



# Transportation Technical Advisory Committee

February 10, 2022 Meeting Minutes

**DATE:** February 10, 2022  
**TIME:** 10:00 a.m.  
**LOCATION:** Via ZOOM Webinar

**MEMBERS PRESENT:**

Larry Halberstadt - <i>Chair</i> (Payson)	Rick Powers (Globe)	Lana Clark (Superior)
Sharon Jakubowski Wolz (Kearny)	Nina Arredondo (Pinal County)	Barney Bigman (San Carlos Apache Tribe)
Thomas Goodman (Gila County)	Jason James (ADOT - MPD)	John Schempf (Mammoth)
Micah Gaudet (Miami)		

**MEMBERS ABSENT:**

Tim Grier (Star Valley)	Sandra Shade (Ak-Chin Indian Community)	VACANT (Hayden)
Tara Chief (White Mountain Apache Tribe)	Sylvia Kerlock (Winkelman)	

**GUESTS PRESENT:**

Jennifer Hobert  
(ADOT LPA)

**CAG Staff:**

Travis Ashbaugh  
(Transportation Planning Manager)

**I. Call to Order**

Chair Halberstadt called the meeting to order at 10:02 AM.

**II. Pledge of Allegiance**

Chair Halberstadt led the Committee in the Pledge of Allegiance.

**III. Roll Call**

Roll call was taken. Ten (10) voting members were present, constituting a quorum as established by the CAG TTAC Bylaws.

**IV. Introductions & Title VI Notice**

Introductions were made individually on the Webinar. Mr. Ashbaugh, at this time, read a statement of where and how to file a complaint regarding Title VI violations.

**V. Approval Of Minutes – (December 16, 2021)**

Chair Halberstadt asked if corrections to the draft minutes were in order. No corrections were needed.

Mr. James made the motion to approve the December 16, 2021 minutes as presented. Mr. Powers seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

## VI. Call to the Public

No one answered the call to the public.

## VII. Standing Reports

### A. Member Jurisdictions

#### Payson

Chair Halberstadt reported on one (1) item:

1. The design plans for the “**Granite Dells Road**” project (**Project # PAY 19-01D**) is now 95 percent complete. An updated schedule to ADOT will be sent within the next few weeks. An updated estimate will be submitted to ADOT once it has been received.

No other agencies present had updates.

### B. Multi-Modal Planning Division, ADOT

Mr. James reported on three (3) items:

1. **ADOT Freight Plan:** A Freight Advisory meeting has been scheduled for Tuesday, February 22 @ 11:00 AM to Noon. The following topics that will be discussed include the Final Arizona State Freight Plan Vision and Goals, a Bottleneck Identification Map, Freight Forecast Updates, and the Initial Discussion of Needs. In Preparation for the FAC #3 meeting, ADOT would like to gain valuable input on Arizona’s freight highway bottlenecks. ADOT has developed an interactive map that identifies the congestion and restriction bottlenecks included in the Inventory of State Freight Transportation System Assets working paper developed for the Arizona Freight Plan Update. You can visit <https://maps.kittelson.com/AZFreightStudy>) to the interactive map to review the bottlenecks that have been identified through the inventory assessment and provide feedback regarding additional highway bottlenecks by clicking on the location on the map and typing a description. Comments are due February 18, 2022. If you have any questions, please reach out to Clemenc Ligocki ([cligocki@azdot.gov](mailto:cligocki@azdot.gov)) and Heidi Yaqub ([hyaqub@azdot.gov](mailto:hyaqub@azdot.gov)).
2. **ADOT Long Range Transportation Plan (LRTP) Update:** The scope of work is being finalized and advertisement is expected soon. For questions reach out to Jason James ([jjames6@azdot.gov](mailto:jjames6@azdot.gov)).
3. **North-South Corridor Study:** The scope of work is currently being drafted for a TIER 2 Study and Design Concept Report (DCR). Advertisement is expected later this fiscal year. For questions, reach out to Carlos Lopez ([clopez@azdot.gov](mailto:clopez@azdot.gov)).

