Highway Commission Review & Advisory Subcommittee
February 8, 2018
Agenda Item C

Report to the Highway Commission Review and Advisory Subcommittee of Each Public Road Construction Project of Ten Million Dollars ($10,000,000) or More.

Questions?

— Stricken language would be deleted from and underlined language would be added to present law. Act 1 of the Third Extraordinary Session

1. State of Arkansas
2. 99th General Assembly
4. A Bill
5. Call Item 2
6. HOUSE BILL 1009
8. By: Senator Hector
9. For An Act To Be Entitled
10. AN ACT TO CREATE THE ARKANSAS HIGHWAY IMPROVEMENT PLAN OF 2016; TO DECLARE AN EMERGENCY; AND FOR OTHER PURPOSES.
11. Subtitle
12. TO CREATE THE ARKANSAS HIGHWAY IMPROVEMENT PLAN OF 2016; AND TO DECLARE AN EMERGENCY.
Update on Job 100686
Highway 63 – Black Rock to Portia
Lawrence County
### Summary

**Contract ID:** 100686  
**Contract Name:** Black Rock-Portia (S)  
**Funding Type:** Federal & State  
**District:** 10  
**County:** Lawrence  
**Route:** Hwy. 63

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Prime Contractor:</th>
<th>Robertson, Inc., Bridge &amp; Grading Div.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Type of Work:</td>
<td>Major Widening</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contract Bid Amount:</td>
<td>$13,792,849.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current Contract Amount:</td>
<td>$14,039,710.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Amount Paid:</td>
<td>$11,216,460.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amount Remaining:</td>
<td>$2,883,249.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent Complete:</td>
<td>79.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent Time Used:</td>
<td>107.1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- **Letting Date:** November 05, 2014  
- **Work Order Date:** December 31, 2014  
- **Original Estimated Completion Date:** Late 2016  
- **Current Estimated Completion Date:** Mid 2018

**Description of Project:**  
The purpose of this project is to widen 1.5 miles of Hwy. 63 from two lanes to five lanes in Lawrence County.
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Agenda Item D-2

Safety on Highway 117/115 and Highway 25
Highway 25
Agenda Item D-2

INTEROFFICE MEMORANDUM

December 15, 2017

TO: 
Mr. Emanuell Banks, Deputy Director and Chief Engineer

THROUGH: 
Kevin Thornton, Assistant Chief Engineer – Planning

FROM: 
Jessie Jones, Division Engineer – Transportation Planning and Policy

SUBJECT: 
Safety Study
Highway 25, Section 6, Log Mile 0.00 – 24.30
Lawrence County

There have been numerous complaints from local residents regarding the safety of Highway 25 in Lawrence County due to a recent increase in truck traffic. Much of the increased truck traffic is related to a sand-hauling operation and new chicken farms in the area. According to a field traffic count in August 2017, there are approximately 189 trucks per day along Highway 25. The 2017 Average Daily Traffic (ADT) ranges from 1,000 vehicles per day (vpd) south of Strawberry to 1,800 vpd near Black Rock.

Crash Analysis

At the request of the local officials, a safety analysis was conducted on Highway 25, Section 6 in Lawrence County (Attachment A). The study segment is a rural two-lane undivided minor arterial on rolling terrain with mostly 10-foot lanes and no paved shoulders. The southern portion of Highway 25 from the Independence County line to Strawberry (from approximately Log Mile 0.00 to 6.20) is part of the identified Southwest Heritage Trail.

The crash analysis conducted, using data from 2011 through 2015, showed that the fatal and serious injury (KA) crash rate was almost double the statewide average for similar facilities over the same time period (Attachment B). Over 80 percent of all crashes were roadway departure crashes, which includes single vehicle crashes, sideswipe crashes, and head-on crashes. A review of KA crash data from January 2016 to October 2017 shows one fatal crash in 2016 and one serious injury crash in 2017 (Attachment C). Both were single vehicle crashes.

A field visit was held on June 26, 2017 with local representatives and staff members from District 10, Roadway Design, and Transportation Planning and Policy. Generally, the local citizens have two major concerns along this highway: inadequate drainage and narrow bridges. The inadequate drainage causes safety hazards due to water covