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Welcome to a meeting of the Arizona State Transportation Board. The Transportation Board consists of seven private citizen members appointed by the Governor, representing specific transportation districts. Board members are appointed for terms of six years each, with terms expiring on the third Monday in January of the appropriate year.

## BOARD AUTHORITY

Although the administration of the Department of Transportation is the responsibility of the director, the Transportation Board has been granted certain policy powers in addition to serving in an advisory capacity to the director.
In the area of highways the Transportation Board is responsible for establishing a system of state routes. It determines which routes are accepted into the state system and which state routes are to be improved. The Board has final authority on establishing the opening, relocating, altering, vacating or abandoning any portion of a state route of a state highway. The Transportation Board awards construction contracts and monitors the status of construction projects.
With respect to aeronautics the Transportation Board distributes monies appropriated to the Aeronautics Division from the State Aviation Fund for planning, design, development, land acquisition, construction and improvement of publicly-owned airport facilities. The Board also approves airport construction.
The Transportation Board has the exclusive authority to issue revenue bonds for financing needed transportation improvements throughout the state. As part of the planning process the Board determines priority planning with respect to transportation facilities and annually adopts the five year construction program.

## CITIZEN INPUT

Citizens may appear before the Transportation Board to be heard on any transportation-related issue. Persons wishing to protest any action taken or contemplated by the Board may appear before this open forum. The Board welcomes citizen involvement, although because of Arizona's open meeting laws, no actions may be taken on items which do not appear on the formal agenda. This does not, however, preclude discussion of other issues.

## MEETINGS

The Transportation Board typically meets on the third Friday of each month. Meetings are held in locations throughout the state. In addition to the regular business meetings held each month, the Board also conducts three public hearings each year to receive input regarding the proposed five-year construction program. Meeting dates are established for the following year at the December organization meeting of the Board.

## BOARD MEETING PROCEDURE

Board members receive the agenda and all backup information one week before the meeting is held. They have studied each item on the agenda and have consulted with Department of Transportation staff when necessary. If no additional facts are presented at the meeting, they often act on matters, particularly routine ones, without further discussion.
In order to streamline the meetings the Board has adopted the "consent agenda" format, allowing agenda items to be voted on en masse unless discussion is requested by one of the board members or Department of Transportation staff members.

## BOARD CONTACT

Transportation Board members encourage citizens to contact them regarding transportation-related issues. Board members may be contacted through the Arizona Department of Transportation, 206 South 17th Avenue, Phoenix, Arizona 85007; Telephone (602) 712-7550.

# NOTICE OF PUBLIC MEETING OF THE STATE TRANSPORTATION BOARD 

Pursuant to A.R.S. Sec. 38-431.02, notice is hereby given to the members of the State Transportation Board and to the general public that the State Transportation Board will hold a meeting open to the public, on Friday, November 19, 2010, beginning at 9:00 a.m., at the Town of Wickenburg Council Chambers, 155 N. Tegner, Suite A, Wickenburg, AZ 85390. Members of the Transportation Board will attend either in person or by telephone conference call. The Board may vote to go into Executive Session to discuss certain matters, which will not be open to the public.

## EXECUTIVE SESSION OF THE STATE TRANSPORTATION BOARD

Pursuant to A.R.S. 38-431.02, notice is hereby given to the members of the Arizona State Transportation Board and to the general public that the Board may meet in Executive Session for discussion or consultation of legal advice with legal counsel at its meeting on Friday, November 19, 2010, relating to any items on the agenda. Pursuant to A.R.S. 38-431.03(A), the Board may, at its discretion, recess and reconvene the Executive Session as needed, relating to any items on the agenda.

## AMERICANS WITH DISABILITIES ACT

Under the Americans with Disabilities Act, the Department must make a reasonable accommodation to allow a person with a disability to take part in a program, service or activity. For example, this means that if necessary, the Department must provide sign language interpreters for people who are deaf, a wheelchair accessible location, or enlarged print materials. It also means that the Department will take any other reasonable action that allows you to take part in and understand a program or activity, including making reasonable changes to an activity. If you believe that you will not be able to understand or take part in a program or activity because of your disability, please let us know of your disability needs in advance if at all possible. Please contact the ADA Coordinator at (602) 712-7761.

## AGENDA

A copy of the agenda for this meeting will be available at the office of the Transportation Board at 206 South 17th Avenue, Room 135 , at least 24 hours in advance of the meeting.

## ORDER DEFERRAL AND ACCELERATIONS OF AGENDA ITEMS, VOTE WITHOUT DISCUSSION.

In the interest of efficiency and economy of time, the Arizona Transportation Board, having already had the opportunity to become conversant with items on its agenda, will likely defer action in relation to certain items until after agenda items requiring discussion have been considered and voted upon by its members. After all such discussional items have been acted upon, the items remaining on the Board's agenda will be expedited and action may be taken on deferred agenda items without discussion. It will be a decision of the Board itself as to which items will require discussion and which may be deferred for expedited action without discussion.

The Chairman will poll the members of the Board at the commencement of the meeting with regard to which items require discussion. Any agenda item identified by any Board member as one requiring discussion will be accelerated ahead of those items not identified as requiring discussion. All such accelerated agenda items will be individually considered and acted upon ahead of all other agenda items. With respect to all agenda items not accelerated. i.e., those items upon which action has been deferred until later in the meeting, the Chairman will entertain a single motion and a single second to that motion and will call for a single vote of the members without any discussion of any agenda items so grouped together and so singly acted upon. Accordingly, in the event any person desires to have the Board discuss any particular agenda item, such person should contact one of the Board members before the meeting or Mary Currie, located at 206 South 17th Avenue, Room 135, Phoenix, Arizona 85007, or by phone (602) 712-7550. Please be prepared to identify the specific agenda item or items of interest.

Dated this 12th day of November, 2010
STATE TRANSPORTATION BOARD
By: Mary Currie

## Arizona Highways, Airports, and Railroads



AGENDA
STATE TRANSPORTATION BOARD MEETING

9:00 a.m., Friday, November 19, 2010

Town of Wickenburg Council Chambers
155 N. Tegner, Suite A
Wickenburg, Arizona 85390
Pursuant to A.R.S. Sec. 38-431.02, notice is hereby given to the members of the State Transportation Board and to the general public that the State Transportation Board will hold a meeting open to the public on Friday, November 19, 2010, 9:00 a.m., at the Town of Wickenburg Council Chambers, 155 N. Tegner, Suite A, Wickenburg, AZ 85390. The Board may vote to go into Executive Session, which will not be open to the public, to discuss certain matters relating to any items on the agenda. Members of the Transportation Board will attend either in person or by telephone conference call.

## EXECUTIVE SESSION OF THE STATE TRANSPORTATION BOARD

Pursuant to A.R.S. 38-431.03 (A)(3), notice is hereby given to the members of the Arizona State Transportation Board and to the general public that the Board may meet in Executive Session for discussion or consultation for legal advice with legal counsel at its meeting on Friday, November 19, 2010. The Board may, at its discretion, recess and reconvene the Executive Session as needed, relating to any items on the agenda.

## Pledge

The Pledge of Allegiance led by Chairman Montoya.

Roll Call
Roll call by Board Secretary, Mary Currie

Opening Remarks
Opening remarks by Chairman Montoya.

Call to the Audience (Information and discussion)
An opportunity for citizens to discuss items of interest with the Board.
Please fill out a Request for Public Input Form and turn in to the Secretary if you wish to address the Board. Time limits may be imposed.

## ITEM 1: District Engineer's Report

District Engineer will provide an update on projects and issues of regional significance. (For information and discussion only - Greg Gentsch, Prescott District Engineer)

## ITEM 2: Director's Report

The Director will provide a report on current issues and events affecting ADOT.
(John Halikowski, Director)

## A) Individual Topics

- Loop 202, South Mountain Freeway - The Director will update the Board on the status of the South Mountain alignment.
- RTP 5-Year Performance Audit - The Director will update the Board on the status of the MAG Regional Transportation Plan 5-Year Performance Audit.
- Arizona Airport Association Meeting - The Director will brief the Board on his attendance at the recent Arizona Airport Association Meeting
- Snow Removal - The Director will update the Board on this year's Snow Removal Plan, including public and media outreach activities
- Twin Peaks TI Ribbon Cutting - The Director will report to the Board on ribbon cutting ceremonies held for the opening of the Twin Peaks TI on November 18, 2010
- "I-11" R/W Agreement Update - The Director will update the Board on the status of the R/W agreement negotiations for possible lands along the future " $\mathrm{I}-11$ " Corridor
(For information and discussion only)


## B) Last Minute Items to Report

(For information only. The Transportation Board is not allowed to propose, discuss, deliberate or take action on any matter under "Last Minute Items to Report", unless the specific matter is properly noticed for action)

## *ITEM 3: Consent Agenda

Consideration by the board of items included in the Consent Agenda. Any member of the board may ask that any item on the Consent Agenda be pulled for individual discussion and disposition.
(For information and possible action)
Items on the Consent Agenda generally consist of the following:

- Minutes of previous Board and PPAC meetings
- Highway Program Monitoring Report
- Right-of-Way Resolutions
- Construction Contracts that have no bidder protest or State Engineer inquiry and meet the following criteria:
- Low bidder is no more than $15 \%$ under state estimate
- Low bidder is no more than $10 \%$ over state estimate


## ITEM 4: Legislative Report

Staff will provide a report on State and Federal legislative issues.
(For information and discussion only - Kevin Biesty)

## ITEM 5: Financial Report

Staff will provide summary reports on revenue collections for Highway User Revenues, Maricopa Transportation Excise Tax Revenues, and Aviation Revenues comparing fiscal year results to last year's actuals and forecasts, and report on interest earnings, HELP Fund status, and other financial information relative to the Board and Department. (For information and discussion only - John Fink)

## ITEM 6: Financing Program

Staff will provide an update on financing issues affecting the Board and the Department, including HURF and RARF Bonding, GAN issuances and Board Funding Obligations. (For information and discussion only - John Fink)
*ITEM 7: Appointment of Underwriters, Grant Anticipation Notes, Series 2011A Staff will present a resolution recommending appointment of Underwriters for the Board's anticipated issuance of Grant Anticipation Notes, Series 2011A (For discussion and possible action - John Fink)

## ITEM 8: Multimodal Planning Division Report

Staff will present an update on the long-range statewide transportation plan and other planning activities pursuant to A.R.S. 28-506.
(For information and discussion only - Jennifer Toth)

| *ITEM 9: | Priority Planning Advisory Committee (PPAC) <br> Staff will present recommended PPAC actions to the Board including <br> consideration of changes to the FY2011-2015 Statewide Transportation <br> Facilities Construction Program. <br> (For discussion and possible action - Jennifer Toth) |
| :--- | :--- |

ITEM 10: State Engineer's Report
Staff will present a report showing the status of highway projects under construction, including total number and dollar value.
(For information and discussion only - Floyd Roehrich)
*ITEM 11: Construction Contracts
PAGE 155
Staff will present recommended construction project awards that are not on the Consent Agenda.
(For discussion and possible action - Floyd Roehrich)

## *ITEM 12: Emergency Funding Policy

PAGE 200
Staff will present and discuss a draft Board Policy on how funding for large, emergency projects may be handled.
(For discussion and possible action - John McGee)
*ITEM 13: Sedona Route Transfer Update
Staff will provide an update on the status of negotiations with the City of Sedona for the possible turnback/abandonment of portions of SR89A.
(For discussion and possible action - John McGee)

## ITEM 14: Comments and Suggestions

Board Members will have the opportunity to suggest items they would like to have placed on future Board Meeting Agendas.
*Adjournment
*ITEMS that may require Board Action

## CONSENT AGENDA

Items on the Consent Agenda generally consist of the following:

- Minutes of previous Board and PPAC meetings
- Highway Program Monitoring Report
- Right-of-Way Resolutions
- Construction Contracts that have no bidder protest or State Engineer inquiry and meet the following criteria:
- Low bidder is no more than $15 \%$ under state estimate
- Low bidder is no more than $10 \%$ over state estimate


## MINUTES APPROVAL

- Board Study Session Minutes, October 5, 2010
- PPAC Minutes, September 29, 2010
- Highway Program Monitoring Report


## RIGHT OF WAY RESOLUTIONS

ITEM 3a: RES. NO:
PROJECT:
HIGHWAY:
SECTION:
ROUTE NO.
ENG. DIST.
COUNTY:
RECOMMENDATION:

ITEM 3b: RES. NO:
PROJECT:
HIGHWAY:
SECTION:
ROUTE NO.
ENG. DIST.
COUNTY:
RECOMMENDATION:

ITEM 3c:
RES. NO:
PROJECT:
HIGHWAY:
SECTION:
ROUTE NO.
ENG. DIST.
COUNTY:
RECOMMENDATION:

2010-11-A-083
095YU013HX17201R
SAN LUIS - YUMA - QUARTZSITE
Avenue D Intersection (Somerton)
U.S. Route 95

Yuma
Yuma
Abandon a portion of U.S. Route 95 to the City of Somerton.

2010-11-A-084
I-010-B-802 / 010MA129H651001R
EHRENBERG - PHOENIX
Dysart Road T.I.
Interstate Route 10
Phoenix
Maricopa
Establish new right of way as a state route and state highway for constructed improvements.

2010-11-A-085
085MA119H640701R
GILA BEND - BUCKEYE
S.R. / I-8 T.I. (Phase 1)
S.R. 85

Yuma
Maricopa
Establish new right of way as a state route and state highway for widening \& traffic interchange improvements.

RES. NO:
PROJECT:
HIGHWAY:
SECTION:
ROUTE NO.
ENG. DIST.
COUNTY:
RECOMMENDATION:

2010-11-A-086
008BYU001H088801R
INTERSTATE BUSINESS ROUTE 8
Catalina Drive - Avenue 3E
Interstate Business Route 8
Yuma
Yuma
Abandon a portion of Interstate Business Route 8 to the City of Yuma and the County of Yuma.

ITEM 3e:
RES. NO:
PROJECT:
HIGHWAY:
SECTION:
ROUTE NO.
ENG. DIST.
COUNTY:
RECOMMENDATION:

2010-11-A-088

2010-11-A-087
F-063-1-724 / 095YU004H441501R
SAN LUIS - YUMA - QUARTZSITE
Gadsden $-32^{\text {nd }}$ Street
U.S. Route 95

Yuma
Yuma
Abandon a portion of U.S. Route 95 to City of Yuma, County of Yuma, City of Somerton and the Cocopah Indian Tribe.

ITEM 3f: RES. NO:
PROJECT:
HIGHWAY:
SECTION:
ROUTE NO.
ENG. DIST.
COUNTY:
RECOMMENDATION:

U-093-A-700 / 093MO001H534701R
HOOVER DAM - KINGMAN
Hoover Dam - Recreation Area
U.S. Route 93

Kingman
Mohave
Establish new right of way as a state route and state highway due to design changes.
(This space left blank intentionally)

## CONSENT AGENDA

## CONTRACTS

Interstate Federal-Aid ("A" "B") projects do not need FHWA concurrence, but must comply with DBE regulations; other projects are subject to FHWA and/or local government concurrence and compliance with DBE regulations)

ITEM 3g: BIDS OPENED:
HIGHWAY:
SECTION:
COUNTY:
ROUTE NO.:
PROJECT:
FUNDING:
LOW BIDDER:
AMOUNT:
STATE AMOUNT:
\$ OVER:
\% OVER:
NO. BIDDERS:
RECOMMENDATION:

October 22
PAGE 157
TUCSON-BENSON HIGHWAY (I-10)
Kino Parkway to Valencia Road
Pima
I-10
ARRA-010-E(206)A 010 PM 262 H765801C
100\% ARRA
Granite Construction Company
\$ 5,117,442.00
\$ 5,097,537.00
\$ 19,905.00
0.4\%

7
AWARD


## CONSENT AGENDA

ITEM 3h:
BIDS OPENED:
October 29
PAGE 161
HIGHWAY:
CORDES JUNCTION - FLAGSTAFF HIGHWAY (I-17)
SECTION:
Munds Park T.I.
COUNTY:
Coconino
ROUTE NO.:
I-17
PROJECT:
IM-017-B(210)A 017 CN 322 H630101C
FUNDING:
94\% Federal 6\% State
LOW BIDDER:
Meadow Valley Contractors, Inc.
AMOUNT:
STATE AMOUNT:
\$ 9,994,538.35
\$ UNDER:
\$ 10,431,856.00
\$ 437,317.65
\% UNDER:
4.2\%

NO. BIDDERS:
13
RECOMMENDATION:
AWARD


## CONSENT AGENDA

Federal-Aid ("A" "B") projects do not need FHWA concurrence, but must comply with DBE regulations; other projects are subject to FHWA and/or local government concurrence and compliance with DBE regulations)

| ITEM 3i: | BIDS OPENED: | October 8 | PAGE 166 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | HIGHWAY: | CITY OF GLENDALE |  |
|  | SECTION: | $51^{\text {ST }}$ Avenue \& Northern |  |
|  | COUNTY: | Maricopa |  |
|  | ROUTE NO.: | N/A |  |
|  | PROJECT: | HES-GLN-0(030)A 0000 MA GLN SH43101C |  |
|  | FUNDING: | 94\% Federal 6\% City of Glendale |  |
|  | LOW BIDDER: | J. Banicki Construction, Inc. |  |
|  | AMOUNT: | \$ 674,800.00 |  |
|  | STATE AMOUNT: | \$ 664,400.00 |  |
|  | \$ OVER: | \$ 10,400.00 |  |
|  | \% OVER: | 1.6\% |  |
|  | NO. BIDDERS: | 9 |  |
|  | RECOMMENDATION: | AWARD |  |



## CONSENT AGENDA

## BIDS OPENED:

HIGHWAY:
SECTION:
COUNTY:
ROUTE NO.:
PROJECT:
FUNDING:
LOW BIDDER:
AMOUNT:
STATE AMOUNT:
\$ OVER:
\% OVER:
NO. BIDDERS:
RECOMMENDATION:

October 29
PAGE 170

## CITY OF APACHE JUNCTION

Ironwood Drive, $16^{\text {th }}$ Avenue to Broadway Avenue
Pinal
N/A
ARRA-APJ-0(203)A 0000 PN APJ SS92701C
100\% ARRA
Combs Construction Company, Inc.
\$ 966,574.05
\$ 945,520.00
\$ 21,054.05
2.2\%

16
AWARD



ITEM 31:
BIDS OPENED:
HIGHWAY:
SECTION:
SECTION:
COUNTY:
ROUTE NO.:
PROJECT:
PROJECT:
FUNDING:
LOW BIDDER:
AMOUNT:
STATE AMOUNT:
\$ UNDER:
\% UNDER:
NO. BIDDERS:
RECOMMENDATION:

October 22
PAGE 179
QUARTZSITE - PARKER - TOPOCK HIGHWAY (US 95)
Milepost 132.5 to Milepost 140.9
Milepost 13.27 to Milepost 14.49
La Paz
SR 95, SR 72
STP-095-C(205)A 095 LA 132 H665601C
STP-072-A(200)A 072 LA 013 H665501C
94\% Federal 6\% State
Combs Construction Company, Inc.
\$ 1,733,146.60
\$ 1,785,938.00
\$ 52,791.40
3.0\%

6
AWARD


BIDS OPENED:
HIGHWAY:
SECTION:
COUNTY:
ROUTE NO.:
PROJECT:
FUNDING:
LOW BIDDER:
AMOUNT:
STATE AMOUNT:
\$ UNDER:
\% UNDER:
NO. BIDDERS:
RECOMMENDATION:

October 29
PAGE 184
QUARTZSITE - PARKER - TOPOCK HIGHWAY (US 95)
Mesquite Avenue to S. Palo Verde Avenue
Mohave
SR 95
TEA-095-C(204)A 095 MO 182 H780701C
94\% Federal 6\% State
Land-Tech Landscape Construction, LLC
\$ 396,000.00
\$ 424,173.00
\$ 28,173.00
6.6\%

5
AWARD


ITEM 3n:
BIDS OPENED:
October 29
PAGE 187
HIGHWAY:
WINKELMAN - SUPERIOR HIGHWAY (SR 177)
SECTION:
Milepost 163.80 to Milepost 164.40
COUNTY:
Pinal
ROUTE NO.:
SR 177
PROJECT:
HES-177-A(003)A 177 PN 163 H692101C
FUNDING:
94\% Federal 6\% State
LOW BIDDER: Fann Contracting, Inc.
AMOUNT:
\$ 2,101,972.65
STATE AMOUNT:
\$ 2,445,751.00
\$ UNDER:
\$ 343,778.35
\% UNDER:
14.1\%

NO. BIDDERS:
9
RECOMMENDATION: AWARD


# STATE TRANSPORTATION BOARD STUDY SESSION <br> MEETING MINUTES 

10:00 a.m., Tuesday, October 5, 2010<br>Human Resource Development Center (HRDC) Grand Canyon Room<br>1130 N. $22^{\text {nd }}$ Avenue<br>Phoenix, Arizona 85009

## Pledge

The Pledge of Allegiance led by Chairman Montoya.

## Roll Call

Roll call by Board Secretary, Mary Currie.
In attendance: Bob Montoya, Bill Feldmeier, Felipe Zubia, Bobbie Lundstrom (telephone), Victor Flores (absent), Steve Christy (telephone), and Kelly Anderson.

## Call to the audience

Jeff Tripp, immediate past President, Arizona Airports Association - On behalf of the Arizona Airport Association, he thanks Mr. Halikowski and staff for allowing them to continue to work with them on the State Transportation Board Policy updates.

Stacy Howard, Regional Representative, Aircraft Owners and Pilots Association - They appreciate the Department's willingness to work with the users of the aviation system and look forward to the presentation this morning. She offers herself as a resource to any members of the Board concerning aviation uses and airport states.

John McGee - Gave an overview of agenda topics. Mr. Nichols, Director of the Administrative Services Division, will give an update of land, buildings, and improvements. This is an area that really is outside the responsibility of the Board, but it is important for the Board to know and understand the challenges that the department is working under with some of the very antiquated facilities and particularly a lot of the districts in the greater Arizona but really all across the state.
Jennifer Toth will address the Aviation Board Policy. They are looking at a different approach to the development of the Aviation Policies moving from a very detailed document to a more generalized document that fits with all the other Board Policies and all the same framework.
A couple of updates from Bill Harmon will be Items 3 and 4; Tombstone crosswalks and medians on SR 92. These are a couple of issues that some members of the Board had some exposure to but want to bring the entire Board up to speed on what is happening on those two issues.
Finally, a very important topic that will be talked about today are the funding prospects for the FY2012-2016 Highway Construction Program. This will be presented by John Fink and Scott Omer. The prospects do not look good. Normally at this point, they generally do not do this presentation to the Board at this point in time but given the nature of the funding prospects for the upcoming 5 year program, it was thought to be very important to spend a little bit of time with the Board today to have an appreciation for what the new program might look like particularly the new 5 year program.

## ITEM 1: Land, Buildings, and Improvements (LB\&I) Issues Update - John Nichols, Director, Administrative Services Division (ASD)

John presented an overview of ADOT Buildings. We have 262 sites around the state and 1,500 buildings on those sites. The current conditions: 193 buildings that are in like new condition, 932 are economically repairable, and 408 should either be replaced or torn down.
The Prescott MDV office is a modern facility. In Tuba City, there is a 1970's vintage mobile home that they operate out of. The point is that with this particular facility that is not unusual. They have quite a few of them around the state. Ports of entry: There is a very modern port of entry such as the Kingman port of entry and they also have ports of entry like there in Springerville built in 1946. That current facility is closed; the roof blew off and they are deciding if they are going to repair it.

Also in the structures that are maintained, some are in good condition and some very poor condition. Mazatzal Rest Area that it has a failed water system and is closed. Currently the others are operational. Maintenance camps, they have quite a number of those, 46 around the state. Some of them are configured very well, very effective, and then some older facilities are in very poor condition.

Construction offices which are usually operated out of modular facilities because they are technically considered temporary in nature and there are a number of those around the state. One of the things that people do not realize about the ADOT facilities, is that at many of the locations, maintenance camps, rest areas, and even construction areas, they have to maintain everything the city has to maintain. There is not piped in water at some of these locations like Gray Mountain and they need their own water system and their own waste water system. They are forced to manage the facilities like a small city. They have approx. 47 different drinking water systems and are one of the third largest water producers or providers in the State of Arizona mainly because of the large number of people that they service through the rest area program and maintenance program and operations. The counterpart to that is the waste water systems, when there is water in the waste system, there has to be something done with it. The configurations that are most effective are the evaporative ponds. An ET bed is a sand filled type of structure. When the water comes to the surface, it is considered a failed system. That is the reason that the Mazatzal rest area was closed.

Construction laboratories - The Prescott lab is the stellar facility that is in the state and then there are labs that are substandard. These are the laboratories that test the materials as the highways are being built. The Kingman lab is scheduled for replacement and the Quartzite lab is another mobile home that has been configured into a lab.

The Administrative Facility - The current administration building was built in 1956, MDV building 1976, the old MDV building is about an 89 year old facility. That was closed a few years ago because it was not safe for human habitation and had to move the people out of that facility into modulars in 2007. There are some new buildings that are between 0-10 years old, most of those are small structures. About $15 \%$ of the facilities are over 40 years old that either need total replacement or renovation. About $11 \%$ of the facilities are new. The majority, 68 , are classified as economically repairable which means if there is a lot of money given, they can make them serviceable. There are about $5 \%$ that are uneconomically repairable and are candidates for demolition.

The Show Low MDV office, which is about 2 home-type modular homes cobbled together to make a MDV office. Where the customers have to stand is very cramped and small. Director Halikowski has
ordered it replaced. They are exploring options to either lease or put a new modular facility on that site. The Superior Maintenance Yard was built in 1952. It does not meet environmental code and functionality is very questionable. We have 1,500 facilities. A normal roof on the facility lasts 15 years. Each year they should be replacing about $1 / 15^{\text {th }}$ of the facility roofs in their structure. HVAC systems are the same, they have about a 15 year life expectancy and these should be replaced also about $1 / 15^{\text {th }}$ every year. Larger systems for a facility like HRDC have a life expectancy of about 25 years. There are growing concerns about pavement issues around the MDV office test area due to weatherizing and just a lot of usage. Pot holes and speed bumps need replacement. These facilities conduct motorcycle and driving testing, and in some of these areas it could be hazardous for the citizen taking the test. There have been a few accidents. Striping needs to be taken care of, as well as curbing. Currently there is about $\$ 1 \mathrm{M}$ in backlog in just pavement for parking lots for MDV offices. Renewal is a process in which they get money that is calculated through a formula. If the buildings are applied into that formula, they should be getting more renewal which is used for upgrade, maintenance, major repairs, roofs, major system repairs. They should be getting about $\$ 8.9 \mathrm{M}$ according to the legislative formula. Over the last three years $\$ 1 \mathrm{M}$ appropriated within about $12 \%$ of requirement. This has forced the agency to do only emergency repairs. If it is not leaking or broken it does not get done, they do not have the funding.

In the general highway fund, there is about $\$ 1 \mathrm{M}$. They should have $\$ 8.9 \mathrm{M}$ dedicated to doing this type of work and they have spent most of this money just doing critical mass type work, roofing, HVAC systems, heating systems, electrical systems that may have failed. Since 2009, the building renewal procreations is at $\$ 1 B$. They have done no renovation, repair, or upgrade to the facility structure in the Department of Transportation. They also have environmental issues with the salt sheds that are used to take material and put it on the road during the snow season. A lot of those sheds were built and designed when they were using cinders 10-15 years ago as the primary source for snow removal and protection. Today they are using salts. The old salt sheds do not meet environmental compliance standards. At the Williams salt shed, if there is any material being exposed to rainwater, it becomes a storm water violation. The latest snow shed which is environmentally compliant, was built at Cordes Junction because of the TI being built there. They can drive the trucks and loaders into the facility. The salts are not exposed to the rainwater or the environment during the loading process or during the storage process. At the Williams shed this does not apply. It has to be exposed to the rainwater. A quick summary of the number that needs to be designed, 2008 and 2009 were canceled due to budgetary requirements. Another major critical environmental issue is the washing facilities. The snow plows and vehicles must be washed however they cannot be washed without a wash facility. It is against the environmental regulation to wash a truck and let it run off into the street or off into the environment. There needs to be a very sophisticated wash system that captures that water and does not allow it to get into the environment or properly dispose of it in the sewer system. They have 10 of these facilities in the design process that need to be built and they need about a total of 26 to meet the Agency's needs. Right now they do not wash the trucks and the salts that they are currently using are devastating these trucks. They have an estimated life expectancy of 12 years and they are lucky of they get 9 out of them. These trucks run at $\$ 250,000$ per truck. Also icing storage tanks, which hold the material used for pre-wetting the bridges to prep for snow have the same environmental concerns and have to be protected. They need an additional 70 storage facilities at about $\$ 1.1 \mathrm{M}$ per building. Salt storage and containment for roadway maintenance support. They have a large number of the old style and then the new style that is environmentally compliant and also very functional. The older ones are basically worn out. Five are currently required, although all funding has been swept. They also have a number of functionality issues and the Safford district office is no longer functional in terms of the operation of the facility. Tucson district is operating out of modulars. They have had to add
modulars to keep functions operating and the same in the Flagstaff district. They have basically become a modular building organization. In 2009, they had a $\$ 101 \mathrm{M}$ requirement and in the last three years we have not had the funding to meet those requirements. They have a $\$ 101 \mathrm{M}$ backlog in all capital for new projects.
These are some of the projects that are considered high priority: vehicle wash facilities, asphalt storage, and deicer facilities. Also, equipment shops need to be upgraded, MDV offices are outsized and too small. Surprise MDV office is an example of one that is too small. They did have enough funding originally to build that new facility but it was swept. The Grand Canyon Airport requires a lot of facility upgrades as well.

The old MDV building which had to be closed, this is currently being used as storage. They have eventually rented areas out to other agencies that came in. It is environmentally controlled but they cannot allow human beings to occupy that facility. They have moved their operations into modulars. The current administration building was built in 1954 and has a lot of challenges. Last year, a switch went out and because this electrical switch box was built in 1954, they could not go to the local hardware store and buy a new one. They were fortunate to find a rebuilt one on eBay. This is one of the projects that they have on the books to replace this electrical system. If that fails, there is not a backup system. In summary of what has happened with insufficient funding that they have had over the last few years, roofing, major concerns, high instances of mold because of buildings leaking creating a lot of indoor issues. One of the biggest concerns is employee exposure to mold. A lot of it is a result of leaky roofs. There is also the opportunity for damaged equipment when the roof starts leaking.

Bill Feldmeier: Asked about the option of privatizing or out-sourcing completely on the projects that ADOT or MDV has the capacity to do?

John Nichols: Not all of the services in the MDV offices have been transferred over to the private sector. There are still a large number of services that still have to be conducted by the state that third parties do not provide, such as driver testing. He does not have all the details, MDV would have to speak on it. Only a portion of the functionality of the MDV office can be privatized at this time.

Bill Feldmeier: Commented about license plates, which are privatized services, and asked about looking at a structure that would house only the portions that could not be privatized.

John Nichols: Explained that in many areas of the state there is no interest by a private party, so the state has to provide that service.

Bill Feldmeier: Mentioned two different private providers in the Prescott area. He was just in one of of the third party facilities last week and it was quick and efficient.

John Nichols: Usually in the heavily populated areas, they have very little difficulty getting the private entities to join. They have tried hard try to get people to take them.

Felipe Zubia: From the funding perspective on repairs, he mentioned that they leased the older building out for a storage spaces. Does the money that they get from that go into the general funding or does it come back.

John Nichols: It comes back.

Felipe Zubia: Would that same hold true for leases of property like wireless towers that are out there, does that come back to the funding with the sales of that property. We are then able to keep and use that money for repair maintenance?

John McGee: Any of the revenues from the sales of property or towers, those do come back into the state highway fund and are available for projects. On average, they generally estimate somewhere around $\$ 10 \mathrm{M}$ a year on those types of funds that come back; so it is not a lot.

Felipe Zubia: Those are just funds that they get from people coming to them and leasing property or buying property. Has there ever been given any thought of actively going out there and marking it as business land to general revenue as property sales?

John McGee: Yes. They have actually recently gone through a fairly extensive (inaudible)
Steve Christy: He saw an interesting piece on the news the other night, about the Georgia Department of Transportation. They sold a lot of advertising to some major firms and corporations on their transportation buildings and equipment. Maybe something of this nature in the new times lived in, economically that this might be some kind of a means to upgrading our facilities or equipment.

