MINUTES
OF THE
STATE TRANSPORTATION BOARD
STUDY SESSION
1:00 p.m., Tuesday, September 7, 2004
Arizona Department of Transportation
Board Room
206 South 17th Avenue
Phoenix, Arizona 85007

The State Transportation Board met in official session for a study session at 1:00 p.m., Tuesday, September 7, 2004, with Chairperson Jeffers presiding. Other Board members present included: Vice Chairperson Rusty Gant, Dick Hileman, Delbert Householder, Joe Lane, Jim Martin, and Si Schorr. Also present were Director Victor Mendez; Debra Brisk, Deputy Director; John McGee, Chief Financial Officer, Administrative Services Division; Dale Buskirk, Director, Planning Division; and Mike Ortega, State Engineer. There were approximately 40 people in the audience.

Chairperson Jeffers welcomed those present and led the audience in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Transportation Enhancement Review Committee (TERC) Round 11 recommendation - Young's Farm Enhancement application

Mr. Tom Foster invited Mr. Michael Patrick to present a recap of a transportation enhancement application for scenic easement of Young's Farm. The Trust for Public Land is a natural conservation organization to protect lands that are important for communities to save. The effort to save Young's Farm is their top priority in Arizona. Young's Farm is located on a low traveled road on state highway 69 from Phoenix to Prescott. ADOT reported that 20,000 motorists use that highway every day. This enhancement program did not come with ADOT board approval because the board was concerned that there was not a viable public benefit in light of not having enough transportation funds. Mr. Patrick continued to explain the steps taken to improve the benefits of the project.

The project encompasses the purchase of development rights and placement of an easement for Young's Farm. Funds are sought for the purchase of these development rights. A map depicting the areas intended for protection was shown. About 10,000 acres of farm lands are being lost each year in Arizona. Yavapai County has grown at a 56% growth rate over the last decade. This project will ensure the preservation of this farm land, provide open space protection, provide easement and enhance historical heritage. With the sale of development rights, the landowner has agreed to offer right of way on their land for a future transportation interchange associated with Highway 69. As highway traffic continues to grow, there is concern for a worsening safety issue. Land for this traffic interchange will provide both safety benefits and also ease of access. Secondary benefits include saving Young's Farm, its educational tours, classrooms, festivals, produce and service as a buffer site.

The conservation easement will encumber 310 acres that will prohibit other future development. A local land trust in Prescott called Central Arizona Land Trust will be the holders of the conservation easement. And the lands will be managed with an approved conservation plan. Under Arizona statue, the local land trust that holds the easement can enforce the rights.

Even though the easement would stop any future development of the property, there is no guarantee that it would not be abandoned. If was felt that there probably isn't any group that guarantees that property continue to be farmed. The farm land is currently leased by Mr. Young. He works to ensure economic viability including marketing. The next generation of Young family members is committed to farming.

The Transportation Enhancement Funds will be used to purchase the development rights. An appraisal of the development rights was obtained. Along with grant approval, a private capital campaign will be conducted to complete the project. A campaign committee has been formed and a fund raising consultant is on staff. $150,000 of the amount has been raised.

In answer to Mr. Householder's question, it will not be taken off the tax role. The fee title will remain with Young Acres.

Cottonwood, Clarkdale and Camp Verde (Verde Valley) Transportation Update

Mr. Foster reported that a study was completed in 1998 and was summarized in a concept report. The two communities of Clarkdale and Cottonwood were not happy with the design concept. Instead of a rural section with a center turn lane, they both needed access management. Concepts were developed with some designs not allowing just driveway accesses everywhere and putting in median islands, and signals. Another concept looked at roundabouts. Communities were given a choice and Clarkdale unanimously supported the roundabout concept and the five lane concept with a center lane and Cottonwood was 6-1 in favor. With that feedback, the project is going forward. Because there is a lot of public opinion with roundabouts, an assessment was conducted. The needs and purposes were noted. Public meetings were held. One hundred and sixty written comments were received. Each is being responded to and an offer to meet is being extended. The environment process will be documented. It is in the five year program advertised for FY07. There is money for the right of way to begin with the environment process beginning in spring '05.

John Olsen, Olsen's Feed and Grain, mentioned there are differences in opinion of how things are done and wanted to point out those differences. For those in the retail business along the highway, their life blood is the ability to allow customers to access their business. Many businesses have been in existence with the highway being in a certain configuration. For a lot of reasons, they want to see a way to develop this highway in such a way that it will be business friendly. Municipalities live on sales tax. He mentioned that he and others were a little disconcerted with the first meeting when this was discussed. The public didn't have a chance to speak. Only one proposal that ADOT was advocating was discussed and that was the roundabouts. There is concern about how roundabouts will work. Mr. Olsen's business is going to be halfway between two roundabouts; anyone accessing the business will have to access a roundabout. He feels that the Vail, Colorado comparison is not valid because Vail's is not on the interstate. The roundabout is in the village and does not have anything to do with a well traveled highway and it works very well. Mr. Olsen feels the signal systems work well. Already, investors have been turned down because of an inability to give a firm commitment as to how the highway is going to be built so that they would have a way to start planning.

Andy Groseta, shared his concerns regarding the segment of highway between Clarkdale and Cottonwood and Highway 260 which also is in ADOT's plans to be widened between Cottonwood and Camp Verde. Before the roundabout idea, the design concept report was

completed in 1998. Several years ago, a user wanted to acquire a site to build a store. They went through the process, including working with the City of Cottonwood. With that, several meetings were held with ADOT and Mr. Foster and his staff to build a neighborhood shopping center, anchored by a grocery store, Bashas. The City asked for a master plan for the entire property of approximately 145 acres. With that, they tried to plan with ADOT, went through the process with collector roads, and in the meantime, lost the project with Bashas. Bashas wanted to be on the corner with a signal light installed. Because the intersection had to be moved to the north, causing realignment problems, and the time and money involved, Bashas decided not to come. Home Depot was interested in this same number one site. Meetings were held with ADOT and the City of Cottonwood, then Home Depot decided the requirements from ADOT were so prohibited, they decided to go to another site. A third user, Lowes expressed interest. During this time the roundabout idea picked up momentum. Lowes didn't want anything to do with roundabouts so they moved to another site on the south part of town. Three potential users wanted to do something on the property. With any kind of commercial development, access is needed. In response to Mr. Schorr's question, Mr. Groseta clarified that both Bashas and Lowes didn't want anything to do with roundabouts.

Steven Brown, Town of Clarkdale, spoke on behalf of the Town in support of access management and the roundabout concept. The concern is that the budget for this current concept with roundabouts is based on a design completed about six years ago and did not include roundabouts. If this project is to be a demonstration project, it needs to be funded in a way that will allow it to be done with a level of funding to develop a kind of administration project allowing this concept to be accepted throughout the state. The Town of Clarkdale views the opportunity as a signal alternative and allows the Town to have a character that doesn't exist anywhere else, providing a corridor and taking advantage of landscape opportunities that roundabouts allow. If we are to go with this concept, the Town Council has voted in favor, and adequate funding needs to be provided.

Diane Joens, member of Cottonwood City Council, is personally concerned about roundabouts and voted no on her community member's behalf. She believes in educating the public on these issues. Ms. Joens' following comments represent those of the Council. ADOT investigated the roundabouts in lieu of traffic signals and the Council believes roundabouts offer several operational advantages. They are safer by eliminating the high energy angled styled crashes. They have a greater capacity for moving cars. The four lane roundabout out-perform a six lane signal light alternative. The Council voted yes on a roundabout system with the following conditions: 1. That ADOT design a public education campaign to ensure that the local public knows the rules of roundabout operation prior to construction in 2007. 2. The roundabout at Black Hills realign be shifted to existing Black Hills Heights, that a maximum addition of two additional roundabouts be allowed upon demonstration of need. 3. That ADOT consider building emergency vehicle crossover. 4. The Prescott District pursue, with the local community, an enhancement grant for this segment to provide pedestrian, bicycle and landscape improvements. 5. Other conditions as the council sees fit.

A presentation overview of SR 260 and progress to date was delivered. Handouts identified segments 1A and 1B. Segment 2 is being built now around Camp Verde. Plans are to develop a scheme and enter an agreement with the County to have them fund future years beginning next fiscal year, a series of projects, including 1A, 1B, 2 and then 3. This is reflected in an intergovernmental agreement that moves the project forward. Right of way or utility issues may cause some changes to the order of projects. Designs are being finalized and right of way acquisitions are being acquired. Regarding Project A, utility relocation is being reviewed and

adjustments are being made to the design for all three construction projects. Segment 2 is completed, a ribbon cutting occurred downtown Camp Verde two weeks ago. Meetings are being held with adjacent property owners to identify where future traffic interchange can be located. Today, there are more than 20,000 high speed, commuter cars a day.

Pat McMahan, owns a mini storage on about 12 acres on the north side of the highway and is concerned about access and the need for access points along the stretch of commercial property. The area to be commercially developed doesn't appear to have access planned for ease of customer use. Mr. McMahan acquired the 12 acres and partially developed it with a historical entrance on the property onto Highway 260. The plan indicates that traffic will be diverted a half mile from his property and he questions whether customers will figure out how they will get to the business or will move onto somewhere else that is easier to access.

