

**STATE TRANSPORTATION BOARD MEETING**  
**9:00 a.m., Friday, May 17, 2019**  
**Arizona Department of Transportation Auditorium**  
**206 S. 17<sup>th</sup> Avenue**  
**Phoenix, AZ 85007**

**Call to Order**

Chairman Sellers called the State Transportation Board Meeting to order at 10:09 a.m.

**Roll Call by Board Secretary was done during the Public Hearing, prior to Board Meeting**

A quorum of the State Transportation Board was present. **In attendance:** Chairman Sellers, Vice Chairman Hammond, Board Member Stratton, Board Member Thompson, Board Member Elters and Board Member Knight. There were approximately 65 members of the public in the audience. Board Attorney, Michelle Kunzman, was not present.

**Title VI of the Civil Rights Act was done during the Public Hearing, prior to the Board Meeting**

ADOT Executive Officer, Floyd Roehrich, Jr. reminded all attendees to please fill out the optional survey cards to assist our Civil Rights Department.

**Call to the Audience for the Board Meeting**

An opportunity was provided to members of the public to address the State Transportation Board. Members of the public were requested not to exceed a three minute time period for their comments.

1. Jeff Meilbeck, FMPO Executive Director

ARIZONA STATE TRANSPORTATION BOARD  
STATE TRANSPORTATION BOARD MEETING

REPORTER'S TRANSCRIPT OF ELECTRONIC PROCEEDINGS

Arizona Department of Transportation Auditorium  
206 South 17th Avenue  
Phoenix, Arizona 85007

May 17, 2019  
10:09 a.m.

PREPARED FOR:  
ADOT - STATE TRANSPORTATION BOARD

(Certified Copy)

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25

CALL TO THE AUDIENCE

SPEAKER:	PAGE:
Jeff Meilbeck.....	4

AGENDA ITEMS

Item 1 - Director's Report, John Halikowski, ADOT Director.....	5
Item 2 - District Engineer's Report, Julie Gadsby, Central District Assistant Engineer .....	5
Item 3 - Consent Agenda.....	10
Item 4 - Financial Report, Floyd Roehrich, Junior.....	13
Item 5 - Multimodal Planning Division Report, Greg Byres, Division Director, Multimodal Planning Division.....	14
Item 6 - Priority Planning Advisory Committee (PPAC), reg Byres.....	15
Item 7 - State Engineer's Report, Brent Cain, TSMO Director...	21
Item 8 - Construction Contracts, Brent Cain, TSMO Director...	22
Item 9 - Suggestions.....	35

1 (Beginning of excerpt.)

2 CHAIRMAN SELLERS: I'll call to order the -- our  
3 regular board meeting. I do have one white card for call to the  
4 audience for our public board meeting -- or board meeting from a  
5 Jeff Meilbeck.

6 MR. MEILBECK: Mr. Chairman, members of the  
7 Board, my name's Jeff Meilbeck. I'm the executive director of  
8 the Flagstaff Metropolitan Planning Organization. I'm the new  
9 guy. I came over from Transit and City Management, and I want  
10 you to know I've had a lot of questions of the staff team over  
11 the past few months, and I am here to say thank you. From every  
12 angle of this organization -- and I was going to say top to  
13 bottom, but really, what I've come to discover is that it feels  
14 more like a team than a strict hierarchy -- staff have been  
15 accessible and responsive and professional.

16 And I have a story, an example of that. On April  
17 10th, Mayor Evans and Council Member Odegaard and Supervisor  
18 Ryan came down with me to meet with Director Halikowski and his  
19 team, and we had two requests. One was for money, and the other  
20 was for ADOT to submit a grant for us. And the answers were  
21 "no" and "no."

22 So you might be asking why am I saying thank you?  
23 And it's really because staff listened, and when they said "no,"  
24 they told us why, and most importantly, the reasons made sense.  
25 And I have had similar experience with John Lennis and Angela

1 Ringor and (inaudible) Pollack in your organization.  
2 Thankfully, those staff members don't say "no" as often as the  
3 director. However, they do listen and provide information and  
4 tell me why.

5                   So I don't know really -- this recognition is for  
6 you as a board. It's for you, Director, and your staff team. I  
7 got to say I am -- I am not the easiest customer. I have been  
8 around for a while, and I don't think my reputation is that I am  
9 the easiest customer, and you're doing a good job. Thank you.

10                   MR. HALIKOWSKI: Thank you.

11                   CHAIRMAN SELLERS: Thank you.

12                   Okay. We'll now move on to Item 1, the  
13 director's report. John Halikowski.

14                   MR. HALIKOWSKI: No last minute items,  
15 Mr. Chairman.

16                   CHAIRMAN SELLERS: Okay. Thank you.

17                   All right. Next we have the district engineer's  
18 report with Julie Gadsby.

19                   MS. GADSBY: Good morning, Mr. Chair, members of  
20 the Board. Mr. Chair, you've covered so many projects in my  
21 district, I was almost off the hook on this one.

22                   So this right here is a picture of South Mountain  
23 over I-10. In addition to being the assistant district  
24 engineer, I'm the construction manager on this job. So I'm  
25 quite proud of it.

1           This last year we've had 34 projects under  
2 construction, 20 of those federally funded. Of those, 12 of  
3 those are LPA projects that we're helping administer.  
4 Currently, so far, we've (inaudible) 862 million this past  
5 fiscal year. When you see the board report, we're roughly  
6 running about 70 percent of the State's program right now in the  
7 Central District.

