

MINUTES
STATE TRANSPORTATION BOARD MEETING
9:00 a.m., Friday, October 11, 2013
Wickenburg Council Chambers
155 North Tegner Street, Suite A
Wickenburg, Arizona 85390

The Pledge of Allegiance was led by Chairman Flores.

Roll call by Board Secretary Lila Trimmer

In attendance: William Cuthbertson, Joe La Rue, Kelly Anderson, Victor Flores, Steve Christy, and Deanna Beaver

Absent: Hank Rogers

Opening Remarks

Chairman Flores stated it was a wonderful evening and thanked the Wickenburg Country Club for their hospitality. He also thanked Julie Brooks and Cindy Logan from the Wickenburg Chamber of Commerce and Rusty Gant for being a host last night. Mayor Cook and Councilwoman Kardinal were in attendance.

Call to the Audience

Citizens addressed various issues:

1. Royce Kardinal, Councilwoman/Town of Wickenburg, Re: on the Mayor's behalf, welcome to Wickenburg; US93 safety issues
2. Julie Brooks, executive director/Wickenburg Chamber of Commerce, Re: ADOT signage on Grand; US93 issues
3. Chris Bridges, administrator/CYMPO, Re: CYMPO is hosting the 2014 Transportation Rural Summit in January; SR89 agreements will soon be final
4. Alan Abare, member/Wickenburg Chamber Transportation Committee, Re: I-11 study; US93 safety issues
5. Woody Grantham, member/Committee Economic Development/Wickenburg Chamber, re: I-11 alignment; copies of petition signatures from **SAVE WICKENBURG FROM ECONOMIC DISASTER** and a copy of a letter to Mayor Cook were submitted to the Board; he does not support toll roads
6. Brian Jones, business owner/member/Wickenburg Chamber, re: Route of I-11 alignment and Wickenburg's economy

ITEM 1: District Engineer's Report—Alvin Stump, Prescott District Engineer

Mr. Stump reported on new and pending projects in the Prescott District. The widening of US 93 between the interchange of SR 71 and the junction of SR 89 is scheduled to be advertised in July, 2014. Pavement preservation projects on SR 89 and US 93 will be scheduled. The District is working with Town of Wickenburg staff regarding the signalization of an intersection near US 60 and Apache Street. The District is also continuing its discussions with the developers of the Wickenburg Ranch, a 3000-home development. Improvements to both US 93 and SR 89 will be needed to accommodate this development. ADOT is considering a joint project with the developer and is beginning design work on US 93 access requirements. Three intergovernmental agreements are being prepared

regarding the widening of SR 89 near Prescott. One of the agreements is with CYMPO. Another is with the City of Prescott. The District is also meeting with communities in the Verde Valley regarding improvements to SR 260. A draft access management plan has been prepared and is under review. In response to a question from Board Member La Rue, Mr. Stump explained that the Department has completed the Wickenburg Ranch traffic impact study and has sufficient funds to proceed with design.

ITEM 2: Director's Report—John McGee, Deputy Director

John McGee reported on the impacts of the Federal Government Budget impasse. The initial assessment is that the impasse will have only minor impacts on the Department. He pointed out that Karla Petty, Division Director for FHWA, is in the audience today and that is good sign that FHWA is up and running. The impacts have been nominal particularly on highway operations. There are a few positions in the planning area that are funded through transit funds and those are handled differently than the federal highway funds and that could have some implications on staffing if the impasse is not soon resolved. Presently work goes on and the Department is not seeing any significant impacts.

***ITEM 3: Consent Agenda**

A motion to approve and accept the Consent Agenda as presented was made by Kelly Anderson and seconded by Steve Christy. In a voice vote, the motion carries.

ITEM 4: Financial Report—Kristine Ward, Chief Financial Officer

Ms. Ward reported that the September 2013 HURF collections totaled \$102.8 Million, representing an increase of 2.5 percent above September 2012 and 0.1 percent above forecast. Ms. Ward also reported that revenues from fuel sales have been slow, even though gas prices are lower than last year. Year-to-date RARF revenues are 1.2 percent above forecast and 6.6 percent above the previous year. Retail sales are strong but restaurant and bar sales are below forecast. The cash management account has earned \$2 Million in earnings year to date at a 0.91 percent yield. Ms. Ward provided an update on the Federal government shutdown. Ms. Ward reported that additional federal funds are scheduled to be transferred to the Highway Trust Fund in FY14. Part of the 18 billion dollar allotment was received in FY13.

