do this project, we're bumping out, say, a pavement preservation prong that's already in the program or some other project that's in there. I can say that it is a need. The priority is where we would have to have more discussion once we know the full dollar amount.

MR. STRATTON: Madam Chair, if I can continue.

CHAIRWOMAN BEAVER: Yes, Board Member Stratton.

MR. STRATTON: The moneys that we had the telephonic meeting on the 347 and we did move some funding around, weren't there about $4.5 million left -- that came back to us because of the local share that was going into that?

MR. HAMMIT: Chairman Beaver, Board Member Stratton, I need to look at those details. I don't remember them off the top of my head.

MR. ROEHRICH: Madam Chair, Mr. Stratton, yes, as

part of that programming, they did reduce the money, rolled it into the contingency. What I don't know and I think we would need to research is has that gone to cover current projects. I can't tell you that there's money just sitting there without understanding if that money has already been reprogrammed into current projects.

MR. HAMMIT: And Madam Chairman, if it was, it is this year's money that we would not be prepared to spend on this project, so we haven't started design as of yet.

MR. ROEHRICH: Right now I think you're targeting 2020 is the construction (inaudible).

MR. HAMMIT: That is correct.

MR. ROEHRICH: So you'd be looking at studying projects in 2020 or 2021 and then how that would affect those projects lifting at that time and as you look at bringing it into the program.

MR. HAMMIT: That is correct. Yes.

MR. STRATTON: So if we were to fund this, we wouldn't have to move it all out of one year, it could be several years?

MR. HAMMIT: Madam Chair, Member Stratton, the year that we fund the construction, we have to have the -- all the money for this project in that year. So if it goes into FY 2020, in FY 2020 we have to have the full amount for that project.

MR. STRATTON: One of the things and I'm sure all of you have realized this through the past meetings is as we receive officers, if you will, for these entities, whether it's Flagstaff or CYMPO or the town of Maricopa, I think it's terribly important that we recognize that and try and fund these projects if they are a priority to make our dollars stretch, and in order for these organizations to continue with their design and programming their money for future years, I believe it takes a commitment on our part so that they understand it will be done. I would really like to see this added to the five-year program. If we -- in 2020. If we don't have contingency moneys, our -- because it's a new year, this is the first month of the new year, then at this point I would ask that we look at other projects and maybe moving some money around.

MR. ROEHRICH: Madam Chair, I guess if I could just comment generally on that. I think that's a real great opportunity, as we talked about, for partnering. And especially the comments earlier that -- like Mr. La Rue had brought up when you look at the national level, if that's what Congress and the administration want to see is more local leverage for the federal government to come in with funding, I think it's great to do that.

To me, again, the comment here is timing. We're talking about trying to fit a project in to fiscal year '20 when we're in 2018, and we still got two programing cycles that, you

know, may allow us to see revenues increase a little bit in the future where this could be brought in without affecting a project. We just don't know that until we get to those programming cycles now. If you fit it in now, that means you're probably displacing something. But yet we're not delaying this project because design is on its way. The study is on its way.

Is there a measure of now that we know this is a priority -- and again, we want to work with the Board and we want to work with the locals -- as we look to bring in the construction in two years, could the next programming cycle be the time to bring it in where we could then see what the new estimates are, revenues? We could see what -- if projects are starting to shift around because of other -- the deferrals so the project's available.

As Dallas said, the contingency fund we have now is only for '18. Don't touch the contingency fund for '20. So there's no extra funds in '20 at this point until we make programming changes. So again, I think the question is -- and the Board needs to ask this question -- when you want to adjust the priority or you want to look at those partnerships to bringing projects in -- bringing projects in the program, when's the best time to do that and not delay those projects? You know, we could do this in the next programing cycle, and theoretically, maybe there might be an increase in funds or maybe there might be something where we know projects are

slipping, and that opens up the funding. And therefore, we have no impact on any other project, other than what was already occurring.

MR. STRATTON: Madam Chair.

CHAIRWOMAN BEAVER: Board Member Stratton.

MR. STRATTON: And I don't disagree with what you're staying, Floyd. I understand.

My concern is when we're dealing with an organization, in this case CYMPO, if we don't make the commitment, then how can they set their yearly budgets up in the future? How could they know, as Chris said, there could possibly be another 650,000? But if we haven't made a commitment of funding on our part, then how can they let that money sit and not do anything with it? They need -- they need some guidance, I believe. And maybe Chris can elaborate on this or what their process is, but my concern is if we don't make the commitment, then how can they commit their dollars to future projects? They may want to reallocate them, because they don't know if we're going to fund our portion.

MR. HAMMIT: Madam Chair, Member Stratton, one thing to remember, and Chris can correct me if I'm wrong, the moneys that they're committing are FY '21 and beyond funds, because the money that they're working on the design are their current years. So the moneys that they have available are FY '21 and beyond. So that's the first that their moneys are

available, if -- with those -- that's their schedule of their funds coming into our -- this project.

MR. STRATTON: I understand that, but my concern is if we don't make a commitment, then how can they hold those funds and not have entities want to put other projects up for those funds that they could do themselves? I feel very strongly that we have to -- especially on a project like this where there's been multiple fatal crashes. It affects a lot of Arizonans. I think we have to -- if this is what the Board wants to do and leverage dollars, as it seems to be the trend from the federal government down, then I think we have to step up and show a commitment. That's my personal opinion.

CHAIRWOMAN BEAVER: I would like to ask if Chris could just respond to that question about the 2021 and the...

MR. BRIDGES: Sure. Currently in our Transportation Improvement Program, we do have committed $650,000 in fiscal year '20. That one's already been approved by the TAC and the Board. What I would need to do, what Dallas is talking about, those years, '21, '22, '23 and so on, we'd have to go back to the Board to add fiscal year '21 to this project in order to make it the full 1.3 million. So we do have '20 currently today as it stands. I'll be happy to take it back to our board. Supervisor Brown's here. He's the chairman of the CYMPO board, and I'll be able to talk to him right away about this and get that on an agenda in September. So that's

where we stand with our funding.

