

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

Call to Order

Vice Chair Hammond called the Public Hearing to order at 9:00 a.m.

Pledge

The Pledge of Allegiance was led by Vice Chair Hammond.

Roll call by Board Secretary Linda Priano

In attendance: Vice Chair Hammond, Board Member Thompson, Board Member Stratton, Board Member Elters and Board Member Knight. Chairman Sellers was not present. There was a quorum. Approximately 45 members of the public were in attendance.

Opening Remarks

Vice Chair Hammond thanked the City of Tucson, Southern Arizona Leadership Council and the Tucson Metro Chamber of Commerce for the dinner they hosted for the board members Thursday evening at Charros Steak. Board Member Stratton also thanked them for their hospitality.

Title VI of the Civil Rights Act

ADOT Executive Officer, 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.

Public Hearing Call to the Audience for the FY2020-2024 Tentative Five Year Transportation Facilities Construction Program:

1. Mayor Rothschild, City of Tucson
2. Jeff Meilbeck, Executive Director Flagstaff Metropolitan Planning Organization
3. Ana Olivares, Director, Pima County Transportation
4. Dave Perry, Greater Oro Valley Chamber President
5. Kara Harris, Cochise County resident
6. Patricia Burris, Community Member
7. Dr. Ronald Spark, Southern Arizona Transit Advocate
8. Paul Keesler, Town of Oro Valley Engineer
9. Diane Call, Resident of Marana, AZ
10. Paul Ward, Executive Director, Yuma Metropolitan Planning Organization
11. Mike Smejkal, TAA Planning VP, Tucson Airport Authority

ARIZONA STATE TRANSPORTATION BOARD

STATE TRANSPORTATION BOARD

PUBLIC HEARING

REPORTER'S TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS

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

March 15, 2019
9:00 a.m.

PREPARED FOR:
ADOT - STATE TRANSPORTATION BOARD

(Certified Copy)

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:
Mayor Rothschild.....	4
Jeff Meilbeck.....	7
Ana Olivares.....	8
Dave Perry.....	10
Kara Harris.....	13
Patricia Burris.....	15
Dr. Ronald Spark.....	17
Paul Keesler.....	18
Diane Call.....	19
Paul Ward.....	21
Mike Smejkal.....	23
Presentation of FY 2020-2024 ADOT Tentative Five-Year Transportation Facilities Construction Program, Greg Byres, Division Director, Multimodal Planning Division.....	25

1 (Beginning of excerpt.)

2 VICE CHAIR HAMMOND: Now we'll have a call to the
3 audience for the public hearing. It is an opportunity for
4 members of the public to discuss items of interest, and we'll be
5 having two public hearings. One for the five-year plan, and
6 those that filled out a yellow form will speak first. We'll
7 give you three minutes. We would really appreciate you staying
8 within that time frame.

9 The first speaker will be Mr. Mayor. And by the
10 way, Mr. Mayor, I know I'm sitting in your seat, but I'm not
11 running.

12 MAYOR ROTHSCHILD: Well, you're the only one
13 then.

14 VICE CHAIR HAMMOND: I know.

15 MAYOR ROTHSCHILD: Well, first of all, welcome to
16 Tucson, and thank you for being here with us. We always enjoy
17 having you here, and thank you for coming to our council
18 chambers.

19 Mike, two problems. One, Mr. Elters, is sitting
20 in the Mayor's chair, which is --

21 VICE CHAIR HAMMOND: Darn.

22 MAYOR ROTHSCHILD: -- which is -- I'm sure he's
23 feeling that extra power. And I think there are little levers
24 on the bottom that might be able to rise you up, but I'm not
25 sure. Okay.

1 VICE CHAIR HAMMOND: That's as high as it will
2 go. I'm sorry.

3 MAYOR ROTHSCHILD: All right. Well, first of
4 all, on behalf of our residents, thank you for all of the
5 projects that are going on in Tucson. We're seeing a lot of
6 different kinds of road work for the State, the RTA and the City
7 of Tucson. Of particular importance, the things that are
8 underway and that people are noticing and liking are the Ajo Way
9 work, which is State Route 86, and the Ina traffic interchange
10 at I-10, which is a big deal right now, because it's been closed
11 for so long. And actually, you can now cross as of this week
12 from all the way across Ina, and we're understanding that the --
13 the on ramps and off ramps are going to be open within a week,
14 and that's a big help to the north side.

15 You've also got a number of projects that are
16 under design and slated for construction soon. Of particular
17 importance is the Houghten traffic interchange with I-10, the
18 Ruthrauff traffic interchange at I-10, and the pavement
19 preservation project along Oracle Road. That's both in the city
20 and the county, and that's particularly important to us. It's
21 become kind of an inner city street, but it's a state highway
22 that gets a lot of use.

23 Outside of the region, we still very much
24 appreciate and acknowledge your help with the State Route 189,
25 which is a design-build project underway at the border in Santa

1 Cruz County, and two I-10 projects that are really in Pinal
2 County but that help us, which, of course, are the expansion of
3 the I-10 between Tucson and Phoenix. Everyone from Phoenix
4 should like that, too.

5 The Irvington traffic -- so probably of most
6 importance this day is the five-year plan. Two things of really
7 critical importance to us are the Irvington traffic exchange --
8 interchange at I-19, which has also got RTA money involved, and
9 the Kino Parkway at I-10. It's a five-year plan. The RTA
10 expires -- is set to expire in 2026. We'll be looking for
11 reauthorization. But it's really important that we get those in
12 in the five-year plan so that we can provide the appropriate
13 match.

14 One of our main concerns, as I'm sure all of
15 yours, is the inadequacy of the HURF funds. We're happy that in
16 the last year or two, the state Legislature has cut back on the
17 sweeps, but still, as we all know, we have a major deficit in
18 being able to repair our roads. The City has just done 100
19 million with voter approval. They're about to do another 100
20 million with voter approval (inaudible). We still have a big
21 deficit, so any help you can give us there.

22 I want to also just acknowledge and appreciate
23 the work that Rod Lane does here locally. He does really a
24 great job of being responsive and communicating, and that helps
25 a lot. And, of course, the folks in Phoenix, Floyd and the

1 director. ADOT's been a really good department to work with for
2 us, and as the Board should know that.

3 So we look forward to continuing our work with
4 you, our cooperation with you, and working with you whenever you
5 see funding opportunities arise that can help our region. And I
6 want to thank all of you on behalf of the State of Arizona, the
7 City of Tucson for your service. I know that you make even less
8 sitting up there than the mayor of Tucson, which isn't much. So
9 thank you for doing it. Thank you.

10 VICE CHAIR HAMMOND: Thank you.

11 Next up is Jeff Meilbeck with the Flagstaff MPO.

12 And by the way, if I butcher any name, you're
13 welcome to correct it when you come to the podium.

14 MR. MEILBECK: Thank you, Mr. Chairman members of
15 the Board. My name is Jeff Meilbeck. I'm the executive
16 director of the FMPO. I'm new in this position, just a couple
17 of months, and Supervisor Thompson is on our board and is a very
18 consistent participant. Thank you for all that you do.

19 I want to let you know we are looking forward to
20 having you up in Flagstaff next month, April 12th, and I also
21 want to thank you sincerely for the support in ADOT staff of the
22 4th Street bridge replacement project. It's really the one
23 things that we have been working on and partnering with for
24 years and looking forward to get that done. So thank you, and
25 look forward to seeing you in Flagstaff next month.

1 VICE CHAIR HAMMOND: Thank you.

2 Ana Olivares, Pima County.

3 MS. OLIVARES: Good morning, Mr. Chair and
4 members of the Board. I was glad to hear you enjoyed your stay
5 in Tucson. My hometown, which I love. So I'm glad you had a
6 good time. My name is Ana Olivares, and I'm the transportation
7 director for Pima County. Thank you for the opportunity to
8 speak today. I will be speaking to the tentative five-year
9 program for 2020 to 2024.

10 As I mentioned in our prior meetings that I have
11 attended, there is no greater public policy initiative for Pima
12 County than improving our local economy and the regional
13 economy. Expanding transportation infrastructure and including
14 the state routes is critically important for that initiative to
15 proceed. And as such, we request your support for the following
16 modifications to the five-year program.