ITEM 5: MPD Report—Michael Kies, MPD - Director of Planning and Programming

Mike reported on two projects and also gave an update on the Federal shutdown. The shutdown has minimal impacts on the planning division; however, one impact is the Passenger Rail Study that ADOT is doing from Tucson to Phoenix. It is funded through FTA and FRA and both of those departments have gone on furlough. The other project is the I-11 Intermountain Feasibility Study. There have been several coordination and public meetings and have concluded the screening of the alternatives that have been in consideration in the study. There was a public meeting in Wickenburg last week. They are looking at multiple alternatives in the Wickenburg area. Other public meetings were held in Avondale, Kingman, Tucson, and presentations were given in Yuma and other coordination meetings across the state. They are making progress on the study. Final recommendations on the study will be in February. They plan to wrap up the entire study in partnership with NDOT by summer 2014.

***ITEM 6: Priority Planning Advisory Committee (PPAC) — Michael Kies, MPD - Director of Planning and Programming**

Project Modifications – *Items 6a through 6i

A motion to accept and approve Project Modifications Items 6a through 6i as presented was made by Steve Christy and seconded by Kelly Anderson. In a voice vote, the motion carries.

New Projects – *Items 6j through 6n

A motion to accept and approve New Projects Items 6j through 6n was made by Kelly Anderson and seconded by Bill Cuthbertson. In a voice vote, the motion carries.

FY 2014 - 2018 Airport Development Program—Requested Modifications

Airports – *Items 6o through 6y

A motion to accept and approve Airports Items 6o and 6y as presented was made by Steve Christy and seconded by Deanna Beaver. In a voice vote, the motion carries.

ITEM 7: State Engineer’s Report—Jennifer Toth, Deputy Director of Transportation/State Engineer

Ms. Toth gave an update on the US 89 landslide. The detour road (N-20) should be opened, with posted speed limits, within a few weeks. The Department has considered several options for a long-term solution, including realignment of the highway. The alternative now being considered is shifting the roadway 60-feet up slope and creating a gravity buttress at the toe of the slope. The department is coordinating its efforts with the Navajo Nation, the Bureau of Indian Affairs, and the Federal Highway Administration. Ms. Toth will provide cost estimates at the next board meeting.

State Engineer’s Report

Jennifer reported 79 projects under construction valued at \$926 Million. The Department finalized 17 different projects in September and finalized 57 projects in the fiscal year to date.

***ITEM 8: Construction Contracts—Jennifer Toth, Deputy Director of Transportation/State Engineer**

***ITEM 8a:** The proposed project is located in Maricopa County on I-17 and SR 303L within the City of Phoenix. The project limits along I-17 begin at SR 101L (MP 215) and extend north to Anthem Way (MP 229) and the project limits along SR 303L begin at I-17 and extend west 2 miles to 51st Avenue. The proposed work includes installation of conduit and fiber optic cables for closed circuit television cameras, overhead sign structures with dynamic message signs, loop detectors, ramp meter installations, and other related items.

***ITEM 8a:** BIDS OPENED: August 23, 2013 Page 160

HIGHWAY: PHX-CORDES JCT HWY I-17 & SR 303L

SECTION: I-17, SR 101L TO ANTHEM WAY & SR 303L, I-17 TO 51ST AVE

COUNTY: MARICOPA

ROUTE NO.: I - 17

PROJECT : TRACS: CM-017-A(230)T : 017 MA 215 H844501C

FUNDING: 94% FEDS 6% STATE

LOWEST BIDDERS: GANNETT FLEMING PROJECT ROADWAY ELECTRIC, LLC
DEVELOPMENT CORPORATION

LOW BID AMOUNT: \$ 5,139,065.40 \$ 6,123,128.60

STATE ESTIMATE: \$ 4,264,152.96 \$ 4,264,152.96

\$ OVER ESTIMATE: \$ 874,912.44 \$ 1,858,975.64

% OVER ESTMATE: 20.5% 43.6%

RECOMMENDATION: REJECT ALL BIDS

COMMENTS:

During review of bids received on this project, the Department found that the plans and specifications did not provide sufficient geotechnical information for bidders to properly assess the difficulty of drilling and trenching work needed for installation of conduit on this project. The Department estimate for those items was under \$800,000 while bids ranged from about \$1.0 to \$3.2 million and is a key item of work within the project. The wide range of bids for the drilling and trenching items indicates that bidding for this work was not done a common basis as required by statute. The Department also notes that the bid of Gannett Fleming Project Development Corporation included a surety bid bond that did not identify the project and is rejected for that reason as well.