MR. STRATTON: Madam Chair.

CHAIRWOMAN BEAVER: Okay. Board Member Hammond has a question.

MR. HAMMOND: It's not a question. It's not a question. It's more of just an observation. I think the Board is very much in favor of this project, but I also -- I try to pay very close attention when I hear this -- any project discussed as to whether ADOT has -- is not listening, ADOT is not properly prioritizing, ADOT is not properly putting projects into the system in a priority that they feel is responsible.

And if -- I have not heard in my -- on this project or pretty much any project that ADOT's not listening. So when I hear a project's going to get bumped that ADOT thinks might have a higher priority to this project or any project, you know, I guess as a board member, I'm okay as long as it's coming out of the same district. If we're bumping projects, but if they're coming out of other districts, you know, then you kind of get my attention as a board member from southern Arizona.

So I guess what I want to hear from Chris or anybody is that ADOT's not listening. ADOT's not being responsive. You know, we should override a process that is -- seems to be functioning very well. I'm sure there's times when it doesn't. But that's what I'm really attentive to. Before I -- as a board member, at this meeting, for example, if it came

to it, decide to vote to do something that staff is not prepared to recommend. So I'm listening very attentively as to whether ADOT staff is not listening and being attentive, because that seems to be what you might be suggesting, and I would like to hear if that's actually the case.

MR. BRIDGES: Board Member Hammond, that is completely not the case. In fact, Dallas, Alvin, all the district staff and all the staff in ADOT have been completely responsive. They listen to our concerns. They work with us. In fact, we have an excellent partnership.

So, you know, in no way do I, you know, want to come across as ADOT's not listening. But, you know, unfortunately the times that we are in, with the tough dollars, it's a tough ask. And everybody has their projects. I realize that. It doesn't matter if it's me or Mayor Price or anybody else showing up here. You know, we all have our regional priorities, and we're trying to relay those to you, and hopefully we get to have those in there. I think we've made great strides on this.

Like I said, Dallas and Alvin have been tremendous on this. We're far enough along where our local communities have thrown in their cash as well, which is also tough for them. I think we're in a good position here. So I would like to keep moving forward with our great partnership, and I don't want to come across as we're not.

MR. HAMMOND: Thank you.

CHAIRWOMAN BEAVER: A comment I would like to make with regard to this is I guess we've been aware of this project for awhile now, and when we were going through the process and had the study session for the 2018-2022, I remember at the very end there were some projects that were added in. It seemed to me is it about 40 million -- there was money found, and so there were projects added in. I'm thinking it was at the study session down in Phoenix where this occurred. And there were some projects added in at the end because of this found money. And so I am thinking -- I guess my question is: This is something we were aware of. Did we feel that those other projects that were added in at the end basically -- bad choice of words -- but trumped this project.

MR. HAMMIT: Madam Chair, and if I get off track someone can help me, but one of the things to remember, every year when we present a program, we -- our long range plan is a funding strategy between capacity projects or expansion, modernization or preservation. We had a target to get to a minimum number of preservation dollars, about 260 at that time. In each year we have spent more -- and which would leave the Greater Arizona about $25 million in expansion projects. Each year we've spent more than 25 million on expansion.

So when those moneys came available, my memory of those projects -- and I'd have to look at each one -- but the

vast majority I can say with confidence were a preservation project that we were able to move forward to meet that goal that the Board had set. "Hey, this is our funding strategy. We want this percentage in preservation, this percentage in modernization, and this percentage in expansion." And so those projects that came in were preservation projects that were in future years that we were just able to advance to the current year.

MR. ROEHRICH: And Madam Chair, I think that's a key point to remember. It's fiscal year, and that 40 million, if you remember, there was the 25 million goal the Legislature gave for 189. There was some of -- the measure of being able to bring in some preservation. But all of that was in this first year, 2018. And again, we're 20 -- if you look at 69, we did not recommend putting money in 69 with using that money, because it wasn't ready in 2018. Design started -- we're looking at now, if it's ready for construction in 2020, then we will have time to bring that into the program through our normal process to adjust when we update each year to the revenues that we have available and to look at what projects need to be prioritized in that year. So this board will have the opportunity to continue to focus on the priority of the projects you watch each fiscal year as we move forward through the programming cycle.

CHAIRWOMAN BEAVER: And if I'm correct, though, the question or the concern that Board Member Stratton's

bringing up is because they're moving along and they've got commitment for certain dollar amounts right now, if we don't build this into the program, are they going to be able to have that ability to say, "Okay. This project's on track. We're needing more dollars." And so I think that's where the question is on their part, is that they're needing some kind of action from our board that says, you know, "We're going to support this," and then they can go forward with developing whatever it is to get their funding portion.

MR. ROEHRICH: Madam Chair, I can't speak to what Mr. Bridges and CYMPO need or want. That's up to them. I'm just trying to react to the decisions this board makes relative to our five-year program and make sure that whatever you're guiding us or you're directing us to do as staff, we can look at you and say it's fiscally constrained and it's the correct thing to do given the programming requirements that we have.

MR. STRATTON: Madam Chair.

CHAIRWOMAN BEAVER: Yes. Board Member Stratton.

MR. STRATTON: First off, I'd like to follow-up on Board Member Hammond's comment that we shouldn't be moving -- I'm not suggesting we take money out of MAG or PAG or anything else if we fund this; that it should come out of Greater Arizona.