Ted Hawks, represented Steve Courey who owns 25 acres near the proposed intersections. Specifically Mr. Courey built a 3 million dollar project in 1998. Combined with other infrastructures and expenses, he's invested $10 million to create the knowledge in the public and the residents of Verde Valley that that is where you go to buy his product at Steve Courey Buick Pontiac GMC. He's concerned that he was not aware of these design evolutions, or he would have made some plans or some changes. Essentially, his customers will be on an elevated freeway and if they miss that exit, they will have to go back another mile or more to the next intersection to come back around or come around on the frontage road that's still in debate. Mr. Courey built Courey drive onto highway 260. If that changes, there will be an issue with customers thinking this drive will get them to the business. Mr. Courey is concerned with an ongoing issue of potential customers driving to Phoenix thinking they will get a better deal on a vehicle. If they miss that exit, there is a probability that they will continue to drive to Prescott or the Valley and not stop at his business. Mr. Courey is concerned with a loss of business due to customer inconvenience.

Diane Joens, member of Cottonwood City Council, expressed support of businesses along the 260 corridor. The community and city will assist them with anything they can to ensure they do well. Speaking as an elected official on behalf of the upper Verde Valley community of more than 30,000 citizens, Ms. Joens described Highway 260 like an umbilical cord to I17 for these residents. In just 20 years, 60,000 citizens are expected along with several challenges. Community members need the Council to make decisions that preserve the operational integrity of the 260 corridor. Increased safety that reduces travel time are needed. With an environment of stop and go traffic, increased driver frustration is created along with poor air quality and increased traffic congestion. Businesses rely on Highway 260 for their success and need improved access to I17. Stop and go traffic is not conducive but the Council highly supports the commercial efforts of the land owners on the Highway 260 corridor and will work positively with them. The Council encourages the ADOT board to honor the access management plans that have already been used in plans in upgrading Highway 260. The Council supports Yavapai County's Supervisor Chip Davis and ADOT's board partnership to expedite this project.

Transportation Enhancement Program Overview

Richard Duarte and Cheryl Banta presented an overview beginning with a synopsis of the state transportation side of the program showing what happened in FY04 and what is planned in FY05, '06, '07 and '08 on the state side of the enhancement project. The projects advertised in FY04 were 16 which is four times as many as the previous year. The obligation amount was $7.045 million. And the five year plan amount for FY04 was $10.6 million. FY 04, 05 and 06 indicate catching up of backlogged projects that were not advertised in rounds 1-10. FY07

projects are essentially round 11 projects selected last year and approved this spring. There are 7 state projects to advertise at $3.1 million and FY08 is upcoming round 12, with an unknown number of projects, with $3.356 million planned based on projections.

On the local side, in FY04, 25 projects were advertised, with an obligation amount of $9.084 million and a planned amount of $10.522 million. FY05, projections include 32 local projects to advertise with $12.25 million obligated. Rounds 1-10 are for a backlog of local enhancement projects to be caught up at the end of FY06. In FY07, 16 projects are planned for Round 11 and FY08 are upcoming round 12.

A transportation enhancement project status chart was reviewed showing in line form, the status of the local and state looking at FY04 through FY08 showing FY05 as the busiest year to date. The number of projects noted in FY08 of 15 local and 7 state are estimates.

The Projects of Opportunity process was reviewed and include:

- ADOT project managers and/or district staff submit a one page application to the Transportation enhancement Section with Project Manager for the ADOT project and District Engineer signatures.
- Transportation Enhancement staff will verify eligibility, sign the form, verify budget item number.
- Project Manager will present to PRB to add Transportation Enhancement funding to the ADOT project.
- Following PRB, Project of Opportunity request goes to PPAC and Board.
- Project of Opportunity fund is $1M per year for FY05-07, $1.5M per year in FY08-09 and proposed $2M FY10.
- FY05 Project of Opportunity funding remaining balance is $175,000.
- FY06 Project of Opportunity funding balance is $ 0.
- FY07 Project of Opportunity funding balance is $1,000,000.

The specific projects for FY05 were shared along with FY06 and FY07. SR179 Sedona Multi-Use Path projects are pending. The applications for those requests are in process.

Mr. Martin noted that it's confusing to note the projects as enhancement when they really are opportunities.

To answer questions about Transportation Enhancement Activities, the twelve activities as noted in federal guidelines were shared. Charts of State and Local Transportation Enhancement Projects by Activity were described.

Transportation Enhancement frequently asked questions were highlighted and include:

- Can projects be moved up in the Transportation Enhancement Five Year Plan if they are ready to go earlier than planned?
    - Yes, if funds are available in that fiscal year.
- When will the backlog of Transportation Enhancement projects be caught up?
    - State projects at the end of FY05 and for local projects at the end of FY06
- Are local Transportation Enhancement project schedules controlled by the local entity or by ADOT?
    - They are controlled by the local entity but with ADOT guidance. The federal aid process must be adhered to for both state and local projects.

In summary, there are 12 eligible activities. The most commonly used category is the bicycle and pedestrian facilities. The project backlog will be caught up by FY06 for both state and local. The Project of Opportunity funding is increasing in the five year program. In round 12, 28 state projects were submitted on September 3 and 47 local projects were submitted. The TERC meeting this year is October 6-8 in Flagstaff. The TERC recommends Round 12 projects to the Board anticipating about December 2004 to kick off the Round 12 projects in January 2005.

Transportation Enhancement Project, Yuma Sponsored, Hotel Revitalization project

Important points of the Historic Hotel del Sol Façade Improvements were presented by Cheryl Banta and Richard Duarte. This application was submitted by the City of Yuma. The original scope of work was reconstruction of missing historic ornamentation, facades, screens and more. The hotel is privately owned and opened in 1926. It is located across the street from the rail station. The hotel is listed on the National Register of Historic Places. The hotel will be the focal point of the Yuma Multi-Model Transportation Center and will serve as administrative offices. The Initial Project Design Concept Report was submitted to ADOT in March 2003. The State Historic Preservation Office had major concerns with the improvements because of the lack of original photographs or other historical direction. In late 2003, the opportunity to purchase the Hotel became available to the City of Yuma. The City submitted a formal request to ADOT in May 2004 to change the scope of the Transportation Enhancement project from the original scope of work to the purchase of the Hotel at no change in the dollar amount of the project. The TERC met in July and unanimously recommended the change in scope. The change in scope was approved by the PRB and the PPAB in August 2004. Federal Highway Administration Final Guidance for Transportation enhancement Activities states: "Real estate and property management issues must be addressed in many of the proposed TE activities identified in TEA-21. Several of the listed activities involve possible property acquisitions, restoration and rehabilitation of structures and lease agreements."

If the City of Yuma doesn't fulfill its obligation, issues can be addressed in a joint project agreement.

Maricopa County Regional Transportation Plan (1/2 Cent Sale Tax) Update

Shannon Wilhelmsen, Director, Communication and Community Partnerships Office provided an overview and update. The ½ cent sales tax extension equals $9 billion. The ADOT 15% funds total $0.8 billion. ADOT discretionary funds total $4.5 billion. The Phoenix/RPTA Federal 5307 funds that can be used for bus capital expenditures total just under $1 billion. The Phoenix/RPTA Federal 5309 funds can be used for capital for bus, transit and capital for light rail transit service total just under $1 billion. The MAG Surface Transportation funds total $0.5 billion and the Federal CMAQ – Congestion Mitigation Air Quality funds total $0.8 billion.

This was as the funds were projected when the regional transportation plan was put together and signed off by the board and MAG. The plan is $17.5 billion total with $1.8 billion for contingency. The total plan spending by mode was presented. A snapshot from the regional transportation plan was shared indicating freeways, highways and arterials.

Mr. Jeffers questioned the final placement of the South Mountain 202 and it was clarified that a footnote was added to leave it open as it is in the infancy of design.

The regional bus system super grid is the first time that the Valley will have regionally connected transit service. This seamless system would be funded through the proposed regional sales tax, federal funds and local funds.

The bus rapid transit and light rail portion is the most controversial piece of the plan. A portion is already funded by three local jurisdictions, the City of Phoenix, Tempe and Mesa. There is an understanding of extensions, totaling 47 miles. The original completion date was projected to be 2006 and has moved to 2008 or 2009. The plan is to open the entire light rail system at the same time with some testing done prior to opening.

A chart showing a snapshot of what the $9 billion for the sales tax extension for the next 20 years would fund was shared and includes rail 14.4%, bus operation and management 14.4%, bus capital 4.6%, streets 10.2%, highway maintenance and mitigation 4.2% and highway capital 52%.

This will go to voters on November 2. The voters opposing the tax extension feel that the plan will not help air quality, will not ease traffic congestion, that transit included in the plan is not cost effective and wish to reject this plan and let the Legislature create another plan. By postponing the project six months, the cost estimates include spending $0.5 billion dollars, in addition to lost opportunities. Major message points for those supporting Proposition 400 include 344 miles of new or improved freeways, accountability, a balanced regional solution, no tax increase and noise and litter reduction.

There is a lot of media attention given to both sides of this campaign including billboards on I10 from the opposition.

Proposed schedule for FY 06 – FY 10 Five Year Construction and Facilities Program

Mr. Buskirk presented a highway construction program development schedule similar to those in the past with one notable exception. The highway administration describes that there will be a separate and discreet process for consultation with local elected officials related to transportation planning. The first consultation with local elected officials is scheduled for the month of September. To make the consultation meaningful, the technical advisory committee will put together a draft tentative program to again go for a second round of consultation to the rural elected officials to give them an opportunity to respond to the draft program. It is the intent to meet with the board individually between January and February and expect in the February study session to present the draft tentative program and ask for adoption. With the adoption, the standard public hearing process will be held in Tucson, Phoenix and Flagstaff. After those public hearings, it will be brought to the board for final approval.

To answer a question about certain people being left out if they are not elected officials, it was explained that federal rules specifically stipulates that they be non metropolitan elected officials.