Subsection 103.01 of the Specifications states in part:

The right is reserved to reject any or all proposals ... or to advertise for new proposals if, in the judgment of the Department, the best interests of the Department will be promoted thereby.

The Department notified all bidders about these concerns in a letter sent by FAX on September 4, 2013. Only one response was received, and that was from Gannett Fleming Project Development Corporation in a letter dated September 10, 2013, asking that the Department reconsider rejection of its bid claiming it used a bond form provided by ADOT. The Department replied in a letter dated September 30, 2013, noting that even if we agreed that ADOT had provided the form, the form that was used is flawed and not acceptable and that the only remedy would be to reject all bids, which we are already recommending due to the lack of geotechnical information in the plans and specifications as noted above.

The Department recommends that all bids be rejected and that this project be re-advertised after obtaining the geotechnical information needed to properly assess the cost of trenching drilling.

Jennifer stated this item was postponed from last month due to the protests and giving additional information. During the review of bids received on this project, the Department found that the plans and specifications did not provide sufficient geotechnical data for the bidders to properly assess the difficulty of drilling and trenching work needed for installation of conduit on this project. The wide range of bids for the drilling and trenching items indicates that bidding for this work was not done on a common basis by statute.

The Department recommends that all bids be rejected and that this project be re-advertised after obtaining the geotechnical information needed to properly assess the cost of trenching drilling.

A motion to accept and approve Staff's recommendation on Item 8a to REJECT ALL BIDS was made by Steve Christy and seconded by Joe La Rue. In a voice vote, the motion carries.

***ITEM 8b:** The proposed striping and signing projects are located in Maricopa and Pinal Counties in various locations. The work consists of upgrading striping in the Town of Buckeye, Queen Creek and City of Coolidge and upgrading signing in the City of El Mirage and other related work.

***ITEM 8b:** BIDS OPENED: August 23, 2013 Page 163

HIGHWAY: TOWN OF QUEEN CREEK, TOWN OF BUCKEYE,
CITY OF COOLIDGE and CITY OF EL MIRAGE

COUNTY: MARICOPA and PINAL

ROUTE NO.: VARIOUS LOCAL ROADS

PROJECT : TRACS: HSIP-QCR-0(210)T : 0000 PN QCR SH48701C
HSIP-BKY-0(206)T : 0000 MA BKY SH48901C
HSIP-CLG-0(202)T : 0000 PN CLG SH49701C
HSIP-ELM-0(207)T : 0000 MA ELM SH54801C

FUNDING:	100% FEDS	
LOWEST BIDDERS:	AJP ELECTRIC, INC.	SUNLINE CONTRACTING, LLC
LOW BID AMOUNT:	\$ 394,131.35	\$ 428,977.22
STATE ESTIMATE:	\$ 536,236.10	\$ 536,236.10
\$ UNDER ESTIMATE:	(\$ 142,104.75)	(\$ 107,258.88)
% UNDER ESTIMATE:	(26.5%)	(20.0%)
PROJECT DBE GOAL:	2.54%	2.54%
BIDDER DBE PLEDGE:	3.04%	2.54%
NO. BIDDERS:	3	3
RECOMMENDATION:	REJECT the bid of AJP ELECTRIC	AWARD to SUNLINE CONTRACTING

COMMENTS:

In a letter received by ADOT on August 30, 2013, Sunline Contracting protested that the contract should not be awarded to AJP, noting that AJP is not prequalified by ADOT to perform pavement marking, that 3 of the 4 projects that comprise this contract only involve pavement marking, and that AJP is only prequalified to self-perform 36% of the work [i.e., signing]. In a letter dated September 6, 2013, AJP Electric responded to the protest, claiming it was able to obtain bid documents and submit a bid based on ADOT's evaluation of the major scopes of work type and type of prequalification necessary, that 42% of the work falls within categories for which it is prequalified [i.e., signing], and that it anticipates self-performing 53% of the work.

Section 102.02 of the Standard Specifications states in part:

Prior to submitting a bid, the bidder will (unless waived by the Department) be required to be prequalified with the Department to bid on the project.