John Nichols: They have actually stored that possibility and the legislature did pass some law that allowed them to do this but however, right now the statute restricts it to public service announcements. There are not a lot of public service people willing to pay a lot of money to put a bumper sticker on our vehicles.

Steve Christy: It was on NBC and stated that Georgia Department of Transportation actually accrued them huge amounts of money and he understands the legislative restrictions but maybe this is something that ADOT may see as a worthwhile endeavor.

John McGee: He saw it and it does appear that Georgia is looking at that concept and entering into it pretty aggressively. Mr. Nichols was talking about the rest areas, of course the Board is very familiar with the rest areas and the issues they have there. They do have a certain amount of legislative authority to do some of that sort of thing at the rest areas and through the P3 program; they have been looking at some of those options. They have had some people come in and talk to them about potentially operating some of those rest area facilities and they are saying that the way that they would do it would be to generate revenue through advertisements. There are FHWA allowances that do allow for such advertising of the rest areas as long as it is not visible to the freeway. They are looking at those and are in discussion with people in looking at every way of bringing in additional revenue.

Steve Christy: This might be another area that they could coordinate activities.
John McGee: They are very aware of that and the P3 office is looking at those kinds of opportunities.

## ITEM 2: Aviation Board Policy - Jennifer Toth

In 2003, the Board in working with ADOT redrafted the majority of the Board Policies to be less detailed and more broad policy statements except in one case and that is the Aviation Policies. They are really very detail oriented and more operating procedures type of situation. For the past two years
the staff has been working with an industry committee to update those and existing aviation policies and try to create a more unto operation type of procedures. Their recommendation is to continue to work with the industry and to move these existing Board policies into operating procedures and then incorporate the broad aviation policy statement into the other existing Board policy statements. In meeting with some of the industry representatives, they have outlined a schedule that leads to presenting the revised policy statements and the operating procedures to the Board by June of next year in a Study Session and then hopefully for adoption in the July timeframe. This really allows them to continue that dialogue for the industry to comment on those operating procedure revisions and also in terms of how we structure some of the additions into the other Board policies to create those aviation policies. This is going to be a very brief presentation and they wanted to make sure that the Board was aware that they are continuing forward with the aviation industry in moving towards broad policy statements and moving the existing Board policy statements into a procedures manual.

Chairman Montoya: Are other states doing the same thing, are their policies more in line with what we are doing or are they inline with the older policies?

Jennifer Toth: She would have to take a look at other states, but believes it is a general trend. She states that from what she has seen and not by any means of comprehensive analysis, the commission policies are mainly broad policy statements instead of operating procedures.

Steve Christy: He is a member of the Tucson Airport Authority. What should he relay to them should this subject come up before they have the study session and then move for adoption of the policies?

Jennifer Toth: In terms of the Tucson Airport Authority, two of the staff members are a part of the committee that she just discussed. They actually have a draft copy of that culmination over the last two years and have been involved with this throughout this process. They have been working with the Arizona Airports Association, they are very much aware of the direction that they are headed. They will be presenting to their general membership and soliciting comments back on those operating procedures and the Division has just been in touch with Ms. Howard and the AOPA, the Pilots Association in order to also get comments back from the Pilots Association. Definitely she would hope that anyone within the aviation community would not be broad-sided by that.

Steve Christy: It does seem that at this particular point that she is getting a full wide range of input from everyone rather than strictly ADOT.

Jennifer Toth: It has been over the past two years that this committee has been working together.
John McGee: In 2003, the Board working with MPD went through and revamped all of the Board policies. This was an effort made over the course of several years. The idea was to move away from the mix of Board policies, some very detailed, and some very general. They were not together in one place and so there was an effort with some information by the Board that the policies should be just that. They should be relatively short policy statements on how the Board views the worls with respect to all kinds of topics and responsibilities. It ended up being a very good effort and very good policy document that the Board has all seen. One area that did not get included in that document because of organizational nature at the time, was an update of the aviation policies. This document has all the other Board policies combined. This is an attempt to sort of bring the aviation policies into a similar format and then essentially develop this or something close to this for standard operating procedures. They are recommending that probably every 10 years or so that the Board sits down and maybe go
through that exercise and look at their policies and maybe set up a little subcommittee. It has been about 7 years since they have done that.

## ITEM 3: Tombstone Crosswalk - Bill Harmon, Safford District Engineer

The City of Tombstone requested that ADOT construct or install painted crosswalks on SR 80 which is mostly known as Fremont Street. The city has known that several times in the past ADOT may not install crosswalks unless they are warranted in a city that claimed an accident history where they saw a little history. In looking at the background in the last 10 years, they have performed three studies and none of those studies indicated that a crosswalk was warranted at any location on SR 80. Now they are sensitive to the concerns expressed by city officials. In 2007, they did a pavement preservation project on SR 80 and we repainted the striping to change the four lane divided highway to a three lane section that provided a three way in each direction and a center left turn lane. That helped a great deal to slow traffic down. Just recently in 2007, the city was awarded an enhancement project to do some streetscape portions, boardwalks, and sidewalks along SR 80. In August 2008, they started scoping and it was determined that what they need to do is actually make the highway narrower to make more room for pedestrian facilities such as sidewalks, boardwalks. With the room that they gained when they went from a four lane section to a three lane section, they would use that room by the side of the curb line and pull through the center line and use that for the sidewalks. We asked the city to poll businesses about their on street parking. The city contacted all the property owners to ask about if they would be willing to give up on street parking on Fremont Street SR 80 and the city provided the results of that and not a complete consensus but a very strong consensus that business owners or property owners were willing to give up on street parking. In February 2009, they issued an initial project assessment which is the scope of work and they started the process of refining that scope of work and then last fall about a year ago, an elderly couple was struck down fatally by a truck around dusk. Last November, the city engaged in a very detailed lengthy safety study that would result in information that could be used to garner the federal safety funds through the HSIT program. They started out with the United Civil group consultant who did that study. They took information about speeds, illumination, site distance, watched where people park, watched where people went to; like the motel. In February, the city marshal provided us an accident history. That accident history had not been forthcoming until they really pushed the city. The city marshal had provided that accident history and it was substantial amount of history indicating injuries and fatalities that they did not know about. With that in the safety study, they determined that some improvements were in order. They presented a draft of the study with recommendations to the city counsel on March $2^{\text {nd }}$. Director Halikowski and other staff members met with the Mayor of Tombstone. On April $13^{\text {th }}$, the city counsel passed the resolution of support for that study. That study was rolling down into short term and interim or longterm improvements. The short term improvements were that they were going to improve the speeding guide signs. They have reduced the speed limit from 35 to 30 . They provided information to the city on suggestions on how to improve their lighting systems. They have suggested short term improvements to add some lighting to brighten up the dark spots, to remove on street parking, and to better manage the special events. The community of Tombstone is less than 2,000 people. Because of its historic notability, they hold special events and some weekends have nearly 100,000 people. They talked to the city about managing those events better.

Long term improvements suggested would be to make the highway narrower and provide room for sidewalks, providing lighting system that would be consistent through the highway, and to add landscaping to guide people toward intersections where we could consider crosswalks. One of the problems is jaywalking. That study indicated that even with fatalities and injuries, crosswalks are still
not warranted because people are using the whole street as a crosswalk. They determined this past summer is that the enhancement project and the new safety project could be combined since they are in the same project limits, same route. This would be combining several issues both federally funded. This past month, the team met with representatives of the State Historic Preservation office for a consultation to advance the scoping efforts and its combined projects. They have essentially delivered on the short term goals. ADOT has removed the on street parking and posted signs, reduced the speed limit and provided information to the city of the things that they need to do. They are revising the scoping document right now to combine the enhancement project and the safety project. The scope would be to make the highway narrower to make room for the sidewalks. They will provide sidewalks, boardwalks, and porches consistent historically for the community, install a lighting system and add landscaping to discourage mid-walk crosses. They expect to advertise late next year and construction will probably take most of the fall the following year. Right now, what the told the city officials is that after all these improvements they are planning on and what they anticipate is that pedestrians will be discouraged from walking in the rose bushes and trees that will wind with the highway and will be a future goal towards the intersections. At that time, they said there could be warrants for crosswalks. They will conduct that study after construction enhancement; ADOT will install it and maintain the process.

Bill Feldmeier: Any discussions about them taking the road back.
Bill Harmon: Yes and no. On the same night that the city counsel passed a resolution of support from the recommendations of the study, they also passed a resolution asking ADOT to evaluate an alternate alignment to actually move the highway towards the fringes of the city. More concerns about where the highway is right now is the trucks running through that narrow right of way surrounded by a lot of historic structures, all of which are adobe and concerns that the vibrations of big trucks slowly shaking those buildings down and accelerating the deterioration which is happening anyway. They are not talking about making a bypass.

Felipe Zubia: Regarding the general overall approach to situations like dealing with the process and working with the community and dealing with those design concepts, do they do that on their own or do they come back and work with the department staff? And how does the relationship work in that sense?

Bill Harmon: When a local agency applies for an enhancement project, that particular district works very closely with the community to button down the scope of work that makes sense, and the application to help with the cost estimate. They are really partners in that effort, not only for a particular project but are encouraging the communities.

Felipe Zubia: As he understands, the relationship and partnership with the community is great and they have been doing a great job with that. He is talking more specifically with the planning aspects.

Jennifer Toth: Bill mentioned the part of the extent of the planning assistance for rural areas. They do have a very successful program that has just been implemented about 2 years ago. They have been awarded $\$ 4.5 \mathrm{M}$ worth of grants for exactly that, to develop a small area transportation study dependent upon that particular community. It could range from working at their street network to looking at pedestrian abilities. They have recently done a Cochise County transportation study for the whole county and then Tombstone either was awarded the grant or has resent the application to look at what is in the transportation system and how is that developed through that particular instance. Their staff is
working very closely with MPD, Scott Omer's planning department and worked very closely with that community that applied for that grant to develop the scope of work and develop the plan that is implemented. In addition, they are working with the COGs, which in that area would be SEAGO.

Felipe Zubia: He knows that they are making great strides in building up the department for the past several years which has been very successful and he knows it does not happen overnight but at some point does it make sense to start looking at some point how they are interfacing with the communities at a more detailed level of design and where they need to improve with that as well. He sees this as becoming a recurring issue in the future in the Sedona area and Tombstone now. It is going to start happening in the rim country. All the rural communities are looking at tourist dollars. When that starts happening, what happens with all those facilities that are along state highways, we will see more instances with this. The second part of that is, is there a way to come up with a policy or standard to get in front of these issues prior to them coming to fatality issues.

Jennifer Toth: Jennifer and Floyd have been working together and discussing some of the same issues such as the functionality and what can they do with the department to help with those overlaps and to work in partnership in describing what will be addressed with the problems that they see.

Floyd Roehrich: The first question he asked about was the efforts to coordinate consistently with the local governments during these technical evaluation phases and things like that.

Felipe Zubia: More specifically that they are on staff either at the DE level or at the district level or at the state level, those planning design professionals that interface directly with the local communities.

Floyd Roehrich: Yes, this is an ongoing improvement program for us. A couple years ago a development engineer position was created to work with their district engineers. Every district right now is developing a position and they can see that he is working on it. The intent would be that this person would be the person who would lead those coordination efforts between what they are seeing locally, and communicate back to the district engineer and to the locals. The goal is to develop that into a development engineer position and an actual position that would do that. Dallas Hammit, the Deputy State Engineer for Operations has been holding meetings with district engineers and development engineers and started talking about some of these issues and the access management control issues, some of the technical issues, the grant conditions for enhancement, and other programs as well as the planning element, Jennifer was talking about, as they have tried to integrate more of an earlier planning mechanism that the districts can help with. They are taking strides to better this, formulate and approach towards how to put people in place to do that but they are not quite there yet. They are still building up the team and building up the working knowledge and the coordination with Jennifer's group as well as the team out in the field. The goal is exactly what the Board says to make sure that we have a comprehensive communicated conduit between the locals through the districts on into the appropriate management team at ADOT.

Felipe Zubia: At some point, he thinks it would be somewhat constructive to look at the overall state and look at the potential problem areas where these issues may come up like for instances the Pine, Strawberry and other areas in the state that are like that.

Floyd Roehrich: He thinks that what would help in that arena is that Jennifer has led the bqAZ and now the long range plan. Looking at the locals to have comprehensive reviews from them as well. What he is doing on a statewide basis, really needs to be fed from the bottom up on locals and what he
thinks they are probably running into a gap in there is that a lot of locals are not prepared to look comprehensively where they want to go over the course of the next 20 years. The division that Jennifer is trying to build has lacked a little bit in that area. He definitely thinks that there is a need to improve but it is going to take a lot of work to help the locals.

Jennifer Toth: That is exactly that they are trying to fill with part of the grants, getting the locals up to the same level.

Scott Omer: They also have regional planners assigned to each COG and MPO region, to interface it with the locals. .

Felipe Zubia: Overall, they are doing a great job and he noticed that it does not happen overnight but they are doing well with their finest at work out there. They will get there.

## ITEM 4: SR92 - Sierra Vista Medians - Bill Harmon, Safford District Engineer

The City of Sierra Vista median project is a similar format The city has asked for a raised median at SR92 in particular between Canyon de Flores and Glenn Rd.. The city, for the last couple of decades has been pretty aggressive in their safety program to improve or to mitigate left turn accidents, not only on the State Route but to under key local routes as well. ADOT has been working with the city to develop a program that is funded primarily with the federal safety money to put in these raised medians. The business owners on the east side expressed not wanting the raised median. Cochise County wanted to delay the construction or mitigate the effects to the raised median. The city has actually pursued a program to install raised medians on the State Routes. On this location, the city is on the west side of the highway and the Cochise County jurisdiction is on the east side. The city for many years has had a strong program of access management. Cochise County is really not so much and a lot of the access points and businesses are in direct access to the highway on the county side. November 2005, they completed a safety study of crash history and potential mitigations. At that time, both city and the county passed resolutions of support for the findings of this study which recommended a raised median. In fall of 2007, they did some additional outreach for a design concept report and separate those two notions here that the raised median issue is a portion of the scope of work that will be described in the design concept report. The design concept report is a major undertaking to improve the SR 92 corridor in Sierra Vista to upgrade it from a 5 lane highway to 3 lanes in each direction with a raised median. They did a lot of public involvement effort and at that time they did not receive any indication at all about concerns with the raised median. In fall 2009, about a year ago, they issued a scoping letter that described a raised median project between Canyon de Flores and Glenn / Kachina with some simple improvements at those two intersections. In December 2009, they received a lot of negative responses from landowners on the east side. In January, the county officials asked if they could delay the project. On February $19^{\text {th }}$, this year, we received a petition against the median that had 1,200 signatures. March $8^{\text {th }}$, this year, they had a public meeting in the City of Sierra Vista and the city participated in that public meeting and the city openly endorsed the raised median and pledged to help. It even went as far as offering to help construct some connecting routes parallel to SR 92 to provide some relief to the subdivision at Golden Acres which connects to SR 92.

Steve Christy: He asks to pardon his interruption but he has to leave the Study Session.

Bobbie Lundstrom: She is also going to have to leave the Study Session
Bill Harmon: ADOT retained a consultant in August to help evaluate the several suggestions that we received. Most of the people who attended that meeting were members of the public who expressed concerns that were opposed to the raised median. Also at this time, they are transitioning from state funding to federal funding for part of the consultant work which slowed things down a little bit but they are back on track. The consultant will evaluate the many suggestions that they received and coevaluate these suggestions with the city, the county in regard to the suggestions from ADOT staff and the public. They are planning for another public meeting either in December or January to do a return report to the public. What they are going to present is that they need the raised median. They still have an accident history that they need to act on but they want to show the public what mitigations they will consider. Right now it is his best guess is that they will advertise for this project this coming summer and complete the construction by the fall or the spring.

Felipe Zubia: There are areas where ADOT is going to need to look at pedestrian solutions and areas where ADOT needs to maintain integrity of access management. He is very familiar with the area and this is an area that he thinks needs access to funding so that they do not create problems in the small rural communities. He asked if it was a timing issue with Cochise County.

Bill Harmon: Cochise County staff and elected officials have indicated that they realize that the area is growing and it is just a matter of time before they expect to see raised medians constructed. At the same time, they are sensitive to their constituents and concerns and being at the intersections. That is why the county wants to delay a little bit which in fact is what happened because of this whole process. They have won a short term reprieve with this delay and they expect that there will be some constructive mitigation, whether it is the northbound or some other feature that can be done to help offset the raised medians.

Bill Feldmeier: Asked if the right way is split between the city and the county or does the city have the right way all the way to the county side.

Scott Dewey: That is right. Part of the businesses are on the east side of the highway and the city. There are some large (inaudible) that go from east side to west side across the (inaudible). As Bill mentioned, the city has been trying for a decade to provide access to all in this intersection. This is primarily affecting businesses.

Bill Feldmeier: The businesses are primarily on the east side in the county's jurisdiction. Are they pursuing annexing?

Scott Dewey: The city is not actually pursuing annexing those.
Bill Feldmeier: Then the same question as before, are there any discussions about getting this highway, once it is completed, back to the county?

Bill Harmon: He really does not expect that.
ITEM 5: Funding prospects for FY 2012 - 2016 Highway Construction Program - Scott Omer, Director of Planning and Programming

John Fink: Gave an overview of where he sees them going for the fifth year program. This puts into context where they are at with current HURF revenues by category showing what year they have to go back to the point in time where the revenue put in that category was lower than it was for FY 2010. For gas tax and used fuel tax, they have to go back to 2003 to find revenues for that category at a lower level. Motor carrier and registration fees, they have to go back to 2004. Vehicle license tax only has to go back to 2005 that looks a little better however from previous discussion at Board Meetings, they have not hit bottom with vehicle license tax, so he is expecting that this will continue to decline some more and they could easily drop back to 2004 levels or even 2003 levels with that category. To put in context where the 2011 forecast currently is for HURF revenues versus where it was just one year ago when they did the official forecast. The official forecast in September 2009, HURF revenues were projected to be about $\$ 1.26 \mathrm{~B}$. Current forecast, the planning forecast that they are using this year is about $\$ 1.21 \mathrm{~B}$. That is a net change of $\$ 59 \mathrm{M}$ reduction of anticipated revenues. If that is split out by ADOT discretionary portion, the controlled access in the cities and counties portion, the ADOT discretionary forecast would be down by about $\$ 25 \mathrm{M}$. Funding levels for 2016, shows the official forecast developed in each of the last four years going back to 2006 and the forecast for 2016 revenues in that forecast. In September 2006, they were forecasting HURF revenues of about \$2.16B. In September 2007, they were still at about $\$ 2.14 \mathrm{~B}$. By the time they got to September 2008, the forecast for 2016 revenues had dropped to $\$ 1.93 B$. By September 2009, it had dropped to $\$ 1.52 \mathrm{~B}$ which was a net change of $\$ 642 \mathrm{M}$. Looking at funding levels for 2016, he recognized that September 2009's forecast was probably high. They have not completed the official forecast yet so they do not have a new number to work with. He sat down with his staff and came up with what they think is a reasonable forecast for 2016, recognizing that when they do get the results from the official forecast that it could change from that number and he labeled it as a wrap forecast which is down to $\$ 1.42 \mathrm{~B}$ which is a net change of $\$ 737 \mathrm{M}$ from September 2006. Based on the 2011 forecast and the 2016 forecast, that would represent a compound annual growth rate of about $3.4 \%$. His feeling is that this is probably not bad although reasonable. It may actually be a little high because they do not know what the coming and goings will be over the next couple of years. This puts it all into context.

They took the $\$ 1.42 \mathrm{~B}$ number and used that to develop a funding estimate for FY 2016. The estimate of state highway discretionary funds based on the $\$ 1.42 \mathrm{~B}$ would be about $\$ 583 \mathrm{M}$. There are other miscellaneous revenues that get added into that for a total of about $\$ 608 \mathrm{M}$ of state revenues available. One big change for many of the prior funding estimates is the line that is labeled HURF bond proceeds which show 0 for that based on the declines in revenues and where they are at with coverage ratios and current debt service, he does not believe there is going to be any HURF capacity by the time of 2016, so those numbers are included in this estimate. From that $\$ 608$ M, they would then deduct the operating program estimate for land, buildings, and improvements, estimate for DPS, estimate for debt service, which totals about $\$ 578 \mathrm{M}$ and that leaves about $\$ 30 \mathrm{M}$ of net state funds available. To that he has added an estimate of federal funds recognizing that an estimate of federal funds in 2016 is highly uncertain. Not only is that beyond the extension of SAFETEA-LU, this would be beyond the extension He does not have a good feeling in terms of what that number should be. This is something to try and be very conservative with and just assume that the relatively nominal growth in federal funds over the next several years. That totals about $\$ 631 \mathrm{M}$ after subtracting out debt service, they are left with about $\$ 613 \mathrm{M}$ so the total estimate including state and federal funds is about $\$ 643 \mathrm{M}$ and deduct $\$ 20 \mathrm{M}$ for inflation adjustment which left about $\$ 623 \mathrm{M}$. Based on that number he is recommending a program left with about $\$ 600 \mathrm{M}$ for FY 2016 . He recognizes that they will be continuing to take a number of looks at this over the next several months. Take a hard look starting in January and then as they get closer to adoption of the final program, that number could change. It could go up or down depending on where they end up. Hopefully in the next couple of months he will have a little better
idea of where things are going. By then they will have the new forecast developed. They may see although not really expecting it but they may see some movement of congress on federal funding. They may have a better idea of whether the state looked at the situations and see what the ramifications of that may be for DPS funding in the future. He is trying to be fairly conservative right now based on the local uncertainty that comes with that.

Scott Omer: They have \$600M available to the program and in FY 2016; they have about \$397M set aside for subprograms. That is barely consistent with the FY 2010 number. There are some additions to it off the top amounts that they have reached that takes the number up. The off the top amount of $\$ 57.274 \mathrm{M}$ actually are amounts approved by the resource allocation committee in four different categories. There is a performance base category, an overhead and operating category, regulatory enforcement category, port of entry support category. Those make up the $\$ 57 \mathrm{M}$. As the planning division, they have a technical advisory committee that assists them in coming up with the subprogram amounts that are available for spending. This technical advisor committee consists of ITD and MPD staff. They actually have two district engineers. MPD staff as well. They have a total of 6 people that helped them come up with them. They tried to maintain the subprogram fairly well from what it was in the previous years. Without available funds to increase, they did not see the increase in subprograms would do any good. After they take the off the top amounts of $\$ 57 \mathrm{M}$, they have about $\$ 340 \mathrm{M}$ available for spending in the subprograms. As this is distributed across, the total now with funding is $\$ 542 \mathrm{M}$ and $\$ 340 \mathrm{M}$ available for the subprograms. They have about $\$ 164 \mathrm{M}$ set aside for the MAG region projects, $\$ 37 \mathrm{M}$ set aside for the PAG region for major projects and that only leaves $\$ 537 \mathrm{~K}$ for major projects in greater Arizona. The subprogram has about $\$ 36 \mathrm{M}$ in the MAG region, $\$ 32 \mathrm{M}$ with PAG region, and $\$ 270 \mathrm{M}$ in the greater Arizona region. The percentages $10.74 \%, 9.67 \%$, and $7 \%$ are actually a three year rolling average. They tracked the amount of what is spent in each region on a yearly basis and that is the average over the last three years. They try to maintain those consistently. Lastly, the total amount available in each region $\$ 200 \mathrm{M}, \$ 270 \mathrm{M}$, and $\$ 271 \mathrm{M}$ is consistent with the casts in maintaining the $37 \%$, $13 \%$, and $50 \%$. Those are what they have set aside as the draft 2016 regional distribution and that is what they have today with not having much to work with.

John McGee: Last year at this time for FY 2015, they were projecting $\$ 100 \mathrm{M}$ and the amount that they had to budget was $\$ 700 \mathrm{M}$. That has dropped down to $\$ 600 \mathrm{M}$. The $\$ 700 \mathrm{M}$ level using the same level of subprograms and what they have done is that they have assumed with 2016 the same level of subprograms as 2015. Obviously that is a decision of the Board and determines how much is going to go in the subprogram. For now they have assumed no increase or decrease in subprogram levels. Last year it was $\$ 700 \mathrm{M}$ at roughly $\$ 100 \mathrm{M}$ more in the program. Greater Arizona gets $50 \%$ of that $\$ 700 \mathrm{M}$ so by the time it is broken down into second level of the program they have about $\$ 40-\$ 50 \mathrm{M}$ roughly of funding left for major projects. This year being $\$ 100 \mathrm{M}$ less, keeping the subprogram levels constant in greater Arizona means that there is essentially no money for major projects. They look at this $2-3$ times during the year. So there could be some changes on the horizon. He also says that they have been predicting for several years now that given the state of transportation revenues, state transportation revenues in particular, greater Arizona, they were getting to the point of a maintenance budget in 13 other counties. He is not saying they do not spend money in the 13 other counties, they spend roughly $\$ 270 \mathrm{~B}$ but the majority of that is going to be pavement and bridge preservation, money for small district projects. If the Board approves a subprogram level as the same level for 2015, there will be no money left for any major capacity enhancement projects in greater Arizona. He has been sounding that alarm for about $2-3$ years. Since this is the first year that they have really had this condition or appears that they have this condition, they briefed the RAAC yesterday. They are aware
of the numbers. They felt that they wanted to bring them to the Board and let them know what this is looking like. Over the course of the next $2-3$ months they will go through and put together the recommendations for the tentative program and let the Board know what to think about and what direction they might want to go with respect to 2016.

Felipe Zubia: Trying to get ahead of what disaster may befall us, there is nothing that they can do about the amount of money that they have here in the short term meeting. Have they looked at any sort of emergency preparedness or any sort of disaster response with how they would reallocate money if a major disaster occurred. Maybe they should look at a Board policy whereby they have something in place so when they do come across that, they already know exactly where the money is coming from and how do deal with it.

John McGee: They do have a very small amount with the state engineer for the subprograms for emergency issues. There is a small amount of money left for that. They also know that in most cases where there is a major emergency on any of ADOT's facilities, those kinds of emergencies that is being talked about in most cases would probably be ultimately eligible for federal. The problem with that program is that the federal program is using 2,3 , and 4 year funding so the state is a part of the funding source before they all were reimbursed by the Federal Government. That is a very valid point. Frankly, if right now something like that were to occur, there is a potential of delaying a bunch of projects to help them to come up with the funds or something like that, they would be a position of having to shift minorities from other projects or other programs to make up for those funds. Right now there is not a lot of flexibility.

Under placement adjustment, they maintain it up until the coming year for a number of reasons. Not the least of which is that they have to cut the program in looking at costs and the process of what the costs are today and the general costs. They have put an adjustment in there so that by the time the $5^{\text {th }}$ year becomes the first year and the second year of the program, they have some ability to build an accurate program and increase some of those costs and that is what the costs are.

Felipe Zubia: There is no money being set aside, so he is not even taking setting aside money for the contingency. He is talking about policy whereby if something major like that happens that it makes sense for one year to have a cast of that report and those percentages. If something like that happens there may be more money that can go in that or more money goes to MAG or Greater Arizona depending on the condition. That is the type of policy that he is talking about rather than having that debate come up in the heat of the moment; it may make sense to look at what certain levels of money would indeed actually be a change in policy that is temporary.

Scott Omer: In 2006 when they projected how much in HURF revenues. This was based upon a conservative estimated growth for a 10 year period. In 2006 when they estimated how much HURF would come in, they estimated about $\$ 2.5 \mathrm{~B}$.

Bill Feldmeier: With that understanding, who else is hearing this besides this Board?
John McGee: It is just a message that they need to start getting out to the public. They have been doing this for the past year and any opportunity that Mr. Halikowski or him or Mr. Fink, they keep raising this issue. The problem is that this is symptomatic of every revenue source in the state. 2016 is the period being the first year to renew the 6 year authorization. They are in some uncharted waters
and is coming upon those unfortunately. They are being pretty conservative. He would not be surprised if they do not start seeing some decreases in the federal funding.

Felipe Zubia: He requests a formal agenda item for the next meeting. Something to address is that he would not go so far as to creating a subcommittee of the Board, but at least an item that would address an emergency preparedness policy for the Board for a five year budget.

Motion made to adjourn the meeting, in a voice note, motion carries.

Bob Montoya, Chairman
State Transportation Board

John S. Halikowski, Director
Arizona Department of Transportation

# MINUTES OF THE <br> ARIZONA DEPARMENT OF TRANSPORTATION PRIORITY PLANNING ADVISORY COMMITTEE 206 S. $17^{\text {TH }}$ AVE., PHOENIX, ARIZONA TRANSPORTATION BOARD ROOM 10:00 A.M., WEDNESDAY, SEPTEMBER 29, 2010 

The special meeting of the Priority Planning Advisory Committee (PPAC) was held on September 29, 2010, at 10:00 AM with Chairman Jennifer Toth presiding.

Other committee members were present as follows:
Floyd Roehrich, Lisa Danka in for John Fink, Teri Kennedy in for Mike Normand, Shannon Scutari, Holly Hawkins in for Michael Klein, Scott Omer, Sam Maroufkhani, Robert Samour, and Matt Burdick

## 1. CALL TO ORDER

A quorum being present, Chairman Jennifer Toth called the Priority Planning Advisory Committee Meeting to order at 10:00 AM.
2. ROLL CALL

Lynn Sugiyama conducted a Roll Call to the committee members all were present except for Stacey Stanton, Roc Arnett, and John Carlson.

## 3. CALL TO THE AUDIENCE

Chairman Toth conducted a Call to the Audience for any comments and issues to be addressed. There were none.

## 4. APPROVAL OF MINUTES OF SEPTEMBER 3, 2010

The minutes of the Regular meeting held on September 3, 2010 are printed and placed in the agenda.

Chairman Toth called for a motion to approve minutes of the September 3, 2010 meeting. Floyd Roehrich made the motion to approve minutes.
Floyd Roehrich seconded the motion, the motion carried.

## 5. HIGHWAY CONTINGENCY FUND REPORT

Joan Cameron reported that the highway contingency fund as of September 20, 2010, showed a positive balance of $\$ 9,894,000$. Floyd Roehrich thanked everyone for their hard work to use up the obligation funds (closeout funds), and there were no lapsing funds.
6. FY 2011-2015 Transportation Facilities Construction Program - Requested Modifications

6 a.
ROUTE NO: I-10 @ MP 104.0
COUNTY: Maricopa
DISTRICT: Phoenix Construction
SCHEDULE: FY 2011
SECTION: I-10 / 303L TI, Phase I (I-10 Realignment)
TYPE OF WORK: Construct traffic interchange
ADVERTISEMENT DATE: 01/28/2011
PROGRAM AMOUNT: \$251,000,000
PROJECT MANAGER: Eric Prosnier
PROJECT: H713901C, Item \# 43311
REQUESTED ACTION: Decrease the construction project by $\$ 19,300,000$ to $\$ 231,700,000$ in the FY 2011 Highway Construction Program. Funds to be returned to the RTP Cash Flow.
NEW PROGRAM AMOUNT:

6 b.
ROUTE NO: SR 303L @ MP 105.0
Page 30
COUNTY: Maricopa
DISTRICT: Phoenix Construction
SCHEDULE: New Project Request
SECTION: Thomas Rd to Camelback Rd.
TYPE OF WORK: Utility relocation
CLEARANCE DATE: May 2011
PROGRAM AMOUNT: New Project
PROJECT MANAGER: Eric Prosnier
PROJECT: H787201U
REQUESTED ACTION: Establish a new utility project for \$1,500,000 in FY 2011 Highway Construction Program. Funds are available from the RTP Cash Flow.
NEW PROGRAM AMOUNT:
\$1,500,000

6 c.
ROUTE NO: SR 303L @ MP 107.0
Page 31
COUNTY: Maricopa
DISTRICT: Phoenix Construction
SCHEDULE: New Project Request
SECTION: Camelback Rd to Glendale Ave.
TYPE OF WORK: Utility relocation
CLEARANCE DATE: May 2011
PROGRAM AMOUNT: New Project
PROJECT MANAGER: Eric Prosnier
PROJECT: H787301U
REQUESTED ACTION: Establish a new utility project for \$8,000,000 in FY 2011 Highway Construction Program. Funds are available from the RTP Cash Flow.
NEW PROGRAM AMOUNT:
\$8,000,000

6 d.
ROUTE NO: SR 303L @ MP 109.0
Page 32
COUNTY: Maricopa
DISTRICT: Phoenix Construction
SCHEDULE: New Project Request
SECTION: Glendale Ave to Peoria Ave.
TYPE OF WORK: Utility relocation
CLEARANCE DATE: October 2011
PROGRAM AMOUNT: New Project
PROJECT MANAGER: Eric Prosnier
PROJECT: H787401U
REQUESTED ACTION: Establish a new utility project for \$9,800,000 in FY 2011 highway construction program. Funds are available from the RTP Cash Flow.
NEW PROGRAM AMOUNT:
\$9,800,000
Chairman Toth called for a motion to approve Items 6a to 6d.
Robert Samour made the motion to approve Items 6a to 6d.
Floyd Roehrich seconded the motion, the motion will be pending upon approval at the MAG Regional Council meeting scheduled for October 27, 2010.

available from the FY 2011
Traffic Signals Fund \#71211.
NEW PROGRAM AMOUNT:

## Chairman Toth called for a motion to approve Item $\mathbf{6 f}$. Floyd Roehrich made the motion to approve Item 6 f. <br> Lisa Danka seconded the motion, the motion carried.