Financial Projection for FY 06 – FY 10 Five Year Construction and Facilities Program

Mr. McGee explained that the first step in putting together a new five year program involves receiving a financial management services update and it consists of two parts. The first part is to look at today's figures versus where they were in May with respect to the current five year program financial numbers FY05-FY09. Not a lot changed. An increase in the FY05 forecast was updated. The remaining years will be updated based upon an analysis process starting this

Friday when the risk analysis panel meets. The estimate for the motor vehicle division was decreased. The debt service for dams was increased. The largest increase was in local programs, looking at outstanding projects. The amount is up $22 million, however it was noted that it is early in the process.

FY10 shows on the net revenue available to support projects basis, an estimated $642 million that year. That's the amount of funding available. The program is based on a cash flow basis.

Draft Board Resolution for supporting dust control management for PM 10 Phoenix Metropolitan Area

Mr. Buskirk stated that the environment protection agency determined that portions of Arizona do not meet air quality standards for Particulate Matter (PM10). To bring the area into compliance will require coordinated activity on the part of the jurisdictions that have responsibility for roadways in Maricopa County. There is a request that those agencies formally commit to a series of actions and activities that will bring the area into compliance. The board was asked to sign a Resolution committing and supporting the dust control management for PM 10 in Phoenix Metropolitan Area.

Beverly Powlowski (sp?) provided background information. The EPA requires the state to submit a State Implementation Plan to show how they will meet these standards. A plan revision was submitted in August. Some of the objectives of the Salt River plan is to implement some control measures by 2005. These control measures have to demonstrate attainment of the standards by December 2006. A map of the Salt River study area was shown along with sources of PM10 in the area. 56% of the source comes from roads. More controls need addressed to meet that requirement. On no wind days, farming has no impact. A table of the reductions expected from the changes was described. There is an expected 11.31% reduction of the paved road dust when it is applied throughout the whole County. The plan identifies control strategies including identifying targeted arterial and collector roadways and assigning sweeping frequencies or other control measures and addressing trackout with facilities and activities that may be adding dirt to the road. ADOT's next step is by September 30, the board adopt a Resolution with a commitment to implement a plan and by February 2 implement the protocol. The resolution was in the packet of information shared, along with the commitment and draft ADOT protocol. Funding for FY04/05 is estimated at $350,000 for purchasing two additional PM10 sweepers. The protocol will be reviewed annually or as needed. The protocol includes ranking the area, traffic control, land use, access points and sweeping frequency. Control measures were developed and described. Reporting and reevaluation of procedures were noted.

In summary, the Resolution asks to proceed in good faith to implement the measures identified in the commitment. If these procedures do not remove the adequate amount of dust, ADOT will consider other road improvements to reduce dust on the roadway. ADOT will periodically review the protocol to determine modifications.

Call to the Audience

There were no comments.

Adjournment

No closing comments were made.

Board Action A motion to adjourn was made, seconded and passed unanimously.

The meeting adjourned at 4:20 p.m.

Bill Jeffers, Chairperson
State Transportation Board

Victor Mendez, ADOT Director
Arizona Department of Transportation

MINUTES
OF THE
STATE TRANSPORTATION BOARD MEETING
9:00 a.m., Friday, September 17, 2004
The City of Flagstaff Council Chambers
211 West Aspen Avenue
Flagstaff, Arizona 86001

The State Transportation Board met in official session for a regular meeting at 9:00 a.m., Friday, September 17, 2004, with Chairperson Jeffers presiding. Other Board members present included: Vice Chairperson Rusty Gant, Dick Hileman, Delbert Householder, Joe Lane and Jim Martin. Si Schorr was absent. Also present were Debra Brisk, Deputy Director; Doug Forstie, Kim Stevens and Arnold Burnham. There were approximately 75 people in the audience.

OPENING REMARKS AND PLEDGE

Chairperson Jeffers led the audience in the Pledge of Allegiance and thanked the City of Flagstaff for their hospitality. Both Vice Mayor Al White and Deb Hill, Chairman of the County Board of Supervisors provided brief remarks. Dignitaries in the audience were introduced.

DISTRICT ENGINEER'S REPORT

John Harper, District Engineer reported that there are several projects underway on I-15 including a major preservation project, a bridge repair, and three other preservation projects on the Reservation to be finished this year, along with an environmental project on Oak Creek to be finished next spring. Of regional significance, construction will begin on East Flag traffic interchange work next summer. There is a design concept report to finish over the next two months. The Page rest area is underway. Highway 179's project is on schedule. Passing lanes have been created on US 89 from Flagstaff to Page dropping the accident rate. There is interest to continue adding passing lanes. Other opportunities are being studied on US 89 and the feasibility of taking over Navajo Route 20 as a state highway is being reviewed. An old US 160 study is underway. Efforts to renew relationship with Navajo Nation are being pursued.

CALL TO AUDIENCE

J.R. Despain, Navajo County Supervisors discussed District 3 and the cities he represents, Winslow, Holbrook and Snowflake. There is still a bottleneck at Highway 77 in Holbrook at the railroad. The trains are getting longer and travel more frequently. Assistance is needed to see if there is some way to access I-40 from Highway 77.

Robert Montoya, Board Member, Flagstaff Businesses, represented the Flagstaff Medical Center and discussed their process of relocating the East Flag Medical Center Walk-In Clinic that is involved in the East Flag interchange. That area of town is a popular area and the Center services the north and east section of the City and part of the County. After finding out the taking of the building, there has been a significant hurdle to locate another site that is within the area that can be replaced for what the appraisal has identified the property. They are in the process for looking for a temporary site to stay in operation. They ask for help and understanding in finding an alternative site for the Clinic.

John Beene, Gila County discussed various projects including Highway 60 widening and repaving through Miami Globe, Highway 70 widening and repaving through the east end of Globe, pavement of US 60 and preservation of US 60 east of Globe and east of Gila County Fair Grounds and reconstruction from Roosevelt Lake to Globe. There are several projects Mr. Beene is looking forward to including a passing lane on US 60. They will be submitting a transportation grant for the Gila County Fair Grounds roads off of US 60.

Jim Boles, Mayor of Winslow discussed the rest area in the east end of Winslow and its undesirability. It's been on the books for a long time. It is understood that there are engineering problems. The City is willing to work with ADOT and would like to see something done. A second item reflected concern of many accidents and deaths on Highway 99 between 87 and Clear Creek. Highway 99 ends at Clear Creek and has unique problems. Mr. Boles recommended that studies be done.

Karen Cooper, Councilmember, City of Flagstaff commended ADOT staff for making the MOVE Arizona State Transportation Plan accessible. Few Flagstaff projects were selected for the next 20 years on the Plan. They are encouraged that the Plan as a tool and guideline will allow flexibility in distribution and allocation of resources. Their comfort level would increase considerably if the Board were to adopt specific policy on how to take MOVE Arizona into consideration in the process.

Kevin Eatherly, City of Yuma Project Manager, spoke on behalf of the City for the Hotel Del Sol project. The City has been working to support efforts to create a place where the Greyhound Bus Station and Amtrak facility be located. This multi use facility located in the Hotel Del Sol will meet needs into the future. A resource survey has been complete.

David Prechtel, President, Dewey Humbolt Community Organization spoke on behalf of the Young's Farm project. The Dewey Humbolt Community Organization is charted and not an official government entity. There are nine members of the board elected by the community. They are active in the incorporation process. Their incorporation will help facilitate smart growth and maintain their community. They are working to preserve the Dewey Humbolt Community. A prize of the community is Young's Farm. Young's Farm is a state attraction. The Community Organization unanimously supports maintaining the rural atmosphere and the Farm is very much a part of that. Mr. Prechtel read a letter from the Chamber of Commerce pleading for a favorable response to the Trust for Public Land request for a grant for the transportation enhancement program to help preserve Young's Farm development rights.

Sarah Young Teskey, third generation family member of Young's Farm spoke in favor of support of the grant proposal for the transportation enhancement. Ms. Young Teskey shared her commitment to the future of the Farm.

Michael Patrick, project manager for Young's Farm discussed the joint partnership with Trust for Public Land with the Natural Resource Conservation Service. Mr. Patrick addressed questions that the board members had last week including Mr. Martin's question about other federal programs. No, Young's Farm has not received any federal dollars. Mr. Householder asked whether the land will stay in private ownership. These projects do not take land off the tax roles. Mr. Schorr asked questions including the assurances of the continuance of farming. The project has the support of the USDA farm and ranch protection program that requires the land stay in agriculture uses and must be

managed under a conservation plan. A state Legislature provision assures that water will be available to Young's Farm for the long term. The Young's have a long history of farming. In answer to who will enforce the terms and restrictions of the conservation on the property, Mr. Patrick stated that the local land trust in Prescott called Central Arizona Land Trust has the rights and responsibilities. The US Government through the farmland protection program has the rights to enforce the easements. A conservation easement is drafted and ADOT is invited to be included in the process of negotiating easement terms and being a signature to the easement if so desired. TEA funds are important to move the project forward. If the Board approves the grant, a disbursement of funds will not be utilized until all fund raising to finish the project is completed.

Steven Corey, President of the Board of Central Arizona Land Trust, urged the ADOT board to support the Young's Farm ADOT grant request. Central Arizona Land Trust, on behalf of people in the state will hold the trust and steward in perpetuity the conservation easement on this property. The Land Trust recognizes the inherent value in the property. USDA has supported the project with funds, along with many others. Approval of the grant request is crucial to Young's Farm success.

Michael Somerville, State Conservationist, Natural Resources Conservation Service promotes agriculture from a sustainable standpoint in the state of Arizona. He mentioned that Arizona loses an acre an hour of agriculture land. He noted that we must continue to search for creative ways to preserve our agriculture communities and appreciates help and support from ADOT.

Deb Hill, Chairman, Coconino County, representing the Board of Supervisors, spoke to the airport interchange project that was taken off the books to support the City of Flagstaff's need to develop the East TI and is now working to get the project back. The airport will be developed. With the runway extension project, business opportunities will grow. More people are utilizing the interchange during their commute. It's the corridor to Sedona; all visiting public uses Highway 89 A. Fort Tuthill is the regional county park that includes the fair grounds. A master plan is being developed for the park. With that growth and a number of large events, there are traffic congestion issues across that intersection onto I-17 and a need to utilize police to resolve traffic issues. Flagstaff is looking into roundabouts. Ms. Hill offered assistance to get this project back on the books. A second item discussed was the Munds Park interchange. Design issues are creating safety concerns in particular the on and off ramps are short. There are site distance issues. And clearance issues for trucks. The drainage issue is a maintenance issue. Ms. Hill asked for ADOT's support. The new federal highway reauthorization Bill being debated in congress, if passed will bring additional funds to Arizona and asked for consideration to pass along some of those funds to local governments.

Jack Dempsey, Vice President Flagstaff Medical Center, shared information on the walk-in clinic in the East Flag TI project. It's been difficult to find an alternative location. Location is important; rent costs are a concern. He asked for more time. If the project can be deferred another season, it would be a great help to about 60,000 patients. Mr. Dempsey also expressed support for Young's Farm.

Amber Hill, Finance Director, City of Holbrook discussed the railroad crossing concern. She visited with senior staff regarding downtown Holbrook enhancements. An enhancement grant application is in to make it a beautiful downtown area. This week, a rural consultation was held in Holbrook with a good turnout. Two projects for the City of Holbrook are on the agenda, number 35 and 36, are for the airport. In conjunction, with the study underway to place an ADOT and FAA joint project for fire fighter training, Holbrook asks to be in the mix for recommendations for that facility.

Richard Young, Interim County Engineer, Navajo County commented on SR 77 crossing. The detour around the crossing in Holbrook is approximately 200 miles. He supports studying some kind of grade separating crossing at that location. He thanked the board on behalf of Navajo County for the funding on the joint project with the town of Pinetop Lakeside for Woodland Road going under contract this winter for construction in the spring. They are in the final stages of awarding a design contract for the transportation enhancement project on the Shevlin Canyon historic bridge preservation. The design will begin late this year or early next year with construction contract in fall 2005.

ADOT's bond attorney, John Pine introduced the bond council.

CONSENT AGENDA

Mr. Schorr recused himself from Items 54, 56, 59, 63 and 64. Item 66 was removed from the consent agenda.

Director's Report

Deputy Director Debra Brisk announced the new aeronautics director, Barkley Dick. Governor Napolitano has an executive order 2004-18, the Governor's Traffic Advisory Safety Council. ADOT is a member of this Council. Yesterday, Hoover Dam bid opening happened on the bridge. The bid ranges from $123 million to $165 million with the engineers estimate at $106 million. These bid results do comply with the overall $234 million allocated for the project. The rural consultation schedule was shared.

Financial Report

For the month of August, HURF collections totaled $97.7 million, exceeding last August's collections by 4.9 percent and the forecast by 0.2 percent. Year-to-date HURF is at $197.1 million, $8 million over last year representing 4.3 percent and 0.4 percent over the estimate. All the categories were up over last year except Use Fuel Tax which was down by 1 percent. These HURF results for August include approximately $6.8 million vehicle license tax that was transferred to the State General Fund. Another transfer was made on September 16 of approximately $6.7 million. The transfers will continue throughout the year with the last transfer made around the month of May. July 2004 RARF collections totaled $25.7 million, which is 10.1 percent over last year and 1.6 percent above the forecast. All categories of RARF collections were up over last year including retail sales which was up 8.2 percent over last year. There was strong construction activity. Most categories were up compared to the estimate.

Financial Program

In July, there was a total of approximately $625 million invested in various funds. Year-to-date and monthly interest income is $957,000 representing a 1.8 percent annualized yield.

The HELP cash balance as of August 31, 2004 is $92.8 million. There was approximately $7 million in loan repayments in August and about the same amount in loan disbursements. There are a total of

46 loans approved for $533.7 million including the $12.3 million loan approved at the last Board meeting. A detailed summary of the loans and the current status was included in the Board packet.

A Dain Rauscher report of Series 2004B Final Pricing Review was included in the Board materials. A financing plan summary and a preliminary schedule of events for the Series 2004B Grant Anticipation Notes were discussed.

Printing and mailing of a preliminary official statement will occur around October 11, pricing on October 25 and close the week of November 8. The maturities for these GANS will run from July 1, 2008 to July 1, 2016. Interest rates are estimated to be around 4.1 to 4.5 percent.

Resolution Authorizing Issuance of Grant anticipation Notes, Series 2004B

The Resolution authorizes up to $120 million of notes. Terms are consistent with the prior GANS resolutions. A process is underway to identify specific projects on the freeway system that will be financed with this issue.

Board Action: A motion that the Resolution authorizing the issuance of Grant Anticipation Notes, Series 2004B be approved as presented was made by Mr. Hileman, seconded by Mr. Gant and passed unanimously.

Appointment of Underwriters – Grant Anticipation Notes, Series 2004B

Given the size of this financing, recommended are a total of four investment banking firms, Bear Stearns, Citigroup, JP Morgan and A.G. Edwards.

Board Action: A motion was made by Mr. Hileman, seconded by Mr. Gant to adopt the Resolution with the appointment of managing underwriters for the Grant Anticipation Notes Series 2004B. It passed unanimously.

Board Resolution for Supporting Dust Control Management for PM 10 Phoenix Metropolitan Area

Mr. Burnham described a Resolution for dust control management for the PM Phoenix Metropolitan Area as it was presented at the last Study Session. Mr. Lane moved and Mr. Gant seconded that the Resolution supporting dust control management for the PM 10 Phoenix Metropolitan Area be approved as discussed and presented. It passed unanimously.

* **MINUTES – APPROVAL**
Board Meeting Minutes – June 18, 2004
Study Session Minutes – July 16, 2004

* **2004 BOARD MEETING DATES AND LOCATIONS**

PLEASE NOTE THE LOCATION CHANGE FOR THE STUDY SESSION ON OCTOBER 5, 2004.

September 17, 2004	**Board Meeting – Flagstaff**	**9:00 a.m.**
October 5, 2004	**Study Session – Tucson**	**1:00 p.m.**
October 15, 2004	**Board Meeting – Queen Creek**	**9:00 a.m.**
November 9, 2004	**Study Session – Phoenix**	**1:00 p.m.**
November 19, 2004	**Board Meeting – Greenlee Cty**	**9:00 a.m.**
December 7, 2004	**Study Session – Phoenix**	**1:00 p.m.**
December 17, 2004	**Board Meeting – Tucson**	**9:00 a.m.**
January 6, 2005	**Study Session – Phoenix**	**9:30 a.m.**
January 21, 2005	**Rural Transportation Summit & Board Meeting – Bullhead City**	**10:30 p.m.**

PRIORITY PLANNING ADVISORY COMMITTEE (PPAC)

FY 2005 - 2009 Transportation Facilities Construction Program Requested Modifications

Approved Changes to the FY 2005 – 2009 Highway Construction Program
Fiscal Year Summary

There were 19 items submitted to the Board, 18 withdrew, one was not approved. There is $8.99 million that came from the Sub programs as projects and $1.8 million for major program increases.

ROUTE NO:	SR 67 @ MP 580.00
COUNTY:	Coconino
SCHEDULE:	FY 2005 – New Project Request
SECTION:	ITS Demo Project, Kaibab Plateau, North Rim Scenic Byway
TYPE OF WORK:	Intelligent Transportation System
PROGRAM AMOUNT:	New Project Request
PROJECT MANAGER:	Kathy Knapp
PROJECT:	H667201X
REQUESTED ACTION:	Add a new ITS demo project in the amount of $241,500 to the FY 2005 Highway Construction Program. **See funding sources below.**

FFY FHWA Discretionary Grant	$191,500
Enterprise Group	$50,000
NEW PROGRAM AMOUNT:	$241,500

Board Action: A motion to approve the above recommendation was made by Mr. Gant, seconded by Mr. Hileman and passed unanimously.

ROUTE NO: I-10 @ MP 326.00

COUNTY:	Cochise
SCHEDULE:	FY 2005 – New Project Request
SECTION:	Texas Canyon Rest Area
TYPE OF WORK:	Replace waterline
PROGRAM AMOUNT:	New Project Request
PROJECT MANAGER:	Debra Einweck
PROJECT:	H630301C
REQUESTED ACTION:	Add a new rest area preservation project in the amount of $650,000 to FY 2005 Highway Construction Program. **Funds are available from the FY 2005 Rest Area Preservation Fund #79105.**
NEW PROGRAM AMOUNT:	$650,000

Board Action: A motion to approve the above recommendation was made by Mr. Martin, seconded by Mr. Householder and passed unanimously.