8           Some successes we've had the past year. SR-88  
9 opened from Apache Junction to Tortilla Flats. If you were down  
10 in Tucson at Roads and Streets, this project also won a  
11 partnering excellence award. So we're very proud of that.

12           SR-202, our FMS system continued around on the  
13 Santan Freeway. We just installed a roundabout on SR-88 and  
14 Apache Trail to improve safety out there. And then some  
15 rehabilitation of pump stations out on US-60.

16           So our ongoing projects. Like I said, South  
17 Mountain Freeway. We're about 71 percent complete with 83  
18 percent of the time used. This picture here is our Pecos  
19 segment if you're looking west from Desert Foothills to 17th  
20 Ave.

21           So we've completed about 21 of the 41 bridges,  
22 and I say "about" because we still have bridge grooving to do,  
23 but we're getting there. So far, and this was a couple weeks  
24 ago, 261,000 tons of asphalt have been placed in the corridor.  
25 We began the ARACFC paving last weekend on I-10. So if you've

1 driven westbound from 59th to 83rd, you'll see that. We were  
2 supposed to go this weekend, but temperatures have gotten in our  
3 way, so... And I thought when I put this presentation we had  
4 completed blasting, but we hit a hard knob in the center  
5 segment, and we have to go back next week.

6 Like you also said, 347 is coming along. 61  
7 percent complete with 71 percent time used. They completed the  
8 deck pour. All the borrow has been completed on the job. The  
9 Honeycutt Road construction, which has been a challenge with  
10 some utilities, has started. And the traffic on the new 347 is  
11 scheduled for mid to late summer.

12 MR. STRATTON: Mr. Chair.

13 CHAIRMAN SELLERS: Yeah. Board Member Stratton.

14 MR. STRATTON: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

15 I know that Dallas told us at one time that  
16 project would be moving a little slower than anticipated. Has  
17 that picked up any? And what's the estimated date of  
18 completion?

19 MS. GADSBY: The date, it's late this year. We  
20 had put a lot of time into that job, and the contractor got a  
21 late start, but they have gained time. As far as an exact time,  
22 I'd have to get back to you.

23 MR. STRATTON: Just approximately. End of this  
24 year?

25 MS. GADSBY: Yeah.

1 MR. STRATTON: Thank you.

2 MS. GADSBY: So another project. We are working  
3 up on I-17, the Pinnacle Peak and Happy Valley TIs. This  
4 project was originally slated as a CMAR, but we couldn't  
5 negotiate the JNP. We went out as a hard bid. FNF is working  
6 out there right now. So we've got the westbound Pinnacle Peak  
7 abutment and pier footings. Drainage work is ongoing, earthwork  
8 and walls. So you'll see us up there.

9 Like you mentioned, SR-101 from I-17 to Pima  
10 Road, this is the weekend we were removing all the asphalt  
11 rubber. Originally we wouldn't allow removal of asphalt to do  
12 construction, but after some lessons learned where you get a lot  
13 of rock damage, we tried it on South Mountain. It's been very  
14 good for us. So we're allowing it on 101, and we'll also allow  
15 it on the Price when that kicks off in May. They're preparing  
16 for the Miller Road detour, just doing barrier removal and  
17 clearing and grubbing out there right now.

18 I-10, Fairway Drive. This picture's a couple weeks  
19 ago. So we're early into the project. We've been doing  
20 clearing and grubbing and earthwork. If you drive out there now  
21 on the south side of the freeway, you'll see that we started  
22 prepping for a noise wall for -- not noise wall. The retaining  
23 wall for the ramps and a lot of earthwork there.

24 Upcoming this next year, SR-101 from Baseline to the  
25 Santan design-build. Like I said, our first closure on that

1 project is slated for May 31st. So we'll establish the work  
2 zone and get started. We've got the I-17, ACDC to Greenway  
3 project. I-10, the fire detection in the tunnel. We have a  
4 plethora of FMS projects and local agency projects, too many to  
5 list here.

6 I appreciate your time, and that pretty much wraps up  
7 Central District.

8 CHAIRMAN SELLERS: Thank you.

9 Really, really am impressed with your projects,  
10 and now that I have to drive in Phoenix several times a week, I  
11 am really anxious for the South Mountain Freeway to be  
12 completed.

13 MS. GADSBY: As am I. I live in Queen Creek, so  
14 I'm excited to be able to use it to get to the West Valley.

15 CHAIRMAN SELLERS: Any questions or comments from  
16 the Board?

17 MR. ELTERS: Mr. Chair, one question. Julie,  
18 good morning.

19 MS. GADSBY: Thank you.

20 MR. ELTERS: South Mountain, you show at 71  
21 percent complete with 83 percent of the time used. That project  
22 was slated to complete at the end of the year this year. Will  
23 this impact the completion date?

24 MS. GADSBY: Under our original contract, we were  
25 supposed to be completed in November. Adding the two additional

1 TIs at Ivanhoe and 32nd Street, we added time. We were  
2 scheduled to be open December 20th of 2019 with additional work  
3 to follow. As you -- I mean, for construction, adding TIs this  
4 late in the game, it's pushed some things back, but my developer  
5 is confident we're going to open this year.

6 MR. ELTERS: So you're timing it as a Christmas  
7 present for you and for Mr. Sellers.

8 MS. GADSBY: Yes.

9 MR. ELTERS: Thank you.

10 DIRECTOR HALIKOWSKI: Actually, Mr. Elters, it's  
11 for me, because I remember when we met with MAG and put this  
12 project into four-wheel drive several years ago. It's been a  
13 long time coming as, you know.

14 CHAIRMAN SELLERS: Yes, it has.

15 MR. ELTERS: I'll take that.

16 CHAIRMAN SELLERS: And I will look forward to the  
17 grand opening.

18 MS. GADSBY: I'll let you run the marathon when  
19 we open it.

20 CHAIRMAN SELLERS: Thank you.

21 Okay. We now move on to the consent agenda.

22 Does any member want any item removed from the consent agenda?

23 Okay. Do I have a motion to approve the consent  
24 agenda?

25 MR. ELTERS: So moved.

1 MR. STRATTON: Second with a question after  
2 (inaudible).

3 CHAIRMAN SELLERS: Okay. Moved by Board Member  
4 Elters, seconded by Board Member Stratton. Discussion?

5 MR. STRATTON: I'd like to ask a question about  
6 Item 3E. A couple questions, actually.

7 DIRECTOR HALIKOWSKI: Mr. Chair, Brent's here for  
8 Dallas today, who's at a national conference. So he asks that  
9 you go easy on him. He's a little worried.

10 MR. STRATTON: Before I ask the questions, I'd  
11 like to make a comment. This is the second bid for this  
12 particular project. The first time it came in over estimate  
13 significantly, and it had to do with the footing, I believe.  
14 (Inaudible) process. And I believe the state engineer's office,  
15 and in particular Steve Mosure (phonetic), came back with an  
16 alternate bid for a different type, and it reduced the cost. So  
17 I'd like to give kudos to the Department and specifically to  
18 Steve if it was him.

19 My question being when will the project start  
20 approximately, and what is the scheduled duration?

21 MR. CAIN: So this is -- good morning, Chair.  
22 Member Stratton --

23 MR. ROEHRICH: Brent, can you get closer, please?

24 MR. CAIN: Good morning, Chair, Member Stratton.  
25 This regards the Pinto Creek project, correct?

1 MR. STRATTON: Yes.

2 MR. CAIN: So we're looking at a start date of  
3 the first week in July, and a 500-day duration. So  
4 approximately two years.

5 MR. STRATTON: I've had several comments from the  
6 different various governments in my area of concern about the  
7 flow of traffic and (inaudible) the bridges being built north of  
8 the current bridge, and be a minimal impact until such time that  
9 we switch over to it. But I would ask that the department or  
10 the PR firm or whoever get with Gila County, the Superior --  
11 Town of Superior, the San Carlos tribe and City of Globe and  
12 (inaudible). Those are the governments that have been  
13 questioning it.

14 MR. CAIN: Great.

15 MR. STRATTON: Thank you.

16 CHAIRMAN SELLERS: Thank you.

17 Any other discussion?

18 MR. ELTERS: Mr. Chair, just a quick comment,  
19 also. I know there was a lot of discussion about this item  
20 related to re-advertising or not, and the concerns of the  
21 industry as well. It looks to me like that was really good  
22 decision to re-advertise it and revisit it and make the changes  
23 necessary. So I -- I would applaud the department and staff and  
24 all involved in the board for supporting that decision to go in  
25 that direction. I think it was a win-win for all. Thank you.

1 CHAIRMAN SELLERS: Okay. Thank you.

2 All right. All in favor of the consent agenda as  
3 submitted, say aye.

4 BOARD MEMBERS: Aye.

5 CHAIRMAN SELLERS: Any opposed? The consent  
6 agenda is approved.

7 We'll now move on to the financial report with  
8 Floyd Roehrich, and you do not have to go easy on Floyd.

9 MR. ROEHRICH: Mr. Chair, members of the Board,  
10 you do not. But the bottom line is any question you ask me, I'm  
11 going to say, "I don't know what you're talking about. Call  
12 Kristine."

13 So Ms. Ward does send her apologizes, because she  
14 got called away at the last minute on another issue that was  
15 urgent for her to address. So really, we're going to forego the  
16 financial report. She will be here for the study session in  
17 June to make sure that we have the discussion of fiscal  
18 constraint for the new program, but in general, what -- the  
19 conversation I had with her is we are barely matching forecast  
20 right now for revenue. So we're continuing to see revenues that  
21 are just holding to what we expected, which really means the  
22 possibility for growing the program is not happening given  
23 current condition. She will have an update at the next board  
24 meeting. With that, Mr. Chair, that's -- that's all I have.

25 CHAIRMAN SELLERS: Thank you.

1 Any questions or comments for Floyd?

2 All right. Moving on to agenda Item No. 5. Greg  
3 Byres, Multimodal Planning Division report. This item is for  
4 information and discussion only.

5 MR. ROEHRICH: Could we get some more staff up  
6 here to figure out (inaudible)?

7 MR. BYRES: So all that was for naught here,  
8 because that's for the next item, but anyway, for the MPD  
9 report, I only have a couple items. First one is, even though  
10 we're still going through the tentative program, we were  
11 actually looking at -- I call for projects into our P2P program.  
12 That's going to be coming out the end of June, first of July.

13 The other thing that I have, item on here, we  
14 have just completed all of our public hearings on our I-11  
15 project. We had hearings at Buckeye, Wickenburg, Casa Grande,  
16 Nogales, Tucson and Marana. We had a very large turnout in  
17 Buckeye, and we had a very large turnout in Marana. We also had  
18 pretty decent turnouts at all the rest of our public hearings.  
19 Word got out. It was actually very well advertised. A lot of  
20 comments that came in. So it was a very productive set of  
21 public hearings. So we're now taking in all those comments.  
22 That comment period actually ends July 8th. So we're still  
23 taking in comments on that, so...