Arizona Administrative Code, Rules for Prequalification, § R17-3-202(H) states in part:

A contractor shall not request bid documents for a contract for which it is not prequalified.

The Advertisement for Bids for this contract states that work is to be done at four project locations, three of which are pavement marking and the fourth is signing work. AJP is prequalified with ADOT for signing but not for pavement marking. The Advertisement did not waive the requirement for prequalification.

The fact that the Specifications allow subcontracting does not relieve a contractor of the need to be prequalified for key elements of work that they intend to subcontract. Analysis of the bids by ADOT concludes that signing is about 40% of the work in this project; consistent with the claims of both Sunline and AJP, and that pavement marking is about 50% or the work with the remaining costs in traffic control items and mobilization. Pavement marking and signing are the key elements of work in this contract.

AJP is not prequalified for pavement marking. AJP should not have requested bid documents and should not have submitted a bid. ADOT made an administrative error in issuing a bid proposal package to AJP for this contract, but that does not relieve AJP of its responsibility to be prequalified for the key items of work in the contract. The bid of AJP is non-responsive because AJP is not prequalified for pavement marking. Sunline is prequalified for both signing and pavement marking and becomes the apparent low bidder. The Department notified all bidders of its findings in this matter in a letter sent by FAX on September 20, 2013, and received no additional responses.

The Department recommends that the Board reject the bid of AJP Electric, Inc. and award to Sunline Contracting, LLP, as the lowest responsible, responsive, prequalified bidder on this project.

Jennifer stated this item was postponed from last month. The bids were opened on August 23 and AJP Electric, Inc. was read as the apparent low bid. On August 30, 2013, Sunline Contracting protested that the contract should not be awarded to AJP, noting that AJP is not prequalified by ADOT to perform pavement marking, that three of the four projects that comprise this contract only involve pavement marking and that AJP is only prequalified to self perform signing not pavement marking.

In looking at the analysis of the bids, ADOT does conclude that signing is about 40% of the work on this project and is consistent with the claims of Sunline Contracting and AJP and that pavement

marking is about 50% of the work with the remaining costs in traffic control items and mobilization. Pavement marking and signing are the key elements of work in this contract. The bid of AJP is considered non-responsive because AJP is not prequalified for pavement marking. Sunline is prequalified for both signing and pavement marking and becomes the apparent low bidder. The Department notified all bidders of its findings in this matter in a letter sent by FAX on September 20th. The Department received no additional responses at that time; therefore, the Department recommends that the Board reject the bid of AJP Electric, Inc. and award to Sunline Contracting, LLC as the lowest responsible, responsive, prequalified bidder on this project.

A motion to accept and approve Staff's recommendation on Item 8b contract to REJECT THE BID of AJP ELECTRIC, INC., and award contract to SUNLINE CONTRACTING, LLP was made by Steve Christy and seconded by Kelly Anderson. In a voice vote, the motion carries.

***ITEM 8c:** The proposed road reconstruction project is located in Coconino County on US 89, at Cameron within the Navajo Nation. This project begins at mile post 463.5 and extends to mile post 467.1. The work consists of reconstructing US 89 to the east of the current alignment with earthwork, aggregate base, paving asphaltic concrete, new northbound and southbound bridges over the Little Colorado River, box culverts, underpasses, drainage, roundabout, sidewalk, raised median, curb and gutter and other related work.

***ITEM 8c:** BIDS OPENED: September 13, 2013 Page 166
HIGHWAY: FLAGSTAFF-CAMERON HWY (US 89)
SECTION: US 89/ SR64 TO LITTLE COLORADO RIVER
COUNTY: COCONINO
ROUTE NO.: US 89
PROJECT : TRACS: NH-089-D(201)S : 089 CN 463 H791501C
FUNDING: 94% FEDS 6% STATE
LOW BIDDER: VASTCO, INC.
LOW BID AMOUNT: \$ 36,669,325.35
STATE ESTIMATE: \$ 29,037,436.80
\$ OVER ESTIMATE: \$ 7,631,888.55
% OVER ESTMATE: 26.3%
PROJECT DBE GOAL: 5.94%
BIDDER DBE PLEDGE: 6.53%
NO. BIDDERS: 9
RECOMMENDATION: AWARD

Jennifer stated after review of the bid not one or two line items but there are multiple items in terms of underestimating and mainly on the production costs.