17 The first one is to please program the funding
18 for both the design and the construction of the interchanges at
19 Kino Parkway and Country Club, as well as the interstate
20 underpass along the Forgeus Road to make the connection for
21 pedestrians. These improvements are needed to support the key
22 Pima County economic development, to create a major
23 entertainment and sports park at Kino venue. Phase one of this
24 venue is currently under construction, so we are proceeding with
25 that. And we have asked for statements of interest that is

1 being due this -- March 22nd for that venue.

2 The completion of the DCR and EIS for I-10, I-19
3 to Kolb and State Route 210 is imminent, and we understand that
4 the corridor work will be phased. So we asked -- in the
5 tentative plan, funding for the design and the right-of-way for
6 Kino has been programmed in fiscal year '20, and fiscal year '22
7 for Country Club. However, funding for construction of these
8 TIs and the underpass should also be included in these phases
9 and included in this five-year plan.

10 Another program we have is the Sonoran Corridor.
11 A very important economic development for our region.
12 Completion of the tier one is scheduled for spring of 2020, and
13 identifying funding for the continuation of tier two is critical
14 for the development of this corridor. Great relationships have
15 been built with all our stakeholders as we progress through the
16 tier one, and we want to continue that momentum and
17 understanding of the project we were proposing to build. The
18 tier one study was funded with regional 2.6 funds, and we ask
19 that you program the additional funding to continue with the
20 tier two in fiscal year '21 of this five-year program.

21 The last project I want to discuss today is the
22 I-10 and Sunset Road interchange. Pima County is continuing the
23 design of the Sunset Innovation Campus in the southwest area of
24 the interchange, and the connection of I-10 to River is
25 important to -- for the success of this campus. We are starting

1 the DCR and design for this segment of Sunset Road, from I-10 to
2 River, and ask that ADOT include the design of the -- and
3 construction of the interchange of Sunset and I-10 as part of
4 the I-10 widening from Ruthrauff Road to Ina.

5 In the tentative plan, ADOT has programmed 109
6 million from the fiscal year '20 to fiscal year '22 for the
7 design and construction of the widening project, and it makes
8 sense for us to partner with ADOT and complete the interchange
9 reconstruction along with the connection of River Road for the
10 projects. Similar to has been done in the other interchanges at
11 Ina and Twin Peaks. Any other type of interim improvement is
12 really not cost effective.

13 So thank you very much for your time today.

14 VICE CHAIR HAMMOND: Thank you, Ana.

15 Dave Perry now with the Greater Oro Valley
16 Chamber.

17 MR. PERRY: Good morning, members of the
18 transportation board, staff and public. Thank you for the
19 opportunity to speak with you today. My name is Dave Perry.
20 I'm the president and CEO of the Greater Oro Valley Chamber of
21 Commerce. Been there eight years now. Our chamber has 550
22 active members and represents thousands of employees in our
23 region. My wife, Lisa, and I have been happy to live in Oro
24 Valley for 11 years.

25 I want to express our organization's gratitude

1 for and support of ADOT investment in Highway 77, which we all
2 know locally as Oracle Road, and in particular, the stretch
3 north from River and into and through Oro Valley. Oracle Road
4 is the most important roadway in our community and beyond. Our
5 major employer, Roche Tissue Diagnostics, with 1,500 workers on
6 its Oro Valley campus, is accessed from Oracle. So is Oro
7 Valley Hospital. So is our resort, El Conquistador Tucson,
8 three new apartment communities, thousands of single-family
9 residences from Ina all the way up through Oracle Junction to
10 Saddlebrook Ranch in Pinal County, and the great majority of our
11 retail businesses. Likewise, thousands of our residents drive
12 Oracle Road every day to and from work at the U of A and
13 downtown Tucson and elsewhere.

14 Oracle is a lifeline, and it is beleaguered. Up
15 to 50,000 vehicles pound Oracle daily from Ina north to First
16 Avenue in Oro Valley. Oracle is rutted. It's loud. It's
17 difficult to access during this time of year. In a community,
18 Oro Valley, that prides itself on good roads, Oracle Road is
19 easily the most deteriorated roadway that we have.

20 Thanks for your planned 2020 investment in
21 sidewalks from River to Magee. Our office is on the west side
22 of Oracle Road, just north of Ina. The bus stops at Ina
23 northbound, and every day, every workday, I see people walk up
24 Oracle Road on that eight foot shoulder next to a high speed,
25 busy roadway. One night, leaving my office, I nearly struck a

1 pedestrian I simply did not see. Lighting would help, and I
2 would encourage lighting north toward Magee if you would.

3 Pavement preservation from River to Calle
4 Concordia is desperately needed, in particular on the heavily
5 congested stretch to Magee at the -- from the south of Ina to
6 Magee. But the pressure doesn't stop there. Your five-year
7 plan includes a project to preserve pavement from Calle
8 Concordia to Tangerine. It is very much needed and becomes more
9 urgent every day.

10 As you make decisions, please consider that Oro
11 Valley is building 300 new single-family residences a year.
12 Marana, our western neighbor, is building 700 new houses a year.
13 And more of those people work in and do business in Oro Valley
14 and along Oracle Road. Within our town, new, large senior
15 living facilities are just opening, are being built, and are
16 proposed. Further, we will see more apartment communities, and
17 a major economic driver is moving forward on Oracle Road as the
18 University of Arizona makes progress toward the opening of its
19 veterinary school in Oro Valley on Oracle Road. All of this
20 adds traffic, and much of it is on Oracle. We understand that
21 Arizona lacks the collective will to generate enough money to
22 take care of our roads --

23 MR. ROEHRICH: Mr. Perry, if you could please
24 wrap up. Mr. Chair, we've exceeded the three minutes.

25 MR. PERRY: I'll go really quick.

1 I wish I could offer a politically acceptable
2 solution. Setting that aside, please understand that several
3 hundred thousand southern Arizona residents rely on Oracle every
4 day, and your support would be appreciated by our chamber, its
5 members and the citizens of our communities.

6 Thank you for your time and service.

7 VICE CHAIR HAMMOND: Thank you, Dave.

8 Next up is Kara Harris.

9 MS. HARRIS: Cochise County, back again today.

10 VICE CHAIR HAMMOND: Is your bicycle here?

11 MS. HARRIS: No. I didn't bring my bike. Don't
12 you -- see, I'm dressing like a grownup these days. And
13 actually, it's been too cold to ride. We've had snow down at
14 our end of the world.

15 So I haven't been on my bike in a while, but I'm
16 still taking pictures, and the one thing I really want to make
17 you aware of, we talked about this in Douglas, and the port of
18 entry being opened in Douglas, well, until that port of entry is
19 opened -- and I don't know if that will change anything -- what
20 we're seeing is an increased traffic of 18-wheel vehicles that
21 are coming and circumventing I-19, and they are not only coming
22 east on -- on 82. They're also going west. And the 18-wheel
23 traffic has been increased enormously. So my butt has become a
24 moving target.

25 Wide loads are common on 82, which means -- here

1 we go, you know. I got a wide load coming up behind me, and
2 cops hitting the -- the DPS officers hitting their sirens to get
3 me out of the way, to pull off the road, because as you can see,
4 in the next picture, that is my strip to ride on, 18 inches.
5 Which before I came to meet all you guys, I went to Saint David.
6 I thought that that was the way to go. And I asked him just to
7 repair my fissures. The man has ignored me for over a year, and
8 that's frustrating, too.

9 And now, since Peggy Judd isn't here, I want to
10 stick up for J6 in your five-year plan. I'm came to Tucson last
11 week. It took me 45 minutes to get from J6 to Empirita Road.
12 The on ramps are dangerous at J6. They're very short. The one
13 at Skyline is non-exist. And when I-10 has an accident, those
14 of us that have to come to Tucson for a doctor or for a medical
15 appointment at the V.A. get caught up.