24 CHAIRMAN SELLERS: Thank you.

25 MR. BYERS: That was all I have.

1 CHAIRMAN SELLERS: Comments or questions?

2 MR. STRATTON: Mr. Chairman, I have questions on  
3 two projects. I don't know if it would be appropriate under  
4 this item or the next item.

5 CHAIRMAN SELLERS: Is it a Multimodal Planning  
6 Division item or a PPAC Item?

7 MR. STRATTON: PPAC.

8 MR. ROEHRICH: Yeah. This is (inaudible) PPAC  
9 item. So when Mr. Byers goes into that, Mr. Stratton, you can  
10 ask.

11 CHAIRMAN SELLERS: Okay.

12 MR. BYERS: Thank you.

13 CHAIRMAN SELLERS: Mr. Byres, would you like to  
14 do Item No. 6, PPAC?

15 MR. BYRES: Yes, I will.

16 This is the PPAC items that we have. We have  
17 three different sets of items. The first one that we're  
18 bringing forward is the new projects. This is Item 6M through  
19 6U, and we bring this forward with a recommendation for  
20 approval.

21 MR. ROEHRICH: Hold on.

22 MR. BYERS: I'm sorry.

23 MR. ROEHRICH: You're up to 6M? Where'd you get  
24 6M?

25 MR. BYERS: Excuse me. You're right. It's --

1 the projects are 6A through 6L. So -- and with that I'd like to  
2 make sure that we make a comment on here that Items 6E through  
3 6H were being deferred from 2019 through to 2020 as approved by  
4 the MAG regional council.

5 CHAIRMAN SELLERS: Okay. Do I have a motion to  
6 approve PPAC Items 6A through 6L with the modifications  
7 mentioned?

8 MR. ELTERS: So moved.

9 MR. KNIGHT: Second.

10 CHAIRMAN SELLERS: Moved by Board Member Elters,  
11 seconded by Board Member Knight. Comments? Questions?  
12 Question?

13 MR. STRATTON: On Item 6B, Virgin River Bridge, I  
14 noticed you're adding quite a bit in the design phase. Can you  
15 expand on that, please?

16 MR. BYERS: Mr. Chairman, Mr. Stratton, on that,  
17 this project is being delivered using an alternative delivery  
18 process. This is going through a CMAR, which is a construction  
19 manager at risk project. The reason that we're going through  
20 with an alternative delivery is just because of the means of the  
21 work on those bridges, the technical aspects as well as the  
22 traffic management that's associated with those. And as such,  
23 we've got a cost, an additional cost up front with that, which  
24 that's where the extra money is going into. The funding that's  
25 being utilized that -- for that is coming out of our bridge

1 preservation subprogram to pay for that.

2 MR. STRATTON: In the bridge program, is that  
3 statewide or is it divided rural and MAG and PAG as the other  
4 moneys are?

5 MR. BYERS: That's statewide moneys.

6 MR. STRATTON: Thank you.

7 Going this route with the CMAR, is it anticipated  
8 then that you would save money in the construction portion and  
9 maybe make up that design money?

10 MR. BYERS: Mr. Chairman, Mr. Stratton, the big  
11 things with the CMAR that -- there's a couple of different  
12 advantages to it. One is we actually take and minimize risk to  
13 the Department, to the State. We basically are transferring  
14 that risk over to the construction managers. The other thing is  
15 is that we have a guaranteed cost and a guaranteed completion  
16 date. So with that, we're taking and putting that risk off onto  
17 the contractor.

18 MR. ROEHRICH: Mr. Chair, Mr. Stratton, and I  
19 want to make sure, because you'd asked would that mean you'll  
20 save money, and I think that it's important to note that we're  
21 not -- we don't know if we're going to save money. Because the  
22 complexity of this bridge, because the type of bridge that it is  
23 and the type of bridge that we're proposing to replace it with,  
24 as well as the critical nature of maintaining traffic through  
25 Interstate 15, because there really is no detour during that

1 phase, as a complexity of that, using this method allows us to  
2 better control how the contractor is approaching his  
3 construction, his methodology, and ultimately, (inaudible)  
4 better yet to help us control those costs. We can't guarantee  
5 it will save money, but what we can guarantee is when we get to  
6 that guaranteed maximum price, we have developed them to the  
7 point where we fully are confident in that cost, whatever that  
8 cost ends up being.

9 MR. STRATTON: Thank you.

10 On Item 6I, the Superior to the Gila County line  
11 mill and fill, number one, is -- when is that anticipated to be  
12 advertised? And number -- the second question is what is the  
13 duration?

14 MR. BYERS: Mr. Chairman, Mr. Stratton, on that,  
15 on looking at this here, we're putting in for funding for --  
16 this is going through a final design. So we're looking at  
17 probably it going to construction, depending on the construction  
18 time frame as far as our construction schedule -- our  
19 construction window, we'll try and set that up to hit that  
20 construction window, but -- as far as weather goes, but I'm  
21 looking at this probably mid year or I should say end of the  
22 year.

23 MR. STRATTON: So this project will be taking  
24 place at the same time the Pinto Creek project is being  
25 constructed; is that correct?

1                   MR. BYERS: I take that back. We're looking at  
2 our current -- the bid date as being around the 4th of July, 3rd  
3 of July, with -- it will probably be going to construction  
4 sometime two months after that.

5                   MR. STRATTON: As you speak to the governmental  
6 entities I mentioned earlier on the Pinto Creek Bridge, this  
7 will be one of the things they're going to ask you. Are these  
8 projects going to be taken simultaneously, and what is the  
9 impact and what is the duration of that impact. So be prepared  
10 for that, please. Thank you.

11                   CHAIRMAN SELLERS: Thank you.

12                   Any other discussion?

13                   All right. All in favor say aye.

14                   BOARD MEMBERS: Aye.

15                   CHAIRMAN SELLERS: Any opposed? Item 6A through  
16 6L are approved.

17                   MR. BYRES: The next item I'm bringing forward is  
18 Project 6M through 6U. And again, these come forward with a  
19 recommendation for approval. One thing I would like to add is  
20 Items S and T are to be approved by the MAG regional council on  
21 May 22nd.

22                   CHAIRMAN SELLERS: Okay. Do I have a motion?  
23 Board Member Thompson?

24                   MR. THOMPSON: So --

25                   MR. HAMMOND: Second.

1 MR. THOMPSON: So what happens if (inaudible)?

2 MR. BYERS: So as of -- we would -- we won't  
3 bring these forward unless they've been approved by the  
4 recommended -- recommendation committees to the regional  
5 council. That's why we bring this forward. If we don't, we  
6 actually delay these projects out another couple of months. But  
7 again, we will not bring these forward unless there's a  
8 recommendation through those previous committees to the regional  
9 council.

10 MR. THOMPSON: Chairman, I would move for  
11 approval.

12 MR. HAMMOND: Second.

13 CHAIRMAN SELLERS: Second by Board Member  
14 Hammond. Any discussion?

15 All in favor say aye.

16 BOARD MEMBERS: Aye.

17 CHAIRMAN SELLERS: Any opposed? Items 6M through  
18 6U are approved.

19 MR. BYRES: I've got one more item. This is Item  
20 6B. This is an airport project. This is additional to what has  
21 been approved prior. We do have adequate funding for it due to  
22 the balances that we're currently running in our Aviation Fund,  
23 and we bring this forward with a recommendation for approval.

24 CHAIRMAN SELLERS: Do we have a motion to approve  
25 PPAC airport project Item 6B?

1 MR. KNIGHT: So moved.

2 CHAIRMAN SELLERS: Moved by Board Member Knight.

3 MR. STRATTON: Second.

4 CHAIRMAN SELLERS: Seconded by Board Member  
5 Stratton. Any discussion?

6 All in favor say aye.

7 BOARD MEMBERS: Aye.

8 CHAIRMAN SELLERS: Any opposed? That motion  
9 carries.

10 MR. BYRES: Thank you.

11 CHAIRMAN SELLERS: All right. Moving on to  
12 Agenda Item 7, the State engineer's report, today with Brent  
13 Cain. This is for information and discussion only.

14 MR. CAIN: Good morning again, Board -- or  
15 Chairman and Board. My name is Brent Cain.

16 MR. ROEHRICH: Brent, could you get closer to  
17 that? It's not picking you up. Sorry.

18 MR. CAIN: You bet.

19 So good morning. My name is Brent Cain. I'm the  
20 division director over TSMO, which is Transportation Systems  
21 Management Operations for ADOT. So Dallas Hammit could not be  
22 here today, so I'm standing in for him.

23 For Item 7, the state engineer's report,  
24 currently there are 101 projects under construction valued at  
25 \$1.9 billion. Julie Gadsby touched on the majority of that in

1 the South Mountain Freeway effort. There were seven projects  
2 were finalized in April, valued at 7.9 million. And to date for  
3 fiscal year 2019, 86 projects have been finalized.

4 Mr. Chair, members, that concludes my  
5 presentation for the state engineer's report.

6 CHAIRMAN SELLERS: Any questions for Brent on  
7 that?

8 Okay. Moving on Agenda Item 8. For discussion  
9 and possible construction, construction contracts. Mr. Cain.

10 MR. CAIN: So thank you for that, Mr. Chair,  
11 members of the Board. Thank you for approving the consent. We  
12 do have nine projects that we're going to go through on the  
13 agenda for discussion and possible action. Fiscal year 2019 to  
14 date, the low bids have been \$80 million, estimated about 15.9  
15 percent over or higher than the State's estimate.

16 Moving on to -- these should have been hidden.

17 MR. ROEHRICH: I'm getting dizzy, Brent.

18 MR. CAIN: Sorry about that. I wasn't even  
19 pushing the button, so...

20 The first item, Item 8A, is to replace the  
21 bridges on I-17 at El Toro Road. The low bid, 5. -- or  
22 \$5,978,331. The State estimate, \$4,373,599, with a difference  
23 of \$1,604,732, the difference for 36.7 percent. The reasons for  
24 the difference, higher than expected pricing for the aggregate  
25 base. The asphaltic concrete, structural concrete and

1 reinforcing steel and drilled shaft foundation. The Department  
2 underestimated the cost of labor associated with the required  
3 construction phasing as well.

4 DIRECTOR HALIKOWSKI: Mr. Chairman, Brent, I  
5 believe you said 17. This is 19. For I-19, correct?

6 MR. CAIN: My -- I stand corrected, director --  
7 Chair and Mr. Director.

8 DIRECTOR HALIKOWSKI: Just for the record, I  
9 wanted to clarify. Thank you.

10 MR. CAIN: I-19. My apologies.

11 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Don't be nervous.