But as Greater Arizona, other than possibly the RTA in Pinal County if it passes in November, doesn't have the

option for help from a MAG or a PAG. And when we get the opportunity to leverage dollars and make those stretch in Greater Arizona for a priority or a warranted project, I really believe we have to pay attention to that.

Secondly, if we'll go back to the conversation in Payson, we don't like to do anything contingent, and I agree with that. We shouldn't.

I'm going to ask that this be tabled until September. I'd like for CYMPO to consider what you suggested and see if they will make those commitments for future years, and I think our scoping document will be a little bit further along. We may have some better information, and we may know a little bit more about contingency funds as we go through this first quarter of FY '18. So I'd make a motion that this is tabled until the September meeting.

MR. ROEHRICH: Madam Chair, Mr. Stratton, we don't need a motion for that. You just guide us and say that this will be a future topic. That's all we need.

MR. STRATTON: I'd like to see it on the September meeting and discussion, and see what CYMPO has done and see where we stand with the -- the scoping document and such.

MR. HAMMIT: Madam Chair, Mr. Stratton, Chris just informed me October would be better, because with their meeting schedule, they won't be prepared to do that before

October.

MR. STRATTON: Then I'll ask that it come back in November, as I may be out of the country in October, and this is certainly a project I want to have input on.

CHAIRWOMAN BEAVER: So as I understand it, the request is to bring this back in November.

MR. ROEHRICH: Madam Chair, that's correct. We'll agenda this item in November.

CHAIRWOMAN BEAVER: Okay.

MR. ROEHRICH: And I'll be out of the country, by the way. Good luck, Dallas.

MR. HAMMIT: Where you going?

MR. ROEHRICH: I haven't figured it out yet. Believe me, I'm finding a place, a place with a beach.

MR. LA RUE: Book a flight for two.

CHAIRWOMAN BEAVER: Okay. So it looks now like we're moving on to the second --

MR. ROEHRICH: Well, okay. Yes. The second item.

CHAIRWOMAN BEAVER: The second half --

MR. ROEHRICH: Right.

CHAIRWOMAN BEAVER: The second half of the Item 8, which now would be the 4th Street Bridge replacement in the city of Flagstaff.

MR. HAMMIT: So we're going to move north. This

-- the 4th Street Bridge is a bridge over Interstate 40 in Flagstaff. You can see that the big map -- and I'm going to zoom in on it. There's actually two bridges over Interstate 40. The -- ADOT was in the process of doing a preservation project on those bridges.

The City of Flagstaff approached the department and said, "While you're doing this work, it would make sense to widen these bridges to add for future capacity of 4th Street." And as you can see from the aerial, that to the north there, there is a widening of the existing roadway. ADOT had a scoping document completed. They are reconsidering that scoping, because the original scoping document was just to preserve the existing roadway -- or the existing bridges.

What do we need to do to -- if we want to expand? One thing we could do is rehab the existing and widen. The other thing we could do is reconstruct the whole thing. One of the advantages of reconstructing the whole thing is we can account for future widening of I-40. Someday we're going to need -- Audra would tell me it's today -- but someday we're going to need three lanes in each direction on I-40. And if we're going to put money into a bridge structure, it makes a lot of sense that that new bridge structure can span three lanes. So we're in that process.

At the same time, Audra and the district staff, are working with the City of Flagstaff, getting agreements on

costs. Right now the -- a rough estimate is around $9 million. ADOT ,looking at 4 million. The City, 5 million. And they have a -- draft ideas for a JPA that have not been executed, but they were moving forward. Once that can happen at the same time, we'll finish the scoping to know, yes, it's going to be a new set of bridges, or we can work with a preservation. That decision should be made in the next -- I'll make sure, but I think it will be done within the next month what type of structures we're going to do. So that project is moving forward through the negotiations of the JPA, and the scoping will be completed early this year, this fiscal year.

CHAIRWOMAN BEAVER: Board Member Stratton.

MR. STRATTON: Dallas, if I'm correct, didn't we have $2 million budgeted for repairs?

MR. HAMMIT: That was in the preservation plan for that. That was part -- that would be part of our 4 million if we bring that forward. Yes.

MR. STRATTON: All right. And what year was that for?

MR. HAMMIT: I believe it was 2020. Do you remember? 2020.

MR. STRATTON: Thank you.

I'd ask that this come back to the Board at the same time as the CYMPO project comes back. I think things will be a lot further along. A JPA may be signed. Your scoping or

your recommendation of replacement or not would be done. I think it would be appropriate to address both of these. It's actually the same situation. We have an entity coming forward with a lot of money, and it would cost ADOT very little in addition to that. So I'd like to discuss it at that time again.

CHAIRWOMAN BEAVER: Okay. And do I understand we don't need any kind of a motion on this, but we would like both of them brought back for the November meeting?

MR. ROEHRICH: That's correct. Yes, ma'am. Well, beyond the agenda.

CHAIRWOMAN BEAVER: If there's nothing further. Are you -- would you like to share anything additional?

MR. HAMMIT: Not on Item 8, Madam Chair.

CHAIRWOMAN BEAVER: Okay.

MR. SELLERS: Madam Chair.

CHAIRWOMAN BEAVER: Yes. Board Member Sellers.

MR. SELLERS: That would not delay this project in any way by delaying our decision on this until November?

MR. HAMMIT: Madam Chair, Member Sellers, no, it would not.

CHAIRWOMAN BEAVER: Okay. If there's no additional questions, we will move on to Item 9, the state engineer's report.

MR. HAMMIT: Thank you, Madam Chair.

As far as the state engineer's report, currently

we have 116 projects under construction totaling $1.527 billion. Ten projects were finaled in April, totaling $20 million, and year to date, we have finalized 133 projects.

