

MINUTES
STATE TRANSPORTATION BOARD MEETING
9:00 a.m., Friday, March 14, 2014
ADOT Administration Building Auditorium
206 S. 17th Avenue
Phoenix, AZ 85007

Roll call by Board Secretary Mary Beckley

In attendance: Steve Christy, Kelly Anderson, Joe La Rue, Hank Rogers, Deanna Beaver and Jack Sellers.

Absent: William Cuthbertson

Opening Remarks

Chairman Christy stated that after adjourning the public hearing, the Board will now begin the regular portion of the Board meeting.

Call to the Audience

Citizens addressed various issues:

1. Charlie Cassens, City Manager, Lake Havasu City, re: Lake Havasu City's refocus and reinvestment as a tourism destination and I-95 signage compliance standards.

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

INDEX

	<u>PAGE</u>
Call to Audience Request: Charlie Cassens, Lake Havasu City	3
TOPIC: Meeting minutes	6
ITEM 1: District Engineer's Report	8
ITEM 2: Director's Report	18
ITEM 3: Consent Agenda	23
ITEM 4: Legislative Report	25
ITEM 5: Financial Report	27
Call to Audience Request: John Liosatos	28
ITEM 6: Multimodal Planning Division Report	30
ITEM 7: Priority Planning Advisory Committee (PPAC)	56
ITEM 8: State Engineer's Report	61
ITEM 10: Tiger Grants Information	71
ITEM 11: New State Transportation Board Website	83
ITEM 12: Suggestions	90

STATE TRANSPORTATION BOARD MEETING – MARCH 14, 2014

I N D E X	PAGE
<u>ITEM 1: DISTRICT ENGINEER’S REPORT (Madhu Reddy)</u>	8
<u>ITEM 2: DIRECTOR'S REPORT (John Halikowski)</u>	18
<u>ITEM 3: CONSENT AGENDA</u>	23
<u>ACTION TAKEN</u>	
MOTION TO APPROVE CONSENT AGENDA.....	25
<u>ITEM 4: LEGISLATIVE REPORT (Megan Kintner)</u>	25
<u>ITEM 5: FINANCIAL REPORT (Kristine Ward)</u>	27
<u>ITEM 6: MULTIMODAL PLANNING DIVISION REPORT (Scott Omer)</u>	30
<u>ITEM 7: PRIORITY PLANNING ADVISORY COMMITTEE (PPAC) (Scott Omer)</u>	56
<u>ACTION TAKEN</u>	
MOTION TO APPROVE PROJECT MODIFICATION ITEMS 7a-7j	59
MOTION TO APPROVE NEW PROJECTS ITEMS 7k-7v	60
MOTION TO APPROVE AIRPORT PROJECTS 7w – 7z	61
<u>ITEM 8: STATE ENGINEER’S REPORT (Jennifer Toth)</u>	61
<u>ITEM 9: CONSTRUCTION CONTRACTS (Jennifer Toth)</u>	62
<u>ACTION TAKEN</u>	
MOTION TO APPROVE ITEM 9a	63
MOTION TO APPROVE ITEM 9b	64
MOTION TO APPROVE ITEM 9c.....	65
MOTION TO APPROVE ITEM 9d	67
MOTION TO APPROVE ITEM 9e	68
MOTION TO APPROVE ITEM 9f	70

STATE TRANSPORTATION BOARD MEETING – MARCH 14, 2014

I N D E X

PAGE

MOTION TO APPROVE ITEM 9g.....	70
<u>ITEM 10: TIGER GRANTS INFORMATION (Floyd Roehrich, Jr.)</u>	71
<u>ITEM 11: NEW TRANSPORTATION BOARD WEBSITE</u>	83
<u>ITEM 12: SUGGESTIONS.....</u>	90
<u>MOTION TO ADJOURN</u>	93

P R O C E E D I N G S

(Proceedings: Agenda Items 1 through 12)

MR. CHRISTY: We have one -- actually we have two folks requesting to speak to the board at the regular board meeting. One will come later under Item 6. So our first speaker, just call to the audience for our regular board meeting, is the City manager of Lake Havasu City, Charlie Cassens.

Mr. Cassens?

MR. CASSENS: Thank you, Mr. Chairman, Board Members, staff, Director Halikowski. Thank you very much for this moment of your time.

As you said, I'm Charlie Cassens, I'm the city manager for Lake Havasu City on the west coast of Arizona, a community of 53,000 permanent residents, although on any given day, we're probably 10- to 20,000 people more than that. And on summer weekends, certainly many more than that as well.

We're in the Kingman District. And we're proudly represented by Kingman District manager -- excuse me -- District Engineer Mike Kondelis, who we consider a friend of the community. He's been very helpful in the community (indiscernible) a big asset in (indiscernible).

We're also represented on this board by Board Member Beaver. Thank you very much for your excellent leadership.

First of all, I want to preface my comments by saying I'm not here to ask you for money. (Indiscernible). But back when the recession killed our growth-related revenues in Lake Havasu City, we had to go introspect. We knew we had to change as a community. We knew we were probably never going to go back to the same revenue streams that we enjoyed for decades prior to the Great Recession. We had to reinvent ourselves as a community. And we had to refocus on what we were going to be going forward. And so that focus turned to tourism, because obviously, that's a very powerful economic engine in our community.

We built new recreation facilities. We expanded our park system. We added access. We added parking. We added a world-class sports center. And we've groomed our beaches. We basically revamped our entire community, and we're sprucing the place up and -- in the interest of making it a more enjoyable visitor experience.

In that effort, we partnered with our local convention and visitors bureau on a branding effort. We rebranded our community. We have a new logo. We have a new tag line. We have a whole new attitude around our

1 community. And we set out to make ourselves a better
2 destination. Our destination development efforts included
3 wayfinding as a very important component, because during
4 the investigation that we did with polling visitors from
5 across country who may have either known about Lake Havasu
6 City or didn't know about Lake Havasu City, they gave us a
7 great deal of data to draw from to try to determine how
8 best to develop our community as a better destination.

9 And wayfinding was identified by those
10 people who did come to Lake Havasu City and only came
11 once, that they had a hard time finding their way around
12 our community. And (indiscernible) to that is the product
13 of a young growing community. We're only 50 years old.
14 But as we grew up through the decades, the signage that
15 popped up over the years now, we have those relics that
16 are in our community, and people just have a hard time
17 getting around.

18 So our convention and visitors bureau
19 engaged services of a national consulting firm on
20 wayfinding. They came into our community and spent the
21 better part of two years as part of our branding and
22 destination development efforts, and came up with a
23 wayfinding program that we found out was actually not in
24 compliance with ADOT's rules and regulations regarding
25 signage on the highway, which it -- State Highway 95 is

1 our main street in Lake Havasu City. It's the only way
2 you come in. It's the only way you can get out. It's --
3 you have to use Highway 95 in our community to get from
4 one place to another. So obviously, it's a key component
5 of our wayfinding efforts.

6 So I'm just here to say, I look forward to
7 working with Director Halikowski on -- on getting ADOT to
8 accept the federal standards on wayfinding so that we can
9 come into compliance with ADOT's rules and regulations and
10 standards and we can move forward with this project and
11 come up with what we think will be a demonstration project
12 for other communities across the state, as well as the
13 nation, and something we can all be proud of. And all it
14 will take, really, is some time and attention on ADOT's
15 part working with us so that we can put this project
16 together so that in November when your board comes to Lake
17 Havasu City for your board meeting, hopefully we'll have
18 something we can show off to you that you can be proud of
19 and that hopefully will bear fruit -- will bear fruit in
20 the end and essentially help us all (indiscernible)
21 community and the state as well.

22 Thank you very much for your time.

23 MR. CHRISTY: Thank you, Mr. Cassens.

24 Before we go to the District Engineer's
25 report, under Item 1, I just would like to talk about the

1 minutes. Mr. Roehrich will address them when we come to
2 the consent agenda. But Ms. Beaver made a request, as did
3 I, regarding minutes, that we have some more detailed and
4 finite minutes under certain agenda items. And I would
5 encourage the board, if there is an agenda item that you
6 would like to make sure that the minutes are fully
7 detailed, please let your request be known. For instance,
8 I, for one, would like to have, under our agenda today, a
9 full detailed minute recordation of the Director's report,
10 and that is Agenda Item 2; and the Multimodal Planning
11 Division report, and that's Agenda Item 6; and the Agenda
12 Item Number 10 under TIGER grants. So if we could see
13 that the minutes are reflected in a very copious manner,
14 that would be very worthwhile on those.

15 MR. ROEHRICH: Mr. Chairman and Board
16 Members, we're going to do that.

17 But what I think in the reality of it,
18 because we're using a transcript -- so we're transcribing
19 the whole meeting, because that is the quickest way and
20 easiest way to do it. If we tell them only transcribe
21 this, don't do this, don't do that, it's all over the
22 place. We are going to transcribe the whole meeting
23 minutes.

24 MR. CHRISTY: Okay. That's even better.
25 Then, having said that, we'll --

1 MR. ROEHRICH: So unless you're like
2 Mr. Omer and you misstated something you wanted out, it is
3 going to be in there.

4 MR. CHRISTY: We'll proceed with Agenda
5 Item 1, the District Engineer's report for the Phoenix
6 District. Madhu Reddy?

7 MALE SPEAKER: Can we make sure the minutes
8 reflect that Scott Omer wanted it out.

9 MR. CHRISTY: Engineer Reddy?

10 MR. REDDY: Thank you, Mr. Chairman,
11 (indiscernible), Members of the Board.

12 On behalf of Phoenix Construction District
13 staff, I appreciate the opportunity to update
14 (indiscernible). I appreciate the opportunity to update
15 on the status of Phoenix Construction District projects.
16 My name is Madhu Reddy. I'm the District Engineer with
17 Phoenix Construction District.

18 Currently Phoenix Construction District has
19 25 projects under construction. Five projects are
20 state-funded projects, and of which two of them are major
21 projects, freeway projects, and three are landscape
22 projects.

23 We also have 20 federally funded projects,
24 and 11 projects are Local Public Agency projects
25 administered by the Department. Up to 9 federally funded

1 projects throughout the Valley, we have projects on Loop
2 303, I-10, State Route 587, and we have also have projects
3 on I-10 (indiscernible) road, and ITS -- various ITS
4 projects.

5 The overall construction cost 374 million
6 dollars.

7 This is the map, this is the regional -- the
8 January 2014 regional transportation plan, freeway program
9 map. This map includes various program projects on Valley
10 freeways since 2006 under various phases.

11 Since 2011, the main focus has been on
12 Loop 303 projects. The District's been very busy with
13 projects, construction projects on Loop 303. We had five
14 segments of Loop 303 projects between I-10 and Grand
15 Avenue. The -- after first -- the first four segments
16 were the design-build projects, and the segment prior,
17 which is the CMAR project, which included two segments
18 combined for 6 miles between Peoria Avenue and Mountain
19 View Road. That project was CM At Risk project.

20 To start with, the TI project on I-10 and
21 the 303 TI are this project started con- -- this project
22 is a 158 million dollar project. It's the biggest
23 five-level interchange in the state. The contractor is
24 Pulice Construction. Construction started back in
25 November 2011. Project includes building freeway ramps

1 and also construction of westbound and eastbound I-10.
2 The project is 98 percent complete as of this month and
3 estimated completion is we are looking at early fall 2014.

4 The next project on this Segment 2, Thomas
5 Road to Camelback Road, this project is a 38 million
6 dollar contract, and the contractor is Ames Construction.
7 Project started back in July 2012. The project is
8 substantially complete. And we have opened lanes in this
9 segment, it's a 2-mile segment of the rubberized asphalt
10 will be done once the Loop 303/I-10 TI project is
11 complete.

12 The next segment, this is the Camelback Road
13 to Glendale Segment 3, this was one of the last projects
14 advertised in December 2012. Construction started in
15 March 2013. The contractor is Pulice Construction and
16 construction costs of approximately 40 million dollars.
17 This project is 76 percent complete and includes bridges
18 on Bethany Home Road and Glendale Avenue around 303. And
19 we are, you know, looking at completing this project by
20 late summer of this year.

21 Segment 4, this is the Loop 303, Glendale --
22 Glendale Avenue to Peoria Avenue project. The contractor
23 is Pulice Construction. The construction cost is 79
24 million dollars. This is a 3-mile segment, and this is
25 also in the Northern Parkway limits, Dyson to Northern

1 Parkway. Construction started back in May 2012. This
2 project, all lanes have been opened to traffic, and you
3 can see the rubberized asphalt, and it's substantially
4 complete.

5 The last segment of the 303 just south of
6 Grand Avenue is the 6-mile segment between Peoria Avenue
7 to Mountain View Boulevard. Contractor is Pulice
8 Construction. As I mentioned earlier, this is a CM At
9 Risk project. We started construction in August of 2011.
10 And the project is substantially complete, and all lanes
11 have been opened to traffic.

12 Then we have landscaping projects along the
13 303, starting, you know, from -- from the north. We have
14 two projects currently under construction, Peoria to
15 Mountain View. And we have the next three segments all
16 the way to Thomas Road, which will be advised in June and
17 July of this year. Then we have the 303/I-10 TI
18 landscaping project (indiscernible) in 2015.

19 Moving on, we have a project along 101,
20 Loop 101 at Maryland Avenue to build a direct HOV
21 connection ramps. It's a design-build project, and
22 contractor is Coffman Specialties, and construction cost
23 is 30 million dollars. This is a design-build project, as
24 I mentioned, it's (indiscernible). The construction
25 started in 2013. It's 90 percent complete. And we are

1 looking at completing this project by the end of this
2 month or early next month. We have ribbon-cutting
3 ceremony scheduled for March 28th (indiscernible).

4 State Route 24, the Gateway Freeway, the
5 project's in the East Valley. Contractor is Ralph L.
6 Wadsworth, and construction cost is 82 million dollars.
7 The project is 97 percent complete, includes construction
8 of State Route 24 and the freeway ramps connecting to 202,
9 State Route 24. The project started back in 2012. It is
10 97 percent complete currently, and looking -- we are
11 looking at completing the project and opening the traffic
12 by late spring. We also have ribbon-cutting ceremony
13 scheduled for this project on April 15.

14 MR. ROGERS: Question, Mr. Chair?

15 MR. CHRISTY: Mr. Rogers.

16 MR. ROGERS: On this here, what -- what
17 actually is that doing there? It's connecting the San Tan
18 to -- to -- is that ... what -- what does that do? Does
19 that connect the San Tan to the Gateway Airport or what?
20 I don't understand what this --

21 MR. REDDY: Mr. Chairman and
22 (indiscernible), this -- you are looking to the north as a
23 position (indiscernible). And this -- the freeway -- the
24 freeway ramps connect to State Route 24. And we also
25 have -- you know, you're looking at the 202 and the ramps

1 mainly connect to State Route 24, which is roughly a mile
2 segment of State Route 24.

3 MR. ROGERS: And --

4 MR. REDDY: -- excuse me --

5 MR. ROGERS: I am not familiar with 24.

6 DIRECTOR HALIKOWSKI: (Indiscernible).

7 MR. REDDY: It does.

8 MR. ROGERS: Yeah, that's my question.

9 DIRECTOR HALIKOWSKI: It's the first mile of
10 that piece. Eventually, I think it will connect to from
11 there all the way out to (indiscernible).

12 MR. ROEHRICH: Mr. Chair, Mr. Director, yes,
13 State Route 24 is in the plan -- the MAG planning region
14 as well as within the statewide region for the
15 (indiscernible) outside MAG region. But it extends from
16 as (indiscernible) San Tan, but it does go east from
17 there. We're still studying whether it connects into the
18 future north-south corridor. Does it extend all the way
19 out to US-60? It's all being studied as part of that
20 whole East Valley into Pinal County corridor study. So it
21 hasn't been completely defined yet. But it will connect
22 that connectivity.

23 DIRECTOR HALIKOWSKI: But I believe the City
24 (indiscernible).

25 MR. ROEHRICH: The City of Mesa brought in

1 money to accelerate the construction of the first mile.

2 MR. ROGERS: Yeah, and it -- so does this --
3 does this go to Ellsworth Road, then? Towards the State
4 Route 24? Does it connect to Ellsworth.

5 MR. REDDY: Yeah, it does.

6 MR. ROGERS: Okay. All right.

7 MR. ROEHRICH: This first part does.

8 MR. ROGERS: Okay. Thank you.

9 MR. REDDY: Then we have the last project on
10 Grand Avenue within McDowell and 19th Avenue to
11 (indiscernible). This project basically, the contractor
12 has been contracting construction costs across
13 (indiscernible) 80 million dollars.

14 On this project, we are constructing
15 right-turn and left-turn ways and also eliminating some of
16 the driveways as part of access (indiscernible) on Grand
17 Avenue. The project is 85 percent complete, and we are
18 looking at completing the project by late spring of this
19 year.

20 MR. CHRISTY: I have to ask, what are we
21 looking at here?

22 MR. REDDY: You are looking at a
23 (indiscernible) marker pipe that on Grand Avenue, we had
24 gone through a lot of substitute -- unknown activities,
25 and this is one of the older pipes that --

1 MR. CHRISTY: Certainly not the finished
2 product.

3 MR. REDDY: So upcoming projects in 2014.
4 We have Meridian Road TI. It's a half-diamond interchange
5 on US-60, connecting basically eastbound onramp and
6 westbound offramp. That's roughly 12 million dollars
7 that's scheduled to be advertised in June of 2014.

8 We have the design-build project on Loop 202
9 Red Mountain Freeway. It's between Loop 101 and Broadway
10 Road. It's roughly 120 -- 121 million dollar project.
11 The project was advertised, and we are planning on getting
12 the project awarded in September of this year. This
13 project basically fills general-purpose lanes between 101,
14 Gilbert Road and HOV lanes between Gilbert Road and
15 Broadway Road.

16 On -- on Pima Freeway, we have a
17 general-purpose lane project, we look to (indiscernible)
18 work. This project is roughly 91 million dollars. And
19 the project is expected to be advertised in April of this
20 year. And it adds a general-purpose lane to
21 (indiscernible).

22 And then we have the 51 Black Mountain
23 Boulevard. This is a (indiscernible) 25 million dollar
24 project. It was programmed as part of the (indiscernible)
25 life cycle program with the City of Phoenix and federal

1 highway funded. It provides connecting ramps from 51 to
2 Black Mountain Boulevard. This project is a CM At Risk
3 project. We are looking at starting construction this
4 summer. And we are working with City of Phoenix on this
5 project.

6 And then in the West Valley, we have the
7 3 -- the Loop 303-US-60 TI. It provides interim
8 connecting ramps to and from US-60 and 303. It's roughly
9 49 million dollar project. The contractor's been
10 selected. And we are working on the design. And this
11 project is scheduled to go to board award in July or
12 August of this year.

13 Then we have the Loop 303 design-build
14 project, currently advertised. It's 54 million dollars
15 project between US-60 and Happy Valley Road. That
16 completes the section of Loop 303 from I-10 all the way to
17 I-17. The project is scheduled to be awarded at June
18 board meeting, and basically -- basically constructs PCP
19 pavement and widening some (indiscernible).

20 Then the last project we have on Loop 303,
21 it's the Loop 303, El Mirage Road TI projects. It's a
22 diamond interchange project. We're currently under design
23 and scheduled to be advertised by June of this year. It's
24 roughly 30 million dollar project.

25 Thank you.

1 MR. CHRISTY: Do any board members have a
2 question? Mr. Anderson? -- or Mr. Rogers, sorry.

3 MR. ROGERS: The -- the light rail in the
4 Mesa area, what's your projection on that as far as a
5 completion date on that? Do you know that? I'm just
6 curious.

7 MR. ROEHRICH: Mr. Chair and Mr. Rogers,
8 that -- that's a Valley Metro. We're not involved with
9 the light rail project --

10 MR. ROGERS: Oh, you're not involved? Oh, I
11 thought --

12 MR. ROEHRICH: Maybe just by knowledge,
13 somebody might know that, but I don't --

14 MR. ROGERS: Okay.

15 MR. ROEHRICH: Yeah, we don't -- we don't
16 oversee the light rail --

17 MR. HALIKOWSKI: The (indiscernible) are
18 regional. And light rail is regional (indiscernible) ADOT
19 does not --

20 MR. ROGERS: Okay, because I was under the
21 impression that they got some ADOT money for that.

22 MR. CHRISTY: Any further questions of the
23 District Engineer?

24 Thank you, Mr. Reddy.

25 Very quickly before we go to the Director's

1 report, I just want to interject a personal note. Earlier
2 this month down in Tucson, some PAG folks and some Pima
3 County folks and some business leaders asked to have a
4 meeting with ADOT staff. Mr. Roehrich, Mr. Omer, and
5 Mr. Kies all took time from their busy schedules to come
6 down and meet with us, which they did. They didn't have
7 to. But they were very agreeable to doing that. And it
8 was very productive and insightful and collaborative
9 meeting. And I, for one, wanted to extend my appreciation
10 and thanks to the ADOT staff that did that. And I think
11 it set a really positive tone that is going to be very
12 beneficial for all.

13 So with that, we'll go right to the
14 Director's report. Director Halikowski.

15 MR. HALIKOWSKI: Well, thanks, Mr. Chairman.
16 (Indiscernible) report on is the recent trip I had to D.C.
17 Mr. Biesty and I went to D.C., and we visited with each of
18 the delegation members and/or their staff during the week
19 of February 24th. We also met with senior staff of
20 Senator Harry Reid's office and the House Transportation
21 and Infrastructure Committee. We discussed with them the
22 importance of long-term transportation authorization bill
23 (indiscernible) sustainable funding. And I think, as you
24 can see from some of the issues we face here in Arizona,
25 sustainable funding for the long term is certainly

1 something that's very necessary.

2 We also discussed with the delegation, the
3 Department's key commerce corridors concept, and we did an
4 update on the progress of the I-11 and the Intermountain
5 West Corridor preliminary study and issues related to
6 clarifying the corridor's designation and funding for the
7 next phase of the necessary environmental studies.
8 Specific to the I-11, I am -- I covered the following
9 points. Funding for the environmental impact study. As
10 you know, our corridor concept report is expected to be
11 released in July of this year. The next step obviously
12 will lead to a full EIS process. And although the
13 proposed I-11 corridor is specially designated as a
14 high-priority corridor, there's no funding allocated
15 (indiscernible) to completing the EIS. And at this time
16 no funding source has been identified for that EIS.

17 And so accordingly, I-11 cannot move forward
18 unless the funding is provided to complete the EIS. And
19 the cost to complete the EIS from Mexico border to the
20 Nevada border, we shared with the delegation and their
21 staff, currently we estimate that cost at 60 million. And
22 the study, as we explained to them, could be broken into
23 phases.

24 We did some clarifications, discussions on
25 the corridor that MAP-21, as it is stated, only designated

1 the future I-11. And it's along US-93 between the
2 vicinity of Phoenix and Las Vegas. We talked to them
3 about further clarification of the I-11 designation that
4 may be needed to be addressed at some point; you know,
5 this idea of in the vicinity of Phoenix and extension of
6 it down to the Mexico border.

7 So all in all, the information that we
8 provided was positively received by the delegation and
9 (indiscernible) committed (indiscernible).

10 MR. CHRISTY: Mr. Director, recently you
11 sent letters to the executive directors of PAG and MAG
12 regarding the funding issue. Could you expand a little
13 bit on what those letters entail as far as what you
14 perceive as a funding issue with those regions?

15 MR. HALIKOWSKI: Sure, Mr. Chairman. Ever
16 since this preliminary study started, I have said publicly
17 that if Arizona is going to (indiscernible) itself and
18 look at construction of an I-11 corridor along with the
19 Intermountain West so that we have a full interstate from
20 border to border, we're going to have to bring all our
21 financial guns to bear. And that's the exact terminology
22 I used in any addresses that I've given.

23 Essentially, we need very likely to use
24 federal dollars for the study, because Arizona itself,
25 ADOT, does not have the financial wherewithal to come up

1 with the 60 million study (indiscernible) corridor. And
2 since we need to use federal dollars, federal law requires
3 coordination with a transportation (indiscernible) agency,
4 of which MAG and PAG are those transportation agencies.
5 And so to comply with what we're planning to do and to
6 complete the idea of that coordination, I sent letters to
7 both the MAG and PAG region because in order for us to
8 proceed, we will need to coordinate with them, and they'll
9 need to put the study into their (indiscernible).

10 MR. CHRISTY: I don't want to paint pictures
11 that you don't feel comfortable with aligning yourself
12 with. I'm just trying to develop a scenario and whether
13 or not -- whether you think it's an accurate one or not,
14 you can let me know, but can you foresee on this funding
15 issue that you just addressed with these two regions, that
16 a potential way to achieve the goal of funding would
17 perhaps be to realign the priorities that the regions --
18 that the individual regions have as far as the
19 construction projects already in place? In other words,
20 as an example, on the PAG -- on the MAG -- or PAG region,
21 we have a I-10 Ruthrauff Road construction project slated
22 somewhere '16 or '17. If that were to be replaced
23 potentially with a funding mechanism, is that the kind of
24 scenario you're talking about as far as funding?

25 MR. HALIKOWSKI: Well, actually when I

1 talked about bringing all financial guns to bear, I'm
2 talking about going to Congress and making the needs of
3 the study known (indiscernible). The other thing I'm
4 talking about is obviously, as was suggested, I believe,
5 by Ms. Cordelio [phonetic] from the PAG region is that we
6 go after a TIGER grant (indiscernible) in MAP-21.

7 However, that's not as easy as simply out --
8 filling out (indiscernible) pages. There is some cost to
9 the Department that will be involved in completing a TIGER
10 grant. In addition, nothing would prohibit regions
11 themselves for applying for TIGER grants to do that sort
12 of planning either.

13 So we were looking at all different ways of
14 being able to come together to potentially fund this
15 study.

16 It certainly could involve reprioritization
17 of projects (indiscernible), but, again, I don't want to
18 be seen, as you put it, driving them toward a particular
19 solution. I think now's the time to think of what can we
20 do to make this happen and how does it (indiscernible).