12 MR. ROEHRICH: Don't let it happen again. What  
13 the hell, man? You're a professional.

14 MR. CAIN: Just let me work through this, Floyd.  
15 Thank you.

16 MR. ROEHRICH: Okay.

17 MR. CAIN: So --

18 CHAIRMAN SELLERS: Yeah. We want to keep this in  
19 Board Member Hammond's district.

20 MR. CAIN: My apologies.

21 The Department has reviewed the bid and believes  
22 it's responsive and responsible and recommends award to FNF  
23 Construction.

24 CHAIRMAN SELLERS: Do we have a motion to award  
25 Item 8A to FNF Construction, Inc., as presented?

1 MR. HAMMOND: I move approval.

2 MR. STRATTON: Second.

3 CHAIRMAN SELLERS: Motion by Board Member  
4 Hammond, second by Board Member Stratton. Any discussion?

5 All in favor say aye.

6 BOARD MEMBERS: Aye.

7 CHAIRMAN SELLERS: Opposed? The motion carries.

8 MR. CAIN: Mr. Chair, members of the Board,  
9 moving to Item 8B, this is a pavement rehabilitation on US-60 in  
10 Show Low. Our recommendation is to -- the Department's working  
11 through DBE contract issues and requests to postpone to a future  
12 board meeting.

13 CHAIRMAN SELLERS: Do I have a motion to postpone  
14 Item 8B?

15 MR. THOMPSON: Chairman, the reason for  
16 postponement? I didn't hear you. What is the reason for  
17 wanting to postpone it?

18 MR. CAIN: I'm sorry. I'm sorry, sir. Chairman.  
19 DBE contract issues.

20 MR. ROEHRICH: Mr. Chair and Mr. Thompson, that's  
21 the design -- or the Disadvantage Business Enterprise part.  
22 There's a component of being a federal contract where they have  
23 to meet certain amounts of disadvantaged business, enterprise  
24 DBE firms that are part of this contract. We have to evaluate  
25 that as part of it, and if there's a discrepancy or an

1 irregularity in that documentation, we have to confirm it before  
2 we can move forward. We're still trying to confirm it in this  
3 case, because there's some issues going on between the -- this  
4 component that we haven't resolved yet. So we're asking to  
5 postpone this project so the Department can continue to evaluate  
6 it.

7 MR. THOMPSON: Thank you very much. I'll go  
8 ahead and motion to approve the recommendation.

9 CHAIRMAN SELLERS: Do I have --

10 MR. ELTERS: Second.

11 CHAIRMAN SELLERS: Second by Board Member Elters.

12 Any discussion?

13 All in favor.

14 BOARD MEMBERS: Aye.

15 CHAIRMAN SELLERS: Any opposed? That motion  
16 carries.

17 MR. CAIN: Chairman, members of the Board, moving  
18 on to Item 8C, this is a bridge deck replacement on SR-89A in  
19 Flagstaff. The low bid \$6,299,734. The State estimate,  
20 \$5,325,527. The difference of \$974,207, a difference of 8.3  
21 percent. The reasons for difference is higher than expected  
22 pricing for borrow, asphaltic concrete, silica fume -- fume,  
23 concrete, sanitary cedar bypass, and also the Department over  
24 estimated the projection rates for earthwork and asphaltic  
25 pavement.

1                   CHAIRMAN SELLERS: Do we have a motion to award  
2 Item 8C to FNF Construction as presented?

3                   MR. THOMPSON: Chairman, I would so move for  
4 approval.

5                   CHAIRMAN SELLERS: Moved by the Board Member  
6 Thompson.

7                   MR. KNIGHT: Second.

8                   CHAIRMAN SELLERS: Second by Board Member Knight.  
9 Any discussion?

10                   All in favor vote aye.

11                   BOARD MEMBERS: Aye.

12                   CHAIRMAN SELLERS: Any opposed? That motion  
13 carries.

14                   MR. CAIN: Chairman, members of the Board, moving  
15 on to Item 8D. This is to construct a right turn -- construct  
16 right turn lanes on SR-95 in Lake Havasu. The low bid was  
17 \$1,395,146. The State estimate of \$1,261,861, with a difference  
18 of \$133,285. Percent difference at 10.6 percent. The reasons  
19 for the higher difference, higher than expected pricing for the  
20 grading roadway for pavement. The Department has reviewed the  
21 bid and believes it's responsive and responsible, and recommends  
22 awarding to Fann Contracting, Incorporated.

23                   CHAIRMAN SELLERS: Is there a motion to award  
24 Item 8D to Fann Contracting, Inc., as presented?

25                   MR. KNIGHT: So moved?

1 CHAIRMAN SELLERS: Moved by Board Member Knight.

2 MR. THOMPSON: Second.

3 CHAIRMAN SELLERS: Second by Board Member  
4 Thompson. Any discussion?

5 All in favor say aye.

6 BOARD MEMBERS: Aye.

7 CHAIRMAN SELLERS: Any opposed? The motion  
8 carries.

9 MR. CAIN: Chairman, members of the board, moving  
10 on to Item 8E. This is a scour retrofit project in Navajo  
11 County, northwest of Show Low. The low bid of 292,000. The  
12 State estimate of 168,818, with a difference of \$123,182.  
13 Percent difference is 73 percent. The reasons for the  
14 difference, the higher than expected pricing for the structural  
15 excavation, structural concrete, embedded signpost. It's also a  
16 a smaller project, and higher than expected costs associated  
17 with the location, size of the project. The Department has  
18 reviewed the bid and believes it's responsive and responsible  
19 and recommends award to KAZ Construction, Inc.