16 It took me 45 minutes for that short stretch of
17 road, and when I got up to Empirita Road, because they put out
18 the signs -- thank you, ADOT -- saying there was an accident,
19 and we already knew that, all that was left was the ADOT trucks
20 that were parked on the side of the road. I did not even see
21 the vehicles there. So when I hear people talk about Oracle
22 Road and stuff like that, I'm thinking -- and seeing the
23 wonderful improvements up here in Tucson and to know, yay, Ina
24 Road's open again -- that we need three lanes leaving this
25 state, also. Because there are also residents in Cochise

1 County -- and I know those of you from rural communities know a
2 lot of times we get missed because all the major funding comes
3 in to the big, Maricopa and Pima Counties. But I'd like you
4 also to put in the five-year plan some -- some improvements for
5 I-10 out there, because it's dangerous, and it's also a main
6 artery for those of us that have to get to the hospital.

7 And thank you again for coming to my end of the
8 world. I'll come to yours. Next month I'm going to come to
9 Flagstaff. See you there.

10 VICE CHAIR HAMMOND: Thank you, Kara.

11 Patricia Burris.

12 MS. BURRIS: Hi. I'm Patricia Burris, and I'm
13 from Cochise County as well. I'm a little further down in the
14 corner of the state, near south Highway 191.

15 We -- you guys did a wonderful job on Milepost 47
16 south a number of years ago, maybe three, I think it was.
17 However, you stopped at Milepost 47. Milepost 47 to Milepost 60
18 is horrendous. Highway 191 south is a main vein to Highway 10.
19 We get the -- we get the semis. We get the -- we get
20 everything. We get everything from there. You know, Border
21 Patrol, sheriff's, everything. It's a wonderful place to live,
22 a wonderful place to visit, and a terrible road to drive on.

23 I have submitted 14 photos of the road that I
24 took two days ago. I walked -- I mean, I drove -- I didn't ride
25 my bike. I didn't -- I didn't walk it. I took my truck, and

1 every mile where I could pull off, I took photos. Hi. I hope
2 you will sincerely look at these photos. It's an accident
3 waiting to happen. It's 13 miles of highway, and the traffic is
4 increasing. We're getting dairies. We're getting the Coronado
5 dairy that is out there that Cochise County okayed has expanded,
6 and now it's going to open another dairy just east of the
7 highway on Highway 180. I think it's 80 -- yeah. 181. It's
8 181.

9 We're -- we have -- the vineyards have arrived
10 and are still planting more vineyards. We have orchards coming,
11 and they are there. We are becoming the new -- what is that
12 wine country of California out there? It's -- and as I said,
13 it's a wonderful place to visit, but this highway is dangerous.
14 Please take into account the photos I have shown you. They're
15 not altered. They're slick when wet because of the mass
16 patching. I've talked to your Willcox office. I've called
17 Mr. Roehrich in Phoenix. And I hope I said your name correctly.

18 MR. ROEHRICH: Yes, ma'am.

19 MS. BURRIS: And I've left notes with Mr. Harmon
20 in Safford. He has not responded to me, but I think he's very
21 familiar with it. Peggy Judd, Gayle Griffin, all of those
22 people are aware of the situation. But I thought perhaps
23 because you don't know me and I don't know you, those photos
24 might come in awful handy, and it is -- it is visible evidence
25 of what is wrong out there. Any amount of money you can take

1 from something else, folks, we would appreciate. We're
2 unincorporated, but we certainly are an important part of
3 Arizona.

4 Thank you for your time, and I appreciate it.

5 VICE CHAIR HAMMOND: Thank you very much.

6 All right. I'm having trouble with this name,
7 but I think it's Dr. Ronald Spark.

8 DR. SPARK: Dr. Ron Spark. I'm a member of the
9 faculty of the College of Medicine. Been in Tucson since 1974.
10 I'm also director of the Southern Arizona Transit Advocates, and
11 that includes everything from pedestrian traffic, hopefully an
12 interurban rail line between Sky Harbor and Tucson's
13 International Airport.

14 I'm a -- I'm a physician, and the analogy --
15 first, I'd like to thank you for your service, giving your time,
16 your due diligence and your attention to the economic and civic
17 and social functionality of transportation in our state. Thank
18 you.

19 Medicine went through a change. We used to be
20 dealing with the ravages of disease. How could we alter them?
21 How could we remedy it? But the pediatricians got it right.
22 Dollar for dollar, prevention is more important than dealing
23 with disease. We don't have polio because they decided for a
24 few bucks, give a polio vaccine, you no longer have polio.

25 I'm here today because when I drive I-10, I see a

1 sign. The sign says, "No median barrier." To me, that's death
2 by design. We could prevent crossover fatalities, save millions
3 of dollars, alter many hundreds of lives by putting dollars into
4 median barriers. So what I'd like to request to you is put that
5 on your agenda. Look at the data driven -- medicine is data
6 driven -- science, evidence, and you'll look at the evidence,
7 and you'll decide it's better to allocate some dollars, build a
8 median barrier, save lives and get into the 21st century. Other
9 states have it. Let's do it here in Arizona. And thank you for
10 your service.

11 VICE CHAIR HAMMOND: Thank you, Dr. Spark.

12 Mr. Humphrey, I noticed you filled out a white
13 card rather than a yellow card. Would you prefer to speak now
14 or would you rather wait for the second?

15 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Now.

16 VICE CHAIR HAMMOND: Okay. The next speaker is
17 Paul Keesler, Town Engineer for Oro Valley.

18 MR. KEESLER: Chair and Board, thank you very
19 much. Again, I'm Paul Keesler. I'm the public works director
20 and the town engineering for the town of Oro Valley. I want to
21 thank the Board, the state engineer and, of course, our
22 fantastic district engineer, Mr. Rod Lane, with regard to
23 getting Oracle Road -- two projects onto the five-year plan.
24 The pavement preservation. That would be the pavement
25 preservation in 2020 and the pavement preservation in 2022.

1 Mr. Perry, our executive director of our chamber
2 of commerce, very, very detailed put out why we need this road
3 improved. It's the pavement condition. This is the main
4 lifeblood, the main corridor for the town of Oro Valley. It's
5 our central district for business, and it is our main connective
6 corridor into the metropolitan region for Tucson.

7 So the Town of Oro Valley wants to thank you for
8 the consideration of putting this on the plan, and we highly
9 urge that it move from the tentative plan to a real project. So
10 I won't belabor this. So thank you very much, and thank you for
11 your service.

12 VICE CHAIR HAMMOND: Thank you, Paul.

13 Diane Call.

14 MS. CALL: Either one? Oh, this one.

15 Good morning. I'm Diane Call. I'm a resident of
16 -- can you hear me if I'm like this?

17 VICE CHAIR HAMMOND: Uh-huh.

18 MS. CALL: I'm a resident of Avra Valley. I'm
19 here to speak on behalf of the residents of Picture Rocks and
20 where I live to I-11, the proposed interstate. We already spoke
21 up against it for years, so we're trying to at one more time
22 bring to the attention that we do not feel that this would
23 benefit our community out there. And we also appreciate that
24 there's a lot of people's interests involved. But we also feel
25 that for those of us where it would most impact us need to be

1 able to feel that for certain our -- our needs are going to be
2 listened to and seriously considered.

3 Rather than being adversarial, my hope is that we
4 could see this as an opportunity where a different vision for
5 what is economic development, not all of us share exactly the
6 same idea of what that would be. For example, out where I live,
7 we've offered up our land to the Native Americans to do
8 ceremonies for the last 15 years. People need places that are
9 unmolested by traffic and all of the -- the impact of our
10 civilization to be able to heal. That means Army combat vets.
11 These people come to our land in order to heal from very serious
12 events in their lives, and -- and we live within a mile where
13 this would come through.

14 I also have a friend who's an Army combat vet who
15 moved out there who worked for the government as a public
16 defender. He left Tucson because he needed a place to go to
17 where his PTSD was not a problem, where he could actually find
18 sanctuary.

19 There's also a lot of innovative and visionary
20 people out there that have -- are creating different types of
21 communities and trying to offer a way to live where we don't
22 have to obliterate nature, where we could actually live in some
23 kind of conjunction. There's wildlife out there. There's the
24 Desert Museum. There's the Saguaro National West.

