





# Summary of Construction Contracts

Item	Highway	Low Bid	State Estimate	Difference	Percent
3b	I-10 SR 210	\$ 814,915.70	\$ 897,840.00	\$ (82,924.30)	-9.2%
3c	I-10	\$ 5,020,802.45	\$ 5,030,546.00	\$ (9,743.55)	-0.2%
3d	I-40	\$ 2,975,983.85	\$ 2,835,746.90	\$ 140,236.95	+4.9%
3e	SR 83	\$ 1,339,450.00	\$ 1,311,402.80	\$ 28,047.20	+2.1%
3f	SR 89	\$ 661,428.90	\$ 653,730.75	\$ 7,698.15	+1.2%
3g	US 89	\$ 115,113.00	\$ 133,371.83	\$ (18,258.83)	-13.7%
3h	SR 101L	\$ 72,695,397.03	\$ 71,928,209.00	\$ 767,188.03	+1.1%




# Summary of Construction Contracts

Item	Highway	Low Bid	State Estimate	Difference	Percent
10a	SR 77	\$ 578,372.20	\$ 457,943.80	\$ 120,428.40	+26.3%
10b	SR 87	\$ 204,966.57	\$ 163,188.50	\$ 41,778.07	+25.6%
10c	SR188 & SR288	\$ 499,977.20	\$ 398,429.50	\$ 101,547.70	+25.5%
10d	SR 303L	\$ 29,782,800.00	\$ 40,212,800.00	\$(10,430,000.00)	-25.9%
10e	Thatcher	\$ 498,036.00	\$ 400,299.50	\$ 97,736.50	+24.4%
10f	Williams	\$ 112,000.00	\$ 97,912.85	\$ 14,087.15	+14.4%
10g	US 60	\$ 623,975.86	\$ 753,110.60	\$ (129,134.74)	-17.1%
10h	US 60	\$ 275,702.71	\$ 271,126.10	\$ 4,576.61	+1.7%
10i	Gila County	\$ 339,932.00	\$ 298,428.50	\$ 41,503.50	+13.9%
		<b>\$116,538,853.47</b>	<b>\$125,844,086.63</b>	<b>\$ (9,305,233.16)</b>	<b>-7.4%</b>



# Agenda Item 10a: SR 77




<b>Bid Amount</b>	<b>\$ 578,372.20</b>
<b>State Estimate</b>	<b>\$ 457,943.80</b>
<b>\$ Over</b>	<b>\$ 120,428.40</b>
<b>% Over</b>	<b>+26.3%</b>

- Reasons for Difference:**
- Roadway Excavation
  - Aggregate Base
  - Asphaltic Concrete
  - Rail Bank Protection



# Agenda Item 10b: SR 87




<b>Bid Amount</b>	<b>\$ 204,966.57</b>
<b>State Estimate</b>	<b>\$ 163,188.50</b>
<b>\$ Over</b>	<b>\$ 41,778.07</b>
<b>% Over</b>	<b>+25.6%</b>

<b>Reasons for Difference:</b>
➤ <b>Preformed Pavement Marking</b>
➤ <b>Concrete Curb</b>



# Agenda Item 10c: SR 188 and SR 288




<b>Bid Amount</b>	<b>\$ 499,977.20</b>
<b>State Estimate</b>	<b>\$ 398,429.50</b>
<b>\$ Over</b>	<b>\$ 101,547.70</b>
<b>% Over</b>	<b>+25.5%</b>

- Reasons for Difference:**
- **Structural Conc. Remove/Replace**
  - **Asphaltic Concrete**
  - **Pipe Culvert 24"**
  - **Concrete Curb & Gutter**



# Agenda Item 10d: SR 303L




<b>Bid Amount</b>	<b>\$ 29,782,800.00</b>
<b>State Estimate</b>	<b>\$ 40,212,800.00</b>
<b>\$ Under</b>	<b>\$(10,430,000.00)</b>
<b>% Under</b>	<b>-25.9%</b>

- Reasons for Difference:**
- **Construct Roadway**
  - **Construct Lighting & FMS**
  - **Signs & Pavement Marking**
  - **Construct Landscaping**



# Agenda Item 10e: Thatcher



**Town of Thatcher: Reay Ln,  
Johnson St. – Church St.**

<b>Bid Amount</b>	<b>\$ 498,036.00</b>
<b>State Estimate</b>	<b>\$ 400,299.50</b>
<b>\$ Over</b>	<b>\$ 97,736.50</b>
<b>% Over</b>	<b>+24.4%</b>

- Reasons for Difference:**
- Roadway Excavation
  - Aggregate Base
  - Asphaltic Concrete





# Agenda Item 10f: Williams



<b>Bid Amount</b>	<b>\$ 112,000.00</b>
<b>State Estimate</b>	<b>\$ 97,912.85</b>
<b>\$ Over</b>	<b>\$ 14,087.15</b>
<b>% Over</b>	<b>+14.4%</b>

- Reasons for Difference:**
- Concrete Sidewalk
  - Mobilization



# Agenda Item 10g: US 60




**US 60, Salt River Canyon Rest Area**

<b>Bid Amount</b>	<b>\$ 623,975.86</b>
<b>State Estimate</b>	<b>\$ 753,110.60</b>
<b>\$ Under</b>	<b>\$ (129,134.74)</b>
<b>% Under</b>	<b>-17.1%</b>

**Reasons for Difference :**  
 ➤ **Composting Toilet System**



# Agenda Item 10h: US 60



<b>Bid Amount</b>	<b>\$</b>	<b>275,702.71</b>
<b>State Estimate</b>	<b>\$</b>	<b>271,126.10</b>
<b>\$ Over</b>	<b>\$</b>	<b>4,576.61</b>
<b>% Over</b>		<b>+1.7%</b>



**Recommendation:**

- Postpone action to the 7/11/14 Board meeting to all time for ADOT to complete the DBE compliance review.



# Agenda Item 10i: Gila County

## GILA COUNTY - VARIOUS LOCAL ROADS



	Roadsafe Traffic Systems	Sunline Contracting
Bid Amount	\$ 276,009.85	\$ 339,932.00
State Estimate	\$ 298,428.50	\$ 298,428.50
% Under/Over	-7.5%	+13.9%

**Recommendation:**

- Roadsafe Traffic Systems Inc. did not sign its bid proposal. Its bid must be rejected.
- Award to Sunline Contracting, LLC.