7. Next regular scheduled meeting of the Priority Planning Advisory committee (PPAC). Times and dates of meetings could vary and will be announced at the time of agenda distribution.

- November 3, 2010 - 10:00 AM Wed.
- December 1, 2010 - 10:00 AM Wed.
- January 5, 2011 - 10:00 AM Wed.
- February 2, 2011 - 10:00 AM Wed.
- March 2, 2011 - 10:00 AM Wed.
- March 30, 2011 - 10:00 AM Wed.
- May 4, 2011 - 10:00 AM Wed.
- June 1, 2011 - 10:00 AM Wed.
- June 29, 2011 - 10:00 AM Wed.
- August 3, 2011 - 10:00 AM Wed.
- August 31, 2011 - 10:00 AM Wed.
- October 5, 2011 - 10:00 AM Wed.
- November 2, 2011 - 10:00 AM Wed.
- November 30, 2011 - 10:00 AM Wed.


## WEB LINKS

Priority Programming
http://www.azdot.gov/MPD/Priority_Programming/Index.asp
PPAC:
http://www.azdot.gov/MPD/Priority_Programming/PPAC/Index.asp
8. Adjourn Priority Planning Advisory Committee (PPAC) Meeting

Chairman Toth called for the motion to adjourn the meeting at 10:09 AM. Floyd Roehrich made the motion to adjourn.<br>Scott Omer seconded the motion.<br>Meeting adjourned.

## Arizona Department of Transportation

## FY 2011 Highway Program Monitoring Report

## YTD Total Transportation Facilities Construction Program Summary

(Dollars in Thousands)

Program Data
Priority Planning Advisory Committee
October 25, 2010
November 3, 2010

| Program Data | Planned | Revised | Program Committed (4) |  | Actual | Committed |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Category | Program | Program (1) | Amount | \% | Committed (4) | Variance |
| Statewide (2) |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Construction | 581,540 | 1,012,437 | 298,118 | 29.45\% | 287,424 | 10,694 |
| Design \& Study | 38,795 | 64,118 | 5,654 | 8.82\% | 5,654 | 0 |
| Right-of-Way | 15,300 | 15,300 | 684 | 4.47\% | 684 | 0 |
| Other (3) | 28,924 | 42,365 | 4,088 | 9.65\% | 4,088 | 0 |
| State Total | 664,559 | 1,134,220 | 308,544 | 27.20\% | 297,850 | 10,694 |
| Regional Transportation Plan |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Construction | 479,220 | 516,069 | 37,045 | 7.18\% | 37,045 | 0 |
| Design \& Study | 24,837 | 28,784 | 9,527 | 33.10\% | 9,527 | 0 |
| Right-of-Way | 313,100 | 313,104 | 128 | 0.04\% | 128 | 0 |
| Other (3) | 14,594 | 14,894 | 11,401 | 76.55\% | 11,401 | 0 |
| RTP Total | 831,751 | 872,851 | 58,101 | 6.66\% | 58,101 | 0 |
| Program Total | 1,496,310 | 2,007,071 | 366,645 | 18.27\% | 355,951 | 10,694 |

Notes: (1) Revised program includes Board approved program changes.
(2) Includes PAG Program.
(3) "Other" category includes subprograms such as training, public information,
recreational trails program, risk management indemnification and hazardous material removal.
(4) Program Committed represents dollars programmed; Actual Committed represents dollars advertised or actual dollars awarded, except for Right-of-Way. Right-of-Way Program Committed and Actual Committed are actual cash expended.


## Arizona Department of Transportation

## FY 2011 Highway Program Monitoring Report

YTD Total Transportation Facilities Construction Program Summary
(Dollars in Thousands)

Priority Planning Advisory Committee
October 25, 2010
November 3, 2010

| Program Data | Planned | Revised | Program Committed (4) |  | Actual | Committed Variance |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Category | Program | Program (1) | Amount | \% | Committed (4) |  |
| Statewide (2) |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Construction | 581,540 | 1,012,437 | 298,118 | 29.45\% | 287,424 | 10,694 |
| Design \& Study | 38,795 | 64,118 | 5,654 | 8.82\% | 5,654 | 0 |
| Right-of-Way | 15,300 | 15,300 | 684 | 4.47\% | 684 | 0 |
| Other (3) | 28,924 | 42,365 | 4,088 | 9.65\% | 4,088 | 0 |
| Total (2) | 664,559 | 1,134,220 | 308,544 | 27.20\% | 297,850 | 10,694 |

Notes: (1) Revised program includes Board approved program changes.
(2) Includes PAG Program.
(3) "Other" category includes subprograms such as training, public information, recreational trails program, risk management indemnification and hazardous material removal.
(4) Program Committed represents dollars programmed; Actual Committed represents dollars advertised or actual dollars awarded, except for Right-of-Way. Right-of-Way Program Committed and Actual Committed are actual cash expended.


## Arizona Department of Transportation

## FY 2011 Highway Program Monitoring Report

YTD Total Transportation Facilities Construction Program Summary
(Dollars in Thousands)

Program Data
Priority Planning Advisory Committee
October 25, 2010
November 3, 2010

| Program Data | Planned | Revised | Program Committed (3) |  | Actual | Committed |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Category | Program | Program (1) | Amount | \% | Committed (3) | Variance |
| Regional Transportation Plan |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Construction | 479,220 | 516,069 | 37,045 | 7.18\% | 37,045 | 0 |
| Design \& Study | 24,837 | 28,784 | 9,527 | 33.10\% | 9,527 | 0 |
| Right-of-Way | 313,100 | 313,104 | 128 | 0.04\% | 128 | 0 |
| Other (2) | 14,594 | 14,894 | 11,401 | 76.55\% | 11,401 | 0 |
| Total | 831,751 | 872,851 | 58,101 | 6.66\% | 58,101 | 0 |

Notes: (1) Revised program includes Board approved program changes.
(2) "Other" category includes subprograms such as training, public information, recreational trails program, risk management and hazardous material removal.
(3) Program Committed represents dollars programmed; Actual Committed represents dollars advertised or actual dollars awarded, except for Right-of-Way. Right-of-Way Program Committed and Actual Committed are actual cash expended.


## Arizona Department of Transportation

## FY 2011 Highway Program Monitoring Report

YTD Total Transportion Facilities Construction Program Summary
(Dollars in Thousands)


Notes:
(a) Excess Budget placed in 72511
(b) Excess budget from FY10 Federal Closeout not included in contingency

## Arizona Department of Transportation

## FY 2011 Highway Program Monitoring Report

Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) Construction Program
(Dollars in Thousands)


Notes:

## Arizona Department of Transportation

## FY 2011 Highway Program Monitoring Report

Statewide Contingency Summary
(Dollars in Thousands)

| Contingency Subprogram Entries | Jul <br> Actual | Aug <br> Actual | Sept <br> Actual | Oct <br> Actual | Nov <br> Proposed | Dec <br> Proposed | Jan <br> Proposed | Feb <br> Proposed | Mar <br> Proposed | Apr <br> Proposed | May <br> Proposed | Jun <br> Proposed | YTD |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2010 Balance Forward |  |  | 5,647 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 5,647 |
| Beginning Balance | 5,000 | 5,042 | 4,247 | 9,894 | 19,774 | 13,110 | 13,110 | 13,110 | 13,110 | 13,110 | 13,110 | 13,110 | 5,000 |
| Program Changes: |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Budget Authority Changes (Federal Aid, PAG, Third Party) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Project Budget Changes | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | $(6,664)$ | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | $(6,664)$ |
| Changes | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Total Program Changes | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | $(6,664)$ | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | $(6,664)$ |
| Project Variances: |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Awards Under (Over) Program Budgets | 0 | 0 | 0 | 9,880 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 9,880 |
| Closeouts - Total Exp Under (Over) Awards | 42 | (795) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | (753) |
| Total Project Variances | 42 | (795) | 0 | 9,880 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 9,127 |
| Month-End Contingency | 5,042 | 4,247 | 9,894 | 19,774 | 13,110 | 13,110 | 13,110 | 13,110 | 13,110 | 13,110 | 13,110 | 13,110 | 13,110 |

## Arizona Department of Transportation

FY 2011 Highway Program Monitoring Report
Statewide Contingency (Program Changes Approved)
(Dollars in Thousands)
Program Modifications
Priority Planning Advisory Committee
October 25, 2010
November 3, 2010


Notes:

## FY 2011 Highway Program Monitoring Report

Statewide Contingency (Program Changes Proposed)
(Dollars in Thousands)


Notes:
(a) Establish project from item 72311
(b) Decrease project and place budget in item 72311

Arizona Department of Transportation

## FY 2011 Highway Program Monitoring Report

YTD Statewide Pavement Preservation Contingency Fund FY 2011 and FY 2012
(Dollars in Thousands)
Program Modifications
Priority Planning Advisory Committee


Notes:
(a) Increase project for pavement preservation work.
(b) Establish a new FY 11 Project.

## Arizona Department of Transportation

## FY 2011 Highway Program Monitoring Report

Program Adjustment Summary FY 2011-2015
(Dollars in Thousands)
Program Data Priority Planning Advisory Committee

| October 25, 2010 |  |  |  | November 3, 2010 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Planned | Program | Revised |
| Area | Year | Program | YTD Adj | Program |
| Statewide <br> (PAG Program is included) | 2011 | 664,559 | 469,661 | 1,134,220 |
|  | 2012 | 371,696 | 0 | 371,696 |
|  | 2013 | 567,199 | 0 | 567,199 |
|  | 2014 | 612,344 | 0 | 612,344 |
|  | 2015 | 523,574 | 0 | 523,574 |
|  | Total | 2,739,372 | 469,661 | 3,209,033 |
| Regional <br> Transportation Plan | 2011 | 831,751 | 41,100 | 872,851 |
|  | 2012 | 409,924 | 0 | 409,924 |
|  | 2013 | 528,340 | 0 | 528,340 |
|  | 2014 | 891,920 | 0 | 891,920 |
|  | 2015 | 768,840 | 0 | 768,840 |
|  | Total | 3,430,775 | 41,100 | 3,471,875 |
| Total | 2011 | 1,496,310 | 510,761 | 2,007,071 |
|  | 2012 | 781,620 | 0 | 781,620 |
|  | 2013 | 1,095,539 | 0 | 1,095,539 |
|  | 2014 | 1,504,264 | 0 | 1,504,264 |
|  | 2015 | 1,292,414 | 0 | 1,292,414 |
|  | Total | 6,170,147 | 510,761 | 6,680,908 |



November 19, 2010

| RES. NO. | $2010-11-A-083$ |
| :--- | :--- |
| PROJECT: | $095 Y U 013 H X 17201 R$ |
| HIGHWAY: | SAN LUIS - YUMA - QUARTZSITE |
| SECTION: | Avenue D Intersection (Somerton) |
| ROUTE NO.: | U.S. 95 |
| ENG. DIST.: | Yuma |
| COUNTY: | Yuma |

## REPORT AND RECOMMENDATION

TO THE HONORABLE ARIZONA TRANSPORTATION BOARD:
The Intermodal Transportation Division has made a thorough investigation concerning the abandonment of right of way acquired for a portion of U.S. Route 95 within the above referenced project.

The right of way to be abandoned was previously established as a state route and state highway designated U.S. Route 95 by Arizona Highway Commission Resolution dated May 26 , 1936 , page 634 of the Official Minutes; thereafter Arizona Transportation Board Resolution 2007-05-A-035, dated May 18, 2007 established additional right of way for improvements thereof.

The right of way is no longer needed for state transportation purposes. The City of Somerton has agreed to accept jurisdiction, ownership and maintenance of the right of way in accordance with Intergovernmental Agreement 05-094, dated May 9, 2006 and Eirst Amendment dated October 4, 2007. Accordingly, I recommend that the State's interest in the right of way be abandoned.

The right of way to be abandoned is depicted in Appendix "A" and delineated on the maps and plans on file in the office of the State Engineer, Intermodal Transportation Division, Phoenix, Arizona, entitled "Right of Way Plans, SAN LUIS - YUMA QUARTZSITE Highway, Project 095YU013HXI7201R."

I further recommend that the right of way depicted in Appendix "A" be removed from the State Highway System and abandoned to The City of Somerton as provided in Arizona Revised Statutes Sections 287207 and 28-7209;

| RES. NO. | 2010-II-A-083 |
| :--- | :--- |
| PROJECT: | $095 Y U 013 H X 17201 R$ |
| HIGHWAY: | SAN LUIS-YUMA-QUARTZSITE |
| SECTION: | Avenue D Intersection (Somerton) |
| ROUTE NO.: | U.S. 95 |
| ENG. DIST.: | Yuma |
| COUNTY: | Yuma |

All other rights of way and easements and appurtenances thereto subject to the provisions of Arizona Revised Statutes Section 287210 shall continue as they existed prior to the disposal of right of way depicted in Appendix "A".

Pursuant to Arizona Revised Statutes Section 28-7046, I recommend that the Transportation Board adopt a resolution making this recommendation effective.

Respectfully submitted,

JOHN S. HALIKOWSKI, Director Arizona Department of Transportation

November 19, 2010

| RES. NO. | 2010-11-A-083 |
| :--- | :--- |
| PROJECT: | $095 Y U 013 H X 17201 R$ |
| HIGHWAY: | SAN LUIS - YUMA-QUARTZSITE |
| SECTION: | Avenue D Intersection (Somerton) |
| ROUTE NO.: | U.S. 95 |
| ENG. DIST.: | Yuma |
| COUNTY: | Yuma |

## RESOLUTION OF ABANDONMENT

JOHN S. HALIKOWSKI, Director, Arizona Department of Transportation, on November 19, 2010, presented and filed with this Transportation Board his written report under Arizona Revised Statutes Section 28-7046, recommending the abandonment of a portion of U.S. Route 95 to the City of Somerton within the above referenced project.

The right of way to be abandoned is depicted in Appendix "A" and delineated on maps and plans on file in the office of the State Engineer, Intermodal Transportation Division, Phoenix, Arizona, entitled "Right of Way Plans, SAN LUIS - YUMA - QUARTZSITE Highway, Project 095YU013HX17201R."

WHEREAS said right of way is no longer needed for state transportation purposes; and

WHEREAS the City of Somerton has agreed to accept jurisdiction, ownership and maintenance of the right of way in accordance with Intergovernmental Agreement 05-094, dated May 9, 2006 and First Amendment dated October 4, 2007; and

WhEREAS this Board finds that public safety, necessity and convenience will be served by accepting the Director's report; therefore, be it

RESOLVED that the recommendation of the Director is adopted and made part of this resolution; be it further

```
RES. NO. 2010-11-A-083
PROJECT: 095YU013HX17201R
HIGHWAY: SAN LUIS - YUMA - QUARTZSITE
SECTION: Avenue D Intersection (Somerton)
ROUTE NO.: U.S. 95
ENG. DIST.: Yuma
COUNTY: Yuma
```

RESOLVED that the right of way depicted in Appendix "A" is hereby removed from the state Highway system and abandoned to The City of Somerton as provided in Arizona Revised Statutes Sections 28-7207 and 28-7209; be it further

RESOLVED that the abandonment becomes effective upon recordation in the Office of the County Recorder in accordance with Arizona Revised Statute Section 28-7213; be it further

RESOLVED that the Director provide written notice to The City of Somerton evidencing the abandonment of the State's interest.

## November 19, 2010

```
RES. NO. 2010-11-A-083
PROJECT: 095YU013HX17201R
HIGHWAY: SAN LUIS - YUMA - QUARTZSITE
SECTION: Avenue D Intersection (Somerton)
ROUTE NO.: U.S. 95
ENG. DIST.: Yuma
COUNTY: Yuma
```


## CERTIFICATION

I, JOHN S. HALIKOWSKI, Director of the Arizona Department of Transportation, do hereby certify that the foregoing is a true and correct copy from the minutes of the Transportation Board made in official session on November 19, 2010.

IN WITNESS WHEREOF I have hereunto set my hand and the official seal of the Transportation Board on November 19, 2010.

JOHN S. HALIKOWSKI, Director Arizona Department of Transportation


|  |  |  |  | Zly＇ $\mathrm{XIN} \mathrm{\exists OHd}$ ヨ $\cap \mathrm{N} \exists \mathrm{A} \forall$ <br>  dSNVYI JO INヨWI $\forall$ Vd $\exists \mathrm{N} \forall 0$ 人dOO $\exists \mathrm{7}$ ด15 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\begin{aligned} & M \\ & \oplus \\ & \mathbb{N} \end{aligned}$ |  |  |  |  |



November 19, 2010

| RES. NO. | 2010-11-A-084 |
| :--- | :--- |
| PROJECT: | I-010-B-802 / 010MA129H651001R |
| HIGHWAY: | EHRENBERG- PHOENIX |
| SECTION: | Dysart Road T.I. |
| ROUTE NO.: | Interstate Route 10 |
| ENG. DIST.: | Phoenix |
| COUNTY: | Maricopa |

## REPORT AND RECOMMENDATION

TO THE HONORABLE ARIZONA TRANSPORTATION BOARD:
The Intermodal Transportation Division has made a thorough investigation concerning the establishment of new right of way for Interstate Route 10 within the above referenced project.

The existing alignment was previously established as a State Route and designated as Interstate Route 10 by the Arizona Highway Commission Resolution 65-25 dated April 2, 1965; Resolution 77-13-A-35 dated August 5, 1977 and also Resolution 77-15-A-45 dated August 30, 1977 established as a controlled-access state highway; Thereafter Arizona Transportation Board Resolution 78-15-A-49 dated September 22, 1978, established additional right of way for improvements; various Resolutions established additional right of way for improvements thereof.

The right of way has been acquired and improvements have been constructed in accordance with the Joint Project Agreement No. 04082, dated January 26, 2005. Accordingly, it is necessary to establish and acquire the right of way for this project.

The new right of way to be established as a state route and state highway for this improvement, to include access control as necessary, is depicted in Appendix "A" and delineated on maps and plans on file in the office of the State Engineer, Intermodal Transportation Division, Phoenix, Arizona, entitled "Right of Way Plans, EHRENBERG - PHOENIX Highway, Project I-010-B-802 / 010MA129H651001R."

November 19, 2010

| RES. NO. | $2010-11-\mathrm{A}-084$ |
| :--- | :--- |
| PROJECT: | I-010-B-802 / 010MA129H651001R |
| HIGHWAY: | EHRENBERG- PHOENIX |
| SECTION: | Dysart Road T.I. |
| ROUTE NO.: | Interstate Route 10 |
| ENG. DIST.: | Phoenix |
| COUNTY: | Maricopa |

In the interest of public safety, necessity and convenience, I recommend that the area depicted in Appendix "A" be established as a state route and state highway, and that access is controlled.

I recommend the acquisition of the new right of way pursuant to Arizona Revised Statutes Sections 28-7092 and 28-7094, an estate in fee, or such other interest as required, including advance, future and early acquisition, access rights, exchanges or donations, or such other interest as is required, including material for construction, haul roads and various easements necessary for or incidental to the improvements as delineated on said maps and plans.

Pursuant to Arizona Revised statutes Section 28-7046, I recommend the adoption of a resolution making this recommendation effective.

Respectfully submitted,

JOHN S. HALIKOWSKI, Director Arizona Department of Transportation

November 19, 2010

| RES. NO. | $2010-11-A-084$ |
| :--- | :--- |
| PROJECT: | I-010-B-802/ $010 M A 129 H 651001 R$ |
| HIGHWAY: | EHRENBERG-PHOENIX |
| SECTION: | Dysart Road T.I. |
| ROUTE NO.: | Interstate Route 10 |
| ENG. DIST.: | Phoenix |
| COUNTY: | Maricopa |

## RESOLUTION OF ESTABLISHMENT

JOHN S. HALIKOWSKI, Director, Arizona Department of Transportation, on November 19, 2010, presented and filed with this Transportation Board his written report under Arizona Revised Statutes Section 28-7046, recommending the establishment of new right of way for constructed improvements to Interstate Route 10 as set forth in the above referenced project.

The new right of way to be established as a state route and state highway for the constructed improvements, to include access control as necessary, is depicted in Appendix "A" and delineated on maps and plans on file in the office of the State Engineer, Intermodal Transportation Division, Phoenix, Arizona, entitled "Right of Way Plans, EHRENBERG - PHOENIX Highway, Project I-010-B802 / 010MA129H651001R."

WHEREAS right of way has been acquired and improvements have been constructed in accordance with the Joint Project Agreement No. 04082, dated January 26, 2005; and

WHEREAS establishment of the improvements is necessary; and
WHEREAS because of these premises, this Board finds public safety, necessity and convenience require the recommended establishment of the new land; and access to the highway be controlled as delineated on the maps and plans; and

WHEREAS the existing county, town or city roadways as delineated on said maps and plans are hereby established as a state route and state highway by this Resolution action and that no further conveying document is required; therefore, be it

RES. NO. 2010-11-A-084
PROJECT: I-010-B-802 / 010MA129H651001R
HIGHWAY: EHRENBERG - PHOENIX
SECTION: Dysart Road T.I.
ROUTE NO.: Interstate Route 10
ENG. DIST.: Phoenix
COUNTY: Maricopa

RESOLVED that the recommendation of the Director is adopted and made part of this resolution; be it further

RESOLVED that the right of way depicted in Appendix "A" is hereby designated a state route and state highway, to include any existing county, town or city roadways, and that ingress and egress to and from the highway and to and from abutting, adjacent, or other lands be denied, controlled or regulated as delineated on said maps and plans. Where no access is shown, none will be allowed to exist; be it further

RESOLVED that the Director is hereby authorized to acquire by lawful means including exchanges, in accordance with Arizona Revised Statues Section 28-7092, and estate in fee, or such other interest as is required.

```
November 19, 2010
```

```
RES. NO. 2010-11-A-084
PROJECT: I-010-B-802 / 010MA129H651001R
HIGHWAY: EHRENBERG - PHOENIX
SECTION: Dysart Road T.I.
ROUTE NO.: Interstate Route 10
ENG. DIST.: Phoenix
COUNTY: Maricopa
```


## CERTIFICATION

I, JOHN S. HALIKOWSKI, Director of the Arizona Department of Transportation, do hereby certify that the foregoing is a true and correct copy from the minutes of the Transportation Board made in official session on November 19, 2010.

IN WITNESS WHEREOF I have hereunto set my hand and the official seal of the Transportation Board on November 19, 2010.

JOHN S. HALIKOWSKI, Director Arizona Department of Transportation



RES. NO. 2010-11-A-085
PROJECT: 085MA119H640701R
HIGHWAY: GILA BEND - BUCKEYE
SECTION: S.R. 85 / I-8 T.I. (Phase \#1)
ROUTE NO.: State Route 85
ENG. DIST.: Yuma
COUNTY: Maricopa

## REPORT AND RECOMMENDATION

TO THE HONORABLE ARIZONA TRANSPORTATION BOARD:
The Intermodal Transportation Division has made a thorough investigation concerning the establishment of new right of way as a state route and state highway for the improvement of State Route 85 within the above referenced project.

The existing alignment was previously established as a state route and state highway designated State Route 80 , by Arizona Highway Commission Resolution dated September 2, 1947, page 218 of the Official Minutes; Resolution dated August 6, 1953, page 211 of the Official Minutes established additional right of way for improvements thereof; subsequently State Route 80 was changed to State Route 85; thereafter Arizona Transportation Board Resolution 2009-11-A-077 dated November 20, 2009, established additional right of way as a state route for this imminent improvement project.

New right of way is now needed due to design changes. Additionally, the construction phase is imminent and it is necessary to establish and acquire the new right of way as a state route and state highway, and that access be controlled as necessary for this improvement project.

November 19, 2010

| RES. NO. | 2010-11-A-085 |
| :--- | :--- |
| PROJECT: | 085MA119H6A0701R |
| HIGHWAY: | GIIA BEND- BUCKEYE |
| SECTION: | S.R. 85/I-8 T.I. (Phase \#1) |
| ROUTE NO.: | State Route 85 |
| ENG. DIST.: | Yuma |
| COUNTY: | Maricopa |

The new right of way to be established as a state route and state highway and acquired for this improvement, to include access control as necessary, is depicted in Appendix "A" and delineated on maps and plans on file in the office of the State Engineer, Intermodal Transportation Division, Phoenix, Arizona, entitled "Right of Way Plans, GILA BEND - BUCKEYE Highway, Project 085MA119H640701R."

In the interest of public safety, necessity and convenience, I recommend that the new right of way depicted in Appendix "A" be established as a state route and state highway, and that access is controlled.

I recommend the acquisition of the new right of way pursuant to Arizona Revised Statutes Sections 28-7092 and 28-7094, an estate in fee, or such other interest as required, including advance, future and early acquisition, access rights, exchanges or donations, or such other interest as is required, including material for construction, haul roads and various easements necessary for or incidental to the improvements as delineated on said maps and plans.

I further recommend the immediate establishment of existing county, town and city roadways into the state highway system as a controlled access state route and state highway which are necessary for or incidental to the improvement as delineated on said maps and plans, to be effective upon signing of this recommendation. This Resolution is considered the conveying document for such existing county, town and city roadways and no further conveyance is legally required.

## November 19, 2010

```
RES. NO. 2010-11-A-085
PROJECT: 085MA119H640701R
HIGHWAY: GILA BEND - BUCKEYE
SECTION: S.R. 85 / I-8 T.I. (Phase #1)
ROUTE NO.: State Route 85
ENG. DIST.: Yuma
COUNTY: Maricopa
```

Pursuant to Arizona Revised Statutes Section 28-7046, I recommend the adoption of a resolution making this recommendation effective.

Respectfully submitted,

JOHN S. HALIKOWSKI, Director Arizona Department of Transportation

ARIZONA DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION
205 SOUTH 17TH AVENUE
R/W Operations, MD 612E
PHOENIX, AZ 85007-3213

November 19, 2010

| RES. NO. | 2010-11-A-085 |
| :--- | :--- |
| PROJECT: | 085MA119H640701R |
| HIGHWAY: | GILA BEND-BUCKEYE |
| SECTION: | S.R. 85/I-8 T.I. (Phase \#1) |
| ROUTE NO.: | State Route 85 |
| ENG. DIST.: | Yuma |
| COUNTY: | Maricopa |

## RESOLUTION OF ESTABLISHMENT

JOHN S. HALIKOWSKI, Director, Arizona Department of Transportation, on November 19, 2010, presented and filed with this Transportation Board his written report under Arizona Revised Statutes Section 28-7046, recommending the establishment and acquisition of new right of way as a state route and state highway for the improvement of State Route 85 as set forth in the above referenced project.

The new right of way to be established as a state route and state highway and acquired for this improvement, to include access control as necessary, is depicted in Appendix "A" and delineated on maps and plans on file in the office of the State Engineer, Intermodal Transportation Division, Phoenix, Arizona, entitled "Right of Way Plans, GILA BEND - BUCKEYE Highway, Project 085MA119H640701R."

WHEREAS establishment and acquisition of the new right of way as a state route and state highway is necessary for this improvement, and includes authorization pursuant to Arizona Revised Statutes Sections 28-7092 and 28-7094 an estate in fee, or such other interest as required, to include advance, future and early acquisition, access control, exchanges, donations and material for construction, haul roads and various easements in any property necessary for or incidental to the improvements as delineated on said maps and plans; and

November 19, 2010

| RES. NO. | 2010-11-A-085 |
| :--- | :--- |
| PROJECT: | 085MA119H640701R |
| HIGHWAY: | GILA BEND-BUCKEYE |
| SECTION: | S.R.85/I-8 T.I. (Phase \#1) |
| ROUTE NO.: | State Route 85 |
| ENG. DIST.: | Yuma |
| COUNTY: | Maricopa |

WHEREAS because of these premises, this Board finds public safety, necessity and convenience require the recommended establishment and acquisition of the new right of way as a state route and state highway needed for this improvement and that access to the highway be controlled as delineated on the maps and plans; and

WHEREAS the existing county, town or city roadways as delineated on said maps and plans are hereby established as a state route and state highway by this Resolution action and that no further conveying document is required; therefore, be it

RESOLVED that the recommendation of the Director is adopted and made part of this resolution; be it further

RESOLVED that the right of way depicted in Appendix "A" is hereby designated a state route and state highway, to include any existing county, town or city roadways, and that ingress and egress to and from the highway and to and from abutting, adjacent, or other lands be denied, controlled or regulated as delineated on said maps and plans. Where no access is shown, none will be allowed to exist; be it further

RESOLVED that the Director is hereby authorized to acquire by lawful means pursuant to Arizona Revised Statutes Sections 28-7092 and 28-7094 an estate in fee, or such other interest as required, to include advance, future and early acquisition, access rights, exchanges or donations, or such other interest as is required, including material for construction, haul roads, and various easements in any property necessary for or incidental to the improvements as delineated on said maps and plans; be it further

```
RES. NO. 2010-11-A-085
PROJECT: 085MA119H640701R
HIGHWAY: GILA BEND - BUCKEYE
SECTION: S.R. 85 / I-8 T.I. (Phase #l)
ROUTE NO.: State Route 85
ENG. DIST.: Yuma
COUNTY: Maricopa
```

RESOLVED that written notice be provided to the County Board of Supervisors in accordance with Arizona Revised Statute 28-7043, and to the affected governmental jurisdictions for whose local existing roadways are being immediately established as a state route and state highway herein; be it further

RESOLVED that the Director secure an appraisal of the property to be acquired, including access rights, and that necessary parties be compensated; with the exception of any existing county, town or city roadways being immediately established herein as a state route and state highway. Upon failure to acquire said lands by other lawful means, the Director is authorized to initiate condemnation proceedings.

```
RES. NO. 2010-11-A-085
PROJECT: 085MA119H640701R
HIGHWAY: GILA BEND - BUCKEYE
SECTION: S.R. 85 / I-8 T.I. (Phase #1)
ROUTE NO.: State Route 85
ENG. DIST.: Yuma
COUNTY: Maricopa
```


## CERTIFICATION

I, JOHN S. HALIKOWSKI, Director of the Arizona Department of Transportation, do hereby certify that the foregoing is a true and correct copy from the minutes of the Transportation Board made in official session on November 19, 2010.

IN WITNESS WHEREOF I have hereunto set my hand and the official seal of the Transportation Board on November 19, 2010.

JOHN S. HALIKOWSKI, Director Arizona Department of Transportation



November 19, 2010

| RES. NO: | $2010-11-A-086$ |
| :--- | :--- |
| PROJECT: | $008 B Y 0001$ H088801R |
| HIGHWAY: | INTERSTATE BUSINESS ROUTE 8 |
| SECTION: | Catalina Drive-Avenue 3E |
| ROUTE NO.: | Interstate Business Route 8 |
| ENG. DIST.: | Yuma |
| COUNTY: | Yuma |

## RESOLUTION OE ABANDONMENT

JOHN S. HALIKOWSKI, Director, Arizona Department of Transportation, on November 19, 2010, presented and filed with this Transportation Board his written report under Arizona Revised Statutes Section 28-7046, recommending the abandonment of a portion of Interstate Business Route 8 to the City of Yuma and to the County of Yuma within the above referenced project.

The right of way to be abandoned is depicted in Appendix "A" and delineated on maps and plans on file in the office of the State Engineer, Intermodal Transportation Division, Phoenix, Arizona, as referenced herein, including various Yuma County Key maps for Interstate Business Route 8.