25 This -- nobody wanted -- in all the stakeholder

1 meetings that they held, in Tucson, the businesses, nobody. So
2 we're very curious who is really behind this? Who is really
3 this going to benefit? I know that it would come and sandwich
4 the Tohono O'Odham Reservation at San Javier Mission. They
5 would now then be sandwiched between two interstates. They've
6 already been marginalized. This just seems grossly unfair to
7 treat these people this way after they've already had so much
8 removed from their lives.

9 So my greater point is it could be an amazing
10 opportunity to have Tucson be a visionary place where, yes, we
11 can have economic development, but let's -- let's do this in a
12 new way that really approaches the future in a way that -- that
13 works better.

14 Thank you. Appreciate your time.

15 VICE CHAIR HAMMOND: Thank you.

16 Paul Ward, Yuma MPO.

17 MR. WARD: Mr. Chairman, members of the State
18 Transportation Board -- thank you, Mr. Chairman. You got my
19 name perfectly correct. I want to --

20 VICE CHAIR HAMMOND: You wrote perfectly well.

21 MR. WARD: I'd like to address the tentative
22 Arizona facilities construction program that was recently
23 released. I took a look at the one originally and did some --
24 some looking at the numbers and did some comparisons for where
25 the money is currently being programmed with throughout the

1 state of Arizona. I've actually updated these numbers, and I'll
2 be willing to pass on some copies to the Board secretary, not
3 for you to take a look at now, because then you'd stop listening
4 to me, but you're welcome to look at them afterwards.

5 Sorry. That was supposed to be a joke. I beg
6 your pardon.

7 From that point of view, just looking at the
8 numbers being programmed, and I've ignored the Maricopa County
9 region and -- sorry about this, Mr. Mayor. He's not here so --
10 I've ignored the Tucson region. So MAG and PAG essentially have
11 their own major programs. I'm really just looking at the
12 Greater Arizona and looking at the division of the numbers
13 concerned, and it turns out that Graham County gets \$10 per
14 person returned to them as part of the state highway program.
15 That, I think, must be an anomaly, because the next one on the
16 list is Yuma County. We get less than \$100. \$97 and change.
17 And that goes all the way up to -- I'm sure Member Thompson will
18 be reasonably happy with this particular one -- up to over
19 \$1,000 for Coconino County. The average, essentially, is 546.

20 I've been in front of the State Transportation
21 Board before bemoaning the fact that the Yuma region gets an
22 incredibly low amount of money from the State Transportation
23 Board, and I'm also very much of the aware of the bind that the
24 State is in. I just wanted to point out something that may be a
25 way of fixing this.

1 This particular ranking system or the way in
2 which the -- the programming process comes out is driven
3 primarily by formula. And it's a perfectly good formula as far
4 as I'm concerned. I'm a professional transportation planner. I
5 know what goes into it, and I'm not particularly arguing with
6 the formula. Unfortunately, formula-driven numbers like these
7 don't necessarily tell the whole story.

8 And I'll give a for instance. I worked at the
9 Maricopa Association of Governments for many years. I was
10 involved in dividing up money between different cities and towns
11 for different modes of transportation. If we had gone with the
12 top ranked projects, pretty much for every single mode, whether
13 it be safety, whether it be intelligent transportation, whether
14 it be intersection improvements, the City of Phoenix would have
15 got pretty much all the money going. They don't. They had a
16 filter. I'm suggesting that the State Transportation Board
17 should be the filter in this particular case and try to ensure
18 at least that the money gets smoothed around.

19 Thank you, sir.

20 CHAIRMAN CUTHBERTSON: Thank you very much.

21 Mike Smejkal, Tucson Airport Authority. Did I
22 pronounce that one right?

23 MR. SMEJKEL: Good morning. Good morning. It's
24 close. Mike Smejkal with the Tucson Airport Authority. I serve
25 as the vice president of planning and engineering for the

1 Airport Authority, and I'm also on the board of directors of the
2 Arizona Airports Association. So again, I want to just thank
3 you, all of you for your time and your efforts.

4 Speaking on behalf of the state airport
5 association first, I just wanted to -- just thanks to the --
6 Greg Byres and his team at aeronautics for their ability to
7 reinstitute the state/local program and the CIP as well as the
8 APMS. Those are very important programs for Arizona airports,
9 and the last couple years without those programs have been very
10 difficult. So we're very appreciative of his efforts and ADOT's
11 efforts to get that program back on track.

12 On the Airport Authority side of here locally, we
13 -- you know, we -- we echo some of the similar comments that
14 there's some very important projects in the program coming up,
15 and we'd like to see those continue on or maybe get some higher
16 priority, specifically on the I-10 widening, you know, that
17 Country Club interchange, we would like to see along with all
18 the improvements along I-10, but that Country Club interchange
19 is very important for the airport and other businesses located
20 on that south side. In order to complete the other interchanges
21 part of that project, that -- the Country Club interchange
22 really needs to be constructed first or one of the first
23 projects in order to maintain access to the airport and those
24 other businesses around the airport.

25 I'd also like to echo the concerns of the

1 continued -- moving forward of the Sonoran Corridor with the
2 hopefully wrap up of the tier one EIS in about a year. I'd like
3 to see the tier two proceed as expeditiously as possible.

4 And then, you know, finally, on the -- getting
5 back to the aeronautics and the state/local program, the Airport
6 Authority's embarking on our biggest capital program we've ever
7 done. It's a major airfield safety enhancement project and the
8 state/local program from the aeronautics group, and their CIP
9 will be instrumental in completing that project in a timely
10 fashion.

11 So, again, thank you. Thank you for everything
12 you do and ADOT staff, and we appreciate working with them.

13 VICE CHAIR HAMMOND: Thank you very much.

14 That will end the call to the audience. We will
15 now open up the public hearing and presentation. Greg Byres
16 will now provide an overview of the tentative fiscal year --
17 2020-2024 Five-Year Transportation Facility Construction
18 Program, for information and discussion only.

19 MR. BYRES: Thank you Mr. Chairman, board
20 members. We'll start off with the -- kind of what the agenda of
21 this presentation is going to be. So we'll be talking about the
22 background of the five-year program as well as an overview of
23 the asset conditions. Our P2P process, which is planning to
24 programming, the tentative five-year highway delivery program,
25 as well as MAG's tentative program, PAG's tentative program, our

1 airport program, and the next steps as far as any public
2 hearings and so forth goes.

3 So as far as the background goes, development of
4 the five-year program is a collaborative effort between this
5 board as well as all of the different divisions within ADOT. It
6 demonstrates how federal dollars are spent and obligated over
7 the next five years. It is approved annually with the fiscal
8 year that starts on July 1 and must be fiscally constrained.

9 So as far as an overview of the asset conditions
10 goes, right now the value of the highway system is set at
11 \$22.4 billion. However if we were actually to replace the
12 entire system, we're talking somewhere in the neighborhood of
13 \$250 billion to replace it.

14 As far as conditions go of our assets, if we're
15 looking at the bridge condition, the graphs that you see here
16 show how the conditions are and how they've ranked through the
17 different years going from 2004 to 2018. We currently have the
18 bridges at 59 percent good condition, 40 percent fair condition,
19 and 1 percent poor condition.

20 Just so you understand what those conditions are,
21 good means primary structure components have no problems or only
22 very minor deterioration. Fair is primary structural components
23 are sound, but have some concrete deterioration or erosion
24 around piers or abutments caused by flowing water. And poor
25 condition is advanced concrete deterioration, scour or seriously

1 affected primary structural components. A poor condition bridge
2 is not necessarily unsafe. Unsafe bridges are closed within
3 ADOT.

4 As far as the pavement conditions go, this is
5 analysis of the interstate highway system. Again, this only
6 ranges from 2010 to 2017. The 2017 data was collected
7 differently than the way that we had collected data prior. We
8 are now collecting all that data through a single electronic
9 source. We travel the entire state with a van that has
10 electronic sensors. We're now picking up much more data than
11 what we used to pick up, which was all done manually with visual
12 observation and assessment. So with that, we currently are at
13 49 percent good condition, 50 percent fair condition and 1
14 percent poor condition.