COUNTY:	Statewide
SCHEDULE:	FY 2005 – New Project Request
SECTION:	Statewide VMS Phase 5B
TYPE OF WORK:	Construct Varible Message Signs (2 - I15;1 - I40, 1-I17)
PROGRAM AMOUNT:	New Project Request
PROJECT MANAGER:	Pankaj Gupte
PROJECT:	H517407C
REQUESTED ACTION:	Add a new VMS in the amount of $1,090,000 to the FY 2005 Highway Construction Program. **Funds are available from the FY 2005 Rural ITS Fund #76605.**
NEW PROGRAM AMOUNT:	$1,090,000

Board Action: A motion to approve the above recommendation was made by Mr. Martin, seconded by Mr. Hileman and passed unanimously.

ROUTE NO:	I-17 @ MP 277.00
COUNTY:	Yavapai
SCHEDULE:	FY 2006 – New Project Request
SECTION:	Cienega Creek Bridges, NB / SB (#428 & #1353)
TYPE OF WORK:	Construct scour retrofit.
PROGRAM AMOUNT:	New Project Request
PROJECT MANAGER:	Itty P. Itty
PROJECT:	H644601C
REQUESTED ACTION:	Add a new scour retrofit project in the amount of $304,000 to the FY 2006 Highway Construction Program. **Funds are available from the FY 2005 Bridge Scour Protection Fund #71505.**
NEW PROGRAM AMOUNT:	$304,000

ROUTE NO:	I-40 @ MP 259.00
COUNTY:	Navajo
SCHEDULE:	FY 2006 – New Project Request
SECTION:	Cottonwood Bridges EB/WB (#519 & #520)
TYPE OF WORK:	Construct scour retrofit.
PROGRAM AMOUNT:	New Project Request
PROJECT MANAGER:	Itty P. Itty
PROJECT:	H644801C
REQUESTED ACTION:	Add a new scour retrofit project in the amount of $600,000 to the FY 2006 Highway Construction Program. **Funds are available from the FY 2006 Bridge Scour Protection Fund #71506.**
NEW PROGRAM AMOUNT:	$600,000

ROUTE NO:	I-40 @ MP 142.00
COUNTY:	Yavapai
SCHEDULE:	FY 2006 – New Project Request
SECTION:	Partridge Creek Bridges, EB / WB
TYPE OF WORK:	Construct scour retrofit
PROGRAM AMOUNT:	New Project Request
PROJECT MANAGER:	Itty P. Itty
PROJECT:	H644701C
REQUESTED ACTION:	Add a new scour retrofit project in the amount of $464,000 to the FY 2006 Highway Construction Program. **Funds are available from the FY 2005 Bridge Scour Protection Fund #71505.**
NEW PROGRAM AMOUNT:	$464,000

Board Action: A motion to approve Items 14, 15 and 16 was made by Mr. Hileman, seconded by Mr. Lane and passed unanimously.

ROUTE NO:	SR 80 @ MP 296.72
COUNTY:	Cochise
SCHEDULE:	2005
SECTION:	Apache Powder Road - Clifford Wash
TYPE OF WORK:	Pavement Preservation
PROGRAM AMOUNT:	$ 3,956,000 Funding Source: STP
PROJECT MANAGER:	Chris Puleo
PROJECT:	H585101C Item #; 18305
REQUESTED ACTION:	Increase program amount by $413,000 to $4,369,000 due to addition of box culvert extensions. **Funds are available from the FY 2005 Title II Safety Fund # 72805.**
PROGRAM AMOUNT:	$3,956,000

INCREASE AMOUNT:	$413,000
NEW PROGRAM AMOUNT:	$4,369,000

Board Action: A motion to approve the above recommendation was made by Mr. Martin, seconded by Mr. Householder and passed unanimously.

ROUTE NO:	SR 202 L @ MP 29.00
COUNTY:	Maricopa
SCHEDULE:	2006
SECTION:	SR 202L / US 60 TI, Phase II
TYPE OF WORK:	Construct Traffic interchange
PROGRAM AMOUNT:	$ 60,307,000 Funding Source: RARF
PROJECT MANAGER:	Joe Warren
PROJECT:	H568604C Item #; 82806
REQUESTED ACTION:	Advance project one year from FY 2006 to FY 2005. **RARF cashflow capacity available to advance project.**

Board Action: A motion to approve the above recommendation was made by Mr. Lane, seconded by Mr. Gant and passed unanimously.

ROUTE NO:	I-10
COUNTY:	Pima
SCHEDULE:	FY 2005 – New Project Request
SECTION:	Pima County
TYPE OF WORK:	Design / Construction
PROGRAM AMOUNT:	New Project Request
PROJECT MANAGER:	Bob Miller
REQUESTED ACTION:	Add a new project in the amount of $1,715,000 to the FY 2005 Highway Construction Program. **Funds are available from underway project, I-10 Prince Road - Jct. I-19, #10504.**
NEW PROGRAM AMOUNT:	$1,715,000

Board Action: A motion to table this agenda item was made by Mr. Gant, seconded by Mr. Lane and passed unanimously.

ROUTE NO:	SR 77 @ MP 69.50
COUNTY:	Pima
SCHEDULE:	2004
SECTION:	Miracle Mile - Prince Road
TYPE OF WORK:	Construct sidewalks
PROGRAM AMOUNT:	$ 316,000 Funding Source: TEA
PROJECT MANAGER:	Bruce Cannon
PROJECT:	H615901C
REQUESTED ACTION:	Reprogram project from FY 04 to FY 05 due to delays in acquiring right of way.

Board Action: A motion to approve the above recommendation was made by Mr. Hileman, seconded by Mr. Martin and passed unanimously.

ROUTE NO:	I-17 @ MP 198.22
COUNTY:	Maricopa
SCHEDULE:	2005
SECTION:	Buckeye Curve - Thomas Road
TYPE OF WORK:	Pavement Preservation
PROGRAM AMOUNT:	$ 1,530,000 Funding Source: IM
PROJECT MANAGER:	Akram Friekh / Steve Mishler
PROJECT:	H613501C Item #; 17405
REQUESTED ACTION:	Delete project from the FY 2005 Highway Construction Program. Work will completed as part of the Quiet Pavement Phase IV project. **Funds to the FY 2005 Program Adjustment Fund #72305.**

ROUTE NO:	SR 101 L @ MP 2.00
COUNTY:	Maricopa
SCHEDULE:	2005
SECTION:	Quiet Pavement, Ph IV; SR 101L McDowell Road – Union Hills Drive
TYPE OF WORK:	Construct quiet pavement
PROGRAM AMOUNT:	$ 4,400,000
PROJECT MANAGER:	Steve Mishler
PROJECT:	H648201C Item #; 19705
REQUESTED ACTION:	Increase program amount by $5,060,000 to $9,460,000 due to two additional work locations, I-17 Buckeye Curve – Thomas Road and SR 51/SR 202L/I-10 Traffic Interchange. Change project descriptions to "Various Regional Freeways" to more accurately reflect the revised scope of work. **See funding sources below.**

PROGRAM AMOUNT:	$4,400,000
INCREASE AMOUNT:	$5,060,000
FY 2005 Bridge Inspection and Repair #71405	$1,100,000
FY 2005 District Minor Fund #73305	$630,000
FY 2005 Program Adjustment Fund #72305	$1,530,000
FY 2005 Pavement Preservation Fund #72505	$1,600,000
Phoenix Traffic Operations, Maintenance Org 9680	$200,000
NEW PROGRAM AMOUNT:	$9,460,000

Board Action: A motion to approve Items 21 and 22 was made by Mr. Gant, seconded by Mr. Lane and passed unanimously.

COUNTY:	Statewide
SCHEDULE:	FY 2005 – New Project Request

SECTION:	Roadside Facilities Support
TYPE OF WORK:	Operational support
PROGRAM AMOUNT:	New Project Request
PROJECT MANAGER:	John Nichols
PROJECT:	New Project Request
REQUESTED ACTION:	Establish a new roadside facilities project in the amount of $300,000 in the FY 2005 Highway Construction Program. **Funds available from FY 2005 Highway Contingency fund #72305.**
NEW PROGRAM AMOUNT:	$300,000

Board Action: A motion to approve the above recommendation was made by Mr. Gant, seconded by Mr. Lane and passed unanimously.

ROUTE NO:	I-17 @ MP 218.00
COUNTY:	Maricopa
SCHEDULE:	FY 2005 – New Project Request
SECTION:	Happy Valley Road
TYPE OF WORK:	Construct roundabout improvements
PROGRAM AMOUNT:	$848,400
PROJECT MANAGER:	Steve Beasley
REQUESTED ACTION:	Increase program amount from $848,400 to $973,400 due to added lighting and landscaping. **See funding sources below.**
PROGRAM AMOUNT:	$848,4000
FY 2005 Projects of Opportunity #75005	$75,000
FY 2005 Traffic Engineering #71205	$50,000
NEW PROGRAM AMOUNT:	$973,400

Board Action: A motion to approve the above recommendation was made by Mr. Gant, seconded by Mr. Lane and passed unanimously.

ROUTE NO:	Statewide
SCHEDULE:	FY 2005 – New Program Item Request
SECTION:	Arizona Amber Alert Program
PROGRAM AMOUNT:	New Program Item Request
PROJECT MANAGER:	Tim Wolfe
REQUESTED ACTION:	Add a new Amber Alert Program item in the amount of $500,000 to the FY 2005 Highway Construction Progam. **See funding sources below.**
FHWA Grant	$400,000
Arizona Broadcasters Association	$100,000
NEW PROGRAM AMOUNT:	$500,000

Board Action: A motion to table this Item was made by Mr. Gant, seconded by Mr. Hileman and passed unanimously.