21 MR. CHRISTY: Any questions of the Director?

22 MR. ROGERS: You're saying border to border,
23 you're talking from -- Nogales to --

24 MR. HALIKOWSKI: (Indiscernible).

25 MR. ROGERS: What border? I know you're

1 talking Nogales. But to the Nevada border?

2 MR. HALIKOWSKI: The study would be from the
3 Mexican border through Arizona all the way to the Nevada
4 border.

5 MALE SPEAKER: Okay. So that's -- that's
6 the border (indiscernible).

7 MR. CHRISTY: Questions for the Director?

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

9 MR. CHRISTY: Thank you, Director
10 Halikowski.

11 We'll move on with the consent agenda,
12 Item Number 3.

13 Mr. Roehrich, did you want to make some
14 comments regarding that?

15 MR. ROEHRICH: Yes, sir, thank you,
16 Mr. Chair and Board Members.

17 On Item Number 3, I'm going to ask that we
18 remove the meeting minutes from the February 4th study
19 session. They're within your packet. They're pages 55 to
20 174. Those meeting minutes, as we've started reviewing
21 those, we found that there were some errors and some
22 incomplete capture of the minutes and the conversations
23 that went on during those -- during that study session.
24 So I'm going to ask that that you -- the rest of the
25 consent agenda, in the staff's opinion, is correct and

1 ready to move forward. But remove the study session
2 minutes from February 4th on the consent agenda. We'll
3 correct those, get them completed, and bring them back
4 next month.

5 MR. CHRISTY: Thank you, Mr. Roehrich.

6 Are there any other items that the board
7 wishes to remove from the consent agenda at this time?

8 If not, the Chair would entertain a motion
9 removing the minutes of the February 4th study session and
10 approving the rest of the consent agenda -- consent agenda
11 items as presented.

12 MS. BEAVER: So move. Now --

13 MR. CHRISTY: There's --

14 MS. BEAVER: -- we would like to remove
15 the --

16 MR. CHRISTY: Let me get a --

17 MS. BEAVER: -- "you know" out of it, I said
18 about a zillion times (indiscernible).

19 MR. CHRISTY: The motion is to -- is, you
20 know, we want to, you know -- no.

21 The -- we have a motion to --

22 MS. BEAVER: And it's for the whole consent
23 agenda less --

24 MR. CHRISTY: Less the February 4th study
25 session.

1 MS. BEAVER: Correct.

2 MR. CHRISTY: We have a motion by Ms. Beaver

3 and a second by Mr. Anderson.

4 All those in favor of the motion, signify by

5 saying aye. Opposed?

6 Hearing none, the motion passes.

7 We'll move on to the legislative report.

8 Mr. Biesty is not here?

9 MR. HALIKOWSKI: But we have Megan Kintner,

10 Mr. Biesty's --

11 MR. CHRISTY: Megan Kintner?

12 MS. KINTNER: Good morning.

13 MR. CHRISTY: Good morning.

14 MS. KINTNER: All right. Well, good

15 morning, Chairman Christy, Members of the Board. My name

16 is Megan Kintner.

17 MR. ROEHRICH: Can you talk -- I'll see if I

18 can --

19 MS. KINTNER: My name is Megan Kintner, and

20 (indiscernible) information (indiscernible) Mr. Biesty

21 this morning. I'll be brief.

22 So I'll just give you a quick update,

23 starting on the state level, next week -- or last week

24 (indiscernible) the last week (indiscernible) in the

25 senate. So it's obviously stacking up to be a very busy

1 week for us (indiscernible) and the (indiscernible)

2 working on the budget.

3 As far as bills that we are tracking,

4 (indiscernible) give an update for the board, 2114, which

5 is land acquisition, conveyances, and relocation bill,

6 this bill is being proposed to address several key issues

7 to keep us in compliance with federal standards,

8 specifically MAP-21 standards. And that bill is

9 (indiscernible) the process (indiscernible). It received

10 a "do pass" from Senate Transportation this week, and it's

11 actually on the calendar for -- on the agenda for Senate

12 Rules on Monday, so that is moving through the process

13 very well.

14 And I'll (indiscernible) the I-11

15 discussions (indiscernible) Director. As far as just a

16 quick federal (indiscernible), the President did release a

17 3.9 trillion dollar budget (indiscernible), so March,

18 first week of March (indiscernible). And that

19 (indiscernible) 302 million dollars (indiscernible)

20 transportation reauthorization. However, that is a new

21 proposal, so we will be tracking that and we will provide

22 (indiscernible) with the necessary updates.

23 So as I mentioned, that was brief.

24 Do -- are there any questions?

25 MR. CHRISTY: Are there any other questions

1 on the legislative report?

2 You know, Mr. La Rue?

3 MR. LA RUE: I have a question and maybe
4 it's more to John and Floyd, but my friends in the utility
5 industry say there's -- there's a bill that's being
6 discussed that's hung up on (indiscernible). Anything to
7 that?

8 MR. HALIKOWSKI: The bill has to do with
9 removal or -- (indiscernible) the fact that
10 (indiscernible) corridor when we go to (indiscernible),
11 they have (indiscernible). And what we're trying to work
12 out right now is exactly when those would have to be
13 (indiscernible) side of the (indiscernible). So we're
14 working with both (indiscernible). And I know Mr. Biesty
15 is working with (indiscernible). We're trying to come to
16 a (indiscernible).

17 MR. LA RUE: Okay.

18 MR. CHRISTY: Any further questions? Thank
19 you very much.

20 MS. KINTNER: Thank you.

21 MR. CHRISTY: Ms. Kintner.

22 And we'll move on to Agenda Item 5, a
23 financial report. Standing in for our chief financial
24 officer Kristine Ward will be Mr. Roehrich.

25 MR. ROEHRICH: Thank you, Mr. Chair.

1 Kristine sends her apologies for not being here. An issue
2 came up pretty late after the agenda was set, for her to
3 be -- to have to be out of the office.

4 But what I would include -- or what Mary's
5 put on all of your desks, is the updated financial report,
6 which takes it through the month of February. Kristine
7 said that there was nothing significant in there that she
8 felt would raise itself to immediate attention.
9 Therefore, she said that -- she asked that if you review
10 that, have questions, please call her, but that she would
11 be here next month, and then she would give the -- again,
12 a more comprehensive update and discussion of the
13 financials at that time.

14 MR. CHRISTY: So we are spared the
15 heart-wrenching --

16 MR. ROEHRICH: You're (indiscernible) to be
17 (indiscernible) on Mr. (Indiscernible) for one month.

18 MR. CHRISTY: Just so it doesn't get worse
19 in one month.

20 Moving on -- any questions of Mr. Roehrich?

21 Hearing no questions to Mr. Roehrich's
22 financial report, we will proceed to Item Number 6. And
23 we have a call to audience request from Pima County PAG
24 Transportation Planning Director Mr. John Liosatos.

25 Mr. Liosatos.

1 MR. LIOSATOS: Mr. Chair, Members of the
2 Committee, on behalf of PAG, first we'd like to start by
3 saying we look forward to seeing you all in the Marana,
4 Tucson area next month. We have some festivities planned,
5 so hopefully you'll have a good trip, just as good as you
6 did last year when you came to Tucson.

7 We'd also like to take the opportunity to
8 thank Rod Lane and his staff, been working along on the
9 I-10 Prince to Ruthrauff project, has hit a milestone,
10 they've opened up, I believe the Prince segment to some
11 access, and, again, that's great community benefit because
12 the new project now goes over the railroad, and before
13 that, the railroad was (indiscernible) came by, the
14 traffic would back up on the frontage -- frontage road all
15 the way up the ramp. And so it's a great safety benefit
16 to the region. And, again, we appreciate a lot of his
17 staff and the work that you're doing in the Tucson region.

18 And then finally, we also, Mr. Christy, want
19 to echo your sentiments on behalf of PAG to ADOT for the
20 meeting we had March 4th on the I-11 and Intermountain
21 West Corridor. It was very informative. There were a lot
22 of great discussions, what the next steps were for the
23 I-11. And we -- we understand now, I think, much better
24 as a region or -- again, we can't -- PAG can't speak for
25 every entity, but (indiscernible) present, there is a much

1 better understanding that the existing Intermountain West
2 I-11 corridor study needs to be completed, those results
3 need to come out, and then we will build forward
4 (indiscernible) on those results after that.

5 And this, Mr. Director, your comments about,
6 you know -- your letter about the Tier 2 and the
7 border-to-border, we completely agree that it needs to be
8 border to border. We look forward to having a discussion
9 statewide with the COGs and MPOs and ADOT and the State
10 Transportation Board, moving to see what is the next-best
11 step. Is it looking to put into the program, you know, 8
12 years from now, getting TIGER grant, whatever. Again,
13 we're looking at this again as a statewide discussion and
14 effort, not as something regional. And we look forward to
15 being part of that discussion and not necessarily pushing
16 anything in particular for our region.

17 And so with that, I would conclude my
18 remarks -- I didn't need to get the old heave-ho -- and we
19 appreciate it very much. And we look forward to seeing
20 you next time.

21 MR. CHRISTY: Thank you, Mr. Liosatos.

22 We'll proceed with Item 6, the Multimodal
23 Planning Division report from our assistant director,
24 Mr. Omer. I'm sure you and the Director are probably very
25 disappointed that you don't have from me a bullet-pointed

1 letter asking you to respond to items.

2 MR. HALIKOWSKI: Actually, it makes life
3 very easy, Mr. (Indiscernible).

4 MALE SPEAKER: For who?

5 MR. HALIKOWSKI: (Indiscernible) you know
6 what you want (indiscernible).

7 MR. CHRISTY: But having said that, we'll
8 proceed with the Multimodal Planning Division report,
9 Mr. Omer.

10 MR. OMER: Mr. Chair, thank you. I'm glad
11 the Director responded so I didn't have to.

12 We have two items to address this month in
13 the MP report. One is your monthly update on I-11
14 Intermountain West Corridor study, so I will give that
15 part of the update. Then I'll ask Mike Kies to come up
16 and talk about the Phoenix-to-Tucson Passenger Rail study,
17 which you have requested to have an update on this month.

18 And I will say that probably next month
19 we'll have our first update on the SR-347 report. We're
20 going to have a meeting later on today to kind of finalize
21 what -- if we'll do it next month or the month after. But
22 we have had that requested as well as, and we'll give you
23 an update on the SR-347 overpass in the future.

24 So where we're at as far as the I-11
25 Intermountain West study goes is we are -- personally I'm

1 surprised how fast this last couple of years has gone on
2 development of the study. When we took -- when we started
3 out on the process, it was eye-opening and understanding
4 just the amount of complexity that it takes to have a two
5 state DOTs work on a 450-mile corridor in Arizona and I
6 don't even know the length in Nevada. It's been a
7 challenge, but it's been very rewarding.

8 Part of that is because of the staff that's
9 actually been doing it. You know, Mike and his group have
10 just been fantastic. And they deserve kudos as well as
11 the Nevada DOT folks. They've been a fantastic job on the
12 study.

13 So the recommendations out of the study are
14 going to recommend that southern Arizona section be
15 Alternative C. As you know, the Alternative C
16 recommendation means that the future proposed
17 Intermountain West Corridor would connect to the border of
18 Mexico in Nogales within the Tucson region. In the
19 Phoenix area, there would be an alternative that went from
20 I-10 to Wickenburg. There would be two alternatives south
21 of I-10 connecting in to Casa Grande. And then the
22 northern Arizona section would be one alternative, which
23 is the US-93 corridor. And that's my biggest concern,
24 because that gets us through the border -- from border to
25 border in the state of Arizona. What Nevada chooses to do

1 in the future, that's Nevada. We'll connect together at
2 the Callaghan-Tillman Bridge.

3 But this study also isn't just about
4 building a new highway. It is a -- we're looking at
5 multi-use -- it's a multi-use corridor so we continue to
6 carry through rail consideration as well as energy
7 considerations as we move throughout the corridor as well.
8 But that would be some of the recommendations that do come
9 out.

10 One of the main questions we asked Mr. --

11 MR. ROGERS: Mr. Chair --

12 MR. CHRISTY: -- Rogers?

13 MR. ROGERS: That last slide, can we get a
14 copy of that last slide there, when you get a chance, full
15 copy of it or whatever, please.

16 MR. OMER: Mr. Chair, Mr. Rogers, we'll make
17 sure that you get a copy of my presentation today.

18 MR. ROGERS: All right. Thank you.

19 MR. OMER: It would also (indiscernible)
20 also provide much more detailed map that would show a more
21 refined alignments in the metro areas also.

22 So one of the questions we asked, Mr. Chair,
23 when we started out on this process, is how are we going
24 to reach 8 million people in the overall study area
25 between the two states. And the brief answer is you work

1 really hard. And that's -- that's what our combined
2 staffs have to do, have done. They've engaged over 2300
3 people representing 800 public and private stakeholder and
4 partner groups. They've had 25 meetings and over a
5 thousand combined people in attendance. And you really
6 rely on your stakeholder partners to communicate the
7 messages.