15 On the non-interstate system, again, this -- same
16 -- same information applies as far as the 2017 data. But with
17 this, we're looking at 35 percent good condition, 63 percent
18 fair condition, and 2 percent poor condition.

19 So for the pavements, as far as the different
20 rankings go, good is smooth -- smooth road surface with little
21 cracking and no ruts or potholes. Fair is moderate amounts of
22 cracking that lead to increased roughness on the road's surface
23 and shallow ruts in the wheel path. Poor condition is numerous
24 cracks, rough road surface, ruts in the wheel, potholes and
25 disintegration of road surface.

1 There we are.

2 So as we go through the rest of this process, one
3 of the big things that we're doing is we're going to start
4 breaking things into our different investment categories. So I
5 just wanted to kind of define that up front. We have
6 preservation, which is the investment to keep pavement smooth
7 and maintain bridges. We have modernization, which is
8 non-capacity investment that improves safety and operations.
9 And we have expansion, which is investment that adds capacity to
10 the highway system.

11 This is a little better explanation or it goes
12 into a little bit more detail. So the preservation include
13 things like surface seal, thin overlays, deck joints, deck
14 overlays, minor mill and fill and so forth. Modernization is
15 such things such as widening existing shoulders, intersection
16 interchange reconfigurations, and let's see, enhancements to
17 address functional obsolescence as well as traffic control
18 management. Expansion is new routes, new lanes, new rail, new
19 interchanges and so forth.

20 So this is our five-year program that we're --
21 the tentative five-year program. The way this works is we're
22 looking at years 2020 to 2024. As we go through each of these
23 different years, we've got preservation in green. We have
24 modernization in red. We have development costs, which is the
25 purple. We have planning costs, which are orange. We have

1 expansion projects in the blue, and we have the executive
2 recommendation coming down from the governor's office, which is
3 dictated in the hatched blue areas.

4 One of the things that you'll see across the --
5 all five -- or all five years is we have a line at \$320 million.
6 That 320 is our target that comes out of our Long Range
7 Transportation Plan that we have for preservation. The arrows
8 indicate the difference between where we're at in this program
9 and what our target value is in trying to hit that Long Range
10 Transportation Plan.

11 And so this -- this kind of gives you an idea of
12 where we're at. You can see that our preservation increases as
13 we go through the years, and our expansion takes and decreases,
14 which is exactly what we proposed in the Long Range
15 Transportation Plan.

16 So on our planning to programming process, in
17 taking and putting projects into the program itself, we're
18 looking at why do we do it. The whole purpose of it is funding.
19 Due to limited funding, projects must be prioritized to ensure
20 the limited funds are utilized on projects which provide the
21 highest value and satisfy the greatest need.

22 Performance measures. Due to the requirements by
23 the Federal Highway Administration, program projects must --
24 must provide an improvement in the performance measures, which
25 includes safety, infrastructure condition as well as congestion

1 reduction, and compliance with objectives and goals provided in
2 the Long Range Transportation Plan.

3 So this is kind of a breakdown of that P2P
4 process, which is pretty much the formula in which Mr. Ward had
5 talked about. What we're looking at here is we take and we have
6 four different categories in which we take and rank projects and
7 prioritize them. We have a technical score. We have a policy
8 score. We have a safety analytic score, as well as a district
9 score. And those have different weightings as we go through
10 each of the different projects and analyze them.

11 All of these projects come from -- I'll go ahead
12 and go to the next one.

13 The projects that we analyze come down from --
14 from several different sources. They come from projects that
15 are possibly presented to this board. They come from studies
16 that we do. They come from the different districts. They come
17 from the MPOs. They come from the COGs. They come from a whole
18 range of different places, and once we take and accumulate that
19 list, we start running through and prioritizing and ranking each
20 of those projects.

21 So with that, we take and rank the -- our
22 preservation projects, our modernization projects and our
23 expansion projects, keeping in mind what the different
24 categories and the different rates are that are set forth in the
25 Long Range Transportation Plan.

1 We take -- once we do that, we take and send
2 those projects in to the tentative five-year program. We have a
3 considerable number of projects that come into P2P, and
4 unfortunately, due to funding, we only have a very limited
5 number of projects that actually make it into the program.

6 With this, this shows basically --

7 MR. ROEHRICH: Mr. Chair, if I could.

8 MR. BYRES: Yes.

9 CHAIRMAN CUTHBERTSON: Yes.

10 MR. ROEHRICH: Greg, when you say "a great
11 number," how many projects did we evaluate and how many did we
12 end up recommending? Outside of the preservation, because the
13 preservation was evaluated a little bit more comprehensive. So
14 how many projects did we evaluate, and how many are we
15 recommending?

16 MR. BYRES: We had roughly 1,800 projects. Of
17 those 1,800 that we analyzed, roughly nine made it into the
18 program. That gives you an idea of what we have for pretty much
19 kind of a gap in need and funding.

20 MR. ROEHRICH: Thank you.

21 MR. BYRES: So with this -- or this particular
22 slide shows basically what we have in the different categories
23 for expansion, modernization and preservation. This shows our
24 overall program, and it also has a comparison to last year's
25 program. So you can see that we've stayed pretty much about the

1 same. We're have -- we have a couple of different changes. We
2 had 41 percent preservation this year. We have 37 last year.
3 We have 46 percent this year in expansion projects. We had 51
4 percent last year. In modernization, we have 10 percent this
5 year. We had 12 percent last year.

6 As a comparison to where our targets are in our
7 Long Range Transportation Plan, for expansion, it's 47 percent,
8 modernization's 18 percent, and preservation's 35 percent. So
9 we're not far off of what our targets are in the Long Range
10 Transportation Plan.

11 This is the Greater Arizona by itself that we
12 have listed, and with it we've got 69 percent in preservation,
13 14 percent in expansion, and 17 percent in modernization.

14 VICE CHAIR HAMMOND: Greg, can I -- can I ask --
15 a little clarification --

16 MR. BYRES: Yes.

17 VICE CHAIR HAMMOND: -- on Floyd's comment? So
18 outside of preservation, only nine additional projects made it
19 into the plan with the P2P process?

20 MR. BYRES: That's correct.

21 VICE CHAIR HAMMOND: And that's either safety or
22 expansion?

23 MR. BYRES: That's -- that's projects that came
24 in through -- that came in from outside that we took and
25 analyzed for all of the Greater Arizona area.

1 VICE CHAIR HAMMOND: Okay. There's more
2 projects, but of all that came in, 1,800, only 9 made it in?

3 MR. BYRES: Correct.

4 VICE CHAIR HAMMOND: Okay.

5 MR. BYRES: Because we -- we add projects into
6 the Greater Arizona area. The MAG and PAG regions do their own
7 planning, so that does not include those two areas.

8 VICE CHAIR HAMMOND: Okay. All right.

9 MR. ELTERS: Mr. Chairman, a follow-up from me.

10 VICE CHAIR HAMMOND: Yes.

11 MR. ELTERS: Greg, was that in the fifth year of
12 the program?

13 MR. BYRES: Those occur in the fourth --

14 MR. ELTERS: In 2024, or is it in five years?

15 MR. BYRES: Those are in -- they come in in the
16 fourth and fifth years. Third, fourth and fifth years,
17 depending on what -- where we're at with schedules so forth.

18 MR. ELTERS: So in the fourth and fifth year of
19 the program. So two of the five years of the program?

20 MR. BYRES: So the --

21 MR. ELTERS: Bring in nine projects out of the
22 1,800?

23 MR. BYRES: That's correct.

24 Now, there's a -- as Clem just reminded me,
25 that's -- that's the ones that we analyze. Now, there's a whole

1 another set of projects that come into the program through our
2 modernization, which is through our HSIP program, our Highway
3 Safety Improvement Program, that is not included in -- in this
4 program, because that's a subprogram that those projects are
5 developed out of. And that's true for -- for other -- a couple
6 of other projects, our pavement preservation projects. Some of
7 those come through that subprogram that's in the five-year
8 program.