Another item in the state engineer's report, I was asked to brief the Board on our safety corridors. Right now, we have four safety corridors throughout the state. Somebody asks, "Well, how did you pick these four? Why only four?" We work very closely with DPS, the Department of Public Safety, as well as the Governor's Office of Highway Safety on identifying corridors that had a large number of crashes as well as a large number of citations. DPS brought that information in.

And the big thing is, is behavior. We believe on these corridors, behavior is causing a number of the crashes. So as you see, the corridors in this area on I-40, and I call it between the 93s, so here in Kingman, 93 as you go north, you take I-40 and then you go south to Wikieup. That segment of I-40 is one of our safety corridors. This segment of I-10 as you approach the tunnel is a safety corridor. The segment of I-10 as you leave the 202 in Chandler and go through the Gila River is another safety corridor. And then our last safety corridor is also in the metro area on US-60.

In these areas, DPS is committed to extra law enforcement. That's one reason we can't expand it to multi -- or a lot more areas, because it does expend multiple resources.

We participated by getting some signs as well as the Governor's Office of Highway Safety brought money to the table in this effect. So, again, we're working to educate the drivers and put increased enforcement are key things we're -- or attempt to make -- save lives by reducing unacceptable behavior. They're going to be ticketing very close to the speed limit. Their signs say zero tolerance, and I have had reports on I-10 that people have been cited for less than five over at different times.

We're also -- target areas, as I said, where we had a large number of fatal crashes and where there was a number of citations based on behavior, speeding, lack of restraint and impairment. So that's how we identified our safety corridors. We have -- we're evaluating them over the next two years. We're about nine months into it. We will evaluate it after that period. We plan to continue the program, but we may switch corridors. Did we make a difference? And if we did, maybe we can find additional funds to put more law enforcement on another corridor.

CHAIRWOMAN BEAVER: Excuse me. I would like to ask you a question with regard to those safety corridors. Two points. With the law enforcement, for those particular areas, have you identified or have they identified for our use, which I'm assuming if they've been identified as safety corridors, they have, but the accidents and things that have happened on those roads, is it speeding? Alcohol related? Drug related?

Texting on a phone? Like, what -- what is causing those particular areas to have a higher level of problem than other areas, one? And two, I'm just curious do those stretches have the overhead signage that are going up around the state?

MR. HAMMIT: Madam Chair, the answer to the first part is yes to all of them. These are identified because of behavior issues, a behavior of driving too fast, and that is the common thread throughout all of these four corridors. There's excessive speed.

But there is also impairment. They have details. They're putting details to do stops to see if there's impaired drivers. They're adding that to this.

They identify distracted driving. Right now we don't have a primary law that we can stop for distraction, other than if you're being careless. You know, they -- we don't have a stop for obvious texting or distracted, but if you're making erratic lane changes, they can stop you for that. They're looking for those behavior areas.

The second question, overhead message boards, in all of these areas we do have a number of overhead message boards that we can alert motorists for any number of -- you know, I was just in Star Valley two nights ago with the city council, and we worked with them after the Payson meeting to get on the message board to warn drivers to slow down. If you remember a few years ago, they had photo enforcement through the

town. That went away and they saw an increase in speed. They put up some speed feedback signs, so it says, "Your speed is," and it flashes at you. And we used our message boards, and they were very happy that we're using that for safety purposes to help speed through their town, control behavior.

CHAIRWOMAN BEAVER: In addition, kind of for the benefit of Board members, if all of you have not been over to the TOC, because that's where those message boards -- the messages that are coming out on those boards come from there to begin with. If you haven't had the opportunity to have that tour yet, you might see if they can set it up for you. I think maybe Jesse and Steve, you haven't been there yet. Very interesting, though.

MR. HAMMIT: Madam Chair, I have one more. And on that note, I'd be happy to take anyone to the TOC if it's your first time or 10th time. We were constantly making changes. A couple years ago, we brought law enforcement in. That's been a game changer. Having them sitting right next to our operators communicating, not only to our staff, but through their staff, and they can see what's going on before their troopers are getting on site has been a game changer in the valley, and we're working to increase that throughout the state where we have cameras.

CHAIRWOMAN BEAVER: And I'd also add, I think that's where the Twitter feed is coming out of, too, for weather

and all of that. So it's just -- it's really, I think, a plus for the citizens of Arizona, because it just adds a level of oversight and safety that we haven't maybe had in the past.

MR. SELLERS: Madam Chair.

CHAIRWOMAN BEAVER: Board Member Sellers.

MR. SELLERS: Yeah. I think I'm the one that asked to have this on an agenda, and I guess one of my questions is: Do we know of other areas that have done something like this and what kind of results they've gotten? And I guess my other question is -- that people keep asking me is: Why don't we set speed limits that we're willing to enforce rather than just having certain areas where we're going to enforce the speed limits?

MR. HAMMIT: Madam Chair, Member Sellers, it has been done in other states, and we have seen success. Other states have different laws. So as you approach Grands, New Mexico on I-40, between Gallup and Albuquerque, they have a safety corridor. One thing New Mexico allows through their legislature, if you're speeding or you're ticketed within a safety corridor, it's a double fine. We don't have that legislation that would allow it in Arizona. But they do have that, and they've seen some reductions in crashes in that area. There's -- in the neighborhood of 10 states that we know of that have these safety corridors with a mixed area of success.

As far as speed limits, a number of these

areas -- US-60 is a good example. The speed limit is posted at 65. When it's on the morning commute, you're lucky to go 45. But after that, we have a very -- we have a lot of pavement. It's very comfortable to drive, and probably your 85th speed average is 75 or above. It would not be prudent to sign that in an urban area at 75, even though we know that the 85th speed is 75.

As far as enforcement, I think DPS would tell me that it's their availability of troopers, that they don't have enough to greatly enforce more than in these corridors. They are out there. I see them on the roads regularly pulling people over, but they're limited on the numbers of troopers they have to put out there.