8 This isn't just my team that does this. The
9 ADOT communications team are just fantastic on the amount
10 of -- ability to get out and reach our partners and
11 stakeholders. They do that through numerous ways. You
12 know, we have an I-11 website, the illstudy.org [sic]
13 website. We send out email blasts. We have the website.
14 There have been over a hundred stories published in print,
15 on television and in the news media. We've had, you know,
16 tons of public meetings in the last couple of years in
17 Nevada, in Arizona, in Phoenix, in Tucson, Kingman. We've
18 had virtual meetings. In the last round of virtual
19 meetings that just wrapped up in February, had over 2,000
20 participants in the public -- virtual public meeting. So
21 getting the message out is something we're very passionate
22 out. This is a very important issue in Arizona, and
23 (indiscernible) to get people's, public's involvement, you
24 have to do the work to go out and make sure that
25 they're -- you're being heard and your message is out

1 there, you're listening to what is being said.

2 So the next steps will be continue to wrap
3 up the study, prepare the final corridor concept report,
4 the final business case, an implementation plan, ideally
5 the purpose and need document for an eventual final NEPA
6 document will be developed out of this. And then our --
7 probably our next core agency partner meeting will be held
8 in May of this year.

9 MR. CHRISTY: Mr. Omer, may I interrupt you
10 (indiscernible) complete that final report, are you still
11 on track for mid to late summer?

12 MR. OMER: Mr. Chair, we are still expecting
13 to have a final report done in the summer of 2014.

14 Mr. Chair, that's all I have for the I-11
15 report. Do you --

16 MR. CHRISTY: Mr. Director?

17 MR. HALIKOWSKI: Just want to make sure it
18 clear, once that final report is done in 2014 in the
19 summertime, what happens then.

20 MR. OMER: Mr. Chair, Mr. Director, at that
21 time, we will have the -- the business case complete.
22 We'll have the final corridor report complete. We'll have
23 the Planning/Environmental Linkages document complete.
24 And at that point, it'll stop, because we don't have
25 anything else programmed or funded at this time. That's

1 that discussion that the Director talked about earlier.
2 Until we identify funding and what we're going to do in
3 the future, we will end at that point.

4 MR. HALIKOWSKI: In other words, we cannot
5 start the NEPA process. So if we ever wanted to get to a
6 point where we were shovel-ready, and let's say in the
7 future, TIGER money or something became available, without
8 the NEPA study, we wouldn't have it on the shelf to go and
9 access that funding. So I just want to make sure folks
10 understand that, Mr. Chairman, because I think they
11 believe that once the PEL's done, we're done, and it's
12 (indiscernible).

13 MR. CHRISTY: Well, that's an insightful
14 point. I'm just wondering between now and then, it's a
15 very short period of time. There should be some
16 initiative from some source that we start doing exactly
17 what you're suggesting and have suggested to your COG
18 letters about identifying funding sources. I'm wondering
19 where that generation of initiative should come from?
20 Should it be from the Department? Should it be from the
21 COGs? From this board? Do you have any insight or
22 suggestion on that?

23 MR. HALIKOWSKI: Well, as I said,
24 Mr. Chairman, for the past couple of years, we've been
25 trying to warn folks that once the (indiscernible) stops,

1 we don't have anything to identify in the future. So I
2 realize the window is short, but my insight is that we
3 really need to pull together as a state to decide how
4 we're going to do this. Obviously, you're not going to do
5 the entire EIS in one -- it could be broken in phases.
6 And I think we need to sit down and have some good
7 discussions about where are we going to be able to do
8 this; in other words, what makes sense for this.

9 MR. CHRISTY: And when you say we -- we
10 should sit down, who would you suggest be "we"?

11 MR. HALIKOWSKI: "We" being the board
12 itself, "we" being the regions, we need to work with our
13 legislators (indiscernible) we need to work with all the
14 folks who have interests in seeing this promptly move
15 forward.

16 MR. CHRISTY: I would like to suggest that
17 perhaps we hold a type of a study session and include all
18 those stakeholders into that process, the legislatures
19 [sic], the representatives of the various committees that
20 are studying this from another standpoint, that -- what is
21 it, TTCA or?

22 MR. HALIKOWSKI: Yes, TPCA is looking at
23 I-11 as part of its key commerce corridors. But
24 obviously, we need to also work much more closely with our
25 delegation. The Department going to D.C. is certainly one

1 avenue that would include the delegation, but there are
2 many others (indiscernible).

3 MR. CHRISTY: I would just -- and I know I
4 shared the concern with you is I would just hate to see
5 that all this study and all this effort is being -- has
6 been conducted and completed, and then we just stop. So
7 between the staff and maybe the COGs or some kind of
8 coordination and collaboration of stakeholders, I'd like
9 to see that we have a plenary meeting of some sort or some
10 kind of an attempt to bring everybody together to discuss
11 this issue.

12 Mr. Rogers?

13 MR. ROGERS: Mr. Chair, my recommendation is
14 that you've got a study coming out. We bring that and
15 invite everybody to come and then present them the study,
16 and say, now, here's the study, here's what we recommend,
17 here's what we -- you know, what we're going to need to do
18 for the future.

19 MR. HALIKOWSKI: For the record,
20 Mr. Chairman, let me -- we'll give this some consideration
21 (indiscernible).

22 MR. CHRISTY: So my idea is along that line.
23 Okay. Very good.

24 MR. OMER: Mr. Chair, and that's why I'd
25 like to point out is while at the end of our existing I-11

1 Intermountain West Corridor study, we're not where we want
2 to be, we'll be in a much more better place than we were
3 two years ago. We will specifically have a corridor
4 identified. We'll have a business case in hand that
5 proves to -- at least to the Department and to the
6 stakeholders that there is a valid use for the study and
7 for the entire corridor, that the entire corridor makes
8 sense. We'll have Planning/Environmental Linkage document
9 done, which will inform the eventual NEPA process. So
10 while it may not be exactly what we want, it will be a
11 very good step towards that as we move forward to the
12 future.

13 So I think -- I don't want to downplay the
14 work that's been done. And the groups between the two
15 states have done yeoman's work to pull this together in
16 two years, is fantastic.

17 MR. CHRISTY: Well, the point being that
18 this is a significant mile -- milepost where we've
19 reached, and based on that significance, it deserves the
20 attention of as many stakeholders involved in this as
21 possible in a grand way, I would say.

22 MR. OMER: Agreed.

23 MS. BEAVER: Mr. Chairman?

24 MR. CHRISTY: Ms. Beaver.

25 MS. BEAVER: I would just like to

1 compliment, just in the year that I have served on this
2 board -- and it seems like you've moved quickly to this
3 point. And I appreciate the fact Director Halikowski, he
4 was hearing our request, and he and Mr. Biesty did get
5 (indiscernible) Washington, D.C. But I think just our
6 presence, I think just like your (indiscernible), and, you
7 know, we're familiar with you. You know? So I think if
8 we continue to make our presence seen in Washington, D.C.,
9 or, you know, even locally, if there's local officers, our
10 representation, you know, good things will happen.

11 MR. CHRISTY: Mr. La Rue?

12 MR. LA RUE: -- Chair, if I could, I second
13 (indiscernible). Mr. Chair, I think, if -- what I
14 understand you're asking, I would strongly support, and
15 that is I think ADOT needs to take the lead to pull
16 together some kind of a forum sooner versus later, because
17 I don't really want to wait until the study comes out, I
18 think it's too late, sooner versus -- sooner versus later
19 to get all of these key constituents in a room to say,
20 What's next, guys, and how are we going to tackle this
21 together and move this forward. And I think that timing
22 is probably, you know, May or June or something to -- to
23 bring it together, because I think there's a lot of people
24 that are interested in it, but a lot of people only see
25 their particular area, and I think it's ADOT has got the

1 entire state. So -- so I think it's really us that needs
2 to -- and maybe it's the Chair, pulling together this
3 statewide forum to ask the question, what's next, and then
4 have the Department with suggestions on what's next and
5 how we -- how we go about this.

6 MR. CHRISTY: I think that could be worked
7 out. Good point.

8 Any other questions of the Director or
9 Mr. Omer on the I-11 issue?

10 Hearing none, let's go ahead with the
11 rail -- rail corridor study.

12 MR. OMER: Mr. Chair, next is Mike Kies to
13 present on passenger rail corridor study you had asked
14 about.

15 I would say that we're very proud of the
16 work that Mike and his team has done. You'll see just in
17 the study the amount of public involvement that has gone
18 into this study as well. They've reached, you know, tens
19 of thousands of people throughout this study. And it's
20 not been easy. It's been (indiscernible) hard work. They
21 dedicate their afternoons and weekends, I mean every
22 weekend for months at a time, they go out physically and
23 address --

24 MALE SPEAKER: We'll put you on to three
25 minutes.

1 MR. OMER: Okay. I still have two minutes
2 and five seconds to go.

3 MALE SPEAKER: -- Mary to raise her hand,
4 but I raised my hand.

5 MR. OMER: So -- and as Mike said, as Mike's
6 going to talk about the amount of public involvement
7 (indiscernible) been out there, I mean to physically give
8 up their nights and weekends, you know, for months at a
9 time to go out and meet with the public, whether it's in
10 Marana or Tucson Meet Yourself or last weekend in the
11 Chandler Ostrich Festival, the State Fair, you know, the
12 group between Mike's group in Planning and Carlos is back
13 in the back (indiscernible) the people that we have in our
14 communications group, they're out there on nights and
15 weekends doing this, and that's how you reach people.
16 That's how you do really effective public involvement.
17 And then we get the people involved and engaged, and
18 that's how they hear about the study. So their hard work
19 that this has been successful, very proud of this study
20 staff.

21 MR. CHRISTY: Well said, Mr. Omer.

22 Mr. Kies? And the board echoes the
23 statements Mr. Omer said.

24 MR. KIES: Thank you, Mr. Chair, and Members
25 of the Board, I'm happy to give you an update on the ADOT

1 passenger rail study, and I appreciate Scott's words, and
2 if those are the type of words you can say, I hope he does
3 use all of his three minutes up.

4 (Laughter)

5 MR. ROEHRICH: If he's complimenting you and
6 the work you did, we'll give him much longer
7 (indiscernible).

8 (Laughter)

9 MR. KIES: This slide is just a reminder of
10 the process that we're following with the passenger rail
11 corridor study. Again, it's another study that's been
12 going on for -- for several years. We started in 2011
13 with a notice of intent. We are doing three major
14 deliverables with this study. It's -- first is an
15 alternative analysis report. That's the report that will
16 describe all of the ideas that we looked at to connect --
17 to potentially connect passenger rail between our two
18 metropolitan areas of Tucson and Phoenix. We are in the
19 last step of that alternative analysis. And I'll go into
20 that in a few minutes.

21 Then we are doing a NEPA document with this
22 study, so we're doing an environmental impact statement.
23 It's a Tier 1 EIS, which will allow us to recommend a
24 preferred corridor for the opportunity to someday
25 implement passenger rail between the two cities.

1 And then the last product is a service
2 development plan, and that would be the report that
3 describes potentially how a passenger rail system would
4 operate, frequency of trains, the potential locations for
5 stations, the type of connections that could connect to
6 such a system.

7 MR. CHRISTY: Mr. Kies, let me interrupt you
8 just for a second.

9 Is it safe to say, then, we're better than
10 two-thirds of the way completed for the entire corridor
11 study process, roughly?

12 MR. KIES: Yes, Mr. Chair, we are
13 anticipated to wrap up the entire study by the end of this
14 calendar year.

15 MR. CHRISTY: That was my next question, so
16 by the end of this calendar year, you anticipate all the
17 necessary studies to be completed.

18 MR. KIES: Correct, sir.

19 MR. CHRISTY: Thank you.

20 MR. KIES: Where we are in the study right
21 now is about 18 months ago, we formulated seven different
22 alternatives to connect the two regions with a
23 high-capacity transit system. We're now down to three
24 final alternatives, and all of our work is concentrated on
25 these three final alternatives. All the alternatives are

1 common as we leave the Tucson International Airport
2 south -- south of Tucson through the Tucson area to about
3 Picacho Peak where -- where the thought is that we would
4 be parallel to the Interstate 10 corridor. Then you can
5 see the different routes that are currently being
6 discussed across Pinal County, the Green, Yellow and
7 Orange alternatives, as we've called them: one crossing
8 the Gila River Indian community; the Yellow alternative
9 following the existing Union Pacific's corridor, that is a
10 freight rail corridor that exists; and the Orange
11 alternative that follows new alignments through Pinal
12 County and the East Valley of the -- of the Phoenix metro
13 area.

14 As Scott mentioned, in order for us to get
15 to the point where we are now, we've relied heavily on
16 input from the public. And previously, when we had seven
17 alternatives, we went out for a community outreach effort
18 where, we went to 20 events all over the state, as Scott
19 mentioned, things like the State Fair and Tucson Meet
20 Yourself and those types of events. We had a survey that
21 people could fill out, and as you see the numbers here,
22 almost 7,000 people filled out a survey, which, as we've
23 looked at the web analysis, it took people 15 to 20
24 minutes to fill out that survey for us, so it was very --
25 very helpful that we got so much -- so many people to give

1 us input.