9 VICE CHAIR HAMMOND: Board Member Stratton.

10 MR. BYRES: Did I just confuse everybody?

11 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Mr. Chair. So Greg,
12 sorry. (Inaudible.) So Greg, (inaudible) clarify that the
13 first two years of the program are set, and we generally don't
14 change the stuff the first few years. Everything that's brought
15 into the new program comes into the years three, four and five.

16 MR. BYRES: That's correct. So we take the
17 current program, advance the first two years from the current
18 program into the tentative program, and then we take and start
19 projecting out years three, four and -- three, four and five.
20 So all of those stay -- the current second and third year
21 programs advance to the first and second of the tentative
22 program.

23 VICE CHAIR HAMMOND: Board Member Stratton.

24 MR. STRATTON: Thank you, Mr. Chair.

25 You said projects from the outside. Could you

1 clarify that, please?

2 MR. BYRES: Projects from the outside are -- I
3 should say -- I should correct that. It's projects -- all of
4 the different ways that we bring projects in. So it -- again,
5 it comes from -- from the COGs, the MPOs, our studies that we do
6 inside and outside of -- of ADOT. So the COGs and MPOs do
7 several studies that we draw projects out of. It also comes
8 from potentially cities. It can come from members or -- of the
9 public that address this board. We take and consider all of
10 those projects into -- into our five year -- or I'm sorry --
11 into our P2P system.

12 MR. STRATTON: So the public comments would be
13 from the outside?

14 MR. BYRES: Correct.

15 MR. STRATTON: And what about the Board comments?
16 Are those inside or outside?

17 MR. BYRES: Those are inside comments.

18 MR. STRATTON: Thank you.

19 VICE CHAIR HAMMOND: Any other comments before we
20 continue?

21 Board Member Thompson.

22 MR. THOMPSON: Mr. Chair, of the nine that made
23 it in onto that list, are there any that -- oh, I'm sorry.
24 Thank you, sir -- any of them come from the rural areas or maybe
25 more specifically north of I-40?

1 MR. BYRES: I would have to look at the list.
2 I'm not certain exactly where each one of those nine projects
3 occurs.

4 MR. THOMPSON: Because I would like to know what
5 challenge that they would have in getting it on the -- abiding
6 or adhering to the performance measures.

7 MR. BYRES: All of those projects that were
8 selected have to meet the performance measures that are
9 currently in place that are set forth in -- by the Federal
10 Highway Administration.

11 MR. THOMPSON: One last question. Of the 1,800,
12 could some of those also meet the performance measures?

13 MR. BYRES: They could, but in so doing, in the
14 way we rank projects, we're taking a lot of that into
15 consideration. So as we rank projects, prioritize those
16 projects, the ones with the highest priorities that rank the
17 highest are the ones that are selected first.

18 MR. THOMPSON: Thank you, Greg. Thank you,
19 Chair.

20 VICE CHAIR HAMMOND: Anyone else?

21 Okay. Continue.

22 MR. BYRES: Thank you. So we'll go on to the
23 next slide here.

24 What we're looking at here in the 2020 year of
25 the five-year program, we've got some expansion projects, which

1 include the 4th Street bridge up in Flagstaff. We also have a
2 project on 93, the West Kingman TI. That's a purchase of
3 right-of-way. We also have a project on 69, which is Prescott
4 Lakes Parkway. Again, that's right-of-way acquisition. On 93,
5 we also have the gap project, which is for -- that one is for
6 construction. As well as the I-17 project, which is for design,
7 as well as there's funding in that that comes in from MAG, as
8 well as we've got money set in there that comes out of the
9 executive budget as well.

10 In 2021, looking at this, we have expansion
11 projects that equal 80.7 million. Again, we're looking at the
12 SR-69 project. We're also -- I'm sorry. Yes. The SR-69.
13 We're also looking at I-17. This, again, has part of that
14 executive recommendation funding as well as I-10 working on the
15 DCR, or the design concept report, for scoping and the
16 environmental assessment.

17 In FY '22, for this one, our major expansion
18 project that we have in it is the I-17, which again, is -- runs
19 from Anthem to Sunset Point, and includes that executive
20 recommendation.

21 Just for clarification, on the I-17 project, this
22 kind of shows where the project lies and what we're looking at
23 for total funding for the entire project, which runs at about
24 \$320 million. The funding that we currently have listed in the
25 program will only do a portion of this project. What we're

1 looking -- we -- in order to do the entire project would take a
2 little bit longer. We also have put in for an INFRA grant that
3 would have additional funding that would accomplish the
4 \$323 million.

5 For the 20 --

6 MR. ELTERS: Mr. Chairman.

7 VICE CHAIR HAMMOND: A question. Board Member
8 Elters.

9 MR. ELTERS: One question on the previous slide.
10 So in 2022, we have one single expansion project around the
11 state, and it's on I-17?

12 MR. BYRES: We have one major expansion project.
13 These are the major expansion projects that we have listed that
14 I'm -- that I'm listing out on these slides. These are the big
15 ticket items that we're going through.

16 MR. ELTERS: I -- I'm, I guess, confused.
17 Thinking of the nine projects that you mentioned earlier that
18 are advancing in the last two years, and I see one project on in
19 2022. Connecting the two may be -- may be jumping the gun, but
20 it would be great if you could clarify that a little more.

21 MR. BYRES: So these are the major expansion
22 projects that we -- that I'm listing that are occurring in each
23 year of the five-year program. I'm not saying this is the only
24 expansion project. The reason I'm saying that is because we may
25 have some smaller projects that have -- that potentially maybe

1 have added lanes or so forth or climbing lanes or so forth. So
2 those would be considered an expansion project, but they're very
3 minor projects.

4 MR. ELTERS: Okay. Thank you.

5 VICE CHAIR HAMMOND: Continue.

6 MR. BYRES: So coming up into -- let's see here.
7 We've got the -- 2024 is -- we have the one project, which is
8 93. This particular case is the West Kingman TI project that we
9 have coming forward. For this, we're talking about this is the
10 money being set forth for construction.

11 As we go forth into the next ten years or the
12 next five years of the program, which would be years six through
13 ten, this is what we're projecting for funding. Again, with the
14 different colors, it kind of dictates exactly what -- what we
15 have going forth. As far as expansion goes, in blue, you notice
16 that there's nothing there, and the reason for that is in our
17 five-year program -- or not our five-year -- in our Long Range
18 Transportation Plan, we have it set forth to minimize, shrink
19 down expansion projects to zero. So this is exactly what we're
20 doing following through with our Long Range Transportation Plan.

21 MR. ELTERS: Chairman.

22 VICE CHAIR HAMMOND: Question.

23 MR. ELTERS: Greg, just -- just to summarize, and
24 again, for my benefit, the Board's benefit, and probably the
25 audience's benefit as well, so in 2022 -- and understanding the

1 major expansion definition that you just provided, so in 2022,
2 we have one major expansion project. We only have one in 2023,
3 one in 2024, and none beyond 2024.

4 MR. BYRES: That is correct.

5 MR. ELTERS: Okay.

6 VICE CHAIR HAMMOND: Board Member Stratton.

7 MR. STRATTON: Greg, in the past five-year plans,
8 we had a project on 260, Lion Springs. I see it's been removed.
9 Could you elaborate on that, please?

10 MR. BYRES: When -- when we take and -- and as I
11 had mentioned earlier, as we set the five-year tentative
12 program, we take the first two years of that program, move them
13 forward. So they become years one and two in the tentative
14 program. Then we take and start prioritizing projects out from
15 years three, four and five. When we did that, those -- we had a
16 couple of different projects in the current program that ranked
17 very low in our prioritization. So they fell out of the program
18 and were replaced with higher ranking projects.

19 MR. STRATTON: So if I'm correct, you're telling
20 me when the Board adopts a five-year plan, we're only assured
21 that the first two years will move forward? Everything else is
22 subject to being dropped out?