CHAIRWOMAN BEAVER: Just it's something related to the safety issue, but I know this is the second time on that Corwin Drive in Bullhead City that it's come up. Is it possible we could just have Alvin look into that and see?

MR. HAMMIT: Madam Chair, I'll make sure you get a briefing on that, the status of that project.

CHAIRWOMAN BEAVER: Okay. Thank you.

MR. HAMMIT: And if I may, one thing that ties into our safety corridors, during holiday events, we've identified these holiday corridors. So on holiday events, Memorial Day, 4th of July, Labor Day, we are putting extra enforcements, very similar to the safety corridors, but we know

on holidays, I-17 is a challenge. I was on there on the 3rd for almost two-and-a-half hours trying to get to Phoenix to the airport. A rollover crash happened. 87 is another area, and I-10 between the (inaudible) between Phoenix and Tucson.

In addition to having the extra enforcement, again, we're working with law enforcement. We're staging equipment. So I put loaders, signs and those things in strategic areas during that period so if we do have a crash, we need to get people fast, I had the equipment already on site during those periods of time. So -- and they have been confused, because in the media they call those safety corridors as well, but I just wanted to point out the difference between our holiday corridors are specific times, versus the safety corridors are all the time.

And that's all for the state engineer's report.

CHAIRWOMAN BEAVER: Thank you.

I will -- I think -- I had heard a comment with regard to the -- because it actually flashes holiday corridor, and somebody said, "Well, the holiday's over." Well, it was, like, the day after, you know, and I don't think things had gotten changed yet. But there was still a lot of traffic that was coming home, but it was just one of those comments that somebody had made about it.

If there's nothing additional with regard to the state engineer report, we'll move on now to the construction

contracts.

MR. HAMMIT: Madam Chair, thank you. And all the Board, thank you for the approval of the items in the consent agenda.

We do have some projects to talk about. I want to point out in the summary sheet, year to date total, we have 445 million, almost $800,000 that we -- are low bids. Our estimate was 441, we'll call it. We were within 1.1 percent.

Starting next month we will start the fiscal year over. I asked because when I saw this yesterday -- or day before yesterday, why is it now we're in the July and the next fiscal year. These were the projects that were advertised in the past year, but starting the next year, we'll start this table over and -- for the new fiscal year. But as -- for the year, we're within 1.1 percent total.

And a lot of that change came in the last few months. We have seen more pricing volatility over the last few months.

Item 10A, if we're ready, Madam Chair.

CHAIRWOMAN BEAVER: Yes.

MR. HAMMIT: This is a project in Flagstaff. It is a widening of a local street, and one of the things -- I get information very fluid. So five minutes after the board meeting started, this project was originally listed asking the Board to postpone. I'm going to have a different recommendation.

Michelle said I will not go to jail if I recommend that, so I am going to move forward with it.

On this project, the low bid was $538,000. The State's estimate was $490,200. It was over the State's estimate by $47,800, or 9.8 percent. One of the concerns that we were looking at on the postponement since it is a local project, did they have the money for the extra funds. I did find out this morning they do. So my recommendation is not to postpone, but after reviewing the bids that the department does believe this was a responsive and responsible bid and would recommend award to Ban Construction, Inc. And one note. If it -- if I'd have had the information earlier, this would have been on the consent agenda, because it's within those limits.

CHAIRWOMAN BEAVER: Okay. Can --

MR. LA RUE: So moved.

CHAIRWOMAN BEAVER: Could I just have clarification? You said Ban Construction, and this is --

MR. HAMMIT: Oh, excuse me. It's Contracting.

CHAIRWOMAN BEAVER: Contracting, Inc.

MR. HAMMIT: Yes.

CHAIRWOMAN BEAVER: Motion --

MR. LA RUE: So moved.

CHAIRWOMAN BEAVER: Motion by Board Member La Rue. Second?

MR. CUTHBERTSON: Second.

CHAIRWOMAN BEAVER: Second by Board Member Cuthbertson to approve Item 10A.

All those in favor?

BOARD MEMBERS: Aye

CHAIRWOMAN BEAVER: All those opposed? Motion carries.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Opposed.

CHAIRWOMAN BEAVER: Okay. Now we'll move on to Item 10B.

MR. HAMMIT: Madam Chair, this is a project in La Paz County. It is a shoulder repair. The low bid was $1,361,893.08. The State's estimate was $900,361.55. It was over the State's estimate by $461,531.53, or 51 percent. We saw higher-than-expected for our concrete poured and mobilization. The County would -- since they were -- they're on the hook for coming up with addition funds, and to ask us to reject all bids, they'd like to take that, rescope it within the budget and re-advertise at a later date. So the recommendation is to reject all bids.

CHAIRWOMAN BEAVER: Is there a motion to accept and approve --

MR. HAMMOND: So moved.

CHAIRWOMAN BEAVER: Okay. Thank you. Board Member Hammond's made a motion to accept and approve staff's recommendation to reject all bids. Is there a second?

MR. STRATTON: Second.

CHAIRWOMAN BEAVER: Seconded by Board Member Stratton.

All those in favor?

BOARD MEMBERS: Aye.

CHAIRWOMAN BEAVER: All those opposed? The motion carries.

Item 10C.

MR. HAMMIT: Thank you, Madam Chair.

This is a project in the city of Glendale. It has some decorative pavement and lighting. The low bid was $595,000. The State's estimate was $477,867. It was over the State's estimate by $117,133, or 24.5 percent. The local has come up with the additional funds. The reason in the difference was some of the special pavers that were used and the grading for the pavement. It was a tight area. With the additional funds, the staff has reviewed the bids and believes the bid is responsive and responsible and would recommend award to KAZ Construction, Inc.

MR. LA RUE: Move to award.

MR. STRATTON: Second.