2 And as Scott mentioned, we're -- we're in
3 the public outreach version 2.0. We just kicked off our
4 public outreach effort for the three final alternatives
5 that I just showed you. Last weekend, we started being --
6 we were out at the Ostrich Festival in Chandler. And then
7 you can see that tomorrow we'll be out on the Gila River
8 Indian community at their fair that they have each year.
9 Different other events, the Tempe Festival of the Arts,
10 and so on. We are hitting -- we're trying to cover the
11 whole study area.

12 The way that we've approached public
13 outreach, as you see the pictures there, we do set up a
14 tent or a booth at these -- these fairs. We have staff
15 available. They can fill out a survey right there, or
16 they can take information with them and go back on -- on
17 the web and fill out the information and mail it in or do
18 it online.

19 With this public outreach event, we've only
20 been at it for a week, and as of yesterday, I was informed
21 that over 700 people have already filled out our survey
22 and given us the information that we've asked about how we
23 can look at those three different final alternatives.

24 One of the things that we are sharing with
25 the public with this public outreach is the idea about

1 potential ridership on a system like this. One of the
2 things that's always asked is, well, how many people would
3 actually use such a system. We do estimate with our
4 initial ridership numbers that three to five million
5 people a year would use a system -- could potentially use
6 a system between Phoenix and Tucson. One of the ideas
7 that we thought we'd do with the public is we would
8 compare that against other peer rail systems across the
9 country in Texas, Chicago, California, and so on, and
10 break it down to riders per mile that we project versus
11 riders per mile that other systems are currently
12 providing. And with our estimates we would be at the
13 top -- near the top of the chart of performance for such a
14 system.

15 With that, as the Chairman alluded to, this
16 is our schedule of next steps that we're completing this
17 public outreach effort between March and May of this year.
18 Then we would be ready to go out with the Tier 1 -- the
19 draft Tier 1 EIS and have a public hearing later in the
20 summer into the fall of 2014. Then in the fall and into
21 the winter of 2014, we would complete the final Tier 1
22 EIS. The products that we are looking forward to on this
23 study is a Record of Decision from our federal lead
24 agencies, which is the Federal Transit Administration and
25 the Federal Railroad Administration. And what the Tier 1

1 EIS, what a Record of Decision on the Tier 1 EIS does is
2 allow us to recommend the corridor that we should be
3 focusing on, should the state of Arizona choose to
4 implement a system like this.

5 Reminder to everybody: No funding has been
6 identified to implement a passenger rail system between
7 Phoenix and Tucson. But as some of the public comments
8 were mentioned earlier in this meeting, this is one of
9 those alternatives that we would have the opportunity to
10 look at in more detail as -- as we go into the future.

11 With that, I also want to give kudos to
12 Carlos Lopez, who is our rail planner and managing all the
13 activities of this -- this project. And anybody who has
14 questions or comments would be free to contact him.

15 With that --

16 MR. CHRISTY: I have a couple of questions.
17 You -- you answered one of them. There's been no funding
18 identified as of yet. How about -- just to back up so
19 everybody's clear, where did the funding for the studies
20 come from?

21 MR. KIES: The study -- the funding for the
22 study comes from several sources.

23 MR. CHRISTY: And can you tell us the
24 amount?

25 MR. KIES: Sure. We were provided a grant

1 from the Federal Transit Administration to look at the
 2 connectivity between Tucson and Phoenix. And then another
 3 grant from the Federal Railroad Administration. The grant
 4 from the Federal Railroad Administration is a million
 5 dollars, which then the ADOT has to match a million
 6 dollars with our -- their own funds. The grant from the
 7 Federal Transit Administration was about 4.6 million
 8 dollars, and then we have to match that with about
 9 \$800,000 of our own funds. And I think -- I believe the
 10 total comes up to be 6 point -- however the math works
 11 out -- 6 --

12 MR. CHRISTY: So -- so what's the
 13 delineation between the grants and ADOT contribution? Out
 14 of the 6.8 million? What -- 3.2? 3.3? Or?

15 MR. KIES: The grant -- the -- ADOT's
 16 contribution to match the grants is about 1.8 million
 17 dollars.

18 MR. CHRISTY: And where does that come from?

19 MR. KIES: That was actually an opportunity
 20 that when ADOT did a study along Interstate 10 to look at
 21 the future plans of Interstate 10, one of the mitigation
 22 measures with that environmental assessment was that
 23 Interstate 10 shouldn't be relied on on the only facility
 24 connecting Tucson and Phoenix and that one of the
 25 mitigation measures was that the state transportation

1 department should continue to study other modes that could
 2 alleviate or help the Interstate 10 corridor, so we were
 3 able to use our Federal Highway Administration funds to
 4 match those grants.

5 MR. CHRISTY: And when -- and when were
 6 those --

7 MR. KIES: I'm sorry. The State Planning
 8 and Research funds to match those --

9 MR. CHRISTY: And when were those funds
 10 given or contributed from ADOT?

11 MR. KIES: In 2011, when the -- when the
 12 study started.

13 MR. CHRISTY: I guess I voted for that on
 14 this board, didn't I?

15 MR. HALIKOWSKI: If I may, Mr. Chairman,
 16 what's the source of your (indiscernible)? Are those
 17 state funds or are they federal funds?

18 MR. KIES: They're (indiscernible).

19 MR. OMER: Mr. Chair, Mr. Director, those
 20 are actually our federal apportionment of State Planning
 21 and Research funds. The transportation board does
 22 actually approve that as part of the overall five-year
 23 program. There's about 16 and a half million dollars
 24 inside the program every year, and the funding that's
 25 available, the SPR funds funds our ability to do statewide

1 planning. It funds our research center and the library.
2 It also funds all the MPO and COG planning throughout the
3 state of Arizona. So that's all come together under our
4 federal apportionment of the SPR funds, so we break them
5 out and distribute them.

6 The funding that Mr. Kies was referring to,
7 that was part of that apportionment. And he says 2011. I
8 think the funding actually came from the prior years'
9 funding, so it may have been 2009 or 2010. It was the
10 only funding that we had available (indiscernible).

11 MR. CHRISTY: And that type of funding would
12 be lumped in one category that -- and that category would
13 be presented in the entire budget presented to the board
14 for approval.

15 MR. OMER: Mr. Chair, how that works is
16 the -- the transportation board approves our overall
17 obligation authority, that 16 and a half million dollars,
18 and I think it's 16.9 or something, to be exact.

19 You approve that as our obligation
20 authority. And then we submit our unified work program,
21 the federal highways on an annual basis do approve the
22 individual projects that are funded. And we do that. And
23 that doesn't come back to the board. That's our contract
24 with the -- with the federal highway, Federal Transit
25 Administration.

1 MR. CHRISTY: So the obligation and
2 authority would not necessarily be itemized to the board.

3 MR. OMER: No, you just approve the
4 overall -- the total amount that's funding, because it's
5 not like our funding. It also goes to all the MPOs and
6 COGs across the state.

7 MR. CHRISTY: Mr. Rogers.

8 MR. ROGERS: This -- according to your --
9 Mr. Kies, according to your presentation, this is for 120
10 miles?

11 MR. KIES: Correct.

12 MR. OMER: Yes.

13 MR. ROGERS: And so 6.2 million got you a
14 Tier 1 EIS?

15 MR. OMER: We are anticipating a Tier 1.

16 MR. ROGERS: All right. Thank you.

17 MR. CHRISTY: Another question, Mr. Kies,
18 one of the issues that we have in the City of Tucson with
19 our modern street car is it was a wonderful TIGER grant
20 that we got into a great big project. But now the City of
21 Tucson is faced with roughly 3 to 4 million dollars in
22 annual maintenance that didn't seem to become a part of
23 the scenario until after the fact.

24 Are we looking at maintenance and what it's
25 going to take and who is going to be responsible for the

1 operation and the maintaining of the light rail, if it
2 should come to fruition?

3 MR. OMER: Yes, he is, Mr. Chairman. Well,
4 it's -- as part of the EIS, we are doing detailed cost
5 estimates to -- for those three alternatives that I
6 showed, so that we can compare them against each other.
7 Part of those cost estimates, we estimate the O&M or
8 operating and maintenance costs that it would cost each
9 year.

10 Obviously, with no funding identified, we
11 are not -- we are not identifying where the source of any
12 of these funds would come from. So, again, it would be a
13 conversation among the (indiscernible) of Arizona.

14 MR. CHRISTY: But you are looking at a cost
15 of maintaining.

16 MR. OMER: Correct.

17 MR. CHRISTY: And have you come up with one
18 yet or?

19 MR. OMER: Yes, we have one. I don't have
20 it with me. But we can provide it to you.

21 MR. CHRISTY: And is it based on which of
22 the alternatives from --

23 MR. OMER: We have a different cost for each
24 alternative. So we can give it to you for each
25 alternative.

1 MR. CHRISTY: And that's on an annual basis?

2 MR. OMER: The O&M would an annual basis.

3 MR. CHRISTY: Yeah, I'd like to see that.

4 Or have it made as a part of the -- your presentation. I
5 think it's important that we discuss that issue.

6 MR. LA RUE: Mr. Christy, if I may.

7 MR. CHRISTY: Mr. La Rue?

8 MR. LA RUE: I think the question that -- or
9 I think the question Mr. Christy was asking is
10 interesting, is who is going to -- who would operate it.
11 Do we know now who would operate that passenger rail
12 service?

13 MR. OMER: Mr. Chair, Mr. La Rue, so
14 there -- that is one of the questions that is not asked as
15 part of the study is the study will not recommend an
16 eventual operator or person that would maintain and
17 operate a system.

18 It really identifies is there an overall
19 purpose and need (indiscernible) upcoming environmental
20 documentation to say that (indiscernible), where the
21 funding would not come from is the state highway fund.
22 You know, legislatively, we can't approve funding for this
23 type of activity (indiscernible). It's highways only.
24 That's how (indiscernible) about. It's not that type of
25 transportation funding that would be made available.

1 If it looks like this is a viable and
2 feasible avenue to pursue in the future, it's probably not
3 the DOT as an Arizona DOT, as you see it today, that would
4 fund this type of overall endeavor. It could be a
5 public-private partnership. It could be a strictly
6 private endeavor. Maybe it's the Federal Railroad
7 Administration. We're not sure exactly who the operator
8 would be.

9 But as we said today, it would not be the
10 Arizona Department of Transportation. That has not been
11 (indiscernible).

12 MR. CHRISTY: Just two final questions.
13 One, you have a picture on the bottom right. Is that
14 what -- is that the equi- -- is it, that's what it's
15 supposed to look like? Or is that just some kind of
16 speculation?

17 MR. KIES: Mr. Chair, we are not
18 recommending specific technology that would be used. The
19 service development plan would sort of give the parameters
20 of how fast the system should operate, how -- how
21 efficient it should work. But, yeah, there's -- there's a
22 whole assortment of technology from the type of Amtrak
23 trains that you see out there today to something that --

24 MR. CHRISTY: This is just an example.

25 MR. KIES: Just an example.

1 MR. CHRISTY: And finally, I'd like to hear
2 little bit more about the Ostrich Festival.

3 MR. KIES: I didn't see one ostrich while I
4 was there.

5 MR. CHRISTY: Must have been a lean year for
6 the ostriches.

7 Any further question of Mr. Kies on the
8 light rail study?

9 Thank you, Mr. Kies.

10 Mr. Omer? We'll proceed with Priority
11 Planning Advisory Committee again, with Mr. Omer, Item 7.

12 MR. OMER: One's a minor clarification,
13 it's -- it's the passenger rail.

14 MR. CHRISTY: What did I say?

15 MR. OMER: Light rail.

16 MR. CHRISTY: Oh, passenger rail.

17 MR. OMER: It's passenger rail.

18 MR. HALIKOWSKI: And, you know, Mr. Christy,
19 I'm guilty of this myself. There's high-speed rail.
20 There's high (indiscernible) rail, passenger rail, they
21 have light rail.

22 MR. CHRISTY: Well, as a car dealer, I
23 didn't spend a lot of time studying the nuances of the
24 railroads.

25 MR. OMER: Mr. Chair, move on to the PPAC

1 items.

2 Thank you very much. You did approve two of
3 our items on 3h and 3i in the consent agenda.

4 Moving on to the actual PPAC agenda items,
5 Items 7a through 7i, as in "indigo," are our project
6 modifications. We can talk about those individually or
7 lump those together. It's the board's pleasure.

8 MR. CHRISTY: Under those projects, are they
9 all in one district or in multiple districts?

10 MR. OMER: Mr. Chair, those would be in
11 multiple districts.

12 MR. CHRISTY: Okay.

13 MR. OMER: We have projects in -- in board
14 districts. We have projects in engineering districts.
15 Either way, we have projects in the Kingman District, the
16 Prescott District, Flagstaff District, the Yuma District,
17 in the Pima Construction District, in the Safford
18 District, all the physical engineering districts that are
19 covered (indiscernible).