23 MR. BYRES: We take and maintain the highest
24 priority projects in each plan that's done as we go forward.
25 Now, normally in those first two years, sometimes all the way

1 out 'til the third year, we have projects that are already
2 proceeding. Either right-of-way has been purchased, design has
3 already started. So those projects are underway, which is why
4 we maintain those first two years in some projects in the third
5 year as well, because those projects have already -- are already
6 underway. So we keep that steady. We keep -- keep it as even
7 keel as we possibly can. We have new projects, and the highest
8 priority projects occurring in the later years of the program.

9 MR. STRATTON: But as a board member, if -- let's
10 say I was in my last two years, and a project got put in. I
11 would not be assured that project would -- would move forward
12 after I was off the Board unless it was in the first two years
13 of the five-year plan?

14 MR. BYRES: As -- if it's -- if it's ranked as a
15 high priority plan and things do not change, it will maintain
16 that high priority. But it has to be a high priority project
17 that we recommend to this board in those later years.

18 MR. ROEHRICH: Mr. Chair, Mr. Stratton, if I
19 could also -- maybe just a quick thought. I think it's
20 important to remember these are staff recommendations. The
21 Board final adopts what goes into the five-year program, and it
22 is modified constantly. Every -- every month we come in with
23 modifications that's come through PPAC and other committees,
24 that come to the Board as, again, staff's recommendation as the
25 best expected set of projects and transportation improvements

1 that we think are needed for the system.

2 But ultimately, the Board has to approve it
3 before we can move forward. So any project that goes in or
4 comes outcome comes back to this Board, which is why we're
5 recommending it now at this time.

6 And I asked the question about how many projects
7 we looked at and how many got in from the general perspective, I
8 guess, as a way to -- to try to highlight the fact that we hear
9 projects every month. The Board hears projects every month from
10 people. They're all valid projects, and we capture those and we
11 look at them. But when we look at a diminishing pie of funding,
12 if you will, where is the best use of those funds? And that's
13 the analysis that Greg's team, the state engineer's team,
14 ultimately comes back and evaluates with the director, and then
15 we present to the Board.

16 So it will be a program that will be in flux as
17 needs change and as other aspects change, but what isn't
18 changing is our funding, and that's what was causing a lot of
19 these hard issues to decide what projects get in and what
20 projects get out.

21 And our subprograms and preservation, whether
22 it's pavement and bridge, we have been trying to keep those as
23 diligently as possible at funding those level of projects, which
24 then means there's just less for these, if you will,
25 discretionary projects.

1 So the nine projects, in my mind, and this is how
2 I had to try to understand this over the years, those are -- are
3 really the discretionary projects in the rural area that we have
4 the availability to recommend something to the Board, and if the
5 Board agrees with that outside of these preservation,
6 modernization and safe -- you know, these subprograms -- this is
7 what is left given the fact our revenues have not changed in
8 decades.

9 And the cost, as you all are aware, when the
10 state engineer talks about construction costs every month, the
11 costs are changing. The development timelines are changing.
12 Right-of-way costs. Every element is changing, but the funding
13 is not, and that was what is leading to a lot of these
14 recommendations, but these are recommendations we're going to
15 work out with the Board to get the final resolution on what goes
16 into that program. It's a tough time right now, and these are
17 the choices we are having to make along with the Board.

18 VICE CHAIR HAMMOND: You know, Floyd, just to be
19 clear, though, the 1992 18 cents federal and state, our funding
20 has not stayed the same. It's actually gone down, because it's
21 not indexed to inflation. And there's -- there's -- you know,
22 I've said this from this podium before, but it's really up to
23 the -- to the constituencies of the state to get it done. And
24 last week, what, gas prices dropped 7 cents, and we can't come
25 up with a nickel more for transportation needs?

1 Which I did ask staff a while ago, and this may
2 be off, but it will just give you an idea. A nickel a gallon
3 indexed to inflation going forward, I was told was about 40
4 percent of the critical needs we need in the next 20 years. You
5 would think it would be an easy lift, but it's not. So we're
6 going to need support. And the pressure is building. I'll
7 grant you that. You're beginning to read about both sides of
8 the aisle recognizing this critical issue, but it's just really
9 tragic we can't plan some of these projects that are very, very
10 well need -- very much needed in this state for lack of funding.

11 MR. STRATTON: If I may continue.

12 Floyd, thank you for the explanation.

13 Greg, in the overall pot of money, if you will,
14 for Rural Arizona, in all three categories, what percentage of
15 that money is dedicated to freeways in this five-year plan?

16 MR. BYRES: I don't have that number right off
17 the top of my head.

18 MR. STRATTON: Okay. I would appreciate if you
19 could get that to myself --

20 MR. BYRES: I certainly can.

21 MR. STRATTON: -- and the rest of the board
22 members for information.

23 MR. BYRES: Yes.

24 MR. STRATTON: Thank you.

25 MR. KNIGHT: Mr. Chair.

1 VICE CHAIR HAMMOND: Go ahead.

2 MR. KNIGHT: It seems like when I look at the
3 five-year plan, we've got six out of the 13 rural counties that
4 for one, two or three years during the five-year program,
5 they're not even getting any preservation funds. They're
6 getting zero. Yet the residents of those counties are, as
7 Mr. Ward pointed out, are paying the fuel tax and expecting to
8 get something out of it, and -- and preservation seems to be all
9 that we can afford or most of all we can -- that we can afford.

10 Yet we've got half the rural counties that --
11 that aren't even going to get preservation funds, which seems
12 like to me maybe we need to take a look at our formula again so
13 that at least everybody gets something, even if it's just
14 preservation, because everybody is paying into the pot and
15 expects something in return.

16 And that's something that staff is probably a
17 little isolated from, because they're not out there with the
18 constituents every day like the Board is, and we hear from them
19 all the time. Well, why aren't we getting some of our money
20 back to repair some of our roads?

21 I'm particularly familiar with -- with Yuma, for
22 instance. Six, seven months out of the year when it's produce
23 time, it looks like an 18-wheeler convention 24/7. There -- in
24 order for the produce to leave the field and get to the rest of
25 the nation, those trucks have to roll constantly, and it's

1 certainly not doing our -- our roads any good. They're --
2 they're falling apart. We've got -- they use 8. They use 95,
3 195.

4 And many of the local roads to get to and from
5 the fields, the produce houses, the packing houses, the coolers,
6 once those vegetables -- once the lettuce is picked, the clock
7 starts ticking, and you've got to get that refrigerated truck
8 and get it on the road and get it to its destination, which as
9 we all know is -- could be as far away as the East Coast, and
10 oftentimes it is, because this time of the year we supply
11 romaine and ice -- iceberg lettuce to just about everywhere in
12 the country.

13 And the 18-wheelers are just -- it's just
14 constant. And so it seems like Yuma being the third largest
15 metropolitan area in the state, to have two years of the five-
16 year plan with zero dollars, to me there's just something wrong
17 with that picture. But, you know, I understand that there --
18 the funds aren't there, but at least if preservation is our
19 highest priority because of the funds, we ought to see some
20 preservation funds, in my mind.

21 MR. BYRES: If I may, Mr. Chairman, Board Member
22 Knight, one of the big things that we do in putting together our
23 P2P process and making the recommendations to the Board is we
24 have to look at our recommendations on a systematic sense. We
25 have to look at the entire system. And so when we take and put

1 together the data that goes into our P2P process and goes
2 through those different categories that in which we rank
3 projects, it's extremely important that we look at the entire
4 system and the effects of the entire system.

5 Now, one thing that you brought up was trying to
6 get produce or any other kind of freight from point A to point B
7 as quick as possible. That's considered in our policy sections
8 of our P2P process for freight travel and all of our key
9 commerce corridors as well. So, I mean, it is considered in
10 there, but again, it's considered in a systematic sense. So we
11 have to look at the entire system when we -- when we take and
12 analyze and prioritize the projects that we recommend to you.

13 CHAIRMAN CUTHBERTSON: Board Member Thompson, did
14 you have a question?

15 MR. THOMPSON: (Inaudible.) I also do agree to
16 the fact that rural communities need to be more competitive for
17 the dollars that are available. How we do that, I think there
18 -- we need to really look at the eligibility criteria. And for
19 my understanding about the projects coming to us, if 191 was to
20 bring all that data to you, that could mean that it would meet
21 the performance measures, and that could be part of the project
22 that (inaudible) will come back before the Board. That's my
23 understanding.