Jennifer covered four of those line items: drilled shaft, roadway excavation, curb and gutter, and the retaining wall, more specifically.

On roadway excavation line item, the State anticipated approximately 20-30% of the roadway excavation would include rock and that it would be rippable. In talking with the apparent low bidder, they felt that blasting was needed for more than 50% of this item, thus increasing their costs and slowing their production, which increases the actual cost of that particular line item.

In the curb and gutter line items, the unit cost received from the sub-contractor included two mobilizations for the slip form machine when the Department estimated it, they only included one mobilization during the phasing of the project.

The retaining wall line item, the contractor believes that they will need blasting for that and they stated that they have to form each of the foundations, which slows the production costs and increases the material costs as compared to the Department's estimate.

In addition some of the mobilization items to construct the drilled shaft foundations were increased for the same issues in terms of two mobilizations versus a single mobilization that the State estimated.

Based on the analysis of the bids, it appears that the low bidder submitted a reasonable bid for the work. It is recommended that the contract be awarded to Vastco, Inc.

A motion to accept and approve Staff's recommendation to award Item 8c contract to VASTCO, INC. was made by Steve Christy and seconded by Kelly Anderson. In a voice vote, the motion carries.

***ITEM 8d:** The proposed work is located in Mohave County on State Route 95 (SR 95). The project begins at Milepost 189.79 approximately 10 miles north of Lake Havasu City and extends north approximately 12 miles to Milepost 201.95, south of Interstate 40 (I-40). The work consists of removal of cable barrier, constructing game fence, installing cattle guards, and other miscellaneous work.

*ITEM 8d:	BIDS OPENED: September 13, 2013	Page 170
	HIGHWAY: QUARTZITE-PARKER-TOPOCK HWY (SR 95)	
	SECTION: LONDON BRIDGE ROAD TO I-40	
	COUNTY: MOHAVE	
	ROUTE NO.: SR 95	
	PROJECT : TRACS: NH-095-C(213)T : 095 MO 189 H846301C	
	FUNDING: 94% FEDS 6% STATE	
	LOWEST BIDDERS: MCCAULEY CONSTRUCTION INC.	SHOW LOW CONSTRUCTION, INC.
	LOW BID AMOUNT: \$ 986,448.24	\$ 1,011,105.34
	STATE ESTIMATE: \$ 959,217.08	\$ 959,217.08
	\$ OVER ESTIMATE: \$ 27,231.16	\$ 52,888.26
	% OVER ESTMATE: 2.8%	5.4%
	PROJECT DBE GOAL: 9.20%	9.20%
	BIDDER DBE PLEDGE: Good Faith Effort	Met Goal
	NO. BIDDERS: 5	5
	RECOMMENDATION: REJECT the bid of McCauley Const.	PENDING AWARD to Show Low Construction, Inc.

COMMENTS:

In its bid documents, McCauley Construction certified it had not met the Disadvantaged Business Enterprises (DBE) goal of 9.20 percent established for this project but claimed to have made a good faith effort to do so as required by the Special Provisions. Show Low Construction and all other bidders on the project certified that they had met the goal.

DBE requirements for this project are included in the EPRISE section of the Special Provisions starting on page 6 of 115. Sections 14.01 and 14.02 of the DBE requirements, starting on pages 16 and 18 of 115, state in part:

If the apparent low bidder has stated in its bid proposal that it has been unable to meet the DBE goal, that bidder must demonstrate, through detailed and comprehensive documentation, that good faith efforts have been made to solicit, assist, and use DBE firms to meet the DBE goal prior to the bid. The bidder cannot change its bid proposal after submission.

Failure to demonstrate good faith efforts to the satisfaction of ADOT will result in the rejection of the bid.

In order to be awarded a contract on the basis of good faith efforts, a bidder must show that it took all necessary and reasonable steps to achieve the DBE goal which, by their scope, intensity, and appropriateness to the objective, could reasonably be expected to obtain sufficient DBE participation, even if they were not fully successful. The Department will consider the quality, quantity, and intensity of the different kinds of efforts the bidder has made. The efforts employed by

the bidder should be those that one could reasonably expect a bidder to make if the bidder were actively and aggressively trying to obtain DBE participation sufficient to meet the DBE goal. Mere pro forma efforts are not sufficient good faith efforts to meet the DBE contract requirements.

In determining whether a bidder has made good faith efforts, the Department will take into account the ability of other bidders to meet the DBE goal.

The bidder will not be considered to have made good faith efforts if the bidder failed to contact the ADOT Civil Rights Office prior to the letting, either in writing, by e-mail, or by telephone, to inform the Civil Rights Office of the firm's difficulty in meeting the DBE goals on a given project, and to request assistance.

If the apparent low bidder fails to submit the required information by the stated time and in the manner herein specified, or if the submitted information reveals a failure to meet the requirements of the specifications, the apparent low bidder shall be ineligible to receive award of the contract and the bid will be rejected.

Section 14.01 of the DBE requirements in the Special Provisions also lists eight types of effort that a bidder must address when submitting good faith effort documentation.

The ADOT Civil Rights Business Engagement & Compliance Office (BECO) has reviewed the claim by McCauley Construction that it had made a good faith effort to meet the DBE goal. BECO concludes that:

MCI's submission fails to address the eight requirements for a good faith effort, as set forth in the specifications.

This alone disqualifies MCI.

MCI failed to contact BECO for assistance before the bid opening as required by the specifications. This also disqualifies MCI. While MCI's failures above are fatal to MCI's claim of good faith effort, BECO examined the documents that were submitted by MCI, and found that MCI failed to meet the eight requirements.

The fact that all other bidders were able to meet the DBE goal before bid opening further demonstrates that the goal was reasonable and attainable. McCauley Construction did not contact Civil Rights for assistance before bid opening as required, did not use all necessary and reasonable means to solicit, assist and use DBEs for this project prior to the bid as required, and failed to make the effort of a bidder actively and aggressively seeking DBE participation as required.

The Department therefore recommends that the bid of McCauley Construction Inc. be rejected and the contract awarded to Show Low Construction, Inc. as the lowest responsible and responsive bidder, subject to a satisfactory DBE compliance review of the Show Low Construction bid.

The Department, in a letter sent by FAX on October 2, 2013, notified all bidders on this project of its recommendation to reject the bid of McCauley Construction and award to Show Low Construction. Show Low Bidders have one week from that letter to respond or protest and Show Low Construction has one week in which to submit its DBE compliance information. Those deadlines come after this agenda will be published. The State Engineer will accordingly provide an update on those items at the Board meeting.

Jennifer stated on September 13, bids were opened and McCauley Construction was read as the apparent low bidder with Show Low Construction as the second low bidder. In its bid documents, McCauley Construction certified that it had not met the Disadvantaged Business Enterprises goal of 9.20 percent established for this project but they claimed to have made a good faith effort to do so as required by the Special Provisions. Show Low Construction and all other bidders on the project did certify that they had met the goal of the 9.20 percent. The DBE requirements in the Special Provisions also lists eight types of effort that a bidder must address when submitting good faith effort documentation. The ADOT Business Engagement and Compliance Office has reviewed the claim by McCauley Construction that it had made a good faith effort to meet the DBE goals. They concluded that McCauley Construction submission failed to address the eight requirements in the Special Provisions and they also failed to contact the Business Engagement and Compliance Office for assistance prior to the bid opening, which is required by the specifications if you cannot meet the DBE goal. The fact that all other bidders were able to meet the DBE goal before bid opening further demonstrates that the goal was reasonable and also attainable. In a letter sent by FAX on October 2 notified all bidders on

this project of its recommendation to reject the bid of McCauley Construction and award to Show low Construction. Any protests were to be received by October 8 and none have been received. In addition Show Low Construction had to submit their DBE information to be reviewed by the Business Engagement and Compliance Office and they have confirmed that Show Low Construction has met its DBE requirements with 38 percent DBE compliance.

The Department therefore recommends that the bid of McCauley Construction be rejected and the contract be awarded to Show low Construction as the lowest responsible and responsive bidder.

A motion to accept and approve Staff's recommendation on Item 8d contract to REJECT THE BID from MCCAULEY CONSTRUCTION and award contract to SHOW LOW CONSTRUCTION, INC. was made by Kelly Anderson and seconded by Steve Christy. In a voice vote, the motion carries.

ITEM 9: Suggestions

None at this time.

Adjournment

A motion to adjourn was made by Steve Christy and seconded by Kelly Anderson. In a voice vote, the motion carries.

Meeting adjourned 10:00 A.M. MST



Victor Flores, Chairman
State Transportation Board



John McGee, Deputy Director
Arizona Department of Transportation