20 CHAIRMAN SELLERS: Do we have a motion to award  
21 Item 8E to KAZ construction, Inc,. as presented?

22 MR. THOMPSON: Chairman, I would so move for  
23 approval.

24 MR. STRATTON: Second.

25 CHAIRMAN SELLERS: Moved by Board Member

1 Thompson, second by Board Member Thompson. Any discussion?

2 All in favor say aye.

3 BOARD MEMBERS: Aye.

4 CHAIRMAN SELLERS: Any opposed? The motion  
5 carries.

6 MR. CAIN: Chairman, board members, moving to  
7 Item 8F, this horizontal curve warning signs in southern central  
8 Arizona. The low bid was \$1,393,288. The State estimate of  
9 \$1,800,286. Difference of \$408,988. A difference of 22.7  
10 percent. The reasons for the difference, better than expected  
11 prices for traffic control and signposts and slip bases. The  
12 Department has reviewed the bid and believes it's responsive and  
13 responsible and recommends award to ABBCO Sign Group,  
14 Incorporated.

15 CHAIRMAN SELLERS: Is there a motion to award  
16 Item 8F to ABBCO Sign Group, Incorporated as presented?

17 MR. ELTERS: So moved.

18 CHAIRMAN SELLERS: Moved by Board Member  
19 Thompson.

20 MR. KNIGHT: Second.

21 CHAIRMAN SELLERS: Second by Board Member Knight.

22 MR. ELTERS: Motion by Elters.

23 CHAIRMAN SELLERS: Oh, okay. All right. I stand  
24 corrected. Motion by Board Member Elters, seconded by Board  
25 Member Knight. Any discussion?

1 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: (Inaudible.)

2 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: You better turn this this  
3 way here. They're nailed down.

4 CHAIRMAN SELLERS: All in favor, say aye.

5 BOARD MEMBERS: Aye.

6 CHAIRMAN SELLERS: Any opposed? The motion  
7 carries.

8 MR. CAIN: Chairman, members of the Board, moving  
9 on to Item 8G, this is a Coyote Wash multi-use path in the Town  
10 of Wellton. The Department requests to postpone to a future  
11 board meeting to allow the Town of Wellton to put together the  
12 additional funding needed for this project, so...

13 CHAIRMAN SELLERS: Is there a motion to postpone  
14 Item 8G?

15 MR. KNIGHT: So moved.

16 CHAIRMAN SELLERS: Moved by Board Member Knight.

17 MR. THOMPSON: Second.

18 CHAIRMAN SELLERS: Seconded by Board Member  
19 Thompson.

20 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: And I just have one  
21 question. That was requested by the Town of Wellton?

22 MR. CAIN: The Department requests -- Yes.  
23 That's correct. Yes.

24 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Thank you.

25 MR. CAIN: To look for additional funding.

1 Correct, sir.

2 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Thank you.

3 CHAIRMAN SELLERS: Any discussion?

4 MR. STRATTON: Mr. Chairman.

5 CHAIRMAN SELLERS: Board Member Stratton.

6 MR. STRATTON: This says that it's 5.7 percent  
7 State. Should that be 5.7 percent Town of Wellton?

8 MR. ROEHRICH: Mr. Chair, Mr. Stratton -- I can  
9 take this one, Brad, if you want.

10 MR. CAIN: Go ahead.

11 MR. ROEHRICH: What they're using is part of the  
12 HURF funds that come through the COG, they've got some money  
13 through them, and that's what they use in the match to get the  
14 rest of the federal dollars. So it didn't affect any of the  
15 ADOT programs because it came from the COG redistribution.

16 CHAIRMAN SELLERS: All right. All in favor?

17 BOARD MEMBERS: Aye.

18 CHAIRMAN SELLERS: Opposed? The motion carries.

19 MR. CAIN: Chairman, members of the Board, Item  
20 8H, a bridge deck rehabilitation, Wellton & Mohawk Canal Bridge  
21 in Yuma County. Low bid, 1,539,912. The State estimate,  
22 \$868,266, with a difference of \$671,646. Percent difference at  
23 77.4 percent. The reasons for the difference, higher than  
24 expected pricing for removing the bridge, precast, PS member,  
25 reinforcing steel. The Department underestimated costs

1 associated with environmental -- in addition to the Department  
2 underestimated costs associated with environmental mitigation  
3 measures and night work. The Department has reviewed the bid  
4 and believes it's responsive and responsible and recommends  
5 award to DBA Construction, Inc.

6 CHAIRMAN SELLERS: Is there a motion to award  
7 Item 8H to DBA Construction, Inc. as presented?

8 MR. KNIGHT: So moved.

9 CHAIRMAN SELLERS: Moved by Board Member Knight.

10 MR. THOMPSON: Second.

11 CHAIRMAN SELLERS: Second by Board Member  
12 Thompson. Any discussion?

13 MR. ELTERS: Mr. Chairman, I have a question.

14 CHAIRMAN SELLERS: Board Member Elters.

15 MR. ELTERS: With respect to -- with full respect  
16 to Board Member Knight, it's in his district, but fresh off a  
17 discussion with Pinto Bridge and re-advertising that because it  
18 came in so high, we have only one bidder here, and it's more  
19 than 75 percent over the State estimate. It begs the question,  
20 I think, is this one that is a candidate to reconsider?