CHAIRWOMAN BEAVER: Okay. Motion to accept and approve staff recommendation for award, the contract for Item 10C to KAZ Construction was made by Board Member La Rue, and seconded --

MR. SELLERS: Can I ask a question?

CHAIRWOMAN BEAVER: -- by Board Member Stratton. (Inaudible.)

MR. HAMMOND: I'd like to ask a question. You know, this is in the middle of the city and you only got two to bid on it? Is that normal?

MR. HAMMIT: Not generally. I think with the lighting and the site work, it's a mix on who's going to be a prime. Is it going to be an electrical contractor or a paving contractor? I think as we put together projects or encourage locals, we need to look at that, because there's few that can do both those items of work. And remember, our contractors have to do at least 40 percent themselves. They can't sub out more than that.

MR. HAMMOND: Thank you.

CHAIRWOMAN BEAVER: Okay. The motion's to accept and approve staff's recommendation for Item 10C.

All those in favor?

BOARD MEMBERS: Aye.

CHAIRWOMAN BEAVER: All those opposed? Motion carries.

Item 10D.

MR. HAMMIT: Thank you, Madam Chair.

Item 10D is a multi-use path in the city of Litchfield Park. On this project, as we reviewed the bids, the

low bid -- low bidder submitted their DBE paperwork. It was found that they did not meet the DBE goal. None of the other three bidders submitted their DBE paperwork within the allotted times. With that, they are all nonresponsive. So the staff's recommendation is to reject all bids, and we will re-advertise.

MR. STRATTON: Madam Chair.

CHAIRWOMAN BEAVER: Board Member Stratton.

MR. STRATTON: Is this the project we received the letter on from Combs?

MR. HAMMIT: Madam Chair, Member Stratton, that is correct.

MR. STRATTON: I have a couple questions, if I may then. Just curiosity.

Is it that all bidders have to put their DBE in with the bid or within five days, or if the low -- apparent low bidder did not submit or didn't meet it, then the next bidder would have five days after notification to turn that in, or does he have to turn it in at the time of the bid, he or she?

MR. HAMMIT: Madam Chair, Member Stratton, it is all bidders have to turn in their DBE within five days of the opening. This did change right at the first of the year, and if you remember, I think we were in the Tucson area, we had a similar issue. I briefed the Board at that time. At the same time, the department did a lot of outreach with our Association of General Contractors. They worked with us very closely on

developing this bid.

Our federal partners also worked with us. One of the recommendations was wanted to turn in all your stuff at bid time, there is some disadvantages for the contracting community with that. The other was the top three have to turn it in every time. The agency, the contractors had some concern with that. One, you're asking a disadvantaged business enterprise, "Give me paperwork and do this work, and you're not going to get the job," because I was second or third, and they didn't think there was going to be compliance.

So we worked out a compromise. Anyone who's going to be considered for the project has to turn it in, but there's no dissidence to the contractor if they don't. One thing to point out to go to your question, before this started this year, if we rejected, number one, number two had five additional days. That's what changed within the spec, and that's where we were told we were non-compliant by FHWA with our current DBE process.

MR. STRATTON: Madam Chair, if I -- I do remember you asking us to postpone a bid so that the next lowest bidder could supply their DBE material, I believe. I didn't remember if it was prior to the first of the year or since the first of the year, but if we changed policies, did we advise all contractors? Do we give them a notice or how was that handled?

MR. HAMMIT: So we work very closely with the

contractors association. Our staff briefed at our joint luncheon. Their AGC went and briefed in their individual meetings, because they were at the table when we drafted the new specification, as well as it's in our specification at least three times saying if you don't turn it in, you're nonresponsive.

So we did outreach. We sent out fliers. And in addition to this, every project, the day after opening, our business engagement group sends a email out to every bidder saying, "Turn in your DBE paperwork." So they're reminded. We did outreach on the project -- or on the process, on the new specifications.

MR. STRATTON: And this is the first it's come up since the first of the year change of policy?

MR. HAMMIT: As a protest, Mr. Stratton, that is correct.

MR. STRATTON: That's all, Madam Chair.

CHAIRWOMAN BEAVER: Thank you.

Do we have a motion?

MR. LA RUE: I'd move to accept the recommendation and reject all bids.

CHAIRWOMAN BEAVER: Okay. Motion by Board Member La Rue. Is there a second?

MR. HAMMOND: Second.

CHAIRWOMAN BEAVER: Seconded by Board Member

Hammond to accept and approve the staff's recommendation to reject all bids.

All those in favor?

BOARD MEMBERS: Aye.

CHAIRWOMAN BEAVER: All those opposed? Motion carries.

Item 10E.

MR. HAMMIT: Thank you, Madam Chair.

This project is in the city of Peoria. It's to install closed-circuit television cameras for their freeway operation. The low bid was $242,484.42. The State's estimate was $211,057.50. It was over the State's estimate by $31,426.92, or 14.9 percent. Almost the whole difference was in the electrical conduit price. We have reviewed the bids, and the department believes it was a reasonable and responsive bid and would recommend award to Contractors West, Inc.

MR. LA RUE: Move to award.

CHAIRWOMAN BEAVER: Motion by Board Member La Rue to accept and approve staff's recommendations to award the contract for 10E to Contractors West, Inc. Is there a second?

MR. CUTHBERTSON: Second.

CHAIRWOMAN BEAVER: Seconded by Board Member Cuthbertson.

All those in favor?

BOARD MEMBERS: Aye.

CHAIRWOMAN BEAVER: All those opposed? The motion carries.

Item 10F.

MR. HAMMIT: Thank you, Madam Chair.