20 MR. CHRISTY: Is there any objection to
21 taking the project modifications Item 7a through 7j in one
22 lump?

23 MR. OMER: 7i, as in "indigo."

24 MR. CHRISTY: I'm sorry. 7i.

25 MR. ANDERSON: Mr. Chairman?

1 MR. CHRISTY: Mr. Anderson.

2 MR. ANDERSON: --

3 MR. OMER: I'm sorry. I -- I stand
4 corrected. It is 7j.

5 MR. CHRISTY: 7a through 7j.

6 Mr. Anderson?

7 MR. OMER: Sorry.

8 MR. ANDERSON: Mr. Omer, I failed to get
9 with you prior to the board meeting, but I met with
10 Ms. Toth in the cafeteria getting breakfast. Are these
11 modifications or are they new projects, because looks like
12 we're going from scoping to maybe design right away, maybe
13 some of them to construction. So is it just a matter of
14 semantics or just how the system works?

15 MR. OMER: Mr. Chair and Mr. Anderson. It's
16 a good question.

17 So the way that our subprogram projects are
18 identified is we originally identify those projects out of
19 the subprograms, and we have to scope a project before we
20 physically move it into the capital program. So these are
21 project modifications (indiscernible) we've already
22 started the scoping process. Before we put in as a line
23 item, scoping is supposed to be complete. That's in the
24 board -- the board policies. So this increase in the cost
25 is actually the new project -- the scoping level into the

1 (indiscernible) project development, design, utilities
2 right away, (indiscernible) clearing space for the project
3 itself.

4 MR. ANDERSON: So the original scoping
5 monies were approved in a prior construction plan.

6 MR. OMER: They were approved by the board
7 through a PPAC items in the past.

8 MR. CHRISTY: So at this point, if there's
9 no objection, we'll take the items A through J, 7a through
10 7j as a whole.

11 MR. SELLERS: So moved.

12 MR. ANDERSON: Second.

13 MR. CHRISTY: All those in favor of
14 approving the project modifications Items 7a through 7j,
15 that was made by Mr. Sellers and it was seconded by
16 Mr. Anderson, signify by saying aye. Opposed?

17 Hearing none, Items 7a through 7j have been
18 approved.

19 Moving on to new projects.

20 MR. OMER: Mr. Chairman, the new projects
21 are Items 7k through 7v as in Victor. We could do those
22 (indiscernible) in the past chair, (indiscernible) scope
23 (indiscernible), so we can do those together or we can do
24 those individually, at the board's pleasure.

25 MR. CHRISTY: It would be the board's

1 pleasure -- or the Chair would entertain a motion to
2 handle Items 7k through 7v as one item.

3 MR. ROGERS: So moved.

4 MR. CHRISTY: There's a motion by
5 Mr. Rogers.

6 Any second?

7 MR. LA RUE: Second.

8 MR. CHRISTY: By Mr. La Rue, to take
9 Items 7k through 7v as in Victor.

10 MR. OMER: Yeah, and Mr. Chair, I would like
11 to add that those -- the first three, 7k, l, and m are the
12 three specific fence projects that Mr. Rogers asked us to
13 pull last month. He needed to go out and have the
14 opportunity to look at them with the district
15 (indiscernible), and we did bring those back to the board
16 this month. So...

17 MR. CHRISTY: Very good.

18 All those in favor of accepting Items 7k
19 through 7v, signify by saying aye. Opposed?

20 Hearing none, 7k through 7v is accepted.

21 And on to airport projects 7w through 7z.

22 MR. OMER: Lastly, Mr. Chair, as you said
23 that the airplane projects are Item Number 7 whiskey,
24 x-ray, and Zulu.

25 MR. CHRISTY: All those in favor of

1 accepting Items 7 whiskey through 7 Zulu, signify by
2 saying aye. Opposed?
3 Hearing none --
4 MR. ROEHRICH: Mr. Chair, we need a --
5 somebody to make a motion.
6 MR. CHRISTY: I beg your pardon.
7 MS. BEAVER: So moved.
8 MR. ANDERSON: Second.
9 MR. CHRISTY: There's motion by Ms. Beaver
10 and a second by Mr. Anderson to accept Items 7w through
11 7z.
12 All those in favor say aye. Opposed?
13 Hearing none, motion passes.
14 Thank you, Mr. Omer.
15 MALE SPEAKER: Well, at least it was the
16 first voice I've heard since (inaudible) he's paying
17 attention.
18 MR. CHRISTY: I guess I got tied up with the
19 whiskey and the Zulu.
20 MALE SPEAKER: I think it was more the
21 whiskey.
22 (Laughter)
23 MR. CHRISTY: It's not (indiscernible).
24 Item 8, the State Engineer's report from our
25 deputy director of transportation and State Engineer,

1 Ms. Toth.
2 MS. TOTH: Good morning, everybody.
3 I know you're just dying for me to cover
4 the -- how much -- how many projects have closed and
5 everything, so instead, I wanted to talk to you today
6 about what today signifies.
7 Today is actually Pi Day, which is really
8 inviting for us engineers, and I don't mean the pie you
9 eat, but the pi, the number, 3.14. So being from my
10 mother is a math teacher, I am an engineer, my husband's
11 an engineer, this is very exciting day for us.
12 (Laughter)
13 MS. TOTH: Okay. So if you have any
14 questions on what you see in front of you, I'd be happy to
15 answer those.
16 MR. CHRISTY: And I must just point out, you
17 must be very easily amused.
18 MS. TOTH: Staff calls me socially
19 challenged.
20 Okay. If no questions, I'll move on to the
21 contracts. Thank you all for approving the first five
22 contracts through the consent agenda.
23 Moving on to Item 9a, this is a bridge deck
24 replacement project on I-40. The department's estimate
25 did not consider the cost related to the disposal of the

1 (indiscernible), and therefore, it resulted in an
2 underestimation of the project. So it does appear that
3 the contractor's unit prices are reasonable for the
4 project. And the Department does recommend that Southwest
5 Concrete Paving company be awarded the contract.

6 MR. CHRISTY: Who represents District 5 on
7 the board?

8 MR. ROGERS: Me.

9 MR. CHRISTY: Mr. Rogers, do you have any
10 comment or --

11 MR. ROGERS: No, I don't.

12 MR. CHRISTY: Hearing no comment, the Chair
13 would entertain a motion to accept Item 9a as presented.

14 MR. ANDERSON: So moved.

15 MR. CHRISTY: There's a motion by
16 Mr. Anderson.

17 MS. BEAVER: Second.

18 MR. CHRISTY: And a second by Ms. Beaver to
19 approve Item 9a as presented.

20 All those in favor say aye. Opposed?

21 Hearing none, it passes.

22 Moving on to Item 9b.

23 MS. TOTH: So Item 9b, this project is --
24 this project is a multi-use pathway in the City of
25 Glendale. At bid opening, the Intermountain West Civil

1 Constructors was read as the apparent low bidder and
2 Standard Construction Company as the second low bidder.
3 On February 28th of this year, the Department received a
4 letter from Intermountain West Civil Constructors asking
5 to withdraw its bid due to serious clerical error in the
6 amount -- in its bid amount for the soil cement item.

7 In addition, the low bid and the second low
8 bid both exceed the amount of federal and local funds
9 programmed for this project by both MAG and the City of
10 Glendale.

11 So the Department does recommend postponing
12 action on this project to allow time for the Department to
13 review the request of Intermountain West to withdraw its
14 bid as well as to allow the City and MAG to look at the
15 additional cost to see if they can incur those costs.

16 MR. CHRISTY: This is from District 1,
17 Mr. La Rue and Mr. Sellers, do you have any comments or
18 questions regarding this item?

19 MR. LA RUE: None. And I would move to
20 accept the recommendation to postpone.

21 MR. CHRISTY: We have a motion to accept the
22 recommendation from staff, by Mr. La Rue and seconded by
23 Mr. Sellers to accept Item 9b as presented by staff.

24 All those in favor, signify by saying aye.
25 Opposed?

1 Hearing none, Item 9b is accepted.

2 Moving on to 9c.

3 MS. TOTH: Okay. Item 9c is a project
4 reconstructing the I-8 south frontage road. DPE
5 Construction is a locally owned and operated company in
6 Yuma. DPE's costs for materials as well as hauling and
7 mobilization are significantly lower because they are
8 locally positioned. And it does appear that the
9 contractor's unit prices are reasonable for the project.
10 And the Department does recommend DPE Construction be
11 awarded the project.

12 MR. CHRISTY: This is board District
13 Number 6, is that Ms. Beaver's?

14 MS. BEAVER: Yes.

15 MR. CHRISTY: Do you have any questions?

16 MS. BEAVER: And I would refer to -- to
17 Mr. Omer (indiscernible).

18 MR. CHRISTY: So you --

19 MS. BEAVER: (Indiscernible).

20 MR. CHRISTY: Move to accept?

21 MS. BEAVER: Yes.

22 MR. CHRISTY: There's a motion to accept the
23 Item 9c as presented by staff, by Ms. Beaver. Is there
24 second?

25 MR. SELLERS: Second.

1 MR. CHRISTY: There's a second by
2 Mr. Sellers to accept 9c as staff has recommended.

3 All those for favor signify by saying aye.
4 Opposed?

5 Hearing none, Item 9c is accepted.

6 9d, as in David.

7 MS. TOTH: Okay. Moving on to Item 9d, this
8 is a widening a project on State Route 77 in Oro Valley in
9 Pinal County. At bid opening, grand -- Granite
10 Construction Company was read as the apparent low bidder
11 and FNF Construction as the second low bidder.

12 On February 20th of this year, the
13 Department did receive a protest letter from FNF
14 Construction claiming that the bid of Granite Construction
15 should be rejected as mathematically and materially
16 unbalanced.

17 In addition, on February 27th, the
18 Department did receive a response from Granite
19 Construction claiming that the bid was not unbalanced.

20 The Department recommends postponing this
21 action until further -- until the Department is better
22 able to analyze the issue and make a recommendation to the
23 board.

24 MR. CHRISTY: That's in my district. It
25 sounds like they have a balancing act problem. So at this

1 point, the Chair would accept -- would entertain a motion
2 to accept staff's recommendation to postpone action on
3 Item 9d.

4 MR. SELLERS: So moved.

5 MR. CHRISTY: There is a motion by
6 Mr. Sellers.

7 MR. ROGERS: Second.

8 MR. CHRISTY: Second by Mr. Rogers to
9 postpone the action on 9d.

10 All those in favor signify by saying aye.
11 Opposed?

12 Hearing none, the motion carries.

13 9e as in Edward.

14 MS. TOTH: Okay. Item 9e is a lighting
15 project that US-89 and 89A in Bitter Springs. At bid
16 opening, TLL Electric was read as apparent low bidder and
17 CS Construction as the second low bidder.

18 After the bid opening, it was found that
19 TLL Electric failed to sign its bid proposal. The
20 Standard Specifications does state in part that proposals
21 will be considered irregular and will be rejected if the
22 bidder fails to sign a proposal when submitting a bid in
23 paper form.

24 By not having the signature, there is no
25 assurance that the responsible person in charge agrees to

1 the bid that was submitted. So therefore, the Department
2 notified TLL Electric that its bid was rejected. And no
3 protest was received. So Department does recommend
4 rejection of TLL Electric's bid and award to CS
5 Construction as the lowest responsible and responsive
6 bidder.

7 MR. CHRISTY: Ms. Beaver, this is in your
8 district, do you have any question or comments?
9 Hearing --

10 MS. BEAVER: (Indiscernible).

11 MR. CHRISTY: Mr. (Indiscernible)?

12 MR. ROGERS: It's me. That's me.

13 MR. CHRISTY: Oh, I'm sorry, Mr. Rogers. Do
14 you have any questions or comments?

15 MR. ROGERS: I don't.

16 MR. CHRISTY: No questions from Mr. Rogers.

17 The Chair would entertain a motion to accept
18 staff's recommendation of Item 9e as presented.

19 MR. ANDERSON: So moved.

20 MR. CHRISTY: So moved by Mr. Anderson.

21 MS. BEAVER: Second.

22 MR. CHRISTY: Second by Ms. Beaver.

23 All those in favor of accepting Item 9e as
24 presented by staff signify by say aye. Opposed?

25 Hearing none, it is accepted.

1 Item 9f as in Frank.

2 MS. TOTH: Moving on to Item 9f, this
3 project is a realignment and widening of State Route 89A
4 in Flagstaff. At bid opening, Rummel Construction was
5 read as apparent low bidder and Fann Contracting as second
6 low bid. After the bids were opened, the Department did
7 find that the bid of Rummel Construction failed to include
8 a bid price for one pay item. The Standard Specification
9 does state in part that proposals will be considered
10 irregular and will be rejected if the bidding schedule
11 does not contain a unit price for each pay item. But not
12 having a unit price, it actually violates the state
13 statute that bidding shall be on a common basis.

14 So the Department did advise Rummel
15 Construction, that its bid was rejected, and no protest
16 was received.

17 So the Department does recommend rejection
18 of Rummel Construction's bid and award to Fann Contracting
19 as the lowest responsible and responsive bidder.

20 MR. CHRISTY: Mr. Rogers, do you have any
21 comments?

22 MR. ROGERS: No. It's too bad for Rummel.

23 MR. CHRISTY: The Chair would entertain a
24 motion to accept staff's recommendation of accepting
25 Item 9f as presented.

1 MR. ROGERS: So moved.

2 MR. CHRISTY: Motion by Mr. Rogers. Is
3 there a second?

4 MR. ANDERSON: Second.

5 MR. CHRISTY: Second by Mr. Anderson.

6 All those in favor of accepting Item 9f as
7 presented by staff, signify by saying aye. Opposed?

8 Hearing none, 9f is accepted.

9 9g as in George.

10 MS. TOTH: Last but not least, we have the
11 pavement preservation project on US-191 in Apache County.
12 And the Department did underestimate the haul cost for
13 this project, and in addition, the cost of the
14 (indiscernible). It has a special asphalt binder in it.
15 So the Department does believe that the contractor's bid
16 for the work is reasonable and does recommend award to
17 Sunland Asphalt & Sealing Company.

18 MR. CHRISTY: Mr. Rogers, do you have any
19 comments?

20 MR. ROGERS: I don't.

21 MR. CHRISTY: Hearing no comments, the Chair
22 would entertain a motion to accept to approve staff's
23 recommendation to award the contract to Sunland Inc.

24 MR. SELLERS: So moved.

25 MS. BEAVER: Second.

1 MR. CHRISTY: There's a motion by Mr.
2 Sellers and a second by Ms. Beaver to accept motion 9g as
3 presented by staff.

4 All those in favor say aye. Opposed?

5 Hearing none, the motion carries.

6 Item Number 10 -- thank you, Ms. Toth. And
7 enjoy Pi Day. Maybe a little dabble in geometry might
8 make the day even better too.

9 Item 10, TIGER grants, information and
10 discussion, Mr. Roehrich.

11 MR. ROEHRICH: Well, thank you, Mr. Chair,
12 and members of the board. I have to check my phone real
13 quick, we're still morning, so I say good morning,
14 although it's getting much closer to the noontime. So
15 I'll try to get through TIGER grant, and then we can get
16 into any questions or comments that you have. So
17 (indiscernible).

18 TIGER grant was a pretty unique program that
19 the U.S. DOT came out with in 2009, and it really was a
20 discretionary grant program that gave an opportunity
21 for -- for local governments, state governments, really
22 any qualifying agency to go ahead and compete for this
23 additional funding for specific projects that have really
24 met the five long-term strategies that the U.S. DOT put
25 out. And it's really an investment in projects that look

1 at safety, economic competitiveness, state of good repair,
2 liveability, and environmental sustainability. And it
3 became an opportunity that as Congress got away from
4 identifying transportation projects as earmarks, it
5 allowed for the U.S. DOT to work with local governments to
6 still find high-priority projects or projects that are
7 unique that can still provide opportunity to invest in
8 multi modes (indiscernible) road, rail transit and other
9 port projects.

10 MR. CHRISTY: Mr. Roehrich, can you -- I'm
11 sorry. Could you tell us what TIGER stands for?

12 MR. ROEHRICH: Yes, sir, the TIGER stands
13 for the Transportation Investment Generating Economic
14 Recovery. And it's a grant program that is administered
15 through the U.S. DOT by the Federal Highway
16 Administration.

17 MS. BEAVER: (Indiscernible).

18 MR. ROEHRICH: Or -- thank you. Or any --
19 the federal transit, federal rail, whatever the -- the
20 type of mode of project it is.

21 So -- and the TIGER grants, we've seen, have
22 been around since 2009, created by Congress. There have
23 been six rounds so far of funding identified for that.
24 The most recent being TIGER Grant 6, which came out this
25 year, which has 600 million dollars in it. Again, these

1 projects could be sponsored by any state or local
2 government, and it's a -- and any person who -- or any
3 governmental agency or authorizing agency to include MPOs,
4 COGs, and another type (indiscernible). They submit their
5 applications directly to the U.S. DOT. There's no
6 requirement to go through the state or go through any
7 other agency. These go directly to the -- to the DOT,
8 U.S. DOT. And each project is evaluated on the merits of
9 the individual project.

10 The intent of the TIGER program is to
11 provide capital funding to any of these entities, the
12 authorizing organizations, in order to either plan for or
13 to fund these specific projects that we identify that meet
14 these five long-term goals.

15 There is a requirement for a local match.
16 The money you request from TIGER for your project,
17 whatever phase it is, does require you to match. And the
18 match is about 20 percent, if I remember, on TIGER that
19 would have to be matched in.

20 And the other part to this is, part of the
21 criteria really looks at an extensive overview of the
22 cost-to-benefit analysis in comparison to these projects
23 as the DOT goes through and evaluates the merits of each
24 individual project. And because of that, what we've found
25 is that the applications become pretty extensive, and

1 there's quite a bit of analysis and input that has to go
2 into the preparation of these applications to make
3 yourself competitive. And I'm going to talk a little bit
4 about the some of the success we've had, what we've
5 learned over the years as each one of these rounds have --
6 of the TIGER rounds have gone. The more you can put in to
7 justify and build your business case or your cost-benefit
8 case and the more you can show how your project meets
9 those long-term objectives of safety, economic
10 competitiveness, state of good repair, liveability, and
11 environmental sustainability, the more competitive you
12 will be. But that is required for every application we
13 do, we're putting in hundreds of work hours, as well as of
14 tens of thousand of dollars per application in order to
15 make yourself competitive with the other applications that
16 are received.

17 So, looking at the past five-plus years of
18 the TIGER program, you see that it is split between all
19 the modes. Yes, highway -- and highway pretty heavy on
20 the roads with about 1.1 billion there. But you can see
21 that between ports, rail, planning functions, transit and
22 bicycle, pedestrian, they have moved the money multimodal
23 all around to these different projects. So it is -- will
24 have been a pretty successful in meeting the goal of
25 multimodal, but spreading them around throughout the

1 different areas.

2 Here in Arizona, you can see the number of
3 projects that we submitted way back in the first TIGER 1
4 and TIGER 2, we ended up spending quite a -- the number of
5 projects in hopes to achieve those funding, to not receive
6 any funding with our first go-around of projects. And
7 then as we've learned from that, we realized the
8 competitiveness that we had to have with, and we started
9 to become more aware of -- of the opportunity for us to be
10 competitive moving forward, we started narrowing it down
11 to a smaller field of very critical projects, and then we
12 started focusing on, as you can see here, I-15 bridges,
13 Fortuna Wash, major investment projects. We've not been
14 successful, up until 2012, was our first success for ADOT,
15 TIGER grant (indiscernible) the I-15 Virgin River bridge.
16 You can see that we received about -- almost 22 million
17 dollars in a TIGER grant for that. And we are matching
18 it. And that's been through the board. The board has
19 identified the additional funding for that. So that
20 project is moving forward.

21 Last year, the TIGER grant that we submitted
22 for the Virgin River, the second Virgin River bridge and
23 Ehrenberg Port of Entry we were not successful on.

24 And -- so this year, as we work out the next
25 round of applications, the Department is looking at

1 resubmitting Virgin River bridge, the Bridge Number 1
2 again, as well as the Ehrenberg Port of Entry. And the
3 third project we are looking at and then we're starting
4 the planning on, Mr. Chair, is what you brought up
5 previously, and that is to submit the Interstate-11 were
6 Intermountain West EIS study as a TIGER grant and start
7 working out with our local partners on how we can submit
8 that, how we would end up wanting to either phase it, if
9 we're going to ask for all the funds, or we end up only
10 getting partial funding, kind of have a phased approach
11 towards how we would group that, as well as, you know,
12 when we're working on this new talk with the state of
13 Nevada about being potentially supporting each other, if
14 they're going to move theirs forward. If not, we will
15 definitely consider our own TIGER grant. But that does
16 not preclude any local governments from submitting their
17 own grants if they would choose to, if they have a
18 different (indiscernible) project or (indiscernible)
19 Interstate-11, the MAG or PAG can decide if they wanted to
20 move within their region, that study forward and submit
21 for their -- for their own TIGER grant.

22 So we're going to continue to work on
23 developing our TIGER grant, the applications for this
24 phase.

25 The TIGER grant notification came out in

1 February. They're due the 28th of April, although you can
2 start submitting the applications the 3rd of April.

3 To help you prepare for the -- for the grant
4 process, the U.S. DOT is hosting three webinars, you can
5 see the location there. It's a www.dot.gov/tiger.
6 There's been one webinar, there's two more coming up the
7 19th and the 26th.

8 But when you get ready to submit your
9 application, they only take them online. You have to go
10 through the application website grants.gov, and there
11 is -- if you've never been through that process, there is
12 a registration process. You have to go and be registered
13 so you can go and submit them electronically.

14 So at this point, Mr. Chair, that's kind of
15 the status we are with the TIGER grant program and ADOT's
16 approach towards what we're going to do with the 6th round
17 of TIGER grant.

18 In addition, if you -- if you go to the
19 dot.gov TIGER website, there's a lot of information there
20 that helps you prepare your application, provides you
21 guidance, frequently asked questions, as well as a whole
22 host of additional information that anybody who's going to
23 submit a TIGER grant really needs to look at that, because
24 you're going to need to follow the example -- well, not
25 the examples, but the guidance and the information there

1 to make sure your application is -- is acceptable and
2 competitive.

3 MR. CHRISTY: Mr. Roehrich, a couple of
4 questions. What -- how are TIGER grants impacted if,
5 let's say ADOT is presenting its own request and then
6 jurisdictions around the same state are requesting their
7 own requests? Is there -- does that create a problem or a
8 friction or a possibility that nobody will get anything or
9 that everybody will get something, or does it have any
10 impact at all?

11 MR. ROEHRICH: Mr. Chair, my opinion, it has
12 maybe little impact. The TIGER grant is fully
13 administered by the U.S. DOT. No other entity is involved
14 in that. They evaluate it, and they make the final
15 decisions. They're looking at each project individually
16 on a criteria basis.

17 Now, I can't tell you if they look at
18 multiple projects for a region, how they compare it
19 against that, if that's a criteria. I don't know that.
20 But the information I saw online, my experience and
21 discussion with -- with our partners through the FHWA and
22 others, each project is on its own merits. Each project
23 is evaluated for -- by the criteria to meet the goals
24 established for that. And there really is no comparison
25 from one entity to the other individually or state.

1 MR. CHRISTY: What would happen if a -- if
2 let's say a city prepared and submitted its -- a TIGER
3 grant, and then the county that the city was in submitted
4 a TIGER grant on another completely different project than
5 from what the city was presenting. Is that a conflict?
6 Would that -- would the folks back in Washington go, wait
7 a minute, wait a minute, you got two entities here in the
8 same jurisdiction doing two different TIGER grants. We
9 can't have that or -- as a scenario?

10 MR. ROEHRICH: Mr. Chair, there should be no
11 impact. As I said, each project submitted by each entity
12 is evaluated on their own by that criteria, and if
13 approved or accepts, they will get the funding. And the
14 TIGER people do not say the --

15 MR. CHRISTY: It matters not.

16 MR. ROEHRICH: -- oh, this region already
17 got enough or this region doesn't (indiscernible) it's
18 each project by each entity.

19 MR. CHRISTY: Each project stands on its
20 own.

21 MR. ROEHRICH: That's correct.

22 Mr. Rogers?

23 MR. ROGERS: You -- and I've had some
24 experience in grant writing, and I actually applied for a
25 TIGER grant last (indiscernible) economic development, but

1 you're better off to partner up. You know, if, say, ADOT
2 applies for it, then have the City of Phoenix and the City
3 of Mesa and the County, Maricopa County, and on and on and
4 on, join as partner on it. You can do that.

5 MR. HALIKOWSKI: To that point, Mr. Chair,
6 ADOT is often asked to write letters in support --

7 MR. ROGERS: Yeah, letters of support.

8 MR. HALIKOWSKI: (Indiscernible).

9 MR. CHRISTY: So there is some -- some
10 benefit in collaboration.

11 MR. ROGERS: Absolutely.

12 MR. CHRISTY: Mr. Sellers?

13 MR. SELLERS: So I guess my question would
14 be if you're in an area that has a federally mandated MPO,
15 funding wouldn't have to go to them?

16 MR. ROEHRICH: Mr. Chair, Mr. Sellers, the
17 MPO could apply for their own -- own TIGER grant. Or if
18 the project is in the MPO and we're applying for the TIGER
19 grant, it does have to be part of their TIP. It does have
20 to especially, conformity issues or any other -- it still
21 has to follow that process. You still follow the federal
22 process. This is only providing funding.

23 Now, to the point, Mr. Christy, you said,
24 yes, I think it -- on individual projects, the more
25 collaboration and support you can show, the better it is

1 for that project. But that, again, doesn't preclude, you
2 know, you got support for this project, everybody's great.
3 But somebody over here still wants to do their project,
4 they can submit their project. There is no limit on that.

5 MR. CHRISTY: And one final question that I
6 have, what is -- is there or what is there any role that
7 the transportation board could or could not have or does
8 not have or does have in this whole scenario?

9 MR. ROEHRICH: Well, Mr. Chair, any -- any
10 project that we get funding for has to be put into the
11 program. And it puts the local government and it gets
12 into their TIP and it comes to our STIP. So --

13 MR. CHRISTY: But as far as recommend --
14 recommending anything.

15 MR. ROEHRICH: Oh, absolutely, Mr. Chair. I
16 mean, if the -- the board has a recommendation that, you
17 know, you want to pursue and submit a TIGER grant for any
18 specific purposes, then we will sit down with you and work
19 on it.

20 MR. CHRISTY: Any questions? Further
21 questions?

22 Mr. Director?

23 MR. HALIKOWSKI: Kind of give some
24 perspective, Floyd, you said there was 4.1 billion that's
25 been awarded. But as I recall, the amount requested among

1 the 50 states, do you have any idea what that is?

2 MR. ROEHRICH: Well, at one point, Mr. Chair
3 and Mr. Director, I heard that up to -- before this round,
4 there had been like more than, what, 500 type of projects,
5 but like 150- to 160-some billion dollars' worth of
6 requests and 4.1 have been identified.

7 MR. HALIKOWSKI: Not to say we shouldn't
8 try, Mr. Chair. But the need out there is great, and
9 obviously, we've got to do our best to make sure that if
10 we're going to get something, we stand above the
11 competition.

12 MR. CHRISTY: Yeah, that's my point about
13 collaboration. I think that's a vital way to go. I just
14 look back at our own City of Tucson with the street car, I
15 mean that was -- at that time, we thought it was a
16 pie-in-the-sky kind of a project, and all of a sudden,
17 we've got this TIGER grant, and now we've got the street
18 car.

19 So these things, if they're done right and
20 done I think in a collaborative effect, they could yield
21 really good results. And as you point out, Mr. Director,
22 you're looking to maybe find funding for the EIS situation
23 with the corridor.

24 So any other questions of Mr. Roehrich or
25 the Director on the TIGER grants?

1 Thank you very much. Very informative,
2 Mr. Roehrich. Appreciate that.

3 And you're still on stage here for the final
4 item from you, the new State Transportation Board website.

5 MR. ROEHRICH: Yes, sir. And I was going to
6 help you get to that (indiscernible).

7 MR. CHRISTY: So it's working just fine
8 already.

9 MR. ROEHRICH: Okay. Last year,
10 Mr. Chair -- whoops -- sorry about that.

11 Last year, Mr. Chair, Members of the Board,
12 ADOT went through a revamp or a reconfiguration and an
13 upgrade to the ADOT website. And some of you that may
14 have been on it have seen the -- the transformation of
15 that from the old format to the new format.

16 After that was completed, we asked our
17 development team to go ahead and do the same for the State
18 Transportation Board. So our creative services group,
19 which in this case was led by Cindy Striegler from our
20 creative services group -- I don't know if Cindy made it
21 back here -- there she is -- she led the team that started
22 to look at the State Transportation Board's website. And
23 in -- here I just wanted to show a few pages from the
24 website that you're going to see Board Members, this is
25 going live, I think probably by Monday, if I'm not

1 mistaken. We're going to have this up and running.

2 But, again, it's got a lot of the same
3 information before, but we tried to make it easier. We
4 also tried to make it easier to contact the board and
5 identify information. So you'll see that when you pop up
6 the main website, we're always going to provide some very
7 snapshot information, where the next meeting is, some of
8 the -- the opportunities for the board to participate --
9 or the public to participate. One of the issues you're
10 going to see is this little note here, when you click on
11 that, it's going to take you to the location of where the
12 board meeting is at, so you can show where it'll be around
13 the state and then you can identify kind of the location
14 of it, to give you an example of -- or a representative
15 example of where it's at, that'll pop up, and then you can
16 close that or by going back.

17 And then you'll see the links to things like
18 the agenda. Here on the right, right-hand side, you'll
19 see related links we're going to have. The request for
20 public input, comments, questions for five-year public
21 hearing going -- you can sign up for the email notice. A
22 lot of the same stuff that was on the website before will
23 be here. But we are trying to make this front page really
24 the gateway to that information. You'll see the notice.
25 You'll see what the general discussion topic point is.

1 And then from there you'll move on to what the specifics
2 you're hearing. And there -- again, we're kind of trying
3 to help the public who has an interest in coming out to
4 the board, you can see that you can get to the map a
5 couple of different ways. We're really just showing some
6 redundancy, but as well as expanding the information
7 available. You can get in there and you can see each of
8 the board members, a little bit of bio on them, a little
9 information of the districts they're at, who they
10 represent, again, you know, as well as the picture and the
11 more information on each one of them.

12 Let's see.

13 Board meeting schedule.

14 MR. HALIKOWSKI: Mr. Rogers wants to know
15 what happens if you click on (indiscernible).

16 MR. ROGERS: Yeah, (indiscernible) is that
17 all about.

18 MR. ROEHRICH: Well, I think those icons,
19 they're just -- they're representing all the modes and all
20 the transportation options available.

21 You can go into (indiscernible) information
22 about the public meetings, public hearings, the board
23 meetings, where they're at, any of the specific additional
24 information related to the board.

25 Then you get in -- obviously, here's the

1 meeting minutes that we post as well as the board awards.
2 You get a lot of information obviously about what
3 construction was awarded, what the meeting minutes were,
4 the agendas for board meeting. We're going to post the
5 past couple of years on here. I'll get a little bit far
6 back in this one, 2010. So people who call up and ask
7 questions about some of the most recent years, the
8 previous meeting, that information will be available all
9 electronically. Any requests for -- that we get for
10 minutes or information beyond that, you know, we have to
11 go back to the archive for.

12 But, again, we're trying to make this a
13 little bit more user-friendly, more informative, give them
14 the opportunity to navigate through here, find the
15 information they want about our public hearings and the
16 five-year program, as well as minutes and (indiscernible)
17 et cetera.

18 MR. HALIKOWSKI: (Indiscernible), are his
19 three minutes up yet?

20 (Laughter)

21 MR. ROEHRICH: Especially this late in
22 the -- there's a -- I just want to make sure I can find
23 the little map here. (Indiscernible) Cindy.

24 MS. STRIEGLER: Go to members.

25 MR. ROEHRICH: I was in members, that is

1 right. Thank you.

2 MS. STRIEGLER: The red one.

3 MR. CHRISTY: They don't show our -- where
4 we live.

5 (Laughter)

6 MS. STRIEGLER: There's a button right here
7 that says state board, about halfway down the page,
8 state --

9 MR. ROEHRICH: Thank you. Thank you.

10 So here's the other issue -- no, we don't
11 show you where you live. But what we do show is if -- if
12 you're not entirely sure where -- what board district
13 you're in, just -- there you go. But you can find the
14 (indiscernible), you can find the board district you're
15 in, and then if you click on to the board district, it's
16 going to show you who your board member is, and then from
17 there, you can go, again, like you said, that
18 (indiscernible) information that's about them.

19 The second part that -- this is the website.
20 This is going to go live. It's been updated. It's pretty
21 similar and informing -- and function of the ADOT website.
22 So they're comparable, as people get in there and get used
23 to doing it. There is one more part that we're going to
24 roll out, but not until later in the summer, and that is
25 how the public communicates with you. To this point now,

1 all it requires you get on are either by telephone, that
2 comes through Mary's phone number or by the board info
3 email address. But as we've heard over the past year or
4 so, all of the emanation of emails you've been getting, a
5 lot of you have talked about, -- Mr. Christy, you
6 specifically, have been getting a lot of emails and your
7 email gets full, and we keep getting push about that.

8 We're developing separate email addresses
9 for each of the board members that the public can contact
10 you. When they go to the member page and they see your
11 name there, they can click on and it's going to put an
12 email address on an ADOT server, that will gather that
13 information, and we'll develop for you and we'll prepare
14 for you an access to that through the (indiscernible)
15 access site, very similar to what ADOT employees do now
16 when they access their email remotely (indiscernible) down
17 a link on here, and what you'll be able to do is go ahead
18 and log into that site, you'll get on the server, and then
19 you'll be able to look at all of your individual emails,
20 and they won't, you know, fill up your email box or your
21 personal email accounts. They'll be in this account, and
22 then from there, you'll be able to track those and
23 respond. Lila and I will be copied on that, so we can
24 help monitor that you get the email and that the response
25 back, in order make sure that nothing gets lost or to

1 assist you in that. The other thing you can say is could
2 you go in and respond for me, and then this way, we'll be
3 able to work through that process.

4 So we're working through that right now, and
5 we hope to have that out this summer. By summer, I'm
6 saying, summer right about the June time frame. So we'll
7 bring that back.

8 And so that's the update to the website.
9 And that's the update on the future communication
10 opportunities.

11 MR. CHRISTY: Terrific.

12 MR. ROEHRICH: That's all I have.

13 MR. CHRISTY: Ms. Beaver.

14 MS. BEAVER: And I'm going to ask him just
15 one more question.

16 With regard to the board email addresses
17 where now it comes through the board info, as far as the
18 retention of mails for over -- you know, will you also
19 have access to those where we're not going to have to
20 retain them ourselves? Is this something that's going to
21 be retained in the ADOT system?

22 MR. ROEHRICH: Mr. Chair, Ms. Beaver, that
23 is correct. And that's -- and that's why we're putting it
24 on our server so the communication can be retained here.
25 You don't have to retain it. It'll -- it'll be in our

1 archives, and then that's where if there's ever a public
2 record request or a subpoena or anything like that, we
3 will be able to get all that. Doesn't have to get into
4 your personal accounts anymore. It'll all be here.

5 MR. CHRISTY: Thank you very much,
6 Mr. Roehrich.

7 Exciting stuff. Before we get to the final
8 agenda item, I just want to make a notation here that our
9 new executive assistant down here, Mary Beckley, this was
10 her first full-blown board meeting. She survived
11 admirably, and I think she deserves a welcome.

12 (Applause)

13 MR. CHRISTY: Item 12, any suggestions for
14 future agenda items?

15 MS. BEAVER: Mr. Chairman, I do.

16 MR. CHRISTY: Ms. Beaver.

17 MS. BEAVER: It's been brought to my
18 attention that the mayor of Lake Havasu City and the
19 chairman of the Lake Havasu MPO executive board are on the
20 League of Arizona Cities and the Towns' executive
21 committee, and the League has a scheduled meeting on
22 November 14th that cannot be changed. They have asked if
23 we could consider moving that meeting date in November.
24 They've asked about the October, but I'm not seeing how
25 that would work.

1 MR. CHRISTY: As far as I'm concerned, we --

2 MS. BEAVER: Maybe a different week in
3 November?

4 MR. CHRISTY: We kind of made a set deal in
5 October in Wickenburg. Is there maybe -- Mary, you could
6 canvass the board to see if there's another day in
7 November that would work for them. Is that possible? We
8 could give it a shot.

9 MR. ROEHRICH: Right, Mr. Chair. You can
10 tell us if you want --

11 MR. CHRISTY: Yeah, if it's -- if it's -- if
12 it can work out that every --

13 MS. BEAVER: Could you work maybe too with
14 Ms. Knight [phonetic] and Mr. Nexsen, the mayor.

15 MR. ROEHRICH: Mr. Chair, we will contact
16 them and find a date that we think will work for the
17 region, and then we will send out something to the board
18 members.

19 MR. CHRISTY: If we can, great. If we
20 can't, we can't.

21 Any other suggestions for future agenda
22 items?

23 MS. BEAVER: Mr. Chairman, the only other
24 thing I would ask is there were several PowerPoint
25 presentations, and I was wondering not just this meeting

1 but in the future, specifically when the district engineer
2 (indiscernible), it doesn't have to be in hard copy, but
3 if we could be provided with a PowerPoint or if it's a
4 (indiscernible) presentation, if we could be provided
5 that, that district engineer, the I-11, and the pass --
6 the rail corridor study, that -- the TIGER grant, did I
7 miss any?

8 MR. CHRISTY: I don't think so. That's the
9 whole agenda.

10 MS. BEAVER: Just, whenever there's a
11 PowerPoint presentation --

12 MR. CHRISTY: Eventually, this should be
13 available on the website, eventually, don't you think?

14 MR. ROEHRICH: Mr. Chairman, that is
15 correct.

16 MR. CHRISTY: Yeah.

17 MR. ROEHRICH: A lot of times the members
18 bring that here, but afterwards as we put together
19 meetings and we make those documents -- PDFs to people
20 electronically, we can email those out. We can send them
21 out.

22 MR. CHRISTY: Any other suggestions? I
23 don't hear any more.


24 Any -- the Chair would entertain a motion to
25 adjourn.

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

MR. ROGERS: So move.
MR. CHRISTY: There's a motion by
Mr. Rogers. Second by?
MR. ANDERSON: Second.
MR. CHRISTY: Mr. Anderson. All those in
favor say aye. Opposed?
We are adjourned.
(The meeting adjourned.)
* * *

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

I, AMY E. WEAVER, do hereby certify that the
94 pages contained herein constitute a full, accurate
transcript, from electronic recording, of the proceedings
had in the foregoing matter, all done to the best of my
skill and ability.
SIGNED and dated this 8th day of April,
2014.


Amy W. Weaver - Transcriber

Adjournment

A motion to adjourn was made by Hank Rogers and seconded by Kelly Anderson. In a voice vote, the motion carries.

Meeting adjourned 12:05 p.m. MST



Stephen Christy, Chairman
State Transportation Board



John S. Halikowski, Director
Arizona Department of Transportation