21 MR. CAIN: Chairman, Board Member Elters, you are  
22 correct. There is only one bidder on this. We could look --  
23 advertise at a later date, but there's no guarantee the price  
24 would come down, potentially increasing cost.

25 MR. ROEHRICH: And Mr. Chair, Mr. Elters, I think

1 I agree with Brent in this case, because if you remember on  
2 Pinto Creek, there were some different design options or some  
3 different considerations that we could make in that area that we  
4 had talked over not only with the locals, but with the bridge  
5 group -- with the bridge group.

6 Here, you -- I don't think we have those same  
7 opportunities. We basically have to go out with about the same  
8 design and the same -- the same bid packet and hope somebody  
9 bids it different. In this case, we don't feel that it's going  
10 to be that big a difference given the current environment, and  
11 all we've been doing is delaying getting these improvements  
12 done.

13 MR. KNIGHT: Mr. Chair.

14 CHAIRMAN SELLERS: Board Member Knight.

15 MR. KNIGHT: I might add the one we postponed,  
16 the previous one that we postponed, there were three bidders,  
17 and DBA was one of the bidders, one of the three bidders, and we  
18 postponed that one. I'm thinking probably if the only one  
19 they're going to get is the bridges, it may go up since they  
20 were planning to be there already, and we postpone the multi-use  
21 path. So they're not going to be there already, although  
22 depending upon when the multi-use path is finalized, they may  
23 be, but that might cause -- since they don't have that to  
24 consider, that they're going to be there already, that might  
25 cause the bridge cost to go up rather than down.

1                   MR. ELTERS: Mr. Chairman, I just wanted to pose  
2 the question. Thank you, Mr. Knight and Mr. Roehrich. I think  
3 you really did answer my question. My question was -- primarily  
4 is the -- have we looked, is there another design option,  
5 because that indeed was the case on the Pinto Bridge. So with  
6 that said, I'm satisfied with the answer. Thank you.

7                   CHAIRMAN SELLERS: Okay. We do have a motion and  
8 a second. Any further discussion?

9                   All in favor say aye.

10                  BOARD MEMBERS: Aye.

11                  CHAIRMAN SELLERS: Any opposed? The motion  
12 carries.

13                  MR. CAIN: Mr. Chair, members of the Board, the  
14 last item, Item 8I. This was an addendum. This is roadway  
15 paving in Nogales. Low bid came in at \$486,896. State  
16 estimate, 464,593, with a difference of \$22,304. Percent  
17 difference at 4.8 percent. Reasons for the difference is the  
18 concrete valley gutter. Department requests the bid to reflect  
19 the low bidder, Granite Construction, for failing to meet  
20 required DBE goals. Department has reviewed the bid of the  
21 second low bidder and believes it's responsive and responsible  
22 and recommends award to KE&G Construction.

23                  CHAIRMAN SELLERS: Do we have a motion for Item  
24 8A --

25                  MS. PRIANO: 8I.

1 CHAIRMAN SELLERS: -- to award to KE&G,  
2 Construction, Inc. as presented by staff?

3 MR. CAIN: 8I.

4 CHAIRMAN SELLERS: 8I. What's I say?

5 MR. CAIN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

6 MS. PRIANO: A.

7 So moved, whether it's I or A.

8 Mr. ELTERS: Second.

9 CHAIRMAN SELLERS: Okay. We have a motion by  
10 Board Member Hammond, seconded --

11 MS. PRIANO: Elters.

12 CHAIRMAN SELLERS: Seconded by Board Member  
13 Elters. Any discussion?

14 MR. ROEHRICH: Don't they realize they've still  
15 got six months with you?

16 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: That's why we've got name  
17 tags.

18 CHAIRMAN SELLERS: Any further discussion?

19 All in favor vote aye.

20 BOARD MEMBERS: Aye.

21 CHAIRMAN SELLERS: Any opposed? That motion  
22 carries.

23 MR. CAIN: Thank you. Chairman, members of the  
24 Board, that concludes my item.

25 CHAIRMAN SELLERS: Are there any suggestions for

1 board members on items they'd like placed on future board  
2 meeting agendas?

3 Seeing none, do I have a motion to adjourn?

4 MR. KNIGHT: So moved.

5 MR. STRATTON: Second.

6 CHAIRMAN SELLERS: Who was the motion by?

7 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Mr. Knight.

8 CHAIRMAN SELLERS: Motion by Board Member Knight,  
9 second by board member Stratton. This board is out of control.

10 DIRECTOR HALIKOWSKI: If you wait long enough,  
11 the monkeys will settle down.

12 MR. ROEHRICH: It's been a long public hearing  
13 process. We're coming toward the end.

14 CHAIRMAN SELLERS: Yeah. I think when the board  
15 gets out of control, it's probably the Chair's fault.

16 CHAIRMAN SELLERS: Any discussion?

17 All in favor say aye.

18 BOARD MEMBERS: Aye.

19 CHAIRMAN SELLERS: Any opposed? This meeting's

20

21 adjourned. (Meeting adjourned at 10:51 a.m.)

22

23

24

25

**Adjournment**

***A motion to adjourn the May 17, 2019 State Transportation Board meeting was made by Board Member Knight and seconded by Board Member Stratton. In a voice vote, the motion carried.***

**Meeting adjourned at 10:51 a.m. MST.**



Jack Sellers, Chairman  
State Transportation Board



John S. Halikowski, ADOT Director  
Arizona Department of Transportation