This project is another local project in the city of Nogales. The low bid was $447,500. The State's estimate was $392,722, or it is $54,778 over the State's estimate, or 13.9 percent. Right now the department is working with the City of Nogales. They are looking for the additional funds. They believe working that they will be able to come up with that funding, but at this time we are recommending postponement so they can get their finances in order.

MR. STRATTON: Madam Chair.

CHAIRWOMAN BEAVER: Board Member Stratton.

MR. STRATTON: I actually had a call from someone in Nogales that I happen to know. The deputy director. And he said they had found the funds, to his knowledge, and he has some concerns that postponing this too long, there may be some difficult weather issues, because they just had a sewer, water line project on that particular street. I understand we have to have it in writing from them, but I would ask that if you receive that, if we could call a telephonic meeting and get this passed so they could move forward in order to accommodate their concerns about weather.

MR. HAMMIT: Madam Chair, Member Stratton, if

that's the Board's prerogative, we'd be happy to do that as soon as we get the information.

Floyd's looking at me like, "What did you commit to?"

MR. ROEHRICH: Well, Madam Chair, don't forget next Friday, we got a telephonic meeting. So if this comes in early next week, we've got the meeting for the wrong way driver next Friday, and I would expect if this comes in, and as Dallas says, it's good to go, that could be included in that agenda, so...

MR. STRATTON: That would be --

MR. ROEHRICH: We've got an opportunity. So we'll keep monitoring that as staff.

CHAIRWOMAN BEAVER: Okay. Thank you.

So do we have a motion to approve -- accept and approve --

MR. CUTHBERTSON: Postpone.

CHAIRWOMAN BEAVER: Oh, to postpone. Excuse me. A motion to accept and approve the staff's recommendation to postpone Item 10F.

MR. HAMMOND: So moved.

CHAIRWOMAN BEAVER: The motion was by Board Member Hammond, seconded by Board Member Cuthbertson to postpone Item 10F as stated.

All those in favor?

BOARD MEMBERS: Aye.

CHAIRWOMAN BEAVER: All those opposed? Motion carries.

Item 10G.

MR. HAMMIT: Thank you, Madam Chair.

This is another local project. This one in the city of Summerton. It is a shared use path is the project. The low bid was $743,936. The State's estimate was $701,573.85. It was over the State's estimate by $42,362.15, or 6 percent. Like the previous one, the City of Summerton does believe they can come up with the funding. They're just going through the process and working out that agreement. The staff's recommendation is to postpone and let us work out that agreement with the City of Summerton.

CHAIRWOMAN BEAVER: Is this one likewise one that might be ready by Friday?

MR. HAMMIT: When I get back or even on the way, I will call and see where we're at with them moving forward. And if it is, Madam Chair, we'll bring it forward as soon as it's ready.

CHAIRWOMAN BEAVER: Okay. Do we have a motion to accept and approve staff's recommendation to postpone Item 10G?

MR. SELLERS: So moved.

CHAIRWOMAN BEAVER: Motion by Jack Sellers or Board Member Sellers, seconded by Board Member Stratton to

postpone Item 10G.

All those in favor?

BOARD MEMBERS: Aye.

CHAIRWOMAN BEAVER: All those opposed? The motion carries.

Item 10H.

MR. HAMMIT: Madam Chair, this is a intersection improvement. This is a project we've worked on for a long time in the Florence area on 79 and 79B. The low bid was $618,961.62. The State's estimate was $809,624.22. It was under the State's estimate by $190,662.60, or 23.5 percent. We did see better-than-expected prices for the removals of the existing aggregate base and the asphaltic concrete. After review of the bids, the department believes it was a reasonable and responsive bid and recommends award to Combs Construction Company, Inc.

MR. STRATTON: So moved.

CHAIRWOMAN BEAVER: Motion by Board Member Stratton to accept and approve staff's recommendation to award the contract for Item 10H to Combs Construction Company, Inc. Is there a second?

MR. LA RUE: Second.

CHAIRWOMAN BEAVER: It's been seconded by Board Member La Rue.

In there's no further discussion, all those in

favor?

BOARD MEMBERS: Aye.

CHAIRWOMAN BEAVER: All those opposed? The motion carries.

Item 10I.

MR. HAMMIT: Thank you, Madam Chair.

This project is within the city of Sierra Vista on SR-90. It's a roadway rehab and widening. The low bid was $2,633,000. The State's estimate was $2,145,017. It was over the State's estimate by $487,983, or 22.7 percent. We saw higher-than-expected pricing within the asphaltic concrete, the aggregate base, and then they have a retaining wall. We saw a higher-than-expected price there. After review of the bids, the department does believe it was a reasonable and responsive bid and would recommend award to KE and G Construction, Inc.

CHAIRWOMAN BEAVER: Do we have a motion to accept and approve the staff's recommendation?

MR. CUTHBERTSON: So moved.

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

MR. HAMMOND: Second.

CHAIRWOMAN BEAVER: Seconded by Board Member Hammond. Motion's to accept and approve staff's recommendation to award the contract for Item 10I to KE and G Construction, Inc.

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

BOARD MEMBERS: Aye.

CHAIRWOMAN BEAVER: All those opposed? The motion carries.

Item 10J.

MR. HAMMIT: Thank you, Madam Chair.

So we're going home for Mr. Cuthbertson here. This is in Clifton. We met with the community about a year-and-a-half ago, and we talked about some traffic calming opportunities through the area. On this project, the low bid was $668,231. The State's estimate was $462 946 -- or excuse me, $462,496. It was over the State's estimate by $205,285, or 44.3 percent. We saw higher-than-expected pricing in the concrete mobilization. The groups will have to mobilize quite some distance. We did review the bids. The staff believes it was a reasonable and responsive bid and would recommend award to AJP Electric, Inc.

CHAIRWOMAN BEAVER: Is there a motion to accept and approve staff's recommendation?

MR. CUTHBERTSON: Move to approve.