COUNTY:	Yavapai
SCHEDULE:	FY 2005 - New Project Request
SECTION:	Young's Farm
TYPE OF WORK:	Historical/Preservation Easement
PROGRAM AMOUNT:	$ 500,000 Funding Source: TEA
PROJECT MANAGER:	Cheryl Banta
PROJECT:	NA
REQUESTED ACTION:	Establish a local TEA enhancement project for a historical/preservation easement

Board Action: Mr. Lane moved to approve this Item. The motion died after no second. Mr. Gant asked if the Board fails to take action, does this Item stay on the agenda. The answer is no. It was moved by Mr. Martin that this enhancement grant not be approved, seconded by Mr. Hileman. Two concerns were shared and include: "There have been some overtures to trade land with this and I really think that the acquisition of right of way that is involved with the obtaining of these finds is an inappropriate use of enhancement funds. Enhancement funds are not right of way funds. And second, I understand the family farm. I don't think transportation funds should be used for the preservation of a farm just simply because it happens to be located next to a state highway." After a motion was made to decline Item 26, the enhancement grant of Young's Farm. After no further discussion, all in favor of declining the enhancement grant say aye. The vote passed 4 to 1.

COUNTY:	Yuma
SCHEDULE:	2005 – Local Enhancement Project
SECTION:	Hotel Del Sol
TYPE OF WORK:	Rehabilitate hotel
PROGRAM AMOUNT:	$ 500,000 Funding Source: TEA
PROJECT MANAGER:	Bruce Cannon
PROJECT:	SL 509
REQUESTED ACTION:	Change scope of work from rehabilitate hotel to acquire hotel site and design rehabilitation improvements.

Board Action: A motion to approve the above recommendation was made by Mr. Hileman, seconded by Mr. Gant and passed unanimously.

FY 2005 - 2009 Airport Development Program – Requested Modifications

*	AIRPORT NAME:	Scottsdale
	SPONSOR:	City of Scottsdale
	AIRPORT CATEGORY:	Reliever
	SCHEDULE:	FY 2005 – 2009
	PROJECT #:	E5F37
	PRESENT PROGRAM	

AMOUNT:		
PROJECT DESCRIPTION:	Improve Runway 03/21 Safety Area, Phase 2	
REQUESTED ACTION:	Approve State matching grant.	
FUNDING SOURCES:	**FAA**	$1,436,771
	Sponsor	$37,811
	State	$37,811
	Total Program	$1,512,393

*	AIRPORT NAME:	Show Low Regional
	SPONSOR:	City of Show Low
	AIRPORT CATEGORY:	Commercial Service
	SCHEDULE:	FY 2005 – 2009
	PROJECT #:	E5F39
	PRESENT PROGRAM AMOUNT:	
	PROJECT DESCRIPTION:	Construct Aircraft Rescue & Fire Fighting Building (ARFF) including access road & crew quarters; Security Enhancements (Security Fencing)
	REQUESTED ACTION:	Approve State matching grant.
	FUNDING SOURCES:	**FAA** $2,047,508
		Sponsor $53,883

*	AIRPORT NAME:	Bisbee-Douglas International
	SPONSOR:	Cochise County
	AIRPORT CATEGORY:	Public General Aviation
	SCHEDULE:	FY 2005 – 2009
	PROJECT #:	E5F40
	PRESENT PROGRAM AMOUNT:	
	PROJECT DESCRIPTION:	Rehabilitate Rwy 17/35 including lighting improvements; Rehabilitate Twy A1, A2 and A3
	REQUESTED ACTION:	Approve State matching grant.
	FUNDING SOURCES:	**FAA** $1,089,973
		Sponsor $28,684
		State $28,685
		Total Program $1,147,342

*	AIRPORT NAME:	Greenlee County

SPONSOR:	Greenlee County
AIRPORT CATEGORY:	Public General Aviation
SCHEDULE:	FY 2005 – 2009
PROJECT #:	E5F41
PRESENT PROGRAM AMOUNT:	
PROJECT DESCRIPTION:	Construct Parallel Twy, Phase 2; Install Miscellaneous NAVAIDS (PAPIs and AWOS); Install Security Fencing including lighting
REQUESTED ACTION:	Approve State matching grant.
FUNDING SOURCES:	**FAA** $823,382 **Sponsor** $21,668 **State** $21,669 *Total Program* $866,719

*

AIRPORT NAME:	Tucson International
SPONSOR:	Tucson Airport Authority
AIRPORT CATEGORY:	Commercial Service
SCHEDULE:	FY 2005 – 2009
PROJECT #:	E5F42
PRESENT PROGRAM AMOUNT:	
PROJECT DESCRIPTION:	Conduct Environmental Impact Statement (EIS), phase 1 for the construction of new Rwy11R/29L, and associated twy system
REQUESTED ACTION:	Approve State matching grant.
FUNDING SOURCES:	**FAA** $637,420 **Sponsor** $31,290 **State** $31,290 *Total Program* $700,000

*

AIRPORT NAME:	Page Municipal
SPONSOR:	City of Page
AIRPORT CATEGORY:	Commercial Service
SCHEDULE:	FY 2005 – 2009
PROJECT #:	E5F44
PRESENT PROGRAM AMOUNT:	
PROJECT DESCRIPTION:	Extend Runway 15/33; Extend Taxiway A; Obstruction Removal; Construct North Apron; Improve Airport Erosion Control; Install Airfield

	Guidance Signs/Upgrade Segmented Circle	
REQUESTED ACTION:	Approve State matching grant.	
FUNDING SOURCES:	**FAA**	$2,048,627
	Sponsor	$53,913
	State	$53,913
	Total Program	$2,156,453

Board Action: It was suggested by Mr. Gant that because Items 27, 29, 30, 31, 32 and 34 are all matching federal grants they be taken together. Mr. Jeffers recused himself from Items 35 and 36 because of a conflict of interest. A motion to approve Items 27-34 less Items 28, 35, 36 and 33 was made by Mr. Gant, seconded by Mr. Hileman and passed unanimously.

AIRPORT NAME:	Williams Gateway	
SPONSOR:	Williams Gateway Airport Authority	
AIRPORT CATEGORY:	Reliever	
SCHEDULE:	FY 2005 – 2009	
PROJECT #:	E5S38	
PRESENT PROGRAM AMOUNT:		
PROJECT DESCRIPTION:	Design/Construct South Central Fire Protections System - Construct pump system for fire protection system for South Central area. Pipeline to be added as development occurs.	
REQUESTED ACTION:	Approve State grant.	
FUNDING SOURCES:	**FAA**	$0.00
	Sponsor	$962,978
	State	$714,975
	Total Program	$1,677,953
	State	$53,884
	Total Program	$2,155,275

Board Action: A motion to approve the above recommendation was made by Mr. Gant, seconded by Mr. Hileman and passed unanimously.

AIRPORT NAME:	Tucson International
SPONSOR:	Tucson Airport Authority
AIRPORT CATEGORY:	Commercial Service
SCHEDULE:	FY 2005 – 2009
PROJECT #:	E5F43

PRESENT PROGRAM AMOUNT:		
PROJECT DESCRIPTION:	Noise Mitigation Measures for Residences within 65-69 DNL	
REQUESTED ACTION:	Approve State matching grant.	
FUNDING SOURCES:	**FAA**	$4,000,000
	Sponsor	$196,354
	State	$196,354
	Total Program	$4,392,708

Board Action: A motion to approve the above recommendation was made by Mr. Hileman, seconded by Mr. Gant and passed unanimously.

AIRPORT NAME:	Holbrook Municipal	
SPONSOR:	City of Holbrook	
AIRPORT CATEGORY:	Public General Aviation	
SCHEDULE:	FY 2005 – 2009	
PROJECT #:	E5F45	
PRESENT PROGRAM AMOUNT:		
PROJECT DESCRIPTION:	Install Airport Perimeter Chain Link Fence	
REQUESTED ACTION:	Approve State matching grant.	
FUNDING SOURCES:	**FAA**	$360,000
	Sponsor	$9,474
	State	$9,474
	Total Program	$378,948

Board Action: A motion to approve the above recommendation was made by Mr. Lane, seconded by Mr. Martin and passed unanimously. (Mr. Jeffers recused himself on this item and let Vice Chairman Rusty Gant Chair the meeting for this item.)

AIRPORT NAME:	Holbrook Municipal	
SPONSOR:	City of Holbrook	
AIRPORT CATEGORY:	Public General Aviation	
SCHEDULE:	FY 2005 – 2009	
PROJECT #:	E5F46	
PRESENT PROGRAM AMOUNT:		
PROJECT DESCRIPTION:	Land Acquisition for Runway 11/29 Extension and Approaches (142 Acres)	
REQUESTED ACTION:	Approve State matching grant.	
FUNDING SOURCES:	**FAA**	$39,000
	Sponsor	$1,026

State		$1,027
	Total Program	$41,053

Board Action: A motion to approve the above recommendation was made by Mr. Hileman, seconded by Mr. Lane and passed unanimously. (Mr. Jeffers recused himself from this item and let Vice Chairman Rusty Gant Chair the meeting for this item.) Ms. Brisk thanked Mr. Stevens for filling an acting position for the aeronautics division.

*

AIRPORT NAME:	Ryan Field
SPONSOR:	Tucson Airport Authority
AIRPORT CATEGORY:	Reliever
SCHEDULE:	FY 2005 – 2009
PROJECT #:	E5F47
PRESENT PROGRAM AMOUNT:	
PROJECT DESCRIPTION:	Grade, drain and pave asphaltic concrete taxiway extension, access road; Grade and drain future taxilane and GA hangar development; Install emergency generator
REQUESTED ACTION:	Approve State matching grant.