WHEREAS said right of way is no longer needed for state transportation purposes; and

WHEREAS the City of Yuma and the County of Yuma, collectively herein referred to as "Local Governmental Units" have agreed to accept into their respective Road System and Interstate Business Route 8 that lie within the boundaries of their respective Local Governmental Units in accordance with Intergovernmental Agreement No. 98-175 dated January 7, 1999; and First Addendum dated September 9, 2000; and

WHEREAS this Board finds that public safety, necessity and convenience will be served by accepting the Director's report; therefore, be it

RES. NO. 2010-11-A-086
PROJECT: 008BYU001H088801R
HIGHWAY: INTERSTATE BUSINESS ROUTE 8
SECTION: Catalina Drive - Avenue 3E
ROUTE NO.: Interstate Business Route 8
ENG. DIST.: Yuma
COUNTY: Yuma

RESOLVED that the recommendation of the Director is adopted and made part of this resolution; be it further

RESOLVED that the right of way depicted in Appendix "A" is hereby removed from the State Highway System and abandoned to the City of Yuma and the County of Yuma as provided in Arizona Revised Statutes Sections 28-7207 and 28-7209; be it further

RESOLVED that the abandonment becomes effective upon recordation in the Office of the County Recorder in accordance with Arizona Revised Statute Section 28-7213; be it further

RESOLVED that the Director provide written notice to the City of Yuma and the County of Yuma evidencing the abandonment of the State's interest.

November 19, 2010

| RES. NO: | $2010-11-A-086$ |
| :--- | :--- |
| PROJECT: | $008 B Y O 001 H 088801 R$ |
| HIGHWAY: | INTERSTATE BUSINESS ROUTE 8 |
| SECTION: | Catalina Drive -Avenue 3E |
| ROUTE NO.: | Interstate Business Route 8 |
| ENG. DIST.: | Yuma |
| COUNTY: | Yuma |

## REPORT AND RECOMMENDATION

TO THE HONORABLE ARIZONA TRANSPORTATION BOARD:
The Intermodal Transportation Division has made a thorough investigation concerning the abandonment of right of way acquired for Interstate Business Route 8 within the above referenced project.

The right of way to be abandoned was previously established as a state route and state highway, designated U.S. Route 80 by the Arizona Highway Commission dated September 9, 1927, pages 26 and 27 of the Official Minutes; Thereafter, various Resolutions established additional right of way for improvements thereof and Arizona Transportation Board Resolution 77-16-A-048 dated September 16, 1977, redesignated and renumbered U.S. Route 80 to Interstate Route 8.

The previously acquired right of way is no longer needed for state transportation purposes. The City of Yuma and the County of Yuma collectively herein referred to as "Local Governmental Units" have agreed to accept into their respective Road system such portions of Business Route 8 that lie within the boundaries of their respective Local Government Unit in accordance with Intergovernmental Agreement 98-175, dated January 7, 1999 and First Addendum dated September 9, 2000. Accordingly, I recommend that the State's interest in the right of way be abandoned.

The right of way to be abandoned is depicted in Appendix "A" and delineated on the maps and plans on file in the office of the State Engineer, Intermodal Transportation Division, Phoenix, Arizona, as referenced herein, including various Yuma County Key maps.

| RES. NO. | $2010-11-A-086$ |
| :--- | :--- |
| PROJECT: | $008 B Y U 001 H 088801 R$ |
| HIGHWAY: | INTERSTATE BUSINESS ROUTE 8 |
| SECTION: | Catalina Drive - Avenue 3E |
| ROUTE NO.: | Interstate Business Route 8 |
| ENG. DIST: | Yuma |
| COUNTY: | Yuma |

I further recommend that the Local Governmental Units accept into their respective road systems the right of way that lies within the boundaries of the respective Local Governmental Units depicted in Appendix "A" and that the right of way be removed from the State Highway System and abandoned to the Local Governmental Units.

All other rights of way and easements and appurtenances thereto subject to the provisions of Arizona Revised Statutes Section 287210 shall continue as they existed prior to the disposal of right of way depicted in Appendix "A".

Pursuant to Arizona Revised Statutes Section 28-7046, I recommend that the Transportation Board adopt a resolution making this recommendation effective.

> Respectfully submitted,

JOHN S. HALIKOWSKI, Director Arizona Department of Transportation

## November 19, 2010

| RES. NO: | $2010-11-A-086$ |
| :--- | :--- |
| PROJECT: | $008 B Y O 001 H 088801 R$ |
| HIGHWAY: | INTERSTATE BUSINESS ROUTE 8 |
| SECTION: | Catalina Drive - Avenue $3 E$ |
| ROUTE NO.: | Interstate Business Route 8 |
| ENG. DIST.: | Yuma |
| COUNTY: | Yuma |

## CERTIEICATION

I, JOHN S. HALIKOWSKI, Director of the Arizona Department of Transportation, do hereby certify that the foregoing is a true and correct copy from the minutes of the Transportation Board made in official session on November 19, 2010.

IN WITNESS WHEREOF I have hereunto set my hand and the official seal of the Transportation Board on November 19, 2010.

JOHN S. HALIKOWSKI, Director Arizona Department of Transportation




November 19, 2010

| RES. NO. | $2010-11-A-087$ |
| :--- | :--- |
| PROJECT: | F-063-1-724/ 095 YU004H441501R |
| HIGHWAY: | SAN LUIS - YUMA - QUARTZSITE |
| SECTION: | Gadsden - $32^{\text {nd }}$ Street |
| ROUTE NO.: | U.S. Route 95 |
| ENG. DIST.: | Yuma |
| COUNTY: | Yuma |

## REPORT AND RECOMMENDATION

TO THE HONORABLE ARIZONA TRANSPORTATION BOARD:
The Intermodal Transportation Division has made a thorough investigation concerning the abandonment of right of way acquired for U.S. Route 95 within the above referenced project.

The right of way for U.S. 95 to be abandoned was previously established as a state route by Arizona Highway Commission Resolution dated May 19 and 20, 1936, pages 586 and 624 of the Official Minutes; Resolution dated May 26, 1936, page 634 of the Official Minutes established the state route as a state highway; Subsequently, various Resolutions established additional right of way for improvements thereof.

The previously acquired right of way is no longer needed for state transportation purposes. The City of Yuma, the County of Yuma, the City of Somerton and the Cocopah Indian Tribe, collectively herein referred to as "Local Governmental Units" have agreed to accept into their Respective Road System such portions of U.S. 95 that lies within the boundaries of the Respective Local Governmental Units in accordance with Intergovernmental Agreement 98-175 dated January 7, 1999; and First Addendum dated September 9, 2000; Accordingly, I recommend that the State's interest in the right of way be abandoned to the City of Yuma, the County of Yuma, the City of Somerton and Cocopah Indian Tribe as defined within the Intergovernmental Government.

```
RES. NO. 2010-11-A-087
PROJECT: E-063-1-724 / 095YU004H441501R
HIGHWAY: SAN LUIS - YUMA - QUARTZSITE
SECTION: Gadsden - 32 nd Street
ROUTE NO.: U.S. Route 95
ENG. DIST.: Yuma
COUNTY: Yuma
```

The right of way to be abandoned is depicted in Appendix "A" and delineated on the maps and plans on file in the office of the State Engineer, Intermodal Transportation Division, Phoenix, Arizona, as referenced herein, including various Yuma County Key Maps.

I further recommend that the Local Governmental Units accept into their respective road systems the right of way that lies within their boundaries of their Respective Local Government Units depicted in Appendix "A" and that the right of way be removed from the State Highway System and abandoned to the Local Governmental Units.

All other rights of way and easements and appurtenances thereto subject to the provisions of Arizona Revised Statutes Section 287210 shall continue as they existed prior to the disposal of right of way depicted in Appendix "A".

Pursuant to Arizona Revised Statutes Section 28-7046, I recommend that the Transportation Board adopt a resolution making this recommendation effective.

Respectfully submitted,

JOHN S. HALIKOWSKI, Director Arizona Department of Transportation

November 19, 2010

| RES. NO. | $2010-11-A-087$ |
| :--- | :--- |
| PROJECT: | F-063-1-724/ 095YU004H441501R |
| HIGHWAY: | SAN LUIS - YUMA - QUARTZSITE |
| SECTION: | Gadsden - $32^{\text {nd }}$ Street |
| ROUTE NO.: | U.S. Route 95 |
| ENG. DIST.: | Yuma |
| COUNTY: | Yuma |

## RESOLUTION OF ABANDONMENT

JOHN S. HALIKOWSKI, Director, Arizona Department of Transportation, on November 19, 2010, presented and filed with this Transportation Board his written report under Arizona Revised Statutes Section 28-7046, recommending the abandonment of U.S. Route 95 within the above referenced project.

The right of way to be abandoned is depicted in Appendix "A" and delineated on maps and plans on file in the office of the State Engineer, Intermodal Transportation Division, Phoenix, Arizona, as referenced herein, including various Yuma County Key Maps for U.S. Route 95.

WHEREAS said right of way is no longer needed for state transportation purposes; and

WHEREAS the City of Yuma, the County of Yuma, the City of Somerton and the Cocopah Indian Tribe collectively herein referred to as "Local Governmental Units" have agreed to accept into their Respective Road Systems U.S. 95 that lies within the boundaries of their Respective Local Governmental Units in accordance with Intergovernmental Agreement 98-175, dated January 07, 1999 and First Addendum dated September 09, 2000; and

WHEREAS this Board finds that public safety, necessity and convenience will be served by accepting the Director's report; therefore, be it

RESOLVED that the recommendation of the Director is adopted and made part of this resolution; be it further

```
November 19, 2010
```

```
RES. NO. 2010-11-A-087
PROJECT: F-063-1-724 / 095YU004H441501R
HIGHWAY: SAN LUIS - YUMA - QUARTZSITE
SECTION: Gadsden - 32 nd Street
ROUTE NO.: U.S. Route 95
ENG. DIST.: Yuma
COUNTY: Yuma
```

RESOLVED that the right of way depicted in Appendix "A" is hereby removed from the State Highway System and abandoned to the City of Yuma, the County of Yuma, the City of Somerton and the Cocopah Indian Tribe as provided in Arizona Revised Statutes Sections 287207 and 28-7209; be it further

RESOLVED that the abandonment becomes effective upon recordation in the Office of the County Recorder in accordance with Arizona Revised Statute Section 28-7213; be it further

RESOLVED that the Director provide written notice to the City of Yuma, the County of Yuma, the City of Somerton and the Cocopah Indian Tribe evidencing the abandonment of the State's interest.

## November 19, 2010

```
RES. NO. 2010-11-A-087
PROJECT: F-063-1-724 / 095YU004H441501R
HIGHWAY: SAN LUIS - YUMA - QUARTZSITE
SECTION: Gadsden - 32 nd Street
ROUTE NO.: U.S. Route 95
ENG. DIST.: Yuma
COUNTY: Yuma
```


## CERTIFICATION

I, JOHN S. HALIKOWSKI, Director of the Arizona Department of Transportation, do hereby certify that the foregoing is a true and correct copy from the minutes of the Transportation Board made in official session on November 19, 2010.

IN WITNESS WHEREOF I have hereunto set my hand and the official seal of the Transportation Board on November 19, 2010.

JOHN S. HALIKOWSKI, Director Arizona Department of Transportation




November 19, 2010

| RES. NO. | $2010-11-A-088$ |
| :--- | :--- |
| PROJECT: | U-093-A-700/093MO001H534701R |
| HIGHWAY: | HOOVER DAM - KINGMAN |
| SECTION: | Hoover Dam - Recreation Area |
| ROUTE NO.: | U.S. Route 93 |
| ENG. DIST.: | Kingman |
| COUNTY: | Mohave |

## REPORT AND RECOMMENDATION

TO THE HONORABLE ARIZONA TRANSPORTATION BOARD:
The Intermodal Transportation Division has made a thorough investigation concerning the establishment of new right of way as a state route and state highway for the improvement of State Route U.S. Route 93 within the above referenced project.

The existing alignment was previously established by Arizona Highway Commission Resolution dated June 18, 1934, page 695 of the Official Minutes as a state route and state highway (formerly designated as State Route 69 and U. S. Route 466); thereafter Arizona Transportation Board Resolution 2008-07-A-033, dated July 18, 2008 established additional right of way for improvements thereof.

New right of way is now needed for improvements due to design changes. Accordingly, it is necessary to establish and acquire the new right of way as a state route and state highway for this improvement project.

The new right of way to be established and acquired as a state route and state highway for necessary improvements is depicted in Appendix "A" and delineated on maps and plans on file in the office of the State Engineer, Intermodal Transportation Division, Phoenix, Arizona, entitled " Right of Way Plans, HOOVER DAM KINGMAN Highway, Project U-093-A-700 / 093M0001H534701R."

In the interest of public safety, necessity and convenience, I recommend that the new right of way depicted in Appendix "A" be established as a state route and state highway.

| RES. NO. | $2010-11-A-088$ |
| :--- | :--- |
| PROJECT: | U-093-A-700/093MO001H534701R |
| HIGHWAY: | HOOVER DAM - KINGMAN |
| SECTION: | Hoover Dam - Recreation Area |
| ROUTE NO.: | U.S. Route 93 |
| ENG. DIST.: | Kingman |
| COUNTY: | Mohave |

I recommend the acquisition of the new right of way pursuant to Arizona Revised Statutes Sections 28-7092 and 28-7094, an estate in fee, or such other interest as required, to include advance, future and early acquisition, including exchanges and donations and material for construction, haul roads and various easements necessary for or incidental to the improvement.

I further recommend the immediate establishment of existing county, town and city roadways into the state highway system as a state route and state highway which are necessary for or incidental to the improvement as delineated on said maps and plans, to be effective upon signing of this recommendation. This Resolution is considered the conveying document for such existing county, town and city roadways and no further conveyance is legally required.

Pursuant to Arizona Revised Statutes Section 28-7046, I recommend the adoption of a resolution making this recommendation effective.

Respectfully submitted,

JOHN S. HALIKOWSKI, Director Arizona Department of Transportation

November 19, 2010

| RES. NO. | $2010-11-A-088$ |
| :--- | :--- |
| PROJECT: | U-093-A-700/093MO001H534701R |
| HIGHWAY: | HOOVER DAM - KINGMAN |
| SECTION: | Hoover Dam - Recreation Area |
| ROUTE NO.: | U.S. Route 93 |
| ENG. DIST.: | Kingman |
| COUNTY: | Mohave |

## RESOLUTION OF ESTABLISHMENT

JOHN S. HALIKOWSKI, Director, Arizona Department of Transportation, on November 19, 2010, presented and filed with this Transportation Board his written report under Arizona Revised Statutes Section 28-7046, recommending the establishment and acquisition of new right of way as a state route and state highway for the improvement of U.S. Route 93 as set forth in the above referenced project.

The new right of way to be established as a state route and state highway and acquired for this improvement is depicted in Appendix "A" and delineated on maps and plans on file in the office of the State Engineer, Intermodal Transportation Division, Phoenix, Arizona, entitled "Right of Way Plans, HOOVER DAM - KINGMAN Highway, Project U-093-A-700 / 093M0001H534701R."

WHEREAS establishment and acquisition of the new right of way as a state route and state highway is necessary for this improvement, and includes authorization pursuant to Arizona Revised Statutes Sections 28-7092 and 28-7094, an estate in fee, or such other interest as required, to include advance, future and early acquisition, including exchanges and donations and material for construction, haul roads and various easements in any property necessary for or incidental to the improvements as delineated on said maps and plans; and

WHEREAS because of these premises, this Board finds public safety, necessity and convenience require the recommended establishment and acquisition of the new right of way as a state route and state highway needed for this improvement; and

November 19, 2010

| RES. NO. | $2010-11-\mathrm{A}-088$ |
| :--- | :--- |
| PROJECT: | U-093-A-700/093M0001H534701R |
| HIGHWAY: | HOOVER DAM - KINGMAN |
| SECTION: | Hoover Dam -Recreation Area |
| ROUTE NO.: | U.S. Route 93 |
| ENG. DIST.: | Kingman |
| COUNTY: | Mohave |

WHEREAS the existing county, town or city roadways as delineated on said maps and plans are hereby established as a state route and state highway by this Resolution action and that no further conveying document is required; therefore, be it

RESOLVED that the recommendation of the Director is adopted and made part of this resolution; be it further

RESOLVED that the right of way depicted in Appendix "A" is hereby designated a state route and state highway, to include any existing county, town or city roadways necessary for or incidental to the improvements as delineated on said maps and plans; be it further

RESOLVED that the Director is hereby authorized to acquire by lawful means pursuant to Arizona Revised Statutes Sections 28-7092 and 28-7094, an estate in fee, or such other interest as required, to include advance, future and early acquisition, including exchanges and donations and material for construction, haul roads, and various easements in any property necessary for or incidental to the improvements as delineated on said maps and plans; be it further

RESOLVED that written notice be provided to the County Board of Supervisors in accordance with Arizona Revised Statute 28-7043, and to the affected governmental jurisdictions for whose local existing roadways are being immediately established as a state route and state highway herein; be it further

RESOLVED that the Director secure an appraisal of the property to be acquired and that necessary parties be compensated; with the exception of any existing county, town or city roadways being immediately established herein as a state route and state highway. Upon failure to acquire said lands by other lawful means, the Director is authorized to initiate condemnation proceedings.

```
RES. NO. 2010-11-A-088
PROJECT: U-093-A-700 / 093MO001H534701R
HIGHWAY: HOOVER DAM - KINGMAN
SECTION: Hoover Dam - Recreation Area
ROUTE NO.: U.S. Route 93
ENG. DIST.: Kingman
COUNTY: Mohave
```


## CERTIFICATION

I, JOHN S. HALIKOWSKI, Director of the Arizona Department of Transportation, do hereby certify that the foregoing is a true and correct copy from the minutes of the Transportation Board made in official session on November 19, 2010.

IN WITNESS WHEREOF I have hereunto set my hand and the official seal of the Transportation Board on November 19, 2010.

JOHN S. HALIKOWSKI, Director Arizona Department of Transportation



## PRIORITY PLANNING ADVISORY COMMITTEE (PPAC)

FY 2011-2015 Transportation Facilities Construction Program Requested Modifications (For discussion and possible action - Jennifer Toth)
*ITEM 9a: Recommended approval of the projects selected by the Transportation Enhancement
PAGE 118 Review Committee (TERC), Round 18, 2010
*TERC Projects not recommended in Round 18, 2010
PAGE 146

PAGE 120
*ITEM 9b:
ROUTE NO: I-17 @ MP 305.0
COUNTY: Coconino
DISTRICT: Flagstaff
SCHEDULE: New Project Request
SECTION: Stoneman - Coconino County Line (NB)
TYPE OF WORK: Pavement preservation
ADVERTISEMENT DATE: 02/01/2011
PROGRAM AMOUNT: New Project
PROJECT MANAGER: Yumi Shapiro
PROJECT: H754701C
REQUESTED ACTION: Establish a new pavement preservation project for $\$ 5,500,000$ in the 2011 Highway Construction Program. Project is 6.6 miles in length.
Funds are available from the FY 2011 Pavement Preservation Fund \#72511.
NEW PROGRAM AMOUNT:


ROUTE NO: SR 86 @ MP 132.8
COUNTY: Pima
DISTRICT: Tucson
SCHEDULE: FY 2011
SECTION: Kitt Peak Road Segment
TYPE OF WORK: Roadway widening
ADVERTISEMENT DATE: N/A
PROGRAM AMOUNT: \$ 6,300,000
PROJECT MANAGER: Jeff Stine
PROJECT: H801001C, Item \#13910
REQUESTED ACTION: Defer the project from FY 2011 to FY 2012.

NEW PROGRAM AMOUNT:


ROUTE NO: SR 86 @ MP 160.0
COUNTY: Pima
DISTRICT: Tucson
SCHEDULE: New Project Request
SECTION: Valencia Road - Kinney Road
TYPE OF WORK: Design
ADVERTISEMENT DATE: N/A
PROGRAM AMOUNT: New Project
PROJECT MANAGER: Jeff Stine
PROJECT: H680601D
REQUESTED ACTION: Establish a new design project for \$4,000,000 in the FY 2011 Highway Construction Program. Funds are available from the FY 2011 Statewide Contingency Fund \#72311.
NEW PROGRAM AMOUNT:
\$ 4,000,000
PAGE 125
*ITEM 9e:
ROUTE NO: SR 86 @ MP 160.0
COUNTY: Pima
DISTRICT: Tucson
SCHEDULE: New Project Request
SECTION: Valencia Road - Kinney Road
TYPE OF WORK: Right of Way acquisition
ADVERTISEMENT DATE: N/A
PROGRAM AMOUNT: New Project
PROJECT MANAGER: Jeff Stine
PROJECT: H68602R
REQUESTED ACTION: Establish a new Right of Way project for \$1,700,000 in the FY 2011 Highway Construction Program. Funds are available from the FY 2011 Statewide Contingency Fund \#72311.
NEW PROGRAM AMOUNT:
\$ 1,700,000


ROUTE NO: I-10 @ MP 196.4
COUNTY: Pinal
DISTRICT: Tucson
SCHEDULE: New Project Request
SECTION: Earley Road to Jct. I-8
TYPE OF WORK: Right of Way
ADVERTISEMENT DATE: N/A
PROGRAM AMOUNT: New Project
PROJECT MANAGER: Steve Wilson
PROJECT: H798402R
REQUESTED ACTION: Establish a new Right of Way project for \$5,000,000 in the FY 2011 Highway Construction Program. Funds are available from the FY 2011 Statewide Contingency Fund \#72311.

## NEW PROGRAM AMOUNT:

\$ 5,000,000


## *ITEM 9g:

ROUTE NO: I-10 @ MP 208.8
COUNTY: Pinal
DISTRICT: Tucson
SCHEDULE: New Project Request
SECTION: SR 87 to Town of Picacho
TYPE OF WORK: Utility relocation
ADVERTISEMENT DATE: N/A
PROGRAM AMOUNT: New Project
PROJECT MANAGER: Steve Wilson
PROJECT: H769601U
REQUESTED ACTION: Establish a new utility project for \$1,664,000 in the FY 2011 Highway Construction Program. Funds are available from the FY 2011 Statewide Contingency Fund \#72311.
NEW PROGRAM AMOUNT:
\$ 1,664,000


ROUTE NO: SR 303L @ MP 112.0
COUNTY: Maricopa
DISTRICT: Phoenix Construction
SCHEDULE: New Project Request
SECTION: Peoria Ave to Waddell Rd
TYPE OF WORK: Utility relocation
ADVERTISEMENT DATE: N/A
PROGRAM AMOUNT: New Project
PROJECT MANAGER: Eric Prosnier
PROJECT: H787501U
REQUESTED ACTION: Establish a new utility project for \$400,000 in the FY 2011 Highway Construction Program. Funds are available from the RTP Cash Flow.
NEW PROGRAM AMOUNT:


## *ITEM 9i:

ROUTE NO: SR 303L @ MP 114.0
COUNTY: Maricopa
DISTRICT: Phoenix Construction
SCHEDULE: New Project Request
SECTION: Waddell Rd to Mountain View Blvd
TYPE OF WORK: Utility relocation
ADVERTISEMENT DATE: N/A
PROGRAM AMOUNT: New Project
PROJECT MANAGER: Eric Prosnier
PROJECT: H787601U
REQUESTED ACTION: Establish a new utility project for
\$5,800,000 in the FY 2011 Highway
Construction Program. Funds are available from the RTP Cash Flow.
NEW PROGRAM AMOUNT:


FY 2011-2015 Airport Development Program - Requested Modifications (For discussion and possible action - Jennifer Toth)

PAGE 130

## *ITEM 9j:

AIRPORT NAME:
SPONSOR:
AIRPORT CATEGORY:
SCHEDULE:
PROJECT \#:
PROGRAM AMOUNT:
PROJECT MANAGER:
PROJECT DESCRIPTION:

REQUESTED ACTION: FUNDING SOURCES:

Eloy Municipal
City of Eloy
Public GA
FY 2011-2015
E1F21
New Project
Tammy Martelle
Remove existing beacon, purchase \& install new beacon

Recommend STB approval.

| FAA |  |
| :--- | ---: |
| Fponsor | $\$ 150,000$ |
| State | $\$ 3,947$ |
| Total Program | $\$ 3,948$ |
|  | $\$ 157,895$ |


*ITEM 9k: AIRPORT NAME:
SPONSOR:
AIRPORT CATEGORY:
SCHEDULE:
PROJECT \#:
PROGRAM AMOUNT:
PROJECT MANAGER:
PROJECT DESCRIPTION:

REQUESTED ACTION:
FUNDING SOURCES:

Coolidge Municipal
City of Coolidge
Public GA
FY 2011-2015
E1F22
New Project
Tammy Martelle
Purchase \& install Automatic Weather Observation System (AWOS)
Recommend STB approval.

| FAA | $\$ 192,850$ |
| :--- | ---: |
| Sponsor | $\$ 5,075$ |
| State | $\$ 5,075$ |
| Total Program | $\$ 203,000$ |



## *ITEM 91:

## AIRPORT NAME: <br> SPONSOR: <br> AIRPORT CATEGORY: <br> SCHEDULE: <br> PROJECT \#: <br> PROGRAM AMOUNT: <br> PROJECT MANAGER: <br> PROJECT DESCRIPTION: <br> REQUESTED ACTION: <br> FUNDING SOURCES:

Lake Havasu City
Lake Havasu City
Commercial Service
FY 2011-2015
E1F23
New Project
Nancy Wiley
Install Airfield Guidance Signs; Install Taxiway Lighting and Markings; Rehabilitate Apron; and miscellaneous Airport Improvements Recommend STB approval.

FAA
\$350,200
Sponsor
State
\$9,216
Total Program
\$368,632

*ITEM 9m: AIRPORT NAME:
SPONSOR:
AIRPORT CATEGORY:
SCHEDULE:
PROJECT \#:
PROGRAM AMOUNT:
PROJECT MANAGER:
PROJECT DESCRIPTION:

REQUESTED ACTION:
FUNDING SOURCES:

Springerville Municipal
Town of Springerville
Public GA
FY 2011-2015
E1F24
New Project
Nancy Wiley
Remove Obstructions (Relocate Obstructions (FBO Building, Weather Station, T-Hangar) Outside Runway Visibility Zone), Design Phase 2 and Construction Phase 3
Recommend STB approval.
FAA
Sponsor \$26,974
State
\$26,973
Total Program
\$1,078,947


## *ITEM 9n:

AIRPORT NAME:
SPONSOR:
AIRPORT CATEGORY:
SCHEDULE:
PROJECT \#:
PROGRAM AMOUNT:
PROJECT MANAGER:
PROJECT DESCRIPTION:
REQUESTED ACTION:
FUNDING SOURCES:

Colorado City Municipal
Town of Colorado City
Public GA
FY 2011-2015
E1F25
New Project
Nancy Wiley
Install Precision Approach Path Indicator (PAPI) for Runway 2
Recommend STB approval.

| FAA | $\$ 245,575$ |
| :--- | ---: |
| Sponsor | $\$ 6,463$ |
| State | $\$ 6,462$ |
| Total Program | $\$ 258,500$ |


*ITEM 9o: AIRPORT NAME:
SPONSOR:
AIRPORT CATEGORY:
SCHEDULE:
PROJECT \#:
PROGRAM AMOUNT:
PROJECT MANAGER:
PROJECT DESCRIPTION:

REQUESTED ACTION:
FUNDING SOURCES:

Flagstaff Pulliam
City of Flagstaff
Commercial Service
FY 2011-2015
E1F126
New Project
Nancy Wiley
Acquire Snow Removal Equipment; Improve Airport Pavement Markings; Reconstruct South Parallel Taxiway A and Perform Airfield Electrical upgrades - Phase 1 (Design Only)
Recommend STB approval.
FAA
Sponsor
\$32,200
State
\$32,201
Total Program
\$1,288,014


AIRPORT NAME: Glendale Municipal
SPONSOR:
AIRPORT CATEGORY:
SCHEDULE:
PROJECT \#:
PROGRAM AMOUNT:
PROJECT MANAGER:
PROJECT DESCRIPTION:

REQUESTED ACTION:
FUNDING SOURCES:
City of Glendale
Reliever
FY 2011-2015

## E1F27

New Project
Nancy Wiley

Recommend STB approval.
FAA

1. Remove obstructions (relocate blast fences near Runway 01 approach end and relocate windcone near Runway 19 approach end). 2. Rehabilitate apron (pavement marking improvements). 3. Construct Runway 01/19 safety area (construct blast pads at each runway)

Sponsor
\$326,307

State
\$8,587
\$8,587
Total Program
\$343,481

*ITEM 9q:
AIRPORT NAME:
SPONSOR:
AIRPORT CATEGORY:
SCHEDULE:
PROJECT \#:
PROGRAM AMOUNT:
PROJECT MANAGER:
PROJECT DESCRIPTION:

REQUESTED ACTION: FUNDING SOURCES:

Payson
Town of Payson
Public GA
FY 2011-2015
E1F28
New Project
Nancy Wiley
Acquire Land for Approaches (Reimbursement for approx. 0.1 acres of land (Parcel A); Acquire Land for Development (Reimbursement for approx. 0.5 acres of land (Parcel A); Improve Runway Safety Area (install runway blast pads on each end of R)
Recommend STB approval.
FAA
Sponsor
\$9,088
State
\$9,087
\$363,500


| AIRPORT NAME: | Page Municipal |
| :--- | :--- |
| SPONSOR: | City of Page |
| AIRPORT CATEGORY: | Commercial Service |
| SCHEDULE: | FY 2011 - 2015 |
| PROJECT \#: | E1F29 |
| PROGRAM AMOUNT: | New Project |
| PROJECT MANAGER: | Nancy Wiley |
| PROJECT DESCRIPTION: | Construct North Apron Expansion including Relocation of |
|  | T-Hangars Phase 2; Strengthen Apron - Phase 1 (Design |
| Only) |  |
| REQUESTED ACTION: | Recommend STB approval. |
| FUNDING SOURCES: | FAA |
|  | Sponsor |
|  | State |


*ITEM 9s: AIRPORT NAME:
SPONSOR:
AIRPORT CATEGORY:
SCHEDULE:
PROJECT \#:
PROGRAM AMOUNT:
PROJECT MANAGER:
PROJECT DESCRIPTION:
REQUESTED ACTION:
FUNDING SOURCES:

Winslow-Lindbergh Regional
City of Winslow
Public GA
FY 2011-2015
E1F30
New Project
Nancy Wiley
Rehabilitate Runway 4/22 (Design Only) Phase 1
Recommend STB approval.

| FAA | $\$ 148,542$ |
| :--- | ---: |
| Sponsor | $\$ 3,909$ |
| State | $\$ 3,909$ |

Total Program
\$156,360


| *ITEM 9t: | AIRPORT NAME: | Yuma MCAS/Yuma International |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
|  | SPONSOR: | Yuma County Airport Authority |
|  | AIRPORT CATEGORY: | Commercial Service |
|  | SCHEDULE: | FY 2011 - 2015 |
|  | PROJECT \#: | E1F31 |
|  | PROGRAM AMOUNT: | New Project |
|  | PROJECT MANAGER: | Nancy Wiley |
|  | PROJECT DESCRIPTION: | Rehabilitate General Aviation Apron - 133,600sy |
|  | REQUESTED ACTION: | Recommend STB approval. |
|  | FUNDING SOURCES: | FAA |
|  |  | Sponsor |
|  |  | State |


*ITEM 9u:
AIRPORT NAME: SPONSOR:

AIRPORT CATEGORY:
SCHEDULE:
PROJECT \#:
PROGRAM AMOUNT:
PROJECT MANAGER:
PROJECT DESCRIPTION:
REQUESTED ACTION: FUNDING SOURCES:

Phoenix Goodyear City of Phoenix
Reliever
FY 2011-2015
E1F32
New Project
Nancy Wiley
Strengthen and Widen Taxiway Connectors A7, A6, A5, and replace A4 (Phase 1)
Recommend STB approval.

| FAA | $\$ 1,000,000$ |
| :--- | ---: |
| Sponsor | $\$ 26,316$ |
| State | $\$ 26,316$ |
| Total Program | $\$ 1,052,632$ |


*ITEM 9v: AIRPORT NAME:
SPONSOR:

## AIRPORT CATEGORY:

## SCHEDULE:

PROJECT \#:
PROGRAM AMOUNT:
PROJECT MANAGER:
PROJECT DESCRIPTION:

REQUESTED ACTION: FUNDING SOURCES:

Phoenix Deer Valley
City of Phoenix
Reliever
FY 2011-2015
E1F33
New Project
Nancy Wiley
Rehabilitate South and NW Apron, Phase lll, including Construct Run-up Area; Install Airfield Guidance Signs/Runway Incursion Caution Bars, including relocating holdlines to meet standards; Rehabilitate Electrical Vault; Install NW Apron Lighting Recommend STB approval.

| FAA | $\$ 3,136,441$ |
| :--- | ---: |
| Sponsor | $\$ 82,538$ |
| State | $\$ 82,538$ |
| Total Program | $\$ 3,301,517$ |


*ITEM 9w:
AIRPORT NAME:
SPONSOR:
AIRPORT CATEGORY:
SCHEDULE:
PROJECT \#:
PROGRAM AMOUNT:
PROJECT MANAGER:
PROJECT DESCRIPTION:
REQUESTED ACTION: FUNDING SOURCES:

Phoenix Sky Harbor International
City of Phoenix
Commercial Service
FY 2011-2015
E1F34
New Project
Nancy Wiley
Improve Runway 7R/25L Safety Area
Recommend STB approval.
FAA
\$11,228,933
Sponsor
\$1,871,489
State
\$1,871,489
Total Program
\$14,971,911


AIRPORT NAME:
SPONSOR:

## AIRPORT CATEGORY:

SCHEDULE:
PROJECT \#:
PROGRAM AMOUNT:
PROJECT MANAGER:
PROJECT DESCRIPTION:
REQUESTED ACTION:
FUNDING SOURCES:

Bisbee Municipal
City of Bisbee
Public GA
FY 2011-2015
E1F36
New Project
Tammy Martelle
Acquire Equipment (Sweeper, Tractor, and Fuel Card Reader)
Recommend STB approval.

| FAA | $\$ 172,900$ |
| :--- | ---: |
| Sponsor | $\$ 4,550$ |
| State | $\$ 4,550$ |
| $\quad$ Total Program | $\$ 182,000$ |



## *ITEM 9y:

AIRPORT NAME:
SPONSOR:
AIRPORT CATEGORY:
SCHEDULE:
PROJECT \#:
PROGRAM AMOUNT:
PROJECT MANAGER:
PROJECT DESCRIPTION:

REQUESTED ACTION:
FUNDING SOURCES:

Ryan Field
Tucson Airport Authority
Reliever
FY 2011-2015
E1S35
New Project
Tammy Martelle
Runway 6L/24R and Taxiway A and Connecting Taxiways stabilization treatment Recommend STB approval.