CHAIRWOMAN BEAVER: Motion by the Board Member Cuthbertson to accept and approve staff's recommendation to award the contract for Item 10J to AJP Electric, Inc. Is there a second?

MR. STRATTON: Second.

CHAIRWOMAN BEAVER: Seconded by Board Member Stratton.

With no further discussion, all those in favor?

BOARD MEMBERS: Aye.

CHAIRWOMAN BEAVER: All those opposed? The motion carries.

Item 10K.

MR. HAMMIT: Thank you, Madam Chair.

And this is my last one. I'm sure right now Mr. Hammond is kicking himself, because he told me last night, "We do not hear enough from you at the board meeting." So right now I'm sure he's kicking himself.

MR. HAMMOND: You made up for it.

MR. HAMMIT: On this project, it is a removal of a water supply. When we did some work on the 260 corridor, a number of projects we put in a water system supply to supply construction water for this project. For the last project, we have a different source. So we need to remove this as a part of our contract and agreement with The Forest Service. The low bid was $482,564.54. The State's estimate was $857,305.77. It did come under the estimate by $374,741.21, or 43.7. We saw better-than-expected pricing for the removal of the pipe, the pump station, some of the structures. One of the things the contractor does receive these materials and sees the salvage

value that they can put into it, and we saw that in the pricing, the good pricing that they gave us. After review of the bids, the department believes the bid is reasonable and responsive, and would recommend award to Hatch Construction and Paving, Inc.

MR. STRATTON: Madam Chair, if I may?

CHAIRWOMAN BEAVER: Board Member Stratton.

MR. STRATTON: A couple questions, Dallas. Will this affect the Lion Springs project in any way?

MR. HAMMIT: Madam Chair, Member Stratton, no. We have found another water source that we do not need this one to do work there.

MR. STRATTON: And will this complete our -- I believe that agreement's between SRP, Forest Service and ADOT

MR. HAMMIT: That is correct.

MR. STRATTON: And the injection wells, is that going to be completed by another contractor, or do we have to do anything there? Is this going to complete and fulfill that contractual?

MR. HAMMIT: Madam Chair, Member Stratton, I believe we have got the water table up to where we need it to be, and so we have met our requirements with SRP.

MR. STRATTON: So will we have to do any further removal of any equipment other than what this contract --

MR. HAMMIT: My understanding, and I'll confirm it, but my understanding is this completes all of our

obligations when we put the water system in.

MR. STRATTON: Move to approve.

CHAIRWOMAN BEAVER: Motion by Board Member Stratton to accept and approve the staff's recommendation award the contract for Item 10K to Hatch Construction and Paving, Inc. Is there a second?

MR. CUTHBERTSON: Second.

CHAIRWOMAN BEAVER: Seconded by Board Member Cuthbertson.

If there's no further discussion, all those the favor?

BOARD MEMBERS: Aye.

CHAIRWOMAN BEAVER: All those opposed? The motion carries.

MR. HAMMIT: Thank you, Madam Chair.

CHAIRWOMAN BEAVER: Wow. Okay. We are now on to Item 11, suggestions.

MR. ROEHRICH: Madam Chair, just a couple of things for the Board's consideration. As already identified, next Friday on the 20th of July, we have scheduled a telephonic board -- a meeting to award the wrong way driver detection system project. In addition, we will monitor -- monitoring the Items 10F and 10G to see if those are prepared and ready to be awarded at that time. Agenda should go out early next week, and so we'll be prepared to do that.

I also wanted to remind the Board that, again, there's no meeting in August. Remember, August was the month off. In consideration of that, I have been working with the Board chair. There will be no study session in August. We are looking at preparing the items that we've been asked to look at for a study session would roll into the October study session. So we're moving forward with the coordination and preparation for that.

But I do want to remind the Board that in August, we still need to address -- because of the contract time frame requirements, we still need to address construction contracts. So we will look at working with the Board's chair schedule and your schedule a time that week of the 14th to the 18th, basically, when the board meeting would have scheduled, to get a telephonic meeting in that and get ourselves prepared so we can address the Board awards at that time.

And then the last item just for consideration in September, reminder, we were coordinating a meeting on the Hopi Nation up in the Second Mesa area, and in coordination with their leadership, it looks as if we're settling on a location on -- at Moenkopi, which is just next to -- or Moenkopi, excuse me, Moenkopi, which is just next to Tuba City. So they have a facility there that will be able to host the meeting. In addition, they have a number of events that they're looking to schedule that Thursday in the afternoon, afternoon into evening,

to include a little tour of the area, a little bit of discussion on the culture, the Hopi culture, a traditional dance, as well as a dinner that night in consideration of the Board having the meeting there.

So we'll have more information as Lynn and I are able to coordinate and get that set up. But just some things to consider over the next couple of months, activities, and then if you've got, obviously, any questions, as we provide the information, just let Linda or myself know.

CHAIRWOMAN BEAVER: Okay. I would just like to ask that an invitation be extended to Arlando Teller, our former board member. The reason we're even having it up in that area is because he made the request. So since he's no longer on the Board, I'd like to at least invite him to --

MR. ROEHRICH: Yes, ma'am.

CHAIRWOMAN BEAVER: Thank you.

MR. ROEHRICH: Yeah. We'll work on that.

So with that, if there are any other agenda items. We do capture the one for November to get a further update on our coordination on the State Route 69 project and the 4th Street Bridge project. If there are any other agenda items, please let us know.

(End of recording.)

Adjournment

A motion to adjourn the July 21, 2017 State Transportation Board meeting was made by Board Member Cuthbertson and seconded by Board Member Sellers. In a voice vote, the motion carries.

Meeting adjourned at 11:13 a.m. MST.

Deanna L. Beaver

Deanna Beaver, Chairwoman
State Transportation Board

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