24 MR. BYRES: Chairman, Board Member Thompson.
25 That's correct. On 191, we have an issue in trying to get the

1 safety data from the Navajo Nation that -- that we basically get
2 from the rest of the state. We have that issue on -- not only
3 at the Navajo Nation, but on other tribal areas, we have that
4 same thing that we're working to correct. In fact, we made huge
5 progress a couple weeks ago at our meeting. So that -- that's
6 correct. As that comes in and we can collect all that -- it's
7 called tracks data -- we will have that safety data to help --
8 help in refining our analysis of particularly 191.

9 MR. THOMPSON: Thank you, Chair.

10 MR. ROEHRICH: Mr. Chair, if I could.

11 Greg, I'd like to go back. I keep hearing that
12 especially -- and I'm going to point, I guess, and say -- point
13 it out. Yuma County, they're not getting, you know, their fair
14 share or they're not getting anything. I think that's a
15 mischaracterization, isn't it, that there's nothing going back
16 to that? Is that correct?

17 MR. BYRES: That is a -- somewhat of a
18 mischaracterization. One of the big things is as you go through
19 and you look at the tentative program, if you look down at our
20 pavement preservation subprogram, you'll notice that the last
21 couple years in that -- in that subprogram have an extremely
22 high value. The reason for that is we have not projected any
23 projects out for pavement preservation in those last two years.
24 The reason being is it's too far out for us to project pavement
25 preservation in order to -- for those projects to be valid as it

1 gets closer and closer to -- to the time of implementation for
2 those projects.

3 So we -- for pavement preservation, we do not
4 program that money out into line itemed projects in those last
5 two years. So as -- as we go through, those projects will get
6 prioritized coming out.

7 So part of what you're talking about, Floyd, with
8 -- is that money in the five-year program? No, it's not
9 currently shown as a project in the five-year program. It's
10 shown in the subprogram for pavements.

11 VICE CHAIR HAMMOND: Okay. Continue.

12 MR. BYRES: As we go -- this is just a quick look
13 at the expansion projects that we had that came through this
14 year's P2P process. Again, there's -- there was no room to --
15 to put these in, but that's exactly the ranking that we had for
16 -- for any projects, if there was funding, to take and put
17 projects in, this was the priority that we came out with.

18 So as we go forward now, we're talking about the
19 MAG Regional Freeway Program or the MAG programming itself.
20 This gives you a quick list of the projects, as well as where
21 they occur. Again, MAG does their programming, and we take and
22 incorporate their program into our five-year program. But this
23 -- this gives you as of the latest information we have today on
24 what MAG is looking at doing.

25 This is the PAG tentative program for --

1 obviously for the Pima County area. As you can look at it,
2 there -- we've got projects on I-10, on I-19, SR-77, as well as
3 210. I-10 has a project in there as well.

4 As we go forward into the last category, which is
5 the Airport Capital Improvement Program, this is kind of a look
6 at last year's program. And you can see that we had two
7 programs, our state/local program as well as our airport
8 development -- our -- I'm -- yeah, the airport development loans
9 program were not funded last year. As we proceed into this
10 year, this gives you an idea of what we've got. Our loan
11 program still is not funded, but we did bring back our
12 state/local program, and this gives you an idea of what the
13 match is or what the funding availability is for each of those
14 different programs.

15 Again, this is a different pot of money. This is
16 coming out of the Aviation Fund. This is not federal funding.
17 This is -- this is all State dollars.

18 VICE CHAIR HAMMOND: Board Member Stratton has a
19 question.

20 MR. STRATTON: Greg, former Board Member Teller
21 has a bill in the House, I believe, that has so far survived
22 that would put \$10 million into that fund. If that does
23 survive, will your tentative five-year plan be revised and
24 brought back or how will that be handled?

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

1 if that survives, we will have already have had a -- or come
2 close to having an approved program. What we'll do is we right
3 now have prioritized through what is called our CIP, our Capital
4 Improvement Program for aeronautics, we have taken and basically
5 done the same thing that we did on the P2P side for highways.
6 We've done that same analysis on the aeronautics side. So we
7 have projects listed that never made it because of funding
8 restraint. So what this does is this allows us to start going
9 much further down that list to take and bring projects in.

10 MR. STRATTON: But it would -- that \$10 million
11 would be included in the budget?

12 MR. BYRES: Oh, yes.

13 MR. STRATTON: That was my point. Thank you.

14 MR. BYRES: Yes.

15 So next steps. We have, obviously, today's
16 hearing. We have a hearing on April 12th in Flagstaff. We also
17 have one in May 17th in Phoenix, as well as the study session
18 that will occur June 4th.

19 We'll present the final program to this board on
20 June 21st at the Pinetop/Lakeside board meeting. The program
21 will be delivered to the governor on June 30th, with the fiscal
22 year beginning on July 1st.

23 With that, that's my presentation.

24 MR. OMER: Mr. Chair, a little clarification
25 maybe on the bill from the former board member. It kind of

1 depends on when, if -- and if that bill passes, when we have the
2 revenues that we would incorporate into the program. It may not
3 be during this cycle. It could be later on. It depends. And I
4 think Kristine would probably add on that to later on, but it
5 may not be in this programming cycle. It could be later on into
6 the next years moving forward, depending on when we get the
7 revenues in.

8 And while I'm at it, thank you, Greg. I'm
9 (inaudible) on the other side for a long time and developing, I
10 think, five programs. It is not easy, and any time you have to
11 go and start removing projects from the program, it's never
12 taken lightly. It is one of those things that takes a lot of
13 consideration.

14 I helped put the P2P program together. So I
15 understand it's a lot of work to do. So I appreciate it. And
16 Floyd's right, this is the Board's program. As staff, we -- we
17 do everything we can over the year to put the program together,
18 and then we give that to the Board for their final -- final
19 decision. So thank you and your team for putting this together.

20 MR. BYRES: Thank you.

21 VICE CHAIR HAMMOND: Board Member Stratton has a
22 question (inaudible).

23 MR. STRATTON: Scott, talking about it may not be
24 programmed in this cycle. My concern is that that fund has been
25 swept before by the State. Would the -- if it's not programmed,

1 would it be obligated to where we could keep that balance?

2 MR. OMER: So Mr. Chair, Mr. Stratton, I think
3 what Kristine will help us out with here, it will be programmed
4 as soon as we are capable of programming it. When I said that
5 may not be the cycle, I meant during the development of this
6 particular five-year program. Starting July 1st of next fiscal
7 year, we start amending the program, when we get those revenues
8 in or active projects. We could add the money in as soon as
9 it's available, 100 percent.

10 MR. STRATTON: Thank you.

11 MR. OMER: Kristine.

12 MS. WARD: If I may. The difficulty is not
13 the -- Mr. Chair. Sorry. I had to find you. Mr. Stratton, the
14 difficulty is not the programming. The difficulty is is that
15 the dollars, if we want to protect the dollars, we've got to get
16 the dollars expended as quickly as possible. What has
17 consistently been happening is that they have been sweeping
18 those dollars, even if we had projects that they were identified
19 for. So our mission is to as soon as we get authorization for a
20 dollar, we move those projects as quickly as possible and move
21 the -- and it's incumbent upon all of us to do that so we don't
22 have inactivity in our projects.

23 MR. STRATTON: Thank you.

24 VICE CHAIR HAMMOND: By the way, I echo the
25 comments earlier. Greg, this is not an easy task for you to

1 stand up there and tell us there's no money to do anything. So
2 we certainly appreciate it.

3 Is there more discussion or comment from the
4 Board?

5 (End of requested excerpt at 10:21 a.m.)

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Adjournment

A motion to adjourn the March 15, 2019 State Transportation Board Public Hearing was made by Board Member Stratton and seconded by Board Member Knight. In a voice vote, the motion carried.

Meeting adjourned at 10:21 a.m. MST.



Jack Sellers, Chairman
State Transportation Board



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