FAA
Sponsor
\$77,404

## State <br> \$774,034


Transportation Enhancement Review Committee

| TERC Ranking | App \# | Sponsoring Agency | Project Name |  | Federal Funds Requested |  | Project Cost |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| LOCAL APPLICATIONS |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1 | PAG - 1L | San Xavier District - Tohono O'odham Nation | San Xavier Road: From Little Nogales to I-19 | \$ | 420,837.00 | \$ | 446,275.00 |
| 2 | NACOG - 1L | Winslow | The Station at La Posada Rehab | \$ | 750,000.00 | \$ | 2,650,210.00 |
| 3 | MAG - 1L | Phoenix | Roosevelt Row Pedestrian Project | \$ | 750,000.00 | \$ | 800,273.00 |
| 4 | SEAGO-1L | Safford | Main Street Intersection and Streetscape Improvement Project | \$ | 659,806.00 | \$ | 699,688.00 |
| 5 | FMPO -1L | Flagstaff | Fourth St. FUTS Trail from Huntington Dr. to Butler Ave | \$ | 646,908.00 | \$ | 745,011.00 |
| 6 | PAG - 2L | Pima County | Sabino High School Bicycle Safety Enhancements | \$ | 750,000.00 | \$ | 802,844.00 |
| 7 | CAAG - 4L | Coolidge | Central Avenue (Arizona Blvd to Main Street) Pedestrian and Streetscape | \$ | 750,000.00 | \$ | 801,081.00 |
| 8 | YMPO-3L | Yuma | West Main Canal Multi-use Path | \$ | 749,921.00 | \$ | 795,250.00 |
| 9 | PAG - 5L | Tucson | Liberty Bicycle Boulevard Los Reales Rd to 43 rd St | \$ | 749,968.00 | \$ | 795,300.00 |
| 10 | CYMPO-3L | Prescott | Prescott W. Gurley Street Pedestrian Enhancements | \$ | 395,033.00 | \$ | 418,911.00 |
| 11 | MAG - 8L | Valley Metro | Bicycle Pedestrian Statewide Safety Education Project | \$ | 750,000.00 | \$ | 795,977.00 |
| 12 | MAG - 2L | Queen Creek | Queen Creek Wash MUP | \$ | 610,459.00 | \$ | 652,358.00 |
| 13 | NACOG - 6L | Navajo County | Woodruff-Snowflake Road Bridge over Little Colorado River Rehab | \$ | 750,000.00 | \$ | 1,175,500.00 |
| 14 | PAG - 3L | Pima County/Tucson | Rillito Riverpath and Camino de la Tierra Bicycle and Pedestrian Enhancements | \$ | 750,000.00 | \$ | 1,293,860.00 |
| 15 | SEAGO - 4L | Sierra Vista | Shared Use Pathway Connectivity Project | \$ | 540,030.00 | \$ | 572,673.00 |
| 16 | PAG - 4L | Pima County/Tucson | Pantano Riverpath Bicycle and Ped Enhancements | \$ | 689,741.00 | \$ | 734,433.00 |
| 17 | YMPO-1L | Somerton | Cesar Chavez Multi-use Pathway | \$ | 741,434.00 | \$ | 786,250.00 |



[^0]ALLOCATION AMOUNT: \$8,000,000 - Remaining Balance of Federal Funds is \$186,809

# ARIZONA DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION INTERMODAL TRANSPORTATION DIVISION WEB PRB REQUEST FORM (version 3.0) 

## 1. PRB MEETING DATE:10/05/2010

2. Phone Teleconference?No At Phone \#:

Video Teleconference?No Click here to view all previous PRB Actions for this project

## GENERAL INFORMATION

| 3. Form Date: |  | 4. Project Manager / Presenter Information: |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 10/07/2010 |  | Yumi Shapiro |  | (602) 712-7983 |  |  |  |
| 5. Form Created By: |  | 9580 Design Section B |  | 205 S 17th Ave, 113, 121F |  |  |  |
| Yumi Shapiro |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| PROJECT INFORMATION <br> 6. Project Location / Name: |  |  |  | 7. T | of Work: |  |  |
| Stoneman - Coconino County Line (NB) |  |  |  | AC \& AR-ACFC Mill and Replace |  |  |  |
| 8. CPS Id: | 9. District: | 10. Route: | 11. County: | 12. Beg MP: | 13. TRACS \#: | 14. Len (mi.): | 15. Fed ID \#: |
| ML1J | Flagstaff | I-17 NB | Coconino | 305.00 | H754701C | 6.6 | 017-B(207)A |

## PROJECT REQUEST SUMMARY

16. Original Program Budget (in $\$ 000$ ):
17. Current Approved
$\frac{\text { Program Budget (in } \$ 000 \text { ): }}{0}$

| 17. Original Program Item \# (Current 5 Yr Program): |  |
| :--- | :---: |
| 18a. $(+/-)$ Program Budget  <br> Request (in $\$ 000):$ 18b. Total Program Budget |  |
| 5,500 | After Request (in \$000): |
| 5,500 |  |

19. Currently Approved Budget Funding List:

19a. New / Budget Change Request Funding List:

| Amount (in \$000): | Fund Item \#: | Amount (in \$000): | 5,500 | Fund Item \#: | 72511 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Comments: | Details: | Comments: |  | Details: |  |
|  |  |  |  | FY:2011-PAV | MENT |
|  |  |  |  | PRESERVAT Preservation | N -Pavement |

20. JPA \#s:

| CURRENTLY APPROVED SCHEDULE | CHANGE REQUEST / NEW PROJECT SCHEDULE |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 21. Current Fiscal Year: | 21a. Request Fiscal Year to: | 2011 |
| 22. Current Bid Pkg Ready Date: | 22a. Request Bid Pkg Ready Date to: | $12 / 17 / 2010$ |
| 23. Current Bid Adv Date: | 23a. Request Bid Adv Date to: | $02 / 01 / 2011$ |

ADDITIONAL DETAILS

| 24a. Scope Changed?No | 24c. Work Type Changed?No |
| :---: | :---: |
| 24b. Project Name/Location Changed?No | $\underline{\text { 24d. What is the current Stage? Stage IV }}$ |
| Have ENVIRONMENTAL Clearance? NO | Have MATERIALS Memo? YES |
| Have U\&RR Clearance? YES | Have C\&S Approval?YES |
| Have R/W Clearance?YES | $\underline{\text { Have CUSTOMIZED Schedule? YES }}$ |

25. DESCRIPTION OF REQUEST:

Establish new project. The scope of work include milling, replacing the AC pavement, new guardrail installation \& superelevation correction.
26. JUSTIFICATION:

The purpose of the project is to maintain the pavement structural integrity and to improve the roadway ride and safety as part of the pavement preservation program.
27. CONCERNS OF THE PROJECT TEAM REGARDING THE REQUEST:

## 28. OTHER ALTERNATIVES:

# ARIZONA DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION INTERMODAL TRANSPORTATION DIVISION WEB PRB REQUEST FORM (version 3.0) 

## 1. PRB MEETING DATE:10/12/2010

2. Phone Teleconference?No At Phone \#:

Video Teleconference?No Click here to view all previous PRB Actions for this project

## -電 <br> GENERAL INFORMATION



## PROJECT REQUEST SUMMARY

16. Original Program Budget (in $\$ 000$ ):
$\frac{\text { 18. Current Approved }}{\text { Program Budget (in } \$ 000 \text { ): }} \quad 6,300$

## 17. Original Program Item \# (Current 5 Yr Program):

13910
19. Currently Approved Budget Funding List:

19a. New / Budget Change Request Funding List:


## 20. JPA \#s:

| CURRENTLY APPROVED SCHEDULE |  | CHANGE REQUEST / NEW PROJECT SCHEDULE |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 21. Current Fiscal Year: | 11 | 21a. Request Fiscal Year to: | 12 |
| 22. Current Bid Pkg Ready Date: | TBD | 22a. Request Bid Pkg Ready Date to: |  |
| 23. Current Bid Adv Date: | TBD | 23a. Request Bid Adv Date to: |  |

## ADDITIONAL DETAILS

> 24a. Scope Changed?No

18a. (+/-) Program Budget
18b. Total Program Budget Request (in \$000):

00
After Request (in \$000):
6,300

| 24a. Scope Changed?No |
| ---: |
| 24b. Project Name/Location Changed? No |
| Have ENVIRONMENTAL Clearance? $N O$ |
| Have U\&RR Clearance? NO |
| Scoping Document Completed? $N O$ |

> 24c. Work Type Changed?No
> 24d. What is the current Stage?Pre Stage II
> Have MATERIALS Memo?NO
> Have C\&S Approval?NO
> Have CUSTOMIZED Schedule?NO

## 25. DESCRIPTION OF REQUEST:

Defer construction of this project to FY12.

## 26. JUSTIFICATION:

Construction of this project is deferred to FY12 because design of this segment has just begun and adjacent construction will not be done until Fall of 2011.

## 27. CONCERNS OF THE PROJECT TEAM REGARDING THE REQUEST:

## 28. OTHER ALTERNATIVES:

## ARIZONA DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION INTERMODAL TRANSPORTATION DIVISION WEB PRB REQUEST FORM (version 3.0)

## GENERAL INFORMATION

| 3. Form Date: |  | 4. Project Manager / Presenter Information: |  |  | (520) 388-4260 |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 10/12/2010 |  | Jeff Stine |  |  |  |  |  |
| 5. Form Cr | ed By: | 9210 Statewide Project Management |  |  | 1221 S 2nd Ave, , T100 |  |  |
| Jeff Stine |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| PROJECT INFORMATION |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 6. Project Location / Name: |  |  | 7. Type of Work: |  |  |  |  |
| VALENCIA ROAD - KINNEY ROAD |  |  | DESIGN |  |  |  |  |
| 8. CPS Id: | 9. District: | 10. Route: | 11. County: | 12. Beg MP: | 13. TRACS \#: | 14. Len (mi.): | 15. Fed ID \#: |
| AZ1G | Tucson | 86 | Pima | 160.0 | H680601D | 7.0 | 086-A(210)A |

## PROJECT REQUEST SUMMARY

16. Original Program Budget (in $\$ 000$ ):
$\frac{\text { 18. Current Approved }}{\text { Program Budget (in } \$ 000 \text { ): }}$
0
17. Original Program Item \# (Current 5 Yr Program):

18a. (+/-) Program Budget
18b. Total Program Budget Request (in \$000):

4,000

After Request (in \$000): 4,000
19. Currently Approved Budget Funding List:

| Amount (in \$000): | Fund Item \#: | Amount (in \$000): | 4,000 | Fund Item \#: | 72311 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Comments: | Details: | Comments: |  | Details: |  |
|  |  |  |  | FY:2011-CO gram Cost A | INGENCY-Pro <br> stments |

I certify that I have verified AND received approval for ALL of the new Funding Sources listed above.

## 20. JPA \#s:

CURRENTLY APPROVED SCHEDULE

21. Current Fiscal Year: ( | CHANGE REQUEST / NEW PROJECT SCHEDULE |
| :--- |

## 28. OTHER ALTERNATIVES:

## REQUESTED ACTIONS:

Establish a New Project.
Request to be in PPAC Agenda for 11/3/2010 .

## APPROVED/RECOMMENDED ACTIONS:

Item(s) Approved. Subject to PPAC Approval.

## ARIZONA DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION INTERMODAL TRANSPORTATION DIVISION WEB PRB REQUEST FORM (version 3.0)

## 1. PRB MEETING DATE:10/12/2010

2. Phone Teleconference?No At Phone \#:

Video Teleconference?No Click here to view all previous PRB Actions for this project

## GENERAL INFORMATION



## PROJECT REQUEST SUMMARY

16. Original Program Budget (in $\$ 000$ ):
17. Original Program Item \# (Current 5 Yr Program):

11508
$\frac{\text { 18. Current Approved }}{\text { Program Budget (in } \$ 000 \text { ): }}$
0

$$
\frac{\text { 18a. (+/-) Program Budget }}{\text { Request (in \$000): }} \frac{1,700}{}
$$

18b. Total Program Budget After Request (in \$000):

1,700
19. Currently Approved Budget Funding List:

19a. New / Budget Change Request Funding List:

| Amount (in \$000): | Fund Item \#: | $\underline{\text { Amount (in \$000): }}$ | 1,700 | Fund Item \#: 72311 <br> Comments: |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
|  | $\underline{\text { Comments: }}$ |  | Details: <br> FY:2011-CONTINGENCY-Pro <br> gram Cost Adjustments |  |

I certify that I have verified AND received approval for ALL of the new Funding Sources listed above.
20. JPA \#s:

| CURRENTLY APPROVED SCHEDULE <br> 21. Current Fiscal Year: | CHANGE REQUEST / NEW PROJECT SCHEDULE <br> 21a. Request Fiscal Year to: <br> 11 |
| :---: | :---: |
| 22. Current Bid Pkg Ready Date: TBD | 22a. Request Bid Pkg Ready Date to: |
| 23. Current Bid Adv Date: TBD | 23a. Request Bid Adv Date to: |
| ADDITIONAL DETAILS |  |
| 24a. Scope Changed? No | 24c. Work Type Changed? No |
| 24b. Project Name/Location Changed? No | 24d. What is the current Stage? Pre Stage II |
| Have ENVIRONMENTAL Clearance? NO | Have MATERIALS Memo?NO |
| Have U\&RR Clearance? NO | Have C\&S Approval? NO |
| Have R/W Clearance? ${ }^{\text {NO }}$ | Have CUSTOMIZED Schedule? NO |
| Scoping Document Completed? NO |  |
| 25. DESCRIPTION OF REQUEST: |  |
| Establish new project for R/W aquisitions. |  |
| 26. JUSTIFICATION: |  |
| The construction of this project is programmed for FY 13. |  |
| 27. CONCERNS OF THE PROJECT TEAM REGARDING THE REQUEST: |  |
| 28. OTHER ALTERNATIVES: |  |

## REQUESTED ACTIONS:

Establish a New Project.
Request to be in PPAC Agenda for 11/3/2010 .

APPROVED/RECOMMENDED ACTIONS:
Item(s) Approved. Subject to PPAC Approval.

## ARIZONA DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION INTERMODAL TRANSPORTATION DIVISION WEB PRB REQUEST FORM (version 3.0)

## 1. PRB MEETING DATE:10/19/2010

2. Phone Teleconference?No At Phone \#:

Video Teleconference?No Click here to view all previous PRB Actions for this project

## GENERAL INFORMATION

## 3. Form Date: <br> 10/19/2010 <br> 5. Form Created By: Steve Wilson <br> PROJECT INFORMATION

4. Project Manager / Presenter Information:

Steve Wilson
9210 Statewide Project Management
(520) 262-3247

2082 E Hwy 70, Safford, AZ , Mail Drop S400
6. Project Location / Name:

Earley Road to Jct I-8

7. Type of Work:

Right of Way

PROJECT REQUEST SUMMARY
16. Original Program Budget (in $\$ 000$ ):
$\frac{\text { 18. Current Approved }}{\text { Program Budget (in } \$ 000 \text { ): }}$
0

| $\frac{\text { 18a. }(+/-) \text { Program Budget }}{\text { Request (in \$000): }}$ | $\frac{\text { 18b. Total Program Budget }}{\text { After Request (in \$000): }}$ |
| ---: | :--- |
|  | 5,000 |

19. Currently Approved Budget Funding List:

19a. New / Budget Change Request Funding List:

| Amount (in \$000): | Fund Item \#: | Amount (in \$000): | 5,000 | Fund Item \#: | 72311 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Comments: | Details: | Comments: |  | Details: |  |
|  |  |  |  | FY:2011-CON gram Cost Adj | INGENCY-Pro <br> stments |

I certify that I have verified AND received approval for ALL of the new Funding Sources listed above.
20. JPA \#s:

| CURRENTLY APPROVED SCHEDULE <br> 21. Current Fiscal Year: |
| :---: |
| 22. Current Bid Pkg Ready Date: |
| 23. Current Bid Adv Date: |
| ADDITIONAL DETAILS |
| 24a. Scope Changed? No |
| 24b. Project Name/Location Changed? No |
| Have ENVIRONMENTAL Clearance? NO |
| Have U\&RR Clearance? NO |
| Have R/W Clearance? ${ }^{\text {NO }}$ |
| Scoping Document Completed? NO |

21a. Request Fiscal Year to: 2011
22a. Request Bid Pkg Ready Date to:
23a. Request Bid Adv Date to:

## ARIZONA DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION INTERMODAL TRANSPORTATION DIVISION WEB PRB REQUEST FORM (version 3.0)

## 1. PRB MEETING DATE:10/19/2010

2. Phone Teleconference?No At Phone \#:

Video Teleconference?No Click here to view all previous PRB Actions for this project

## GENERAL INFORMATION

| 3. Form Date: | 4. Pr |
| :---: | :---: |
| 10/19/2010 | Stev |
| 5. Form Created By: | 9210 |
| Steve Wilson |  |

6. Project Location / Name:
7. Type of Work:

Utility Relocation

| 8. CPS Id: | 9. District: | 10. Route: | 11. County: | 12. Beg MP: | 13. TRACS | 14. Len (mi.): | 15. Fed ID \#: |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| SX1J | Tucson | I-10 | Pinal | 208.79 | H769601U | 4.21 |  |

PROJECT REQUEST SUMMARY
16. Original Program Budget (in $\$ 000$ ):
$\frac{\text { 18. Current Approved }}{\text { Program Budget (in } \$ 000 \text { ): }}$
0

| 17. Original Program Item \# (Current 5 Yr Program): |  |
| :--- | :--- |
| 18a. $(+/-)$ Program Budget  <br> Request (in $\$ 000):$ 18b. Total Program Budget <br> 1,664  |  |

19. Currently Approved Budget Funding List:

| Amount (in \$000): | Fund Item \#: | Amount (in \$000): | 1,664 | Fund Item \#: | 72311 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Comments: | Details: | Comments: |  | Details: |  |
|  |  |  |  | FY:2011-CON gram Cost Ad | INGENCY-Pro <br> stments |

20. JPA \#s:

| CURRENTLY APPROVED SCHEDULE | CHANGE REQUEST / NEW PROJECT SCHEDULE |
| :---: | :---: |
| 21. Current Fiscal Year: | 21a. Request Fiscal Year to: 2011 |
| 22. Current Bid Pkg Ready Date: | 22a. Request Bid Pkg Ready Date to: |
| 23. Current Bid Adv Date: | 23a. Request Bid Adv Date to: |
| ADDITIONAL DETAILS |  |
| 24a. Scope Changed? No | 24c. Work Type Changed? ${ }^{\text {No }}$ |
| 24b. Project Name/Location Changed? ${ }^{\text {No }}$ | 24d. What is the current Stage? Stage III |
| Have ENVIRONMENTAL Clearance? NO | Have MATERIALS Memo?NO |
| Have U\&RR Clearance? NO | Have C\&S Approval? NO |
| Have R/W Clearance? ${ }^{\text {NO }}$ | Have CUSTOMIZED Schedule? YES |
| Scoping Document Completed? NO |  |
| 25. DESCRIPTION OF REQUEST: |  |
| Establish a new project to relocate utilities. |  |
| 26. JUSTIFICATION: |  |
| The realignment of I-10 through Picacho necessitates 27. CONCERNS OF THE PROJECT TEAM REGARDIN | . UEST: |

## 28. OTHER ALTERNATIVES:

## REQUESTED ACTIONS:

Establish a New Project.
Request to be in PPAC Agenda for 11/3/2010.

## APPROVED/RECOMMENDED ACTIONS:

Item(s) Approved. Subject to PPAC Approval.

# ARIZONA DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION INTERMODAL TRANSPORTATION DIVISION WEB PRB REQUEST FORM (version 3.0) 

## 1. PRB MEETING DATE:10/19/2010

2. Phone Teleconference?No At Phone \#:

Video Teleconference?No

## GENERAL INFORMATION



## PROJECT REQUEST SUMMARY

16. Original Program Budget (in $\$ 000$ ):
$\frac{\text { 18. Current Approved }}{\text { Program Budget (in } \$ 000 \text { ): }}$
0

| 17. Original Program Item \# (Current 5 Yr Program): |  |
| :--- | :--- |
| 18a. $(+/-)$ Program Budget  <br> Request (in $\$ 000$ ): 18b. Total Program Budget |  |
| 400 | $\frac{\text { After Request (in } \$ 000 \text { ): }}{400}$ |

19. Currently Approved Budget Funding List:

19a. New / Budget Change Request Funding List:

| Amount (in \$000): | $\frac{\text { Fund Item \#: }}{\text { Comments: }}$ | $\underline{\text { Amount (in \$000): }} 400$ | $\frac{\text { Fund Item \#: }}{\text { Details: }}$ | $\frac{\text { Comments: }}{\text { RTP CASH FLOW }}$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |



# ARIZONA DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION INTERMODAL TRANSPORTATION DIVISION WEB PRB REQUEST FORM (version 3.0) 

## 1. PRB MEETING DATE:10/19/2010

2. Phone Teleconference?No At Phone \#:

Video Teleconference?No

## GENERAL INFORMATION

| 3. Form Date: | 4. Project Manager / Presenter Information: |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 10/20/2010 | Eric Prosnier |  |  | (602) 712-8495 |  |  |
| 5. Form Created By: | 9250 Valley Project Management |  |  | 1611 W Jackson St, , EM01 |  |  |
| Eric Prosnier |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| PROJECT INFORMATION |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 6. Project Location / Name: |  |  | 7. Type of Work: |  |  |  |
| WADDELL ROAD TO MOUNTAIN VIEW BOULEVARD |  |  | UTILITY RELOCATION |  |  |  |
| 8. CPS Id: 9. District: | 10. Route: | 11. County: | 12. Beg MP: | 13. TRACS \#: | 14. Len (mi.): | 15. Fed ID \#: |
| Phoenix | 303L | Maricopa | 114.0 | H787601U | 4.0 |  |

## PROJECT REQUEST SUMMARY

16. Original Program Budget (in $\$ 000$ ):

17. Original Program Item \# (Current 5 Yr Program):
18a. (+/-) Program Budget
Request (in \$000):

5,800

18b. Total Program Budget After Request (in \$000): 5,800
19. Currently Approved Budget Funding List:

19a. New / Budget Change Request Funding List:

| Amount (in \$000): | Fund Item \#: | Amount (in \$000): | 5,800 | Fund Item \#: | OTHR11 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Comments: | Details: | Comments: |  | Details: |  |
|  |  | RTP CASH FLOW |  | FY:0-.-. |  |



# ARIZONA DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION MPD - Aeronautics Group 

## Project Committee Recommendations

| AIRPORT: | ELOY MUNI | $\checkmark$ New Project |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| SPONSOR: | CITY OF ELOY |  |
| CATEGORY: | Public GA | Changed Project |
| PROJECT NUMBER: | 1F21 |  |
| AIP NUMBER: | $3-04-0014-009-2010$ |  |
| DATE: | September 29,2010 |  |


| Current Program <br> Description | Fiscal <br> Year | State Share | Sponsor Share | FAA Share | Total Amount | Priority <br> Number |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  <br> install new beacon | 2011 | $\$ 3,948.00$ | $\$ 3,947.00$ | $\$ 150,000.00$ | $\$ 157,895.00$ | 98 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Revised Program <br> Description | Fiscal <br> Year | State Share | Sponsor Share | FAA Share | Total Amount | Number |

Justification For Recommendation:
Sponsor requesting State matching grant to FAA AIP 3-04-0014-009-2010

| Source of Funds: | 2011 - Federal Programs (State Match) |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Original Set-Aside | Amount committed to date | Present Balance | Balance if Approved |
| $\$ 3,519,892$ | $\$ 1,036,683$ | $\$ 2,483,209$ | $\$ 2,479,261$ |

Aeronautics Project Development Committee Recommends to PPAC:

[ ] Disapprova Y) Gta(te

Date: September 21, 2010
Aeronautics Representative:
Priority Planning Committee Recommends to Transportation Board:
[ ] Approval
[ ] Disapproval
Date: November 3, 2010

State Transportation Board Action:
[ ] Approval [ ] Disapproval Date: November 19, 2010

# ARIZONA DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION MPD - Aeronautics Group 

## Project Committee Recommendations

| AIRPORT: | COOLIDGE MUNI |
| :--- | :--- |
| SPONSOR: | CITY OF COOLIDGE |
| CATEGORY: | Public GA |
| PROJECT NUMBER: | 1F22 |
| AIP NUMBER: | $3-04-0011-007-2010$ |
| DATE: | September 29, 2010 |


| Current Program Description | Fiscal Year | State Share | Sponsor Share | FAA Share | Total Amount | Priority <br> Number |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Purchase \& install Automatic Weather Observation System (AWOS) | 2011 | \$5,075.00 | \$5,075.00 | \$192,850.00 | \$203,000.00 | 89 |
| Revised Program Description | Fiscal Year | State Share | Sponsor Share | FAA Share | Total Amount | Priority Number |


| Source of Funds: | 2011 -Federal Programs (State Match) |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Original Set-Aside | Amount committed to date | Present Balance | Balance if Approved |
| $\$ 3,519,892$ | $\$ 1,040,631$ | $\$ 2,479,261$ | $\$ 2,474,186$ |

Aeronautics Project Development Committee Recommends to PPAC:


Priority Planning Committee Recommends to Transportation Board:
[ ] Approval
[ ] Disapproval
Date: November 3, 2010

State Transportation Board Action:
[ ] Approval [ ] Disapproval Date: November 19, 2010

# ARIZONA DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION <br> MPD - Aeronautics Group 

## Project Committee Recommendations

| AIRPORT: | LAKE HAVASU CITY |
| :--- | :--- |
| SPONSOR: | LAKE HAVASU CITY |
| CATEGORY: | Commercial Service |
| PROJECT NUMBER: | 1F23 |
| AIP NUMBER: | $3-04-0071-22$ |
| DATE: | October 4, 2010 |


| Current Program Description | Fiscal Year | State Share | Sponsor Share | FAA Share | Total Amount | Priority Number |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Install Airfield Guidance Signs; Install Taxiway Lighting and Markings; Rehabilitate Apron; and Miscellaneous Airport Improvements | 2011 | \$9,216.00 | \$9,216.00 | \$350,200.00 | \$368,632.00 | 98 |
| Revised Program Description | Fiscal Year | State Share | Sponsor Share | FAA Share | Total Amount | Priority Number |

Justification For Recommendation:
Sponsor is requesting a state matching grant to Federal AIP grant 3-04-0071-22

| Source of Funds: | 2011-Federal Programs (State Match) |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Original Set-Aside | Amount committed to date | Present Balance | Balance if Approved |
| $\$ 3,519,892$ | $\$ 1,045,706$ | $\$ 2,474,186$ | $\$ 2,464,970$ |

Aeronautics Project Development Committee Recommends to PPAC:
Aeronautics Representative:

## Priority Planning Committee Recommends to Transportation Board:

[ ] Approval
[ ] Disapproval
Date: November 3, 2010

## State Transportation Board Action:

# ARIZONA DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION <br> MPD - Aeronautics Group 

## Project Committee Recommendations

| AIRPORT: | SPRINGERVILLE MUNI |
| :--- | :--- |
| SPONSOR: | TOWN OF SPRINGERVILLE |
| CATEGORY: | Public GA |
| PROJECT NUMBER: | 1F24 |
| AIP NUMBER: | $3-04-0038-21$ |
| DATE: | October 4, 2010 |

## New Project

Changed Project

DATE:
October 4, 2010

| Current Program <br> Description | Fiscal <br> Year | State Share | Sponsor Share | FAA Share | Total Amount | Priority <br> Number |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Remove Obstructions (Relocate <br> Obstructions (FBO Building, Weather <br> Station, T-Hangar) Outside Runway <br> Visibility Zone), Design Phase 2 and <br> Construction Phase 3 | 2011 | $\$ 26,973.00$ | $\$ 26,974.00$ | $\$ 1,025,000,00$ | $\$ 1,078,947.00$ | 124 |


| Source of Funds: | 2011 - Federal Programs (State Match) |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Original Set-Aside | Amount committed to date | Present Balance | Balance if Approved |
| $\$ 3,519,892$ | $\$ 1,054,922$ | $\$ 2,464,970$ | $\$ 2,437,997$ |

Aeronautics Project Development Committee Recommends to PPAC:


Priority Planning Committee Recommend's to Transportation Board:
[ ] Approval [ ] Disapproval Date: November 3, 2010

## State Transportation Board Action:

[ ] Approval [ ] Disapproval Date: November 19, 2010

# ARIZONA DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION <br> MPD - Aeronautics Group 

Project Committee Recommendations

| AIRPORT: | COLORADO CITY MUNI | $\checkmark$ New Project |
| :--- | :--- | :---: |
| SPONSOR: | TOWN OF COLORADO CITY | $\square$ Changed Project |
| CATEGORY: | Public GA |  |
| PROJECT NUMBER: | 1 1F25 |  |
| AIP NUMBER: | $3-04-0076-16$ |  |
| DATE: | October 5,2010 |  |


| Current Program <br> Description | Fiscal <br> Year | State Share | Sponsor Share | FAA Share | Total Amount | Priority <br> Number |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Install Precision Approach Path <br> Indicator (PAPI) for Runway 2 | 2011 | $\$ 6,462.00$ | $\$ 6,463.00$ | $\$ 245,575.00$ | $\$ 258,500.00$ | 13 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Revised Program <br> Description | Fiscal <br> Year | State Share | Sponsor Share | FAA Share | Total Amount | Number |

Justification For Recommendation:
Sponsor requests a state matching grant to Federal AIP 3-04-0076-16

| Source of Funds: | 2011 - Federal Programs (State Match) |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Original Set-Aside | Amount committed to date | Present Balance | Balance if Approved |
| $\$ 3,519,892$ | $\$ 1,081,895$ | $\$ 2,437,997$ | $\$ 2,431,535$ |