FUNDING SOURCES:

FAA		$1,567,381
Sponsor		$41,248
State		$41,248
	Total Program	$1,649,877

*

AIRPORT NAME:	Ryan Field
SPONSOR:	Tucson Airport Authority
AIRPORT CATEGORY:	Reliever
SCHEDULE:	FY 2005 – 2009
PROJECT #:	E5F48
PRESENT PROGRAM AMOUNT:	
PROJECT DESCRIPTION:	Update airport wide basin study
REQUESTED ACTION:	Approve State matching grant.

FUNDING SOURCES:

FAA		$99,750
Sponsor		$2,625
State		$2,625
	Total Program	$105,000

*

AIRPORT NAME:	Nogales International

SPONSOR:	Santa Cruz County
AIRPORT CATEGORY:	Public General Aviation
SCHEDULE:	FY 2005 – 2009
PROJECT #:	E5F49
PRESENT PROGRAM AMOUNT:	
PROJECT DESCRIPTION:	Construct Commercial Cargo Apron (Phase 2)
REQUESTED ACTION:	Approve State matching grant.

FUNDING SOURCES:		
	FAA	$637,420
	Sponsor	$16,774
	State	$16,775
	Total Program	$670,969

*

AIRPORT NAME:	Sierra Vista Municipal-Libby AAF
SPONSOR:	City of Sierra Vista
AIRPORT CATEGORY:	Commercial Service
SCHEDULE:	FY 2005 – 2009
PROJECT #:	E5F50
PRESENT PROGRAM AMOUNT:	
PROJECT DESCRIPTION:	Construct Taxiway J
REQUESTED ACTION:	Approve State matching grant.

FUNDING SOURCES:		
	FAA	$2,280,000
	Sponsor	$60,002
	State	$60,002
	Total Program	$2,400,004

*

AIRPORT NAME:	Tucson International
SPONSOR:	Tucson Airport Authority
AIRPORT CATEGORY:	Commercial Service
SCHEDULE:	FY 2005 – 2009
PROJECT #:	E5F51
PRESENT PROGRAM AMOUNT:	
PROJECT DESCRIPTION:	Rehabilitate runway guard lights and taxiway lighting; modify aircraft rescue & fire fighting building (ARFF); Acquire ARFF vehicle and two sweepers; Improve runway safety area 11L
REQUESTED ACTION:	Approve State matching grant.

FUNDING SOURCES:		
	FAA	$2,323,305

Sponsor	$114,048
State	$114,048
Total Program	$2,551,401

* Priority Planning Advisory Committee (PPAC)
- Minutes – August 4, 2004
- Highway Program Monitoring Report.

* Next regular scheduled meetings of the Priority Planning Advisory Committee (PPAC). Times and dates of meetings could vary and will be announced at time of agenda distribution.
- September 29, 2004 1:30 PM
- November 3, 2004 9:00 AM
- December 1, 2004 9:00 AM

http://ADOTPPAC.ORG/

RIGHT OF WAY RESOLUTIONS

*

RES. NO:	2004-09-A-047
PROJECT:	F.I. 159 / 080MA000H088801R
HIGHWAY:	BUCKEYE – GILA BEND
ROUTE NO.:	Old U.S. Route 80
ENG. DIST:	Yuma
COUNTY:	Maricopa
RECOMMENDATION:	Disposal by easement extinguishment and vacation

*

RES. NO:	2004-09-A-048
PROJECT:	F-022-3-603 / 060GI251H088801R
HIGHWAY:	PHOENIX - GLOBE
SECTION:	East – Globe (Gila County Courthouse)
ROUTE NO.:	U.S. Route 60
ENG. DIST:	Globe
COUNTY:	Gila
RECOMMENDATION:	Establish additional right of way as a state route and state highway in accordance with Intergovernmental Agreement #03-126, dated June 14, 2004

*

RES. NO:	2004-09-A-049
PROJECT:	STP-013-1(18) / 090CH312H313902R

HIGHWAY:	Whetstone T.I. – Junction S.R. 80
SECTION:	Huachuca City - Whetstone
ROUTE NO.:	State Route 90
ENG. DIST:	Safford
COUNTY:	Cochise
RECOMMENDATION:	Disposal by abandonment to Cochise County In accordance with JPA 02-193, dated December 12, 2003

* RES. NO:	2004-09-A-050
PROJECT:	I-17-2(6)117 / 017CN317H088801R
HIGHWAY:	CORDES JCT. - FLAGSTAFF
SECTION:	Yavapai County Line – North Section
ROUTE NO.:	Interstate Route 17
ENG. DIST:	Flagstaff
COUNTY:	Coconino
DISPOSAL:	D-F-021
RECOMMENDATION:	Disposal by extinguishment and relinquishment to the United States of America, Coconino National Forest

* RES. NO:	2004-09-A-051
PROJECT:	600-2-702 / 051MA009H205901R
HIGHWAY:	STATE ROUTE 51
SECTION:	Shea Blvd. – Thunderbird Rd.
ENG. DIST:	Phoenix
COUNTY:	Maricopa
DISPOSAL:	D-M-324
RECOMMENDATION:	Disposal by abandonment to the City of Phoenix

* RES. NO:	2004-09-A-052
PROJECT:	S-251-701 / 287PN114H088801R
HIGHWAY:	CASA GRANDE – LA PALMA
SECTION:	Casa Grande – East (Gateway Commercial Center)
ROUTE NO.:	State Route 287 (Florence Blvd.)
ENG. DIST:	Tucson
COUNTY:	Pinal
PARCEL:	11-0643
RECOMMENDATION:	Establish donated right of way as a state route and state highway for recently constructed improvements by developer

* RES. NO:	2004-09-A-053
PROJECT:	S-A89-A-800 / 089AYV326H609301R
HIGHWAY:	PRESCOTT - FLAGSTAFF
SECTION:	Coyote Springs – Forest Boundary

ROUTE NO.:	State Route 89A
ENG. DIST:	Prescott
COUNTY:	Yavapai
RECOMMENDATION:	Establish additional right of way as a state Route and state highway for widening Improvements

* RES. NO:	2004-09-A-054
PROJECT:	F-191-C-800 / 191GE144H303001R
HIGHWAY:	SAFFORD - SPRINGERVILLE
SECTION:	Greenlee County Line – M.P. 151
ROUTE NO.:	U.S. Route 191
ENG. DIST:	Safford
COUNTY:	Greenlee
RECOMMENDATION:	Establish additional right of way as a state Route and state highway due to design Change

STATE ENGINEER'S REPORT

* Report on construction and projects completed in August, 2004.

* Right of Way Acquisition Report for August, 2004.

CONSTRUCTION CONTRACTS

Interstate, Non-Federal Aid

BIDS OPENED:	August 27	
HIGHWAY:	TOPOCK-KINGMAN HIGHWAY (I-40)	
SECTION:	Holy Moses Wash	
COUNTY:	Mohave	
ROUTE NO:	I-40	
PROJECT:	I-040-A-514 040 MO 046 H662201C	
FUNDING:	100% State	
LOW BIDDER:	Combs Construction Company, Inc.	
AMOUNT:	$	389,284.00
STATE ESTIMATE:	$	298,060.00
$ OVER:	$	91,224.00
% OVER:		30.6%
NO. BIDDERS:		1
RECOMMENDATION:	AWARD	

Board Action: A motion to approve the above recommendation was made by Mr. Hileman, seconded by Mr. Martin and passed unanimously. (Mr. Schorr recused himself from this item.)

(Interstate Federal-Aid ("P" 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.

BIDS OPENED:	August 27
HIGHWAY:	PHOENIX-CASA GRANDE HIGHWAY
SECTION:	Queen Creek Road - Picacho Peak Road (I-10)
COUNTY:	Maricopa
ROUTE NO:	I-10
PROJECT:	IM-010-C-(008)A 010 MA 163 H601601C
FUNDING:	94% Federal 6% State
LOW BIDDER:	Warning Lites & Equipment, Inc.
AMOUNT:	$ 1,500,228.00
STATE ESTIMATE:	$ 1,819,314.00
$ UNDER :	$ 319,086.00
% UNDER:	17.5%
NO. BIDDERS:	7
RECOMMENDATION:	Award contingent upon the Contractor obtaining the appropriate Contractor's License within 60 calendar days of the bid opening in accordance with the specifications.

Board Action: A motion to approve the above recommendation was made by Mr. Lane, seconded by Mr. Hileman and passed unanimously.