### C. Local Public Agency, ADOT

Ms. Hobert reported on one (1) item:

1. A reminder that the applications for FY23 “Off-System Bridge” funds are due February 18, 2022. The anticipated available amount is \$3.9 million (\$1 million per eligible project). Applications must be submitted through CAG.

### D. District, Engineers, ADOT

No ADOT District Engineers were present for updates.

## **E. CAG Transportation Planning Update**

Mr. Ashbaugh reported on two (2) items:

1. Advertising for the “Mobility Management Coordinator” position continues.
2. There will be an attempt to breakdown the Infrastructure Investment & Jobs Act (IIJA) with regards to the different funding opportunities that exist for transportation related projects. The plan is to try and have a general summary for the March or April TTAC meeting.

## **VIII. Old Business**

### **Transportation Improvement Program**

Mr. Ashbaugh stated that no agency brought forth a recommendation for changes leading up to the meeting but is always on the agenda in case action needs to occur that he was unaware of. No action was taken on the TIP.

## **IX. New Business**

### **A. Annual Title VI Training**

Mr. Ashbaugh explained that as a recipient of federal funds, CAG receives federal assistance and is required to have a Title VI Non-Discrimination Plan. As part of the plan, CAG is required to provide staff training at least once a year regarding Title VI requirements. He also stated that he is extending this training to all CAG committees touching transportation items to ensure compliance is being met. Mr. Ashbaugh explained that the ADOT Civil Rights Office (CRO) has been providing new information on what is expected annually as Title VI requirements are more understood from the ADOT CRO. He present a PowerPoint presentation of Title VI requirements.

### **B. STBGP Application – Revision/Process Discussions**

Mr. Ashbaugh provided a brief summary of what transpired from the STBGP Application Workshop that was held on January 24, 2022 with four member agencies from the TTAC Committee. He stated the group went through each section of the application to discuss what works and what doesn't and other modifications to help improve and/or clarify what information is being requested. He stated the documents that were sent as part of the meeting materials included a “Track Change” version of the word document and a version that accepted all changes to see what it would look like at this point in time. Mr. Ashbaugh emphasized that the Committee is not making any recommendations today as there is still more work that is needed to complete the application. However, he stated that the purpose of today's discussion is to go over the changes and provide the thoughts behind them and seek confirmation from the rest of the Committee to see if the working group is headed in the right direction. He then opened the discussion by asking if the participating members of the workshop had anything to state before presenting each section of the suggested changes.

Ms. Clark started by sharing a comment concerning the “Cost Estimate & Project Programming” section being scored at 10 points and the “Safety” section only being scored at 5 points. She stated Safety should be more as it's more important.

Mr. Ashbaugh agreed that Safety is an important piece to consider. He stated that the section shifted from 10 points to 5 points due to the conversation surrounding the “Safety Countermeasure” sheet of the application. He stated this section of the application is there to help the Committee understand if a given project should seek Highway Safety Improvement Program (HSIP) funding first before requesting the limited allocation of STBGP dollars. Mr. Gaudet then asked how safety can be really measured within cost estimates. Mr. Ashbaugh stated that the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) has factors associated with specific

safety countermeasures, which is how the HSIP applications are scored in determining their Benefit/Cost Ratio requirement. Ms. Jakubowski Wolz stated that the discussion on how the ranking points are allocated can be discussed at a future workshop. She pointed out that during the last workshop, the group directed Mr. Ashbaugh to assign points to the ranking criteria for discussion later. After further discussion, the Committee stated it was more appropriate to hammer out the details such as the points and other questions at the next workshop.

Mr. Ashbaugh proceeded to present the suggested changes from the workshop. Most of the changes were met without much detailed discussion. However, the following discussions took place for participants at the next workshop to consider:

1. “Level of Service” (LOS) and how it changed from 10 points to 2 points. Chair Halberstadt stated he would like to see that the 2 points be broken down as such: No LOS change = 0 points; One LOS change = 1 point; Two or more LOS change = 2 points. Group discussed that more than likely most applications will probably not receive the full two points. However, there is always a possibility of a potential project improving LOS by two levels and to consider keeping it as is.
2. Sections “Project Need” and “Project Work Description” should probably follow each other and not be separated by any other sections for continuity purposes. The overall sections will be reevaluated with their placement of the overall application with the workshop.
3. “Project Inclusion In Previous Plans” section is good to be kept at three points but direction was given to the working group to discuss how the points would allocated.
4. “Safety Countermeasures” section was condensed to fewer questions and the crash data question was generalized to allow more flexibility in where the data is coming from. The points were reduced to five points from 15 points, however the discussion that was held earlier will have the working group look at a possible readjustment of the points in the next workshop.
5. Under “Other Considerations” using the “Utilities,” subsection as an example, the question was asked how someone ranks such a question if the applicant doesn’t provide enough information for determination. Conversation circled around whether the application should request proof via plans or other documentation. Mr. Ashbaugh responded by stating that there was major push back years ago when requiring certain plans as part of the application. He stated any such documentation could always supplement the application to strengthen the proposal, assuming it is done in an efficient and effective manner.

### **C. Chair & Vice Chair Elections**

Nominations were open for Chair. Ms. Clark nominated Larry Halberstadt to remain as Chair for 2022. Mr. Powers seconded the motion. No other nominations were presented. Ms. Clark made a motion to close nominations. Mr. Powers seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously. Ms. Clark made a motion to appoint Larry Halberstadt to remain as Chair for 2022. Mr. Powers seconded the motion. The motion passed 9-0 with Chair Halberstadt abstaining.

Nominations were open for Vice-Chair. Chair Halberstadt nominated Jason James to remain as Vice Chair for 2022. Ms. Arredondo seconded the motion. No other nominations were presented. Ms. Arredondo made a motion to close nominations. Mr. Powers seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously. Ms.

Arredondo made a motion to appoint Jason James to remain as Vice Chair for 2022. Chair Halberstadt seconded the motion. The motion passed 9-0 with Vice Chair James abstaining.

#### **D. Round Table**

Chair Halberstadt asked if there were any new updates on the Gila County Transit Governance Study as he knew there were concerns and reserves about the results of the study with a few of the communities. He also stated that the Payson Senior Center has contacted the Town of Payson stating that they will not be continuing to operate the Beeline Bus service after September 30, 2022. He asked if there are any plans to discuss this situation as it has become a pressing issue on the local level.

Mr. Ashbaugh stated that he has been working hard to schedule a meeting with the County/City/Town Managers, as well as the Transit Managers operating the Beeline Bus (Payson) and Copper Mountain Transit (Miami/Globe), to explore the potential formation of an Intergovernmental Public Transportation Authority (IPTA) within the County.

#### **E. Future Agenda Items**

Mr. Ashbaugh stated that since there are new representatives on the Committee, it would be a good idea to schedule presentations in a future meeting regarding the HURF Exchange process and the Highway Safety Infrastructure Program (HSIP) application process, which would also serve as a refresher for those familiar with it.

Mr. Ashbaugh also stated that if he is able to summarize the grants within the Infrastructure Investment and Jobs Act (IIJA) into a palpable manner, he will try to have that ready for the next meeting as well.

Mr. Barney stated that within San Carlos, there are safety issues that have been discussed for some time, more specifically along SR 70 near the casino and other areas where SR 70 traverses into the tribal districts. He stated that the primary discussion has been funding sources and asked what those may be.

Mr. Ashbaugh responded that once the HSIP application is open, that is a good source to go after. He stated the STBGP funds within the CAG TIP could also be used, however the TIP is currently programmed out for many years and would take a while. He mentioned that requesting general funds through the State Legislature would be the fastest avenue, should they be successful in getting a bill passed for such a project.

Mr. Barney asked if it is possible for the current BIA 170 sidewalk project to be advanced within the TIP. Mr. Ashbaugh stated he will look into what's available and contact him about a potential future TIP Amendment to do so at the next meeting. He also stated that if it is possible, he would have to open the same opportunity for the rest of the members who may have projects they would want to advance as well.

#### **X. Scheduling of Next Meetings**

The next tentatively scheduled meetings are for March 17, 2022 and April 14, 2022.

#### **XI. Adjournment**

Chair Halberstadt adjourned the meeting at 11:59 AM.