Aeronautics Project Development Committee Recommends to PPAC:


Aeronautics Representative: $Y$ larmey $K(C-C C \in$

## Priority Planning Committee Recommends to Transportation Board:

[ ] Approval [ ] Disapproval Date: November 3, 2010
State Transportation Board Action:
[ ] Approval [ ] Disapproval Date: November 19, 2010

# ARIZONA DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION MPD - Aeronautics Group 

## Project Committee Recommendations

| AIRPORT: | FLAGSTAFF PULLIAM | New Project |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| SPONSOR: | CITY OF FLAGSTAFF |  |
| CATEGORY: | Commercial Service |  |
| PROJECT NUMBER: | 1F26 |  |
| AIP NUMBER: | $3-04-0015-034$ |  |
| DATE: | October 5,2010 |  |



| Source of Funds: | 2011 - Federal Programs (State Match) |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Original Set-Aside | Amount committed to date | Present Balance | Balance if Approved |
| $\$ 3,519,892$ | $\$ 1,088,357$ | $\$ 2,431,535$ | $\$ 2,399,334$ |

Aeronautics Project Development Committee Recommends to PPAC:
H AlV'y] Approval [ ] Disapproval Date: October 5,2010


Priority Planning Committee Recommends to Transportation Board:
[ ] Approval [ ] Disapproval Date: November 3, 2010
State Transportation Board Action:
[ ] Approval [ ] Disapproval Date: November 19, 2010

# ARIZONA DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION <br> MPD - Aeronautics Group 

## Project Committee Recommendations

| AIRPORT: | GLENDALE MUNICIPAL | $\checkmark$ |
| :--- | :--- | :---: |
| SPONSOR: | CITY OF GLENDALE |  |
| CATEGORY: | Reliever Project |  |
| PROJECT NUMBER: | 1F27 | $\square$ |
| AlP NUMBER: | $3-04-0064-020$ |  |
| DATE: | October 5,2010 |  |


| Current Program <br> Description | Fiscal <br> Year | State Share | Sponsor Share | FAA Share | Total Amount | Priority <br> Number |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1. Remove obstructions (relocate blast <br> fences near Runway 01 approach end <br> and relocate windcone near Runway <br> 19 approach end). 2. Rehabilitate <br> apron (pavement marking <br> improvements). 3. Construct Runway <br> 01/19 safety area (construct blast pads <br> at each runway | 2011 | $\$ 8,587.00$ | $\$ 8,587.00$ | $\$ 326,307.00$ | $\$ 343,481.00$ | 160 |
| Revised Program <br> Description |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Justification For Recommendation:
Sponsor requests state matching grant to Federal AIP 3-04-0064-020-2010

| Source of Funds: | 2011 - Federal Programs (State Match) |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Original Set-Aside | Amount committed to date | Present Balance | Balance if Approved |
| $\$ 3,519,892$ | $\$ 1,120,558$ | $\$ 2,399,334$ | $\$ 2,390,747$ |

## Aeronautics Project Development Committee Recommends to PPAC:

Why l' by Approval [ ] Disapproval Date: October 5, 2010

Aeronautics Representative:


Priority Planning Committee Recommends to Transportation Board:
[ ] Approval [ ] Disapproval Date: November 3, 2010
State Transportation Board Action:
[ ] Approval [ ] Disapproval Date: November 19, 2010

# ARIZONA DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION <br> MPD - Aeronautics Group 

## Project Committee Recommendations

| AIRPORT: | PAYSON | $\boldsymbol{v}$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| SPONSOR: | TOWN OF PAYSON Project |  |
| CATEGORY: | Public GA | $[-]$ Changed Project |
| PROJECT NUMBER: | 1F28 |  |
| AIP NUMBER: | $3-04-0027-016$ |  |
| DATE: | October 5,2010 |  |



| Source of Funds: | 2011 - Federal Programs (State Match) |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Original Set-Aside | Amount committed to date | Present Balance | Balance if Approved |
| $\$ 3,519,892$ | $\$ 1,129,145$ | $\$ 2,390,747$ | $\$ 2,381,660$ |

Aeronautics Project Development Committee Recommends to PPAC:


## Priority Planning Committee Recommepds to Transportation Board:

[ ] Approval [ ] Disapproval Date: November 3, 2010
State Transportation Board Action:
[ ] Approval [ ] Disapproval Date: November 19, 2010

# ARIZONA DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION <br> MPD - Aeronautics Group 

Project Committee Recommendations

| AIRPORT: | PAGE MUNI | $\boxed{V}]$ New Project |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| SPONSOR: | CITY OF PAGE |  |
| CATEGORY: | Commercial Service | $\square$ Changed Project |
| PROJECT NUMBER: | 1F29 |  |
| AIP NUMBER: | $3-04-0025-024$ |  |
| DATE: | October 5,2010 |  |


| Current Program Description | Fiscal Year | State Share | Sponsor Share | FAA Share | Total Amount | Priority Number |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Construct North Apron Expansion including Relocation of T-Hangars Phase 2; Strengthen Apron - Phase 1 (Design Only) | 2011 | \$2,570.00 | \$2,569.00 | \$97,633.00 | \$102,772.00 | 86 |
| Revised Program Description | Fiscal Year | State Share | Sponsor Share | FAA Share | Total Amount | Priority Number |
| Justification For Recommendation: |  |  |  |  |  |  |


| Source of Funds: | 2011 - Federal Programs (State Match) |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Original Set-Aside | Amount committed to date | Present Balance | Balance if Approved |
| $\$ 3,519,892$ | $\$ 1,138,232$ | $\$ 2,381,660$ | $\$ 2,379,090$ |

Aeronautics Project Development Committee Recommends to PPAC:


Priority Planning Committee Recommends to Transportation Board:
[ ] Approval [ ] Disapproval Date: November 3, 2010
State Transportation Board Action:
[ ] Approval [ ] Disapproval Date: November 19, 2010

# ARIZONA DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION <br> MPD - Aeronautics Group 

## Project Committee Recommendations

| AIRPORT: | WINSLOW-LINDBERGH REGIONAL | $\checkmark$ | New Project |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| SPONSOR: | CITY OF WINSLOW |  |  |
| CATEGORY: | Public GA | Changed Project |  |
| PROJECT NUMBER: | 1F30 |  |  |
| AIP NUMBER: | $3-04-0052-018$ |  |  |
| DATE: | October 5,2010 |  |  |


| Current Program <br> Description | Fiscal <br> Year | State Share | Sponsor Share | FAA Share | Total Amount | Priority <br> Number |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Rehabilitate Runway 4/22 (Design <br> Only) Phase I | 2011 | $\$ 3,909.00$ | $\$ 3,909.00$ | $\$ 148,542.00$ | $\$ 156,360.00$ | 54 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Revised Program <br> Description | Fiscal <br> Year | State Share | Sponsor Share | FAA Share | Total Amount | Number |

Justification For Recommendation:
Sponsor requests state matching grant for Federal AIP 3-04-0052-018-2010

| Source of Funds: | 2011 -Federal Programs (State Match) |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Original Set-Aside | Amount committed to date | Present Balance | Balance if Approved |
| $\$ 3,519,892$ | $\$ 1,140,802$ | $\$ 2,379,090$ | $\$ 2,375,181$ |

Aeronautics Project Development Committee Recommends to PPAC:

[ ] Approval [ ] Disapproval Date: November 3, 2010
State Transportation Board Action:
[ ] Approval [ ] Disapproval Date: November 19, 2010

# ARIZONA DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION <br> MPD - Aeronautics Group 

## Project Committee Recommendations

| AIRPORT: | YUMA MCAS/YUMA INTL | New Project |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| SPONSOR: | YUMA COUNTY AIRPORT AUTHORITY |  |
| CATEGORY: | Commercial Service | Changed Project |
| PROJECT NUMBER: | 1F31 |  |
| AIP NUMBER: | $3-04-0053-033$ |  |
| DATE: | October 5,2010 |  |


| Current Program <br> Description | Fiscal <br> Year | State Share | Sponsor Share | FAA Share | Total Amount | Priority <br> Number |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Rehabilitate General Aviation Apron - <br> 133,600 sy | 2011 | $\$ 57,091.00$ | $\$ 57,091.00$ | $\$ 2,169,458.00$ | $\$ 2,283,640.00$ | 130 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Revised Program <br> Description | Fiscal <br> Year | State Share | Sponsor Share | FAA Share | Total Amount | Number |

## Justification For Recommendation:

Sponsor requests a state matching grant to Federal AIP 3-04-0053-033-2010

| Source of Funds: | 2011 - Federal Programs (State Match) |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Original Set-Aside | Amount committed to date | Present Balance | Balance if Approved |
| $\$ 3,519,892$ | $\$ 1,144,711$ | $\$ 2,375,181$ | $\$ 2,318,090$ |

Aeronautics Project Development Committee Recommends to PPAC:
H [ ] Disapproval D Approval Date: October 5,2010

Priority Planning Committee Recommedds to Transportation Board:
[ ] Approval [ ] Disapproval Date: November 3, 2010
State Transportation Board Action:
[ ] Approval
[ ] Disapproval
Date: November 19, 2010

# ARIZONA DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION <br> MPD - Aeronautics Group 

## Project Committee Recommendations

| AIRPORT: | PHOENIX GOODYEAR | $\checkmark$ New Project |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| SPONSOR: | CITY OF PHOENIX | -Changed Project <br> CATEGORY: |
| Reliever |  |  |
| PROJECT NUMBER: | 1 F32 |  |
| AIP NUMBER: | $3-04-0018-016$ |  |
| DATE: | October 5,2010 |  |


| Current Program <br> Description | Fiscal <br> Year | State Share | Sponsor Share | FAA Share | Total Amount | Priority <br> Number |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Strengthen and Widen Taxiway <br> Connectors A7, A6, A5, and replace <br> A4 (Phase 1) | 2011 | $\$ 26,316.00$ | $\$ 26,316.00$ | $\$ 1,000,000.00$ | $\$ 1,052,632.00$ | 96 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Revised Program <br> Description | Fiscal <br> Year | State Share | Sponsor Share | FAA Share | Total Amount | Number |

Justification For Recommendation:
Sponsor requests a state matching grant to Federal AIP 3-04-0018-016-2010

| Source of Funds: | 2011 -Federal Programs (State Match) |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Original Set-Aside | Amount committed to date | Present Balance | Balance if Approved |
| $\$ 3,519,892$ | $\$ 1,201,802$ | $\$ 2,318,090$ | $\$ 2,291,774$ |

Aeronautics Project Development Committee Recommends to PPAC:
Hy
Aeronautics Representative: $\bar{l}+2 k y(l l k l)$
Priority Planning Committee Recommends to Transportation Board:
[ ] Approval [ ] Disapproval Date: November 3, 2010
State Transportation Board Action:
[ ] Approval [ ] Disapproval Date: November 19, 2010

# ARIZONA DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION <br> MPD - Aeronautics Group 

## Project Committee Recommendations

| AIRPORT: | PHOENIX DEER VALLEY | New Project |
| :--- | :--- | :---: | :--- |
| SPONSOR: | CITY OF PHOENIX |  |
| CATEGORY: | Reliever | Changed Project |
| PROJECT NUMBER: | 1 F33 |  |
| IP NUMBER: | $3-04-0028-026$ |  |
| DATE: | October 5,2010 |  |


| Current Program <br> Description | Fiscal <br> Year | State Share | Sponsor Share | FAA Share | Total Amount | Priority <br> Number |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Rehabilitate South and Northwest <br> Apron, Phase III, including Construct <br> Run-up Area; Install Airfield Guidance <br> Signs/Runway Incursion Caution Bars, <br> including relocating hold lines to meet <br> standards; Rehabilitate Electrical <br> Vault; Install Northwest Apron Liq | 2011 | $\$ 82,538.00$ | $\$ 82,538.00$ | $\$ 3,136,441.00$ | $\$ 3,301,517.00$ | 107 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Revised Program |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Description | Fiscal |  |  |  |  |  |


| Source of Funds: | 2011 - Federal Programs (State Match) |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Original Set-Aside | Amount committed to date | Present Balance | Balance if Approved |
| $\$ 3,519,892$ | $\$ 1,228,118$ | $\$ 2,291,774$ | $\$ 2,209,236$ |

Aeronautics Project Development Committee Recommends to PPAC:
Hola/D [Y] Approval. [ ] Disapproval Date: October 5,2010

Aeronautics Representative: y) andy Lesley

Priority Planning Committee Recommends to Transportation Board:
[ ] Approval [ ] Disapproval Date: November 3, 2010
State Transportation Board Action:
[ ] Approval [ ] Disapproval Date: November 19, 2010

# ARIZONA DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION <br> MPD - Aeronautics Group 

## Project Committee Recommendations

| AIRPORT: | PHOENIX SKY HARBOR INTL | $\checkmark$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| SPONSOR: | CITY OF PHOENIX | New Project |
| CATEGORY: | Commercial Service |  |
| PROJECT NUMBER: | 1F34 |  |
| AIP NUMBER: | $3-04-0029-069$ |  |
| DATE: | October 5,2010 |  |


| Current Program <br> Description | Fiscal <br> Year | State Share | Sponsor Share | FAA Share | Total Amount | Priority <br> Number |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Improve Runway 7R/25L Safety Area | 2011 | $\$ 1,871,489.00$ | $\$ 1,871,489.00$ | $\$ 11,228,933.00$ | $\$ 14,971,911.00$ | 125 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Revised Program <br> Description | Fiscal <br> Year | State Share | Sponsor Share | FAA Share | Total Amount | Number |

## Justification For Recommendation:

Sponsor requests a state matching grant to Federal AIP 3-04-0029-069-2010

| Source of Funds: | 2011 - Federal Programs (State Match) |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Original Set-Aside | Amount committed to date | Present Balance | Balance if Approved |
| $\$ 3,519,892$ | $\$ 1,310,656$ | $\$ 2,209,236$ | $\$ 337,747$ |

Aeronautics Project Development Committee Recommends to PPAC:


Priority Planning Committee Recommends to Transportation Board:
[ ] Approval [ ] Disapproval Date: November 3, 2010
State Transportation Board Action:
[ ] Approval [ ] Disapproval Date: November 19, 2010

# ARIZONA DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION <br> MPD - Aeronautics Group 

## Project Committee Recommendations

| AIRPORT: | BISBEE MUN | $\checkmark$ New Project |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| SPONSOR: | CITY OF BISBEE | $\square$ Changed Project |
| CATEGORY: | Public GA |  |
| PROJECT NUMBER: | 1 1F36 |  |
| IP NUMBER: | $3-04-0004-10-2010$ |  |
| DATE: | October 18, 2010 |  |



| Source of Funds: | 2011 - Federal Programs (State Match) |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Original Set-Aside | Amount committed to date | Present Balance | Balance if Approved |
| $\$ 3,527,552$ | $\$ 3,174,486$ | $\$ 353,066$ | $\$ 348,516$ |

Aeronautics Project Development Committee Recommends to PPAC:
HAt [4D [r] Approval [ ] Disapproval Date: October 5, 2010
Aeronautics Representative:


Priority Planning Committee Recommends to Transportation Board:
[ ] Approval [ ] Disapproval Date: November 3, 2010
State Transportation Board Action:
[ ] Approval [ ] Disapproval Date: November 19, 2010

## ARIZONA DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION MPD - Aeronautics Group

## Project Committee Recommendations

| AIRPORT: | RYAN FIELD | $\checkmark$ New Project |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| SPONSOR: | TUCSON AIRPORT AUTHORITY |  |
| CATEGORY: | Reliever | Changed Project |
| PROJECT NUMBER: | 1 S 35 |  |
| AIP NUMBER: |  |  |
| DATE: | October 15,2010 |  |



| Source of Funds: | 2011 - State/Local Program (State Match) |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Original Set-Aside | Amount committed to date | Present Balance | Balance if Approved |
| $\$ 3,379,568$ | $(\$ 1,379,568)$ | $\$ 4,759,135$ | $\$ 4,062,505$ |

Aeronautics Project Development Committee Recommends to PPAC:


Priority Planning Committee Recommends to Transportation Board:
[ ] Approval
[ ] Disapproval
Date: November 3, 2010

## State Transportation Board Action:

[ ] Approval
[ ] Disapproval
Date: November 19, 2010
Transportation Enhancement Review Committee
Round 18: 2010 Evaluations Not Recommended

| TERC <br> Ranking | App \# | Sponsoring Agency | Project Name | Federal Funds <br> Requested | Total Project Cost |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| LOCAL APPLICATIONS |  |  |  |  |  |


| 1 | MAG - 3L | Gilbert | Pedestrian-Bicycle Mid-block Crossings Project | \$ | 750,000.00 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2 | PAG - 6L | Tucson | Treat Avenue Bicycle Boulevard | \$ | 749,685.00 |
| 3 | WACOG - 1 L | Quartzsite | Hi Jolly Way Finding Signage \& West Main Street Beautification | \$ | 598,205.00 |
| 4 | SEAGO - 6L | Sierra Vista | West End Connector SUP | \$ | 607,203.00 |
| 5 | NACOG - 2 L | Page | Haul Road Sidewalk | \$ | 689,805.00 |
| 6 | CAAG - 13 L | Queen Creek | South Ellsworth Rd Shared Use Path from Cloud Rd to Hunt Hwy | \$ | 731,933.00 |
| 7 | PAG - 8L | Tucson Parks and Recreation | Arcadia Multi-use Path: 5th St to Speedway Blvd | \$ | 749,084.00 |
| 8 | FMPO-2L | Coconino County | Kona Trail Sidewalk Extension | \$ | 576,587.00 |
| 9 | PAG - 7L | Tucson | 9th Street Bicycle Boulevard | \$ | 749,968.00 |
| 10 | MAG -7L | Litchfield Park | MUP \& Median Refuge on Litchfield Rd North of Bird Lane | \$ | 231,854.00 |
| 11 | CAAG - 2 L | Apache Junction | State Route 88 (MP195.6) and Old West Highway | \$ | 390,956.00 |
| 12 | CAAG - 6L | Gila County | Pine-Strawberry Satety Rest Stops for Pedestrians/Bicyclists | \$ | 478,010.00 |
| 13 | CAAG -8L | Globe | Globe Railroad Corridor Enhancement | \$ | 351,486.00 |
| 14 | CAAG -11L | Payson | Green Valley Park Pedestrian Lighting | \$ | 337,919.00 |
| 15 | CAAG - 3L | Casa Grande | Peart to Trekell Road Community Trail | \$ | 750,000.00 |
| 16 | SEAGO-7L | Cliton | San Francisco River Shared Use Path | \$ | 218,735.00 |
| 17 | MAG -6L | Glendale | Ball Park Boulevard Connection | \$ | 527,661.00 |
| 18 | WACOG - 3L | Lake Havasu City | Landscaping Enhancements: City Owned Planter Strips Along Sr-95: Phase II | \$ | 463,326.00 |
| 19 | CAAG - 5L | Coolidge | Coolidge Avenue-Arizona Blvd to 1st Street Streetscape Improvements | \$ | 669,726.00 |
| 0 | NACOG 7 LL | Holbrook | West Hopi Drive Downtown Enhancements | \$ | 729,882.00 |
| 21 | PAG - 10L | Tucson-Parks and Recreation | Arcadia Multi-use Path: Golf Links Rd Sahuara Ave Signalized Bike/Ped Crossing | \$ | 488,215.00 |
| 22 | PAG - 11L | Pima County / Sahuarita | Duval Mine Road Bicycle Safety Enhancements | \$ | 750,000.00 |
| 23 | CAAG.1L | Apache Junction | North Apache Trail: From Apache Trail to Idaho | \$ | 711,697.00 |
| 24 | MAG - 5L | Tolleson | Van Buren Street Mult-use Path | \$ | 714,912.00 |
| 25 | CYMPO -4L | Dewey-Humboldt | Dewey-Humboldt Huron St. to Hecla St. Main St. \& Prescott St. Sidewalk | \$ | 748,318.00 |
| 26 | NACOG -8L | Winslow | Renaissance on Route 66 - Phase VI | \$ | 750,000.00 |
| 27 | CAAG -12L | Pinal County | Ironwood Grantzel Median Improvement Project | \$ | 368,183.00 |
| 28 | CYMPO-2L | Prescott Valley | Pipeline Multi-Use Path Phase $4 B$ | \$ | 311,096.00 |
| 29 | NACOG 4L | Pinetop-Lakeside | Porter Mountain Road Multi-use Pathway | \$ | 448,585.00 |
| 30 | MAG - 4L | Maricopa County | New River Road Bicycle Lanes | \$ | 459,610.00 |
| 31 | PAG - 13L | Oro Valley | Oro Valley - Lambert Lane Bicycle Lane Project | \$ | 647,447.00 |



[^1]
## STATE ENGINEER'S REPORT

## October 2010

The Status of Projects Under Construction report for October 2010 shows 163 projects under construction valued at $\$ 1,121,540,090.06$. The transportation board awarded 6 projects during October valued at approximately $\$ 91.8$ million.

During October the Department finalized 8 projects valued at $\$ 111,363,933.74$. Projects where the final cost exceeded the contractors bid amount by more than $5 \%$ are detailed in your board package.

Year to date we have finalized 38 projects. The total cost of these 38 projects has exceeded the contractors bid amount by $8.0 \%$. Deducting incentive/bonus payments, revisions, omissions and additional work paid for by others, fiscal year to date reduces this percentage to $5.4 \%$.

# MONTHLY CONSTRUCTION REPORT 

## Oct-10

PROJECTS UNDER CONSTRUCTION ..... 163
MONETARY VALUE OF CONTRACTS ..... \$1,121,540,090.06
PAYMENTS MADE TO DATE ..... \$875,507,462.09
INTERSTATE ..... 43
PRIMARY ..... 74
LOCAL GOVERNMENT ..... 39
NON-FEDERAL AID ..... 7
OTHER ..... 0
CONTRACTS EXECUTED IN OCTOBER 2010 ..... 8
MONETARY AMOUNT OF CONTRACTS EXECUTED ..... $\$ 92,608,817.35$
FIELD REPORTS SECTIONEXT. 7301

## Arizona Department of Transportation

Field Reports Section
Completed Contracts Fiscal Year 2011
October, 2010


## Arizona Department of Transportation

 Field Reports SictionCompleted Contracts Fiscal Ye Completed Contracts Fiscal Year 2011 State Estimate Contractor
Bid Amount

| Project Number | Location District | State Estimate | Contractor | Bid Amount | Final Cost | Monetary | Percent |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 264-A-NFA | POLACCA |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| H64940IC | Holbrook District |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | 1,283,315.00 | COMBS CONSTRUCTION COMPANY, INC. | $\begin{gathered} \text { Low Bid }= \\ \$ 1,114,764.9 \end{gathered}$ | ( $\$ 168,550.05$ ) or $13.13 \%$ under State Estimate \$911,207.88 | (\$203,557.07) | -18.3\% |
| ARRA-010F(201)A H68220IC | I-10; EAST BENSON INTERCHANGE Safford District |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | 7,316,166.00 | FNF CONSTRUCTION, INC. | $\begin{gathered} \text { Low Bid }= \\ \$ 5,541,928.17 \end{gathered}$ | $(\$ 1,774,237.83)$ or $24.25 \%$ under State Estimate $\$ 5,794,712.11$ | \$252,783.94 | 4.6\% |
| ARRA-GLN0(214)A SS77401C | VARIOUS LOCATIONS IN Phoenix District |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | 224,671.40 | PAVEMENT MARKING, INC. | Low Bid = \$186,702.96 | ( $\$ 37,968.44$ ) or $16.90 \%$ under State Estimate $\$ 174,631.33$ | (\$12,071.63) | -6.5 \% |
| ARRA-SUPO(200)A <br> SS74901C | MAIN STREET, US 60 TO HIGH SCH <br> Globe District |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Working Days: $23=20$ Days Used: 23 | $+3$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| \% |  | 377,640.00 | J. BANICKI CONSTRUCTION, INC. | Low Bid = <br> $\$ 335,868.50$ | ( $\$ 41,771.50$ ) or $11.06 \%$ under State Estimate $\$ 341,680.38$ | \$5,811.88 | 1.7\% |




| No. of Contracts | Accumulative <br> State Estimate | Bid Amount | Final Cost | Monetary | Percent |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 36 | $\$ 379,812,271.95$ | $\$ 369,775,615.69$ | $\$ 399,516,300.36$ | $\$ 29,740,684.67$ | $8 . \%$ |





## CONTRACTS

Federal-Aid ("A" "B") projects do not need FHWA concurrence, but must comply with DBE regulations; other projects are subject to FHWA and/or local government concurrence and compliance with DBE regulations)

| *ITEM 11a: | BIDS OPENED: | October 22 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
|  | HIGHWAY: | TOWN OF FOUNTAIN HILLS |
|  | SECTION: | Fountain Hills Boulevard - Fayette Drive to Middle School |
|  | COUNTY: | Maricopa |
|  | ROUTE NO.: | N/A |
|  | PROJECT: | CM-FTH-0(202)A 0000 MA FTH SS66001C |
|  | FUNDING: | $100 \%$ Federal |
|  | LOW BIDDER: | Visus Engineering Construction, Inc. |
|  | AMOUNT: | $\$$ |
|  | STATE AMOUNT: | $\$$ |
|  | \$ UNDER: | $\$$ |
|  | \% UNDER: | $18.6 \%, 000.00$ |
|  | NO. BIDDERS: | 12 |
|  | RECOMMENDATION: | AWARD |



## CONTRACTS

*ITEM 11b:
BIDS OPENED:
HIGHWAY:
SECTION:
COUNTY:
ROUTE NO.:
PROJECT:
FUNDING:
LOW BIDDER:
October 8
PAGE 196
CITY OF GLENDALE
Skunk Creek at Bell Road
Maricopa
N/A
CM-GLN-0(206)A 0000 MA GLN SS69001C
100\% Federal
Intermountain West Civil Constructors, Inc.
AMOUNT:
\$ 218,293.24
STATE AMOUNT:
\$ 183,063.00
\$ OVER:
\$
35,230.24
\% OVER:
19.2\%

NO. BIDDERS:
14
RECOMMENDATION:
AWARD

Printed: 11/09/2010

## ARIZONA DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION <br> INTERMODAL TRANSPORTATION DIVISION <br> NOI

## BID RESULTS


Page 2 of 2
Apparent Low Bidder is 0.4\% Over Department Estimate (Difference = \$19,905.00)
Printed: 11/09/2010

# ARIZONA DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION 

## ADVERTISEMENT FOR BIDS

BID OPENING: FRIDAY, OCTOBER 22, 2010, AT 11:00 A.M. (M.S.T.)

| TRACS NO | 010 PM 262 H765801C |
| :--- | :--- |
| PROJ NO | ARRA-O10-E(206)A |
| TERMINI | TUCSON - BENSON HWY (I-10) |
| LOCATION | Kino Parkway to Valencia Road |


| ROUTE NO. | MILEPOST | DISTRICT | ITEM NO. |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| I-10 | 262.40 to 267.57 | Tucson | 26010 |

The amount programmed for this contract is $\$ 7,000,000$. The location and description of the proposed work and the representative items and approximate quantities are as follows:

The proposed work is located in Pima County, within the City of Tucson on I-10, extending from Kino Parkway to Valencia Road. The work begins at approximate MP 262.40 and extends southeasterly for a distance of approximately 5.17 miles to MP 267.57. The project is pavement preservation that consists of milling and paving on mainline, ramps and crossroads, PCCP slab and spall repair, crack sealing, dense graded AC and asphalt rubber friction course, shoulder build up and compaction, safety upgrades, pavement markings, and other miscellaneous work.

## REPRESENTATIVE ITEMS

Remove Bituminous Pvmt. (Milling)(Var. Depths)
Seal Edge of PCCP (Joints)
Repair PCCP (Spalled Areas)
PCCP Slab Repair
Bituminous Materials
Asphaltic Concrete Friction Course (Asph. Rubber)
Asphalt Rubber Material (For AR-ACFC)
Asphaltic Concrete (1/2" Mix)(E.P.)(Spec. Mix)
Pavement Marking (Thermo)(Extruded 0.90")
Guard Rail Terminal (Tangent Type)
Provide-on-the-Job Training
Contractor Quality Control

UNIT QUANTITY
SQ.YD. 431,297
L.FT. 135,850

SQ.FT. 750
SQ.YD. 2,525
TON 962
TON 17,557
TON 1,580
TON 15,473
L.FT. 582,230

EACH 45
HOUR 500
L.SUM

The time allowed for the completion of the work included in this project will be $\mathbf{2 0 0}$ calendar days.

The Arizona Department of Transportation hereby notifies all bidders that pursuant to this advertisement for bids, Disadvantaged Business Enterprises will be afforded full opportunity to submit bids in response to this solicitation and will not be discriminated against on the grounds of race, color, sex, or national origin in consideration for an award.

Project plans, special provisions, and proposal pamphlets may be purchased from Contracts and Specifications Section, 1651 W. Jackson, Room 121F, Phoenix, AZ 85007-3217, (602) 7127221. Plans and bidding documents should be available for sale to bidders within one week following the advertisement for bids. The cost is $\$ \mathbf{2 7}$, payable at time of order by cash, check or money order. Please indicate whether a bid proposal package or a subcontractor/supplier set is desired. An additional fee of $\$ \mathbf{5}$ will be charged for each set of Special Provisions requested which is not accompanied by the purchase of a related set of project plans. Checks should be made payable to the Arizona Department of Transportation. No refund will be made for plans and specifications returned. We cannot guarantee mail delivery.

This project is eligible for electronic bidding.
No contracting firm will be issued a proposal pamphlet until it has become prequalified. The Application for Contractor Prequalification shall be filed at least 15 calendar days prior to the bid opening date. The Application may be obtained from Contracts and Specifications Section.

No award will be made to any contractor who is not a duly licensed contractor in accordance with Arizona Revised Statutes 32-1101 through 32-1170.03.

All labor employed on this project shall be paid in accordance with the minimum wage rates shown in the General Wage Decision. These rates have been determined in accordance with the requirements of the law and issued by the Secretary of Labor for this project. The wage scale is on file in Contracts and Specifications Section and copies may be obtained at all reasonable times.

A proposal guaranty in the form of either a certified or a cashier's check made payable to the State Treasurer of Arizona for not less than ten percent of the amount of the bid or in the form of a surety (bid) bond for ten percent of the amount of the bid shall accompany the proposal.

Surety (bid) bonds will be accepted only on the form provided by the Department and only from corporate sureties authorized to do business in Arizona.

Proposal pamphlets shall be submitted only in the envelope provided by the Department to:

```
Arizona Department of Transportation
Intermodal Transportation Division
Contracts and Specifications Section
1651 West Jackson Street, Room 121F
Phoenix, Arizona 85007-3217
```

Sealed bids will be received until the hour indicated and then publicly opened and read. No bids will be received after the time specified.