Interstate Federal Aid (required FHWA Concurrence and compliance with DBE regulations)

* BIDS OPENED:	August 13	
HIGHWAY:	NOGALES-TUCSON HIGHWAY (I-19)	
SECTION:	Duval Mine Road T.I.	
COUNTY:	Pima	
ROUTE NO:	I-19	
PROJECT:	STP-TEA-019-A(013)N 019 PM 043 H510401C	
FUNDING:	94% Federal 6% State	
LOW BIDDER:	Granite Construction Company	
	"A" AMOUNT	"A+B" AMOUNT
AMOUNT:	$12,337,300.94	$14,197,300.94
STATE ESTIMATE:	$11,620,976.00	$13,852,976.00
$ OVER:	$ 716,324.94 (Based on "A" Amount)	

% OVER: 6.3%(Based on "A" Amount)
NO. BIDDERS: 5
RECOMMENDATION: AWARD

(Non-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)

*

BIDS OPENED:	August 13	
HIGHWAY:	QUARTZSITE-WICKENBURG HIGHWAY (US 60)	
SECTION:	Sunset Park – Vulture Mine Road	
COUNTY:	Maricopa	
ROUTE NO:	US 60	
PROJECT:	TEA-060-A(004)A 060 MA 106 H622201C	
FUNDING:	94% Federal 6% State	
LOW BIDDER:	Falcone Bros & Associate Inc.	
AMOUNT:	$	483,246.50
STATE ESTIMATE:	$	440,936.00
$ OVER:	$	42,310.50
% OVER:		9.6%
NO. BIDDERS:		4
RECOMMENDATION:	AWARD	

BIDS OPENED:	August 13	
HIGHWAY:	CORDES JUNCTION-PRESCOTT HIGHWAY (SR 69)	
SECTION:	Navajo-Glassford	
COUNTY:	Yavapai	
ROUTE NO:	SR 69	
PROJECT:	TEA-069-A(003)A 069 YV 287 H605001C	
FUNDING:	94% Federal 6% State	
LOW BIDDER:	K.A.Z. Construction, Inc.	
AMOUNT:	$	700,000.00
STATE ESTIMATE:	$	861,537.75
$ UNDER:	$	161,537.75
% UNDER:		18.7%
NO. BIDDERS:		5
RECOMMENDATION:	AWARD	

Board Action: A motion to approve the above recommendation was made by Mr. Hileman, seconded by Mr. Householder and passed unanimously.

*

BIDS OPENED:	August 13	
HIGHWAY:	GILA BEND – BUCKEYE HIGHWAY (SR 85)	
SECTION:	Milepost 141.71 to Milepost 147.74	
COUNTY:	Maricopa	
ROUTE NO:	SR 85	
PROJECT:	AC-NH-085-B(006)B 085 MA 142 H595506C	
FUNDING:	94% Federal 6% State	
LOW BIDDER:	Fann Contracting, Inc.	
AMOUNT:	$	7,497,596.40
STATE ESTIMATE:	$	7,458,245.75
$ OVER:	$	39,350.65
% OVER:		0.5%
NO. BIDDERS:		5
RECOMMENDATION:	AWARD	

BIDS OPENED:	August 13	
HIGHWAY:	WHY-TUCSON HIGHWAY (SR 86)	
SECTION:	Sells Wash Pedestrian Bridge, #2770	
COUNTY:	Pima	
ROUTE NO:	SR 86	
PROJECT:	TEA-086-A(006)A 086 PM 113 H624401C	
FUNDING:	94% Federal 6% State	
LOW BIDDER:	Falcone Bros. & Associate Inc.	
AMOUNT:	$	454,585.65
STATE ESTIMATE:	$	364,210.00
$ OVER:	$	90,375.65
% OVER:		24.8%
NO. BIDDERS:		4
RECOMMENDATION:	AWARD	

Board Action: A motion to approve the above recommendation was made by Mr. Gant, seconded by Mr. Hileman and passed unanimously.

*

BIDS OPENED:	August 13	
HIGHWAY:	SIERRA VISTA – BISBEE HIGHWAY (SR 92)	
SECTION:	Greenbriar Road to Buffalo Soldier Trail	
COUNTY:	Cochise	
ROUTE NO:	SR 92	
PROJECT:	TEA-092-A(002)A 092 CH 323 H623901C	
FUNDING:	94% Federal 6% State	
LOW BIDDER:	KE & G Development, LLC	
AMOUNT:	$	320,232.05
STATE ESTIMATE:	$	344,257.00

$ UNDER:	$	24,024.95
% UNDER:		7%
NO. BIDDERS:		3
RECOMMENDATION:	AWARD	

*

BIDS OPENED:	August 27	
HIGHWAY:	SANTAN FREEWAY (SR 202L)	
SECTION:	Frye Road – Power Road	
COUNTY:	Maricopa	
ROUTE NO:	SR 202L	
PROJECT:	STP-CM-202-C(003)B 202 MA 036 H591101C	
FUNDING:	77% Federal 16% RARF 7% Town of Gilbert	
LOW BIDDER:	Pulice Construction, Inc.	
AMOUNT:	$	58,869,153.70
STATE ESTIMATE:	$	61,400,000.00
$ UNDER:	$	2,530,846.30
% UNDER:		4.1%
NO. BIDDERS:		2
RECOMMENDATION:	AWARD	

(Non-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)

BIDS OPENED:	August 13	
HIGHWAY:	TOWN OF FOUNTAIN HILLS	
SECTION:	Shea Boulevard, Saguaro Boulevard 144th Street	
COUNTY:	Maricopa	
ROUTE NO:	N/A	
PROJECT:	CM-FTH-0(006)A 0000 MA FTH SS45101C	
FUNDING:	68% Federal 32% Town of Fountain Hills	
LOW BIDDER:	Combs Construction Company	
AMOUNT:	$	537,785.15
STATE ESTIMATE:	$	429,794.75
$ OVER :	$	107,990.40
% OVER:		25.1%
NO. BIDDERS:		1
RECOMMENDATION:	Postpone Board Action	

Non-Interstate, Non-Federal Aid

Board Action: A motion to table Item 63 was made by Mr. Lane, seconded by Mr. Martin and passed unanimously.

BIDS OPENED:	August 13	
HIGHWAY:	GLOBE-LORDSBURG HIGHWAY (US 70)	
SECTION:	Bylas Lighting Retrofit	
COUNTY:	Graham	
ROUTE NO:	US 70	
PROJECT:	U-070-A-511 070 GH 294 H665201C	
FUNDING:	100% State	
LOW BIDDER:	Show Low Construction, Inc.	
AMOUNT:	$	105,845.00
STATE ESTIMATE:	$	130,100.00
$ UNDER:	$	24,255.00
% UNDER:		18.6%
NO. BIDDERS:		7
RECOMMENDATION:	AWARD	

Board Action: A motion to approve the above recommendation was made by Mr. Hileman, seconded by Mr. Householder and passed unanimously.

BIDS OPENED:	August 27	
HIGHWAY:	JUNCTION SR 95 – HOPE HIGHWAY (SR 72)	
SECTION:	SR 72 at Milepost 27	
COUNTY:	La Paz	
ROUTE NO:	SR 72	
PROJECT:	S-072-A-502 072 LA 027 H637601C	
FUNDING:	100% State	
LOW BIDDER:	EME West Construction, Inc.	
AMOUNT:	$	100,329.00
STATE ESTIMATE:	$	84,992.50
$ OVER:	$	15,336.50
% OVER:		18.0%
NO. BIDDERS:		3
RECOMMENDATION:	AWARD	

Board Action: A motion to approve the above recommendation was made by Mr. Hileman, seconded by Mr. Gant and passed unanimously.

BIDS OPENED:	August 27
HIGHWAY:	NOGALES-TOMBSTONE HIGHWAY (SR 82)
SECTION:	San Rafael State Park
COUNTY:	Santa Cruz
ROUTE NO:	SR 82
PROJECT:	F-082-A-501 082 SC ASP H541501C
FUNDING:	100% State
LOW BIDDER:	Dar-Hil Corporation

AMOUNT:	$	498,297.00
STATE ESTIMATE:	$	478,000.00
$ OVER:	$	20,297.00
% OVER:		4.3%
NO. BIDDERS:		5
RECOMMENDATION:	REJECT ALL BIDS	

COMMENTS: Subsequent to the bid opening, we found that ADOT staff had made a clerical error involving the posting of electronic bid documents. The revised bid documents relating to addendum number 1 were not made available for firms who submitted bids electronically. As a result, there was not a common basis for all of the bids. Dar-Hil submitted its bid electronically and was unable to acknowledge receipt of addendum number 1.

In order to ensure a common basis for competition, the State Engineer recommends that the Transportation Board reject all bids and re-advertise this project.

Board Action: A motion to approve the above recommendation to reject all bids was made by Mr. Martin, seconded by Mr. Gant and passed unanimously.

BIDS OPENED:	August 13	
HIGHWAY:	FLAGSTAFF-CAMERON HIGHWAY (US 89)	
SECTION:	Flagstaff City Limits North	
COUNTY:	Coconino	
ROUTE NO:	US 89	
PROJECT:	U-089-C-502 089 CN 420 H662401C	
FUNDING:	100% State	
LOW BIDDER:	C and E Paving & Grading L.L.C.	
AMOUNT:	$	160,000.00
STATE ESTIMATE:	$	199,574.50
$ UNDER:	$	39,574.50
% UNDER:		19.8%
NO. BIDDERS:		5
RECOMMENDATION:	AWARD	

Board Action: A motion to approve the above recommendation was made by Mr. Gant, seconded by Mr. Martin and passed unanimously.

*

BIDS OPENED:	August 27
HIGHWAY:	SASABE-ROBLES RANCH HIGHWAY (SR 286)
SECTION:	Cerro Prieto Wash

COUNTY:	Pima	
ROUTE NO:	SR 286	
PROJECT:	S-286-A-501 286 PM 028 H605701C	
FUNDING:	100% State	
LOW BIDDER:	Dar-Hil Corporation	
AMOUNT:	$	197,973.00
STATE ESTIMATE:	$	212,165.00
$ UNDER:	$	14,192.00
% UNDER:		6.7%
NO. BIDDERS:		5
RECOMMENDATION:	AWARD	

CONSENT AGENDA

Board Action: A motion to approve the Consent Agenda was made by Mr. Hileman, seconded by Mr. Gant and passed unanimously.

ADJOURN

Board Action: A motion to adjourn was made by Mr. Gant, seconded by Mr. Lane and passed unanimously.

The meeting adjourned at 11:40 a.m.

Bill Jeffers, Chairperson
State Transportation Board

Victor Mendez, Director
Arizona Department of Transportation

*Denotes items approved in the consent agenda.