Engineering Specialist: Jim Skonhovd (602) 712-6879
Construction Supervisor:
Jay Gomes
(520) 209-4552

BARRY CROCKETT,
Engineer-Manager
Contracts \& Specifications Section

```
010 PM 262 H765801C
ARRA-010-E(206)A
09/15/2010
JGS:jgs:U:WORD:PROJECTS:H765801C:H7658ADV
```

Printed: 11/09/2010

## ARIZONA DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION <br> INTERMODAL TRANSPORTATION DIVISION <br> CONTRACTS AND SPECIFICATIONS SECTION

## BID RESULTS


Page 2 of 2
age 2 or

| Rank | Bid Amount | Contractor Name | Address of Contractor |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 7 | \$10,879,047.40 | LEDCOR CMI INC. | 2538 E. UNIVERSITY DR., STE. 100 PHOENIX, AZ 85034 |
| 8 | \$10,978,670.15 | ACHEN-GARDNER CONSTRUCTION, LLC | 550 S. 79TH STREET CHANDLER, AZ 85226 |
| 9 | \$11,073,900.00 | MARKHAM CONTRACTING CO., INC. | 22820 NORTH 19TH AVENUE PHOENIX, AZ 85027 |
| 10 | \$11,296,936.85 | NESBITT CONTRACTING CO., Inc. | 100 SOUTH PRICE ROAD TEMPE, AZ 85281 |
| 11 | \$12,172,382.29 | J. BANICKI CONSTRUCTION, INC. | 6423 S. ASH AVENUE TEMPE, AZ 85283 |
| 12 | \$12,598,057.54 | ASPHALT PAVING \& SUPPLY, INC. | 2425 NORTH GLASSFORD HILL RD PRESCOTT VALLEY, AZ 86314 |
| 13 | \$13,432,065.05 | BISON CONTRACTING CO., INC. | 2449 EAST CHAMBERS STREET PHOENIX, AZ 85040 |

Apparent Low Bidder is 4.2\% Under Department Estimate (Difference $=(\$ 437,317.65)$ )
Printed: 11/09/2010

## ARIZONA DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

## ADVERTISEMENT FOR BIDS

BID OPENING: FRIDAY, OCTOBER 29, 2010, AT 11:00 A.M. (M.S.T.)

| TRACS NO | 017 CN 322 H6301 01C |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :---: | :---: |
| PROJ NO | IM-017-B(210)A |  |  |
| TERMINI | CORDES JCT. - FLAGSTAFF HIGHWAY, I-17 |  |  |
| LOCATION | MUNDS PARK T.I. |  |  |
| ROUTE NO. | MILEPOST | DISTRICT | ITEM NO. |
| I-17 | 322.17 to 323.22 | FLAGSTAFF | 15211 |

The amount programmed for this contract is $\$ 16,000,000$. The location and description of the proposed work and the representative items and approximate quantities are as follows:

The proposed traffic interchange work is located in Coconino County on Interstate 17 from milepost 322.17 to 323.22 . The work consists of raising the roadway profile, reconstructing two single span bridges, extending a box culvert, removing and reinstalling guard rail, milling the existing pavement and replacing it with Asphaltic Concrete End Product (Special Mix), reconstructing Pinewood Boulevard, improving drainage, reconstructing lighting systems, installing rock containment system, removing and reinstalling water line, placing pavement marking, and performing other related work.

| REPRESENTATIVE ITEMS | UNIT | QUANTITY |
| :--- | ---: | ---: |
| Remove Bridge | L.SUM | 1 |
| Removal of Asphaltic Concrete Pavement | SQ.YD. | 40,809 |
| Removal of Portland Cement Concrete | SQ.YD. | 4,550 |
| Remove Guard Rail | L.FT. | 3,657 |
| Remove Bituminous Pavement (Milling) | SQ.YD. | 35,829 |
| Roadway Excavation | CU.YD. | 81,494 |
| Aggregate Base, Class 2 | CU.YD. | 28,162 |
| Joint and Crack Repair | L.FT. | 20,000 |
| Asphalt Binder | TON | 1,544 |
| Asphaltic Concrete Friction Course | TON | 3,922 |
| Asphaltic Concrete (3/4" Mix)(EP)(Sp. Mix) | TON | 24,461 |
| Structural Concrete (Class S)(f'c = 3,500) | CU.YD. | 512 |
| Structural Concrete (Class S)(f'c = 4,500) | CU.YD. | 276 |
| F-Shape Bridge Concrete Barrier and Transition (32") | L.FT. | 500 |
| Approach Slab (SD 2.01) | SQ.FT. | 3,900 |
| Precast, P/S Member (Box Beam Type BIV-48) | L.FT. | 2,760 |
| Reinforcing Steel | LB. | 175,695 |
| Storm Drain Pipe | L.FT. | 2,576 |
| Dual Component Pavement Marking (Epoxy) | L.FT. | 91,300 |
| Pole (Type G) (Standard Base) | EACH. | 37 |
| Conductor | L.FT. | 57,550 |
| Seeding (Class II) | ACRE | 41 |
| Water Line | L.FT. | 1,060 |
| Concrete Sidewalk (C-05.20) | SQ.FT. | 10,517 |
| Guard Rail, W-Beam, Single Face | L.FT. | 4,463 |
| Wire Mesh Rockfall Protection | SQ.FT. | 72,248 |
| Contractor Quality Control | 1 |  |
| Construction Surveying and Layout | L.SUM | 1 |

The time allowed for the completion of the work included in this project will be 365 working days.

The Arizona Department of Transportation hereby notifies all bidders that pursuant to this advertisement for bids, Disadvantaged Business Enterprises will be afforded full opportunity to submit bids in response to this solicitation and will not be discriminated against on the grounds of race, color, sex, or national origin in consideration for an award.

Project plans, special provisions, and proposal pamphlets may be purchased from Contracts and Specifications Section, 1651 W. Jackson, Room 121F, Phoenix, AZ 85007-3217, (602) 7127221. Plans and bidding documents should be available for sale to bidders within one week following the advertisement for bids. The cost is $\$ 130$, payable at time of order by cash, check or money order. Please indicate whether a bid proposal package or a subcontractor/supplier set is desired. An additional fee of $\$ 5$ will be charged for each set of Special Provisions requested which is not accompanied by the purchase of a related set of project plans. Checks should be made payable to the Arizona Department of Transportation. No refund will be made for plans and specifications returned. We cannot guarantee mail delivery.

This project is eligible for electronic bidding.
Cross sections and/or earthwork quantity sheets may be ordered from the Control Desk of Roadway Design Section at (602) 712-8667. Orders must be placed at least five days prior to bid opening to insure availability. Documents may be picked up and paid for at Contracts \& Specifications Section.

One CD containing the geotechnical investigation report is available for sale at Contracts and Specifications. The cost of each CD is $\$ 5.00$, payable at time of order by cash, check or money order.

No contracting firm will be issued a proposal pamphlet until it has become prequalified. The Application for Contractor Prequalification shall be filed at least 15 calendar days prior to the bid opening date. The Application may be obtained from Contracts and Specifications Section.

No award will be made to any contractor who is not a duly licensed contractor in accordance with Arizona Revised Statutes 32-1101 through 32-1170.03.

All labor employed on this project shall be paid in accordance with the minimum wage rates shown in the General Wage Decision. These rates have been determined in accordance with the requirements of the law and issued by the Secretary of Labor for this project. The wage scale is on file in Contracts and Specifications Section and copies may be obtained at all reasonable times.

A proposal guaranty in the form of either a certified or a cashier's check made payable to the State Treasurer of Arizona for not less than ten percent of the amount of the bid or in the form of a surety (bid) bond for ten percent of the amount of the bid shall accompany the proposal.

Surety (bid) bonds will be accepted only on the form provided by the Department and only from corporate sureties authorized to do business in Arizona.

# Arizona Department of Transportation Intermodal Transportation Division Contracts and Specifications Section 1651 West Jackson Street, Room 121F Phoenix, Arizona 85007-3217 

Sealed bids will be received until the hour indicated and then publicly opened and read. No bids will be received after the time specified.

| Engineering Specialist: | Mohammed Salahuddin |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Construction Supervisor: | Astrid Potter | (602) 712-8260 |
|  | (928) 714-2225 |  |

BARRY CROCKETT,
Engineer-Manager
Contracts \& Specifications Section

Page 2 of 2
$\begin{array}{ll}\text { INTERMOUNTAIN WEST CIVIL CONSTRUCTORS, } & \text { P.O. BOX } 2790 \text { PAYSON, AZ } 85547 \\ \text { INC. } \\ \text { KNOCHEL BROTHERS, INC. } & 1441 \text { E. ALAMEDA PHOENIX, AZ } 85024 \\ \text { Apparent Low Bidder is 1.6\% Over Department Estimate (Difference = \$10,400.00) }\end{array}$
Printed: 11/09/2010
Rank $\quad$ Bid Amount
$\begin{array}{ll}8 & \$ 909,916.20 \\ 9 & \$ 983,384.00\end{array}$


# ARIZONA DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION 

## ADVERTISEMENT FOR BIDS

BID OPENING: FRIDAY, OCTOBER 8, 2010, AT 11:00 A.M. (M.S.T.)

| TRACS NO | 0000 MA GLN SH43101C |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| PROJ NO | HES-GLN-0(030)A |  |  |
| TERMINI | CITY OF GLENDALE |  |  |
| LOCATION | (51 ${ }^{\text {st }}$ Avenue \& Northern) |  |  |
|  |  | ITEM NO. |  |
| ROUTE NO. | MILEPOST | DISTRICT | LOCAL |
| N/A | N/A | PHOENIX |  |

The amount programmed for this contract is $\$ 825,000$. The location and description of the proposed work and the representative items and approximate quantities are as follows:

The proposed work is located in Maricopa County, at the intersection of 51 Avenue with Northern Avenue, within the City of Glendale. The work consists of adding turn lanes and bus pull-outs to the existing intersection roadways and will involve drainage, paving, signals, traffic markings and landscaping.

| REPRESENTATIVE ITEMS | UNIT | QUANTITY |
| :--- | ---: | ---: |
| Grading Roadway for Pavement | S Y | 4,210 |
| Portland Cement Concrete Pavement for Bus Bay | S Y | 188 |
| Asphaltic Concrete | Ton | 730 |
| Foundation for Sign Post | Each | 25 |
| Signal Poles | Each | 4 |
| Loop Detectors, Various | Each | 18 |
| Tree, 24" Box | Each | 15 |
| Concrete Curb and Curb and Gutter | LF | 3,370 |

The time allowed for the completion of the work included in the Construction Phase of the contract will be $\mathbf{1 2 0}$ calendar days.

The time allowed for the completion of the work included in the Landscape Establishment Phase of the contract will be 365 calendar days.

The Arizona Department of Transportation hereby notifies all bidders that pursuant to this advertisement for bids, Disadvantaged Business Enterprises will be afforded full opportunity to submit bids in response to this solicitation and will not be discriminated against on the grounds of race, color, sex, or national origin in consideration for an award.

Project plans, special provisions, and proposal pamphlets may be purchased from Contracts and Specifications Section, 1651 W. Jackson, Room 121F, Phoenix, AZ 85007-3217, (602) 712-7221. Plans and bidding documents should be available for sale to bidders within one week following the advertisement for bids. The cost is $\mathbf{\$ 4 2}$, payable at time of order by cash, check or money order. Please indicate whether a bid proposal package or a subcontractor/supplier set is desired. An additional fee of \$5.00 will be charged for each set of Special Provisions requested which is not apgemanied
by the purchase of a related set of project plans. Checks should be made payable to the Arizona Department of Transportation. No refund will be made for plans and specifications returned. We cannot guarantee mail delivery.

This project is eligible for electronic bidding.
No contracting firm will be issued a proposal pamphlet until it has become prequalified. The Application for Contractor Prequalification shall be filed at least 15 calendar days prior to the bid opening date. The Application may be obtained from Contracts and Specifications Section.

No award will be made to any contractor who is not a duly licensed contractor in accordance with Arizona Revised Statutes 32-1101 through 32-1170.03.

All labor employed on this project shall be paid in accordance with the minimum wage rates shown in the General Wage Decision. These rates have been determined in accordance with the requirements of the law and issued by the Secretary of Labor for this project. The wage scale is on file in Contracts and Specifications Section and copies may be obtained at all reasonable times.

A proposal guaranty in the form of either a certified or a cashier's check made payable to the State Treasurer of Arizona for not less than ten percent of the amount of the bid or in the form of a surety (bid) bond for ten percent of the amount of the bid shall accompany the proposal.

Surety (bid) bonds will be accepted only on the form provided by the Department and only from corporate sureties authorized to do business in Arizona.

Proposal pamphlets shall be submitted only in the envelope provided by the Department to:

> Arizona Department of Transportation
> Intermodal Transportation Division
> Contracts and Specifications Section
> 1651 West Jackson Street, Room 121F
> Phoenix, Arizona $85007-3217$

Sealed bids will be received until the hour indicated and then publicly opened and read. No bids will be received after the time specified.

| Engineering Specialist: | Richard Murphy | (602) 712-8267 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Construction Supervisor: | Madhu Reddy | (602) 712-8965 |

BARRY CROCKETT,<br>Engineer-Manager<br>Contracts \& Specifications Section

0000 MA GLN SH43101C
HES-GLN-0(030)A
RIM:rm:u/word:431BidAd.doc
Printed: 11/09/2010

## ARIZONA DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION INTERMODAL TRANSPORTATION DIVISION CONTRACTS AND SPECIFICATIONS SECTION <br> ARIZONA DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION INTERMODAL TRANSPORTATION DIVISION CONTRACTS AND SPECIFICATIONS SECTION <br> ARIZONA DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION INTERMODAL TRANSPORTATION DIVISION CONTRACTS AND SPECIFICATIONS SECTION <br> -

BID RESULTS
Page 1 of 2
Printed: $11 / 09 / 2010$
Completion Date:
120 Working Days
related works.

The proposed work is located in Pinal County, within the City of Apache Junction, on Ironwood Drive, immediately north of the 16 th avenue traffic interchange and extends列

> Bid Opening Date : 10/29/2010, Prequalification Required, Engineer Specialist : Patwary Mohammed

|  | Project No. | Highway Termini | Location | Item |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 0000 PN APJ SS92701C ARRA-APJO(203)A |  | CITY OF APACHE JUNCTION | IRONWOOD DRIVE 16TH AVE TO BRO Phoenix District | LOCAL |
| Rank | Bid Amount | Contractor Name | Address of Contractor |  |

$$
\text { P.O. BOX } 10789 \text { GLENDALE, AZ } 85318
$$

$$
\text { P.O. BOX } 2790 \text { PAYSON, AZ } 85547
$$

100 SOUTH PRICE ROAD TEMPE, AZ 85281
5959 N 55th AVE GLENDALE, AZ 85301
3749 E. SUPERIOR AVE. PHOENIX, AZ 85040
 IES, LLC
COMBS CONSTRUCTION COMPANY, INC.
INTERMOUNTAIN WEST CIVIL CONSTRUCTORS,
INC. INC.
NESBITT CONTRACTING CO., INC.
COMPAN

CACTUS TRANSPORT, INC.
RICOR, INC.
CACTUS TRA

## DEPARTMENT

\$945,520.00
$\$ 966,574.05$
\$972,398.55
\$984,430.05
\$1,029,805.95
\$1,084,946.00

Rank
$\tau$
~
3
4
Page 2 of 2

027
85233
22820 NORTH 19TH AVENUE PHOENIX, AZ 85
1327 WEST SAN PEDRO STREET GILBERT, AZ 85233
1831 NORTH ROCHESTER MESA, AZ 85205
222 S 52ND STREET TEMPE, AZ 85281

810 E WESTERN AVE AVONDALE, AZ 85323
4750 N. LA CHOLLA BLVD. TUCSON, AZ 85705
550 S. 79TH STREET CHANDLER, AZ 85226
P.O. BOX 11081 CASA GRANDE, AZ 85130
Apparent Low Bidder is 2.2\% Over Department Estimate (Difference = \$21,054.05)
Printed: 11/09/2010

| Rank | Bid Amount |
| :---: | :---: |
| 7 | $\$ 1,091,378.00$ |
| 8 | $\$ 1,109,000.00$ |
| 9 | $\$ 1,127,000.00$ |
| 10 | $\$ 1,149,946.78$ |
| 11 | $\$ 1,155,909.55$ |
| 12 | $\$ 1,241,719.40$ |
| 13 | $\$ 1,247,493.25$ |
| 14 | $\$ 1,280,045.00$ |
| 15 | $\$ 1,367,995.09$ |

# ARIZONA DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION 

ADVERTISEMENT FOR BIDS
BID OPENING: FRIDAY, OCTOBER 29, 2010, AT 11:00 A.M. (M.S.T.)

| TRACS NO | 0000 PN APJ SS92701C |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| PROJ NO | ARRA-APJ-0(203)A |  |  |
| TERMINI | CITY OF APACHE JUNCTION |  |  |
| LOCATION | IRONWOOD DRIVE, 16TH AVE. TO BROADWAY AVE. |  |  |
|  |  |  | ITEM NO. |
| ROUTE NO. | MILEPOST | DISTRICT | LOCAL |

The amount programmed for this contract is $\$ 1,467,000$. The location and description of the proposed work and the representative items and approximate quantities are as follows:

The proposed work is located in Pinal County, within the City of Apache Junction, on Ironwood Drive, immediately north of the 16th avenue traffic interchange and extends northerly approximately 0.50 mile to Broadway Avenue. The proposed work consists of removing and reconstructing existing roadway pavement. Additional work includes construction of an extended storm drain system, reconstruction of sidewalk, sidewalk ramps, curb and gutter, traffic signal improvements, pedestrian improvements and other related works.

| REPRESENTATIVE ITEMS | UNIT | QUANTITY |
| :--- | ---: | ---: |
| Grading Roadway for Pavement | Sq. Yd. | 17,000 |
| Aggregate Base, Class 2 | Cu. Yd. | 3,300 |
| Asphaltic Concrete (3/4" Mix) | Ton | 5,600 |
| Reinforced Concrete Pipe (Various Sizes) | L. Ft. | 1,150 |
| Pavement Marking (Thermoplastic) | L. Ft. | 8,600 |
| Conductors | L. Ft. | 3,500 |
| Loop Detector for Traffic Signal (Various Sizes) | Each | 10 |
| Reset Frame and Cover for Manhole and Valve box | Each | 22 |
| Concrete Curb and Gutter | L. Ft. | 1,480 |
| Concrete Sidewalk | Sq. Ft. | 10,570 |
| Concrete Driveway | Sq. Ft. | 8,300 |
| Contractor Quality Control | L. Sum | 1 |
| Construction Surveying and Layout | L. Sum | 1 |

The time allowed for the completion of the work included in this project will be 120 working days.

The Arizona Department of Transportation hereby notifies all bidders that pursuant to this advertisement for bids, Disadvantaged Business Enterprises will be afforded full opportunity to submit bids in response to this solicitation and will not be discriminated against on the grounds of race, color, sex, or national origin in consideration for an award.

Project plans, special provisions, and proposal pamphlets may be purchased from Contracts and Specifications Section, 1651 W. Jackson, Room 121F, Phoenix, AZ 85007-3217, (602) 712-7221. Plans and bidding documents should be available for sale to bidders within one week following the advertisement for bids. The cost is $\$ 25.00$, payable at time of order by cash, check or money order. Please indicate whether a bid proposal package or a subcontractor/supplier set is desired. An additional fee of $\$ 5.00$ will be charged for each set
of Special Provisions requested which is not accompanied by the purchase of a related set of project plans. Checks should be made payable to the Arizona Department of Transportation. No refund will be made for plans and specifications returned. We cannot guarantee mail delivery.

This project is eligible for electronic bidding.
No contracting firm will be issued a proposal pamphlet until it has become prequalified. The Application for Contractor Prequalification shall be filed at least 15 calendar days prior to the bid opening date. The Application may be obtained from Contracts and Specifications Section.

No award will be made to any contractor who is not a duly licensed contractor in accordance with Arizona Revised Statutes 32-1101 through 32-1170.03.

All labor employed on this project shall be paid in accordance with the minimum wage rates shown in the General Wage Decision. These rates have been determined in accordance with the requirements of the law and issued by the Secretary of Labor for this project. The wage scale is on file in Contracts and Specifications Section and copies may be obtained at all reasonable times.

A proposal guaranty in the form of either a certified or a cashier's check made payable to the State Treasurer of Arizona for not less than ten percent of the amount of the bid or in the form of a surety (bid) bond for ten percent of the amount of the bid shall accompany the proposal.

Surety (bid) bonds will be accepted only on the form provided by the Department and only from corporate sureties authorized to do business in Arizona.

Proposal pamphlets shall be submitted only in the envelope provided by the Department to:

> Arizona Department of Transportation
> Intermodal Transportation Division
> Contracts and Specifications Section
> 1651 West Jackson Street, Room 121F
> Phoenix, Arizona $85007-3217$

Sealed bids will be received until the hour indicated and then publicly opened and read. No bids will be received after the time specified.

| Engineering Specialist: | Mohammed Patwary |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Construction Supervisor: | Julie E. Kliewer | (602) 712-8187 $712-8965$ |

BARRY CROCKETT,
Engineer-Manager
Contracts \& Specifications Section
Printed: 11/09/2010

## ARIZONA DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION <br> INTERMODAL TRANSPORTATION DIVISION <br> CONTRACTS AND SPECIFICATIONS SECTION

## BID RESULTS

The proposed work for Project 093 MO 113 H743801C is located in Mohave County on US 93, approximately 10 miles north of Wikieup. The project includes constructing a two-lane southbound roadway between milepost 113.00 and milepost 116.30 . The work consists of grading, paving, installing pipe culverts, extending concrete box culverts, constructing new AASHTO Type 4 girder concrete bridges, installing guardrail and guardrail end terminals, placing pavement markings, signing, seeding, and other miscellaneous work.
The proposed work for Project 093 MO 109 H743901C is located in Mohave County on US 93, approximately 13 miles north of Wikieup. The project includes constructing a wo-lane southbound roadway between milepost 109.13 and milepost 113.00. The work consists of grading, paving, installing pipe culverts, extending concrete box culverts, constructing new AASHTO Type 6 modified girder concrete bridges, installing guardrail and guardrail end terminals, placing pavement markings, signing, seeding, and other miscellaneous work.
Completion Date: 425 Working Days
Bid Opening Date : 10/08/2010, Prequalification Required, Engineer Specialist : Hossain Iqbal


[^2]PO BOX 4356 PRESCOTT, AZ 86302
 R.E.MONKS CONSTRUCTION COMPANY, LLC
DEPARTMENT
AMES CONSTRUCTION, INC.
FANN CONTRACTING, INC
8333 E. HARTFORD DRIVE SCOTTSDALE, AZ 85255
FNF CONSTRUCTION, INC.
DEPARTMENT
093 MO 113 H743801C 093-B-(202)N
093 MO 109 H743901C 093-B-(203)N
\$25,936,716.65
\$26,555,589.00
\$27,081,110.22
\$27,567,730.00

Rank
2
Page 2 of 2
Page 2 of 2

| Rank | Bid Amount | Contractor Name | Address of Contractor |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 5 | \$28,332,504.05 | MARKHAM CONTRACTING CO., INC. | 22820 NORTH 19TH AVENUE PHOENIX, AZ 85027 |
| 6 | \$30,056,981.20 | MEADOW VALLEY CONTRACTORS, INC. | 4602 E. THOMAS RD. PHOENIX, AZ 85018 |
| 7 | \$30,099,422.00 | ROYDEN/AP\&S, JV, LLC. | 2425 N GLASSFORD HILL RD PRESCOTT VALLEY, AZ 86314 |
| 8 | \$30,485,000.00 | COFFMAN SPECIALTIES, INC. | 9685 VIA EXCELENCIA, SUITE 200 SAN DIEGO, CA 92126 |
| 9 | \$30,753,253.02 | AUSTIN BRIDGE \& ROAD, LP | 2538 E UNIVERSITY DRIVE SUITE 200 PHOENIX, AZ 85034 |

Apparent Low Bidder is 2.3\% Under Department Estimate (Difference $=(\$ 618,872.35)$ )
Printed: 11/09/2010

# ARIZONA DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION 

## ADVERTISEMENT FOR BIDS

BID OPENING: FRIDAY, OCTOBER 08, 2010, AT 11:00 A.M. (M.S.T.)

TRACS NO
PROJ NO
TERMINI
LOCATION
TRACS NO
PROJ NO
TERMINI
LOCATION
ROUTE NO.
US 93
US 93

093 MO 113 H743801C
STP-093-B(202)N
WICKENBURG - KINGMAN HIGHWAY (US 93)
SOUTHBOUND DELUGE WASH
093 MO 109 H743901C
STP-093-B(203)N
WICKENBURG - KINGMAN HIGHWAY (US 93)
SOUTHBOUND WAGON BOW RANCH

The amount programmed for this contract is $\$ 45,800,000$. The location and description of the proposed work and the representative items and approximate quantities are as follows:

The proposed work for Project 093 MO 113 H743801C is located in Mohave County on US 93, approximately 10 miles north of Wikieup. The project includes constructing a two-lane southbound roadway between milepost 113.00 and milepost 116.30. The work consists of grading, paving, installing pipe culverts, extending concrete box culverts, constructing new AASHTO Type 4 girder concrete bridges, installing guardrail and guardrail end terminals, placing pavement markings, signing, seeding, and other miscellaneous work.

The proposed work for Project 093 MO 109 H743901C is located in Mohave County on US 93, approximately 13 miles north of Wikieup. The project includes constructing a two-lane southbound roadway between milepost 109.13 and milepost 113.00. The work consists of grading, paving, installing pipe culverts, extending concrete box culverts, constructing new AASHTO Type 6 modified girder concrete bridges, installing guardrail and guardrail end terminals, placing pavement markings, signing, seeding, and other miscellaneous work.

## REPRESENTATIVE ITEMS

Clearing and Grubbing
Roadway Excavation
Drainage Excavation
Borrow (In Place)
Aggregate Base, Class 2
Asphaltic Concrete Friction Course (Asphalt-Rubber)
Asphaltic Concrete (SHRP) End Product (3/4" Mix)
Pipe, Corrugated Metal (Various Sizes)
Pipe Culvert (Various Sizes)
Structural Concrete
F-Shape Concrete Barrier and Transition

| UNIT | QUANTITY |
| :---: | ---: |
| Acre | 210 |
| Cu.Yd. | 880,000 |
| Cu.Yd. | 34,000 |
| Cu.Yd. | 45,400 |
| Cu.Yd. | 67,600 |
| Ton | 4,500 |
| Ton | 87,000 |
| L.Ft. | 1,450 |
| L.Ft. | 4,450 |
| Cu.Yd. | 10,000 |
| L.Ft. | Page 176,8601 |


| Deck Joint Assembly (Various Types) | L.Ft. | 310 |
| :--- | ---: | ---: |
| Approach Slab | Sq.Ft. | 5,400 |
| Precast, P/S Member (AASHTO Girder)(Various Types) | L.Ft. | 3,900 |
| Reinforcing Steel | Lb. | $1,560,000$ |
| Drilled Shaft Foundation (Various Diameters) | L.Ft. | 2,050 |
| Pavement Marking (Painted) | L.Ft. | 496,500 |
| Pavement Marking (Thermoplastic) | L.Ft. | 304,000 |
| Pavement Markers (Raised) | Each | 7,100 |
| Seeding | Acre | 150 |
| Cactus (Various Sizes) | Each | 1,130 |
| Game Fence | L.Ft. | 54,500 |
| Guard Rail, W-Beam, Single Face | L.Ft. | 5,300 |
| Cattle Guard (Various Units) | Each | 11 |
| Riprap (Slope Mattress) | Cu.Yd. | 3,200 |
| Riprap (Various Gradations) | Cu.Yd. | 20,600 |
| Rail Bank Protection | L.Ft. | 1,950 |
| Cement Stabilized Alluvium | Cu.Yd. | 9,300 |
| Provide-On-The-job Training | Hour | 1,500 |
| Contractor Quality Control | L.Sum | 1 |
| Construction Surveying and Layout | L.Sum | 1 |
| Ground-In-Rumble Strip | L.Ft. | 132,000 |

The time allowed for the completion of the work included in the Construction Phase of the contract will be 425 working days.

The time allowed for the completion of the work included in the Landscape Establishment Phase of the contract will be 365 calendar days.

The Arizona Department of Transportation hereby notifies all bidders that pursuant to this advertisement for bids, Disadvantaged Business Enterprises will be afforded full opportunity to submit bids in response to this solicitation and will not be discriminated against on the grounds of race, color, sex, or national origin in consideration for an award.

Project plans, special provisions, and proposal pamphlets may be purchased from Contracts and Specifications Section, 1651 W. Jackson, Room 121F, Phoenix, AZ 85007-3217, (602) 712-7221. Plans and bidding documents should be available for sale to bidders within one week following the advertisement for bids. The cost is $\$ 310.00$, payable at time of order by cash, check or money order. Please indicate whether a bid proposal package or a subcontractor/supplier set is desired. An additional fee of \$5.00 will be charged for each set of Special Provisions requested which is not accompanied by the purchase of a related set of project plans. Checks should be made payable to the Arizona Department of Transportation. No refund will be made for plans and specifications returned. We cannot guarantee mail delivery.

This project is eligible for electronic bidding.
Cross sections and/or earthwork quantity sheets, if available, may be ordered from the Control Desk of Roadway Design Section at (602) 712-8667. Orders must be placed at least five days prior to bid opening to insure availability. Documents may be picked up and paid for at Contracts \& Specifications Section.

No contracting firm will be issued a proposal pamphlet until it has become prequalified. The Application for Contractor Prequalification shall be filed at least 15 calendar days prior to the bid opening date. The Application may be obtained from Contracts and Specifications Section.

No award will be made to any contractor who is not a duly licensed contractor in accordance with Arizona Revised Statutes 32-1101 through 32-1170.03.

All labor employed on this project shall be paid in accordance with the minimum wage rates shown in the General Wage Decision. These rates have been determined in accordance with the requirements of the law and issued by the Secretary of Labor for this project. The wage scale is on file in Contracts and Specifications Section and copies may be obtained at all reasonable times.

A proposal guaranty in the form of either a certified or a cashier's check made payable to the State Treasurer of Arizona for not less than ten percent of the amount of the bid or in the form of a surety (bid) bond for ten percent of the amount of the bid shall accompany the proposal.

Surety (bid) bonds will be accepted only on the form provided by the Department and only from corporate sureties authorized to do business in Arizona.

Proposal pamphlets shall be submitted only in the envelope provided by the Department to:

Arizona Department of Transportation
Intermodal Transportation Division
Contracts and Specifications Section
1651 West Jackson Street, Room 121F
Phoenix, Arizona 85007-3217
Sealed bids will be received until the hour indicated and then publicly opened and read. No bids will be received after the time specified.

| C\&S Technical Leader: | Iqbal Hossain | (602) 712-7471 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Construction Supervisor: | Luke Brazdys | (928) 681-6039 |

BARRY CROCKETT,<br>Engineer-Manager<br>Contracts \& Specifications Section

Printed: 11/09/2010

## ARIZONA DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION <br> INTERMODAL TRANSPORTATION DIVISION <br> CONTRACTS AND SPECIFICATIONS SECTION

BID RESULTS
Printed: 11/09/2010
Page 2 of 2

# ARIZONA DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION 

## ADVERTISEMENT FOR BIDS

BID OPENING: FRIDAY, OCTOBER 22, 2010, AT 11:00 A.M. (M.S.T.)

TRACS NO
PROJ NO
TERMINI
LOCATION
TRACS NO
PROJ NO
TERMINI
LOCATION

095 LA 132 H665601C
STP-095-C(205)A
QUARTZSITE-PARKER-TOPOCK HWY (SR 95)
MP 132.5 - MP 140.9
072 LA 013 H665501C
STP-072-A(200)A
JCT SR 95 - HOPE HWY (SR 72)
MP 13.27 - MP 14.49

| ROUTE NO. | MILEPOST | DISTRICT | ITEM NO. |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| SR 95 | 132.50 to 140.90 | YUMA | 11311 |
| SR 72 | 13.27 to 14.49 | YUMA | 11211 |

The amount programmed for this contract is $\$ 2,800,000$. The location and description of the proposed work and the representative items and approximate quantities are as follows:

The proposed work for Project 095 LA 132 H665601C is located in La Paz County on State Route 95 approximately 15 miles south of the Town of Parker, between mileposts 132.50 and 140.90 . The work encompasses widening the roadway to add paved shoulders. The work consists of roadway excavation, cold recycled AC millings placement, pipe culvert extension, pipe lining, signing, marking, and other miscellaneous work.

The proposed work for Project 072 LA 013 H665501C is located in La Paz County on State Route 72 south of the JCT SR 95, between mileposts 13.27 and 14.49. The work encompasses widening the roadway to add paved shoulders. The work consists of roadway excavation, cold recycled AC millings placement, pipe culvert extension, pipe lining, signing, marking, and other miscellaneous work.

## REPRESENTATIVE ITEMS

Removal of Asphaltic Concrete Pavement
Roadway Excavation
Aggregate Base Class 2
Recycled Asphaltic Concrete (Cold Recycling)
Pipe, Corrugated Metal (Various Sizes)
Metal End safety Section (Various Sizes)
Pipe Lining (Various Sizes)
Pavement Marking (Paint)
Pavement Marking (Thermoplastic)
Seeding Class II
Erosion Control (Wattles)
Barbed Wire Fence, Type 1
Contractor Quality Control
Construction Surveying and Layout

UNIT
Sq. Yd.
Cu. Yd.
Cu. Yd.
Ton
L. Ft.

Each
L. Ft.
L. Ft.
L. Ft.

Acre
L. Ft.
L. Ft.
L. Sum
L. Sum

QUANTITY
10,600
78,980
8,950
7,570 350 34
1,220 43,000 64,500

28
21,250
7,090
1
Page 181 of 201

The time allowed for the completion of the work included in this project will be 100 working days.

The Arizona Department of Transportation hereby notifies all bidders that pursuant to this advertisement for bids, Disadvantaged Business Enterprises will be afforded full opportunity to submit bids in response to this solicitation and will not be discriminated against on the grounds of race, color, sex, or national origin in consideration for an award.

Project plans, special provisions, and proposal pamphlets may be purchased from Contracts and Specifications Section, 1651 W. Jackson, Room 121F, Phoenix, AZ 85007-3217, (602) 712-7221. Plans and bidding documents should be available for sale to bidders within one week following the advertisement for bids. The cost is $\$ 42.00$, payable at time of order by cash, check or money order. Please indicate whether a bid proposal package or a subcontractor/supplier set is desired. An additional fee of $\$ 5.00$ will be charged for each set of Special Provisions requested which is not accompanied by the purchase of a related set of project plans. Checks should be made payable to the Arizona Department of Transportation. No refund will be made for plans and specifications returned. We cannot guarantee mail delivery.

This project is eligible for electronic bidding.
Cross sections and/or earthwork quantity sheets, if available, may be ordered from the Control Desk of Roadway Design Section at (602) 712-8667. Orders must be placed at least five days prior to bid opening to insure availability. Documents may be picked up and paid for at Contracts \& Specifications Section.

No contracting firm will be issued a proposal pamphlet until it has become prequalified. The Application for Contractor Prequalification shall be filed at least 15 calendar days prior to the bid opening date. The Application may be obtained from Contracts and Specifications Section.

No award will be made to any contractor who is not a duly licensed contractor in accordance with Arizona Revised Statutes 32-1101 through 32-1170.03.

All labor employed on this project shall be paid in accordance with the minimum wage rates shown in the General Wage Decision. These rates have been determined in accordance with the requirements of the law and issued by the Secretary of Labor for this project. The wage scale is on file in Contracts and Specifications Section and copies may be obtained at all reasonable times.

A proposal guaranty in the form of either a certified or a cashier's check made payable to the State Treasurer of Arizona for not less than ten percent of the amount of the bid or in the form of a surety (bid) bond for ten percent of the amount of the bid shall accompany the proposal.

Surety (bid) bonds will be accepted only on the form provided by the Department and only from corporate sureties authorized to do business in Arizona.

Proposal pamphlets shall be submitted only in the envelope provided by the Department to:

Arizona Department of Transportation
Intermodal Transportation Division
Contracts and Specifications Section
1651 West Jackson Street, Room 121F
Phoenix, Arizona 85007-3217
Sealed bids will be received until the hour indicated and then publicly opened and read. No bids will be received after the time specified.

| Engineering Specialist: | Mohammed Patwary | (602) 712-8187 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Construction Supervisor: | Jaime Hernandez | (928) 317-2150 |

BARRY CROCKETT,
Engineer-Manager
Contracts \& Specifications Section

MP: mp: U\A PROJECTSIH665601C\ADVERTISE: Long AD H6656
Date: September 27, 2010.
The proposed landscape construction project is located on in Mohave County on SR 95 in the City of Lake Havasu City. The project begins at MP 182.5 and extends north a 60 Working Days
Completion Date: distance of 0.62 mile
Printed: 11/09/2010

# ARIZONA DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION 

ADVERTISEMENT FOR BIDS
BID OPENING: (FRIDAY, OCTOBER 8, 2010), AT 11:00 A.M. (M.S.T.)

TRACS NO
PROJ NO
TERMINI
LOCATION
ROUTE NO.
SR 95

095 MO 182 H789701C
TEA-095-C(204)A
QUARTZSITE - PARKER - TOPOCK HIGHWAY (SR 95)
MESQUITE AVE - S. PALO VERDE AVE
MILEPOST
182

DISTRICT
KINGMAN

ITEM NO. 11811

The amount programmed for this contract is $\$ 477,000$. The location and description of the proposed work and the representative items and approximate quantities are as follows:

The proposed landscape construction project is located on in Mohave County on SR 95 in the City of Lake Havasu City. The project begins at MP 182.5 and extends north a distance of 0.62 miles. The work consists of landscaping, irrigation, decomposed granite, rock mulch, concrete pads, trash receptacles, and other related work.

## REPRESENTATIVE ITEMS

Jacking, Boring, or Tunneling of Pipe (Sleeves)
Decomposed Granite (1" Screened)(2" Depth)
Rock Mulch (2" - 6")
Tree (5 Gallon)
Tree ( 15 Gallon)
Tree (Palm)(8' to 10' High)
Shrub (1 Gallon)
Shrub (5 Gallon)
Ocotillo (4' to 6' High)
Controller (Automatic)
Control Valve (Remote)(Automatic)(1")
Gate Valves (1", 2-1/2")
Bubbler Heads
PVC (Schedule 40)(6")
PVC (Schedule 40)(1", 2-1/2")
PVC (SDR 21)(Class 200)(3/4")
Riprap (Gabions)(Decorative)
Trash Receptacle
Construction Surveying and Layout

UNIT
L.FT.

SQ. YD.
SQ.YD.
EACH
EACH
54
EACH 7
EACH 99
EACH 73
EACH 10
EACH 2
EACH 28
EACH 32
EACH 286
L.FT.
L.FT. 7,610
L.FT.

CU.YD.
EACH
L.SUM

QUANTITY 171
23,210 6,010

38
7
9

3
13,150

1

The time allowed for the completion of the work included in this project will be 60 working days, plus an additional 365 calendar day landscape establishment period.

The Arizona Department of Transportation hereby notifies all bidders that pursuant to this advertisement for bids, Disadvantaged Business Enterprises will be afforded full opportunity to submit bids in response to this solicitation and will not be discriminated against on the grounds of race, color, sex, or national origin in consideration for an award.

Project plans, special provisions, and proposal pamphlets may be purchased from Contracts and Specifications Section, 1651 W. Jackson, Room 121F, Phoenix, AZ 85007-3217, (602) 7127221. Plans and bidding documents should be available for sale to bidders within one week following the advertisement for bids. The cost is $\$ 17.00$ payable at time of order by cash, check or money order. Please indicate whether a bid proposal package or a subcontractor/supplier set is desired. An additional fee of $\$ 5.00$ will be charged for each set of Special Provisions requested which is not accompanied by the purchase of a related set of project plans. Checks should be made payable to the Arizona Department of Transportation. No refund will be made for plans and specifications returned. We cannot guarantee mail delivery.

This project is eligible for electronic bidding.
No contracting firm will be issued a proposal pamphlet until it has become prequalified. The Application for Contractor Prequalification shall be filed at least 15 calendar days prior to the bid opening date. The Application may be obtained from Contracts and Specifications Section.

No award will be made to any contractor who is not a duly licensed contractor in accordance with Arizona Revised Statutes 32-1101 through 32-1170.03.

All labor employed on this project shall be paid in accordance with the minimum wage rates shown in the General Wage Decision. These rates have been determined in accordance with the requirements of the law and issued by the Secretary of Labor for this project. The wage scale is on file in Contracts and Specifications Section and copies may be obtained at all reasonable times.

A proposal guaranty in the form of either a certified or a cashier's check made payable to the State Treasurer of Arizona for not less than ten percent of the amount of the bid or in the form of a surety (bid) bond for ten percent of the amount of the bid shall accompany the proposal.

Surety (bid) bonds will be accepted only on the form provided by the Department and only from corporate sureties authorized to do business in Arizona.

Proposal pamphlets shall be submitted only in the envelope provided by the Department to:

```
Arizona Department of Transportation Intermodal Transportation Division Contracts and Specifications Section
1651 West Jackson Street, Room 121F
Phoenix, Arizona 85007-3217
```

Sealed bids will be received until the hour indicated and then publicly opened and read. No bids will be received after the time specified.

| Engineering Specialist: | Robert Petrillo | (602) 712-8168 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Construction Supervisor: | Chris Olson | (928) 681-6015 |

BARRY CROCKETT
Engineer-Manager
Contracts \& Specifications Section
Printed: 11/09/2010

## ARIZONA DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION <br> INTERMODAL TRANSPORTATION DIVISION <br> CONTRACTS AND SPECIFICATIONS SECTION

## BID RESULTS

Bid Opening Date : 10/29/2010, Prequalification Required, Engineer Specialist : Petrillo Robert
approximataly 5 miles south of the Town of Superior. The work consists of constructing a new permanent roadway on both a new horizontal and vertical alignment, as well as constructing a temporary detour roadway. The curve realignment work will include roadway excavation, removal of existing pavement, placing new asphaltic concrete pavement, and signing, landscaping, utility relocations, and other related work.
Completion Date: 135 Working Days
177 PN 163 H692101C HES 177-A(003)A WINKELMAN SUPERIOR HIGHWAY

$$
\begin{array}{|c|}
\hline \text { Contractor Name } \\
\hline
\end{array}
$$

FANN CONTRACTING, INC
WINKELMAN - SUPERIOR HIGHWAY (SR 177)
177 PN 163 H692101C HES 177-A(003)A

| Rank | Bid Amount |
| :--- | :--- |

\$2,101,972.65
\$2,133,072.60
\$2,277,684.97
\$2,278,704.55 \$2,445,751.00
\$2,477,742.00
DEPARTMENT
C.S. \& W. CONTRACTORS, INC.
BISON CONTRACTING CO., INC.
DEPARTMENT
6135 N. 7TH STREET PHOENIX, AZ 85014
2449 EAST CHAMBERS STREET PHOENIX, AZ 85040
16646 E LASER DRIVE FOUNTAIN HILLS, AZ 85268
115 S. 48TH ST TEMPE, AZ 85281
FNF CONSTRUCTION, INC.
(
.
$\tau$
$N$
๗
$\nabla$
$\nabla$
ค
R.E.MONKS CONSTRUCTION COMPANY, LLC
$\$ 2,507,057.00$
DISTRICT INC.
2.275,
Page 2 of 2
Page 2 of 2

| Rank | Bid Amount | Contractor Name | Address of Contractor |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 7 | \$2,532,232.76 | MARKHAM CONTRACTING CO., INC. | 22820 NORTH 19TH AVENUE PHOENIX, AZ 85027 |
| 8 | \$2,665,878.00 | MERIDIAN ENGINEERING COMPANY | 3855 NORTH BUSINESS CENTER DRIVE TUCSON, AZ 85705 |
| 9 | \$2,973,404.60 | J. BANICKI CONSTRUCTION, INC. | 6423 S. ASH AVENUE TEMPE, AZ 85283 |

Apparent Low Bidder is 14.1\% Under Department Estimate (Difference $=(\$ 343,778.35)$ )
Printed: 11/09/2010

# ARIZONA DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION ADVERTISEMENT FOR BIDS 

BID OPENING: FRIDAY, OCTOBER 29, 2010, AT 11:00 A.M. (M.S.T.)

| TRACS NO | 177 PN 163 H692101C |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :---: | :---: |
| PROJ NO | HES-177-A(003)A |  |  |
| TERMINI | WINKELMAN-SUPERIOR HIGHWAY (SR 177) |  |  |
| LOCATION | MP $163.80-$ MP 164.40 |  |  |
|  |  | ITEM NO. |  |
| ROUTE NO. | MILEPOST | DISTRICT | 16211 |

The amount programmed for this contract is $\$ 5,250,000$. The location and description of the proposed work and the representative items and approximate quantities are as follows:

The proposed curve realignment project is located in Pinal County, on SR 177, beginning at milepost 163.80 and ending at milepost 164.40. The project location is approximately 5 miles south of the Town of Superior. The work consists of constructing a new permanent roadway on both a new horizontal and vertical alignment, as well as constructing a temporary detour roadway. The curve realignment work will include roadway excavation, removal of existing pavement, placing new asphaltic concrete pavement, installation of new and extension of existing corrugated metal pipe culverts and related channel realignment, installation of guardrail and barbed wire fence, pavement marking and signing, landscaping, utility relocations, and other related work.

## REPRESENTATIVE ITEMS

Remove AC Pavement
Remove Guardrail
Remove Fence
Roadway Excavation
Drainage Excavation
Borrow
Trenching \& Backfill for Gas Line
Aggregate Base, Class 2
Asphaltic Concrete (Misc. Struct.)(Special Mix)
Emulsified Asphalt (CRS-2)
Cover Material
Pipe, Corrugated Metal (24"-54")
Drainage Structure - Headwall
Barbed Wire Fence
Construct Guard Rail from Salvage
Guard Rail Terminal
Temporary Pavement Marking (Stripe)
Permanent Pavement Marking (Painted)
Permanent Pavement Marking (Thermoplastic)
Seeding (Class II)
Cactus (Saguaro)(15 Gallon)
Contractor Quality Control
Construction Surveying and Layout


SQ.YD.
L.FT.
L.FT.

CU.YD.
CU.YD.
CU.YD.
L.FT.

CU.YD.
TON
TON
CU.YD.
L.FT.

EACH
L.FT.
L.FT. 1,150

EACH
L.FT.
L.FT.
L.FT.

ACRE
EACH
L.SUM
L.SUM

QUANTITY 15,000

3
2,900
5,540
74,900 870
7,300
1,170
3,660
4,590
26
140
750
4
5,740

22,800
10,950
16,430
12
9
1
1

The time allowed for the completion of the work included in this project will be 135 working days. In addition, there will be a Landscaping Establishment period of 60 calendar days.

The Arizona Department of Transportation hereby notifies all bidders that pursuant to this advertisement for bids, Disadvantaged Business Enterprises will be afforded full opportunity to submit bids in response to this solicitation and will not be discriminated against on the grounds of race, color, sex, or national origin in consideration for an award.

Project plans, special provisions, and proposal pamphlets may be purchased from Contracts and Specifications Section, 1651 W. Jackson, Room 121F, Phoenix, AZ 85007-3217, (602) 712-7221. Plans and bidding documents should be available for sale to bidders within one week following the advertisement for bids. The cost is $\$ 39.00$, payable at time of order by cash, check or money order. Please indicate whether a bid proposal package or a subcontractor/supplier set is desired. An additional fee of $\$ 5.00$ will be charged for each set of Special Provisions requested which is not accompanied by the purchase of a related set of project plans. Checks should be made payable to the Arizona Department of Transportation. No refund will be made for plans and specifications returned. We cannot guarantee mail delivery.

This project is eligible for electronic bidding.
Cross sections and/or earthwork quantity sheets may be ordered from the Control Desk of Roadway Design Section at (602) 712-8667. Orders must be placed at least five days prior to bid opening to insure availability. Documents may be picked up and paid for at Contracts \& Specifications Section.

A hardcopy of the geotechnical investigation report is available for sale at Contracts and Specifications. The cost of each copy is $\$ 15.00$, payable at time of order by cash, check or money order

No contracting firm will be issued a proposal pamphlet until it has become prequalified. The Application for Contractor Prequalification shall be filed at least 15 calendar days prior to the bid opening date. The Application may be obtained from Contracts and Specifications Section.

No award will be made to any contractor who is not a duly licensed contractor in accordance with Arizona Revised Statutes 32-1101 through 32-1170.03.

All labor employed on this project shall be paid in accordance with the minimum wage rates shown in the General Wage Decision. These rates have been determined in accordance with the requirements of the law and issued by the Secretary of Labor for this project. The wage scale is on file in Contracts and Specifications Section and copies may be obtained at all reasonable times.

A proposal guaranty in the form of either a certified or a cashier's check made payable to the State Treasurer of Arizona for not less than ten percent of the amount of the bid or in the form of a surety (bid) bond for ten percent of the amount of the bid shall accompany the proposal.

Surety (bid) bonds will be accepted only on the form provided by the Department and only from corporate sureties authorized to do business in Arizona.

Proposal pamphlets shall be submitted only in the envelope provided by the Department to:

Arizona Department of Transportation
Intermodal Transportation Division
Contracts and Specifications Section
1651 West Jackson Street, Room 121F
Phoenix, Arizona 85007-3217
Sealed bids will be received until the hour indicated and then publicly opened and read. No bids will be received after the time specified.

| Engineering Specialist: | Robert Petrillo | (602) 712-8168 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Construction Supervisor: | Bobby Lall | (623) 203-7643 |

BARRY CROCKETT,
Engineer-Manager
Contracts \& Specifications Section

177 PN 163 H692101C
October 5, 2010
Printed: 11/09/2010 ARIZONA DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION
INTERMODAL TRANSPORTATION DIVISION
CONTRACTS AND SPECIFICATIONS SECTION
BID RESULTS
Completion Date: 50 Working Days
The proposed sidewalk construction project is located in Maricopa County within the Town of Fountain Hills along Fountain Hills Boulevard from Fayette Drive to the Fountain Hills Middle School. The project includes construction of sidewalk, sidewalk ramps, driveways, PVC conduit for future use by the Town of Fountain Hills, and other related work.
Bid Opening Date : 10/22/2010, Prequalification Required, Engineer Specialist : Petrillo Robert

| Project No. | Highway Termini | Location |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| OO00 MA FTH SS66001C CM-FTH0(202)A | TOWN OF FOUNTAIN HILLS | FOUNTAIN HILLS BOULEVARD PHX Maintenance District | LOCAL |

Address of Contractor
1831 NORTH ROCHESTER MESA, AZ 85205
3635 S. 43RD AVE. PHOENIX, AZ 85009
810 E WESTERN AVE AVONDALE, AZ 85323
P.O. BOX 2790 PAYSON, AZ 85547
1614 E CURRY ROAD TEMPE, AZ 85281
3329 E SOUTHERN AVE PHOENIX, AZ 85040
P.O. BOX 6686 PHOENIX, AZ 85005
Page 2 of 2
Page 2 of 2
．
CITYWIDE CONTRACTING L．L．C 4114 EAST WASHINGTON STREET PHOENIX，AZ 85034
3719 W WINDROSE DRIVE PHOENIX，AZ 85029
ACCURATE，SMART，\＆AFFORDABLE DBA ASPHALT P．O．BOX 56364 PHOENIX，AZ 85079 SERVICES OF AZ，INC

P．O．BOX 3316 PAYSON，AZ 85547
Apparent Low Bidder is $\mathbf{1 8 . 6 \%}$ Under Department Estimate $($ Difference $=(\$ 43,308.00))$
Printed：11／09／2010

| Rank | Bid Amount |
| :--- | :--- |

\＄257，270．00
\＄283，372．78
00’9ZL＇દદદ\＄
$\$ 370,872.00$
$\$ 376,852.35$
$\cdot$＇ONI NOI $\forall \wedge \forall$ OXヨ ヨとldWヨ
KNOCHEL BROTHERS，INC．
SANDSTORM－GAM，LTD

# ARIZONA DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION 

## ADVERTISEMENT FOR BIDS

BID OPENING: (FRIDAY, OCTOBER 22, 2010), AT 11:00 A.M. (M.S.T.)
TRACS NO
PROJ NO
TERMINI
LOCATION

0000 MA FTH SS66001C
CM-FTH-O(202)A
TOWN OF FOUNTAIN HILLS
FOUNTAIN HILLS BLVD - FAYETTE DR - MIDDLE SCHOOL

| ROUTE NO. | MILEPOST | DISTRICT | ITEM NO. |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| FOUNTAIN | N/A | PHOENIX | LOCAL |

HILLS BLVD

The amount programmed for this contract is $\$ 506,000$. The location and description of the proposed work and the representative items and approximate quantities are as follows:

The proposed sidewalk construction project is located in Maricopa County within the Town of Fountain Hills along Fountain Hills Boulevard from Fayette Drive to the Fountain Hills Middle School. The project includes construction of sidewalk, sidewalk ramps, driveways, PVC conduit for future use by the Town of Fountain Hills, and other related work.

## REPRESENTATIVE ITEMS

Remove Concrete Curb
Remove Concrete Sidewalks, Driveways, \& Slabs
Remove Asphaltic Concrete Pavement
Roadway Excavation
Borrow
Asphaltic Concrete (Miscellaneous Structural)
Concrete Sidewalk (MAG Det. 230)
Concrete Sidewalk Ramps (MAG Types A, C)
Concrete Driveway
Decomposed Granite (3/4" Screened) - 2" Thick
PVC Conduit (2" - 3")
Pull Boxes (No. 7, No. 9)
Construction Surveying and Layout

| UNIT | QUANTITY |
| :--- | ---: |
| L.FT. | 310 |
| SQ.FT. | 790 |
| SQ. YD. | 240 |
| CU.YD. | 650 |
| CU.YD. | 132 |
| TON | 34 |
| SQ.FT. | 16,500 |
| EACH | 9 |
| SQ.FT. | 2,020 |
| SQ.YD. | 625 |
| L.FT. | 870 |
| EACH | 6 |
| L.SUM | 1 |

The time allowed for the completion of the work included in this project will be 50 working days.
The Arizona Department of Transportation hereby notifies all bidders that pursuant to this advertisement for bids, Disadvantaged Business Enterprises will be afforded full opportunity to submit bids in response to this solicitation and will not be discriminated against on the grounds of race, color, sex, or national origin in consideration for an award.

Project plans, special provisions, and proposal pamphlets may be purchased from Contracts and Specifications Section, 1651 W. Jackson, Room 121F, Phoenix, AZ 85007-3217, (602) 7127221. Plans and bidding documents should be available for sale to bidders within one week following the advertisement for bids. The cost is $\$ 25.00$ payable at time of order by cash, check or money order. Please indicate whether a bid proposal package or a subcontractor/supplier set is desired. An additional fee of $\$ 5.00$ will be charged for each set of Special Provisions
requested which is not accompanied by the purchase of a related set of project plans. Checks should be made payable to the Arizona Department of Transportation. No refund will be made for plans and specifications returned. We cannot guarantee mail delivery.

This project is eligible for electronic bidding.
No contracting firm will be issued a proposal pamphlet until it has become prequalified. The Application for Contractor Prequalification shall be filed at least 15 calendar days prior to the bid opening date. The Application may be obtained from Contracts and Specifications Section.

No award will be made to any contractor who is not a duly licensed contractor in accordance with Arizona Revised Statutes 32-1101 through 32-1170.03.

All labor employed on this project shall be paid in accordance with the minimum wage rates shown in the General Wage Decision. These rates have been determined in accordance with the requirements of the law and issued by the Secretary of Labor for this project. The wage scale is on file in Contracts and Specifications Section and copies may be obtained at all reasonable times.

A proposal guaranty in the form of either a certified or a cashier's check made payable to the State Treasurer of Arizona for not less than ten percent of the amount of the bid or in the form of a surety (bid) bond for ten percent of the amount of the bid shall accompany the proposal.

Surety (bid) bonds will be accepted only on the form provided by the Department and only from corporate sureties authorized to do business in Arizona.

Proposal pamphlets shall be submitted only in the envelope provided by the Department to:

Arizona Department of Transportation Intermodal Transportation Division Contracts and Specifications Section 1651 West Jackson Street, Room 121F Phoenix, Arizona 85007-3217

Sealed bids will be received until the hour indicated and then publicly opened and read. No bids will be received after the time specified.

Engineering Specialist:<br>Construction Supervisor:<br>Robert Petrillo<br>Brandon DiCarlo<br>(602) 712-8168<br>(602) 712-8965

BARRY CROCKETT
Engineer-Manager
Contracts \& Specifications Section
Printed: 11/09/2010

## ARIZONA DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION <br> INTERMODAL TRANSPORTATION DIVISION <br> CONTRACTS AND SPECIFICATIONS SECTION

## BID RESULTS

BID RESULIS
Page 2 of 2

7591 N．74TH AVENUE GLENDALE，AZ 85303
6267 S．157TH WAY GILBERT，AZ 85298
P．O．BOX 1768 IDAHO FALLS，ID 83403
472 E WICKENBURG WAY \＃106 WICKENBURG，AZ 85390
3719 W WINDROSE DRIVE PHOENIX，AZ 85029
P．O．BOX 6686 PHOENIX，AZ 85005
11525 E．GERMANN ROAD CHANDLER，AZ 85286

Apparent Low Bidder is $\mathbf{1 9 . 2 \%}$ Over Department Estimate（Difference $\boldsymbol{=} \mathbf{\$ 3 5 , 2 3 0 . 2 4}$ ）
Printed：11／09／2010
\＄262，831．50
\＄265，100．00

## \＄277，711．25

\＄284，964．00
0で678＇06て\＄
\＄293，534．40
$\$ 312,085.95$
$0 L^{\circ} \angle \downarrow \varepsilon^{\prime} \downarrow L \varepsilon \$$
＇ONI＇＂Oכ ЭNI」つ૪
R．K．SANDERS，INC．
DCS CONTRACTING，INC．
CARSON CONSTRUCTION CO．，INC．
Q 7 ‘W $W \bigcirc$－WYOLSON
NICKLE CONTRACTING L．L．C．
BECO CONSTRUCTION CO．，INC．
Carsonconstruchonco．，nc． I
，

# ARIZONA DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION 

## ADVERTISEMENT FOR BIDS

BID OPENING: FRIDAY, OCTOBER 08, 2010 AT 11:00 A.M. (M.S.T.)

TRACS NO
PROJ NO
TERMINI
LOCATION
ROUTE NO.
N/A

0000 MA GLN SS69001C
CM-GLN-O(206)A
CITY OF GLENDALE
SKUNK CREEK AT BELL ROAD.
MILEPOST
N/A

DISTRICT
PHOENIX

ITEM NO.
LOCAL

The amount programmed for this contract is $\$ 400,000$. The location and description of the proposed work and the representative items and approximate quantities are as follows:

The proposed project is located in Maricopa County along the Skunk Creek between 67th Avenue and 75th Avenue within the City of Glendale. The north boundary of the project is Bell Road and the approximate length of the project is 0.17 miles. The work includes construction of concrete multi-use path, bank protection with riprap slope mattress, signing, striping and other related works.

```
REPRESENTATIVE ITEMS
CHANNEL EXCAVATION
BORROW (IN PLACE)
AGGREGATE BASE, CLASS 2
PIPE, CORRUGATED METAL, 8"
METAL HANDRAIL (MAG DTL 145)
PAVEMENT MARKING(THERMOPLASTIC)(YELLOW )
EROSION CONTROL(WATTLES)(9")
CONCRETE SIDEWALK (MAG DTL 230)(6")
RIPRAP (SLOPE MATTRESS)
SEEDING
CONSTRUCTION SURVEYING AND LAYOUT
```

UNIT
CU.YD.
QUANTITY
CU.YD.
1,785

| UNIT | QUANTITY |
| :---: | ---: |
| CU.YD. | 1,785 |
| CU.YD. | 691 |
| CU.YD. | 27 |
| L.FT. | 74 |
| L.FT. | 584 |
| L.FT. | 919 |
| L.FT. | 898 |
| SQ.FT. | 10,722 |
| CU.YD. | 508 |
| ACRE | 1 |
| L.SUM | 1 |

The time allowed for the completion of the work included in this project will be 80 working days.
The Arizona Department of Transportation hereby notifies all bidders that pursuant to this advertisement for bids, Disadvantaged Business Enterprises will be afforded full opportunity to submit bids in response to this solicitation and will not be discriminated against on the grounds of race, color, sex, or national origin in consideration for an award.

Project plans, special provisions, and proposal pamphlets may be purchased from Contracts and Specifications Section, 1651 W. Jackson, Room 121F, Phoenix, AZ 85007-3217, (602) 7127221. Plans and bidding documents should be available for sale to bidders within one week following the advertisement for bids. The cost is $\$ 13.00$ payable at time of order by cash, check or money order. Please indicate whether a bid proposal package or a subcontractor/supplier set is desired. An additional fee of $\$ 5.00$ will be charged for each set of Special Provisions requested which is not accompanied by the purchase of a related set of project plans. Checks should be made payable to the Arizona Department of Transportation. No refund will be made for plans and specifications returned. We cannot guarantee mail delivery.

This project is eligible for electronic bidding.

No contracting firm will be issued a proposal pamphlet until it has become prequalified. The Application for Contractor Prequalification shall be filed at least 15 calendar days prior to the bid opening date. The Application may be obtained from Contracts and Specifications Section.

No award will be made to any contractor who is not a duly licensed contractor in accordance with Arizona Revised Statutes 32-1101 through 32-1170.03.

All labor employed on this project shall be paid in accordance with the minimum wage rates shown in the General Wage Decision. These rates have been determined in accordance with the requirements of the law and issued by the Secretary of Labor for this project. The wage scale is on file in Contracts and Specifications Section and copies may be obtained at all reasonable times.

A proposal guaranty in the form of either a certified or a cashier's check made payable to the State Treasurer of Arizona for not less than ten percent of the amount of the bid or in the form of a surety (bid) bond for ten percent of the amount of the bid shall accompany the proposal.

Surety (bid) bonds will be accepted only on the form provided by the Department and only from corporate sureties authorized to do business in Arizona.

Proposal pamphlets shall be submitted only in the envelope provided by the Department to:
Arizona Department of Transportation Intermodal Transportation Division Contracts and Specifications Section 1651 West Jackson Street, Room 121F Phoenix, Arizona 85007-3217

Sealed bids will be received until the hour indicated and then publicly opened and read. No bids will be received after the time specified.

| Engineering Specialist: | Mahfuz Anwar | (602) 712-7663 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Construction Supervisor: | Julie Kliewer | (602) 712-8965 |

BARRY CROCKETT,
Engineer-Manager
Contracts \& Specifications Section
0000 MA GLN SS69001C
CM-GLN-O(206)A
September 10, 2010

## 21. Program Development Policy

1. Prior to developing a draft tentative Five-Year Transportation Facilities Construction Program, the Board will notify the Transportation Management Areas (TMA) of the estimated amount of funding allocated to those areas for use in developing their Transportation Improvement Plan (TIP). The Board will direct ADOT to work with the TMAs to cooperatively develop a joint listing of the projects proposed for the draft tentative Program within the TMA area. The projects shall be prioritized in accordance with criteria cooperatively developed by ADOT and the TMAs to support the Board's overall policy objectives.
2. The Board will direct ADOT to cooperate with Metropolitan Planning Organizations (MPOs), and consult with Council of Governments (COGs), Tribal governments and Transit Operators in development of the draft tentative Program and on proposed projects in their respective areas.
3. It is the policy of the Board to endorse the Casa Grande Resolves, which identified seven guiding principles for planning and established the Resource Allocation Advisory Committee (RAAC) to provide advice to the Director of ADOT on the Five Year Construction Program. Furthermore, the Board reiterates the intent of the Resolves to have the long range plan serve as the basis for the five Year Program and to employ the RAAC, or a similar process, to maintain the intent of the guiding principles after the completion of the long range plan.

The seven guiding principles are:

1. There will be one multi-modal transportation planning process.
2. It will be a process that encourages early and frequent public participation and stakeholder involvement.
3. The policy and transportation objectives of the state, regional and local plans will form the foundation for the statewide Long-Range Transportation Plan (20 years).
4. The statewide Five-Year Transportation Plan and Programs will be based on clearly defined and agreed to information and assumptions.
5. Each project programmed (within the Five-Year Plan) shall be linked to the statewide Long-Range Transportation Plan with each project selected to achieve one or more of the Plan objectives.
6. Implementation of the Plan and Program shall be monitored using $a$ common database.
7. There will be a shared responsibility by state, local and tribal governments and regional organizations to ensure that Plan and Program implementation meets the transportation needs of the people of Arizona.
8. While the Board endorses the Casa Grande Resolves, and the recommendations of the RAAC providing advice to the Director of ADOT and the Board, the Board also recognizes the need to have a policy to address emergency funding for projects in the event of a major emergency or catastrophic event. In such case, it will be the policy of the Board to fund such projects, to the extent such funding is available, from the following sources in the following order;
9. From any subprogram funds specifically designated by the Board for Emergency Projects Contingencies
2 From General Program Cost Adjustment Contingency funds
10. From other discretionary project funds or sub-program funds that may be available within the region (Maricopa, Pima or Greater Arizona) in which the emergency project(s) exist.
11. From discretionary projects funds or sub-program funds from regions external to the region in which the emergency project(s) exists, in accordance with all applicable laws including the provisions of ARS 28-304\{C\}(1). The Board further directs that the Department, in such emergencies, pursue all opportunities for reimbursement of such emergency expenditures through Federal Aid Emergency funds. The Board further directs that such Federal Aid Emergency funds, if and when received, be used to reimburse those project or sub-program funds within the region from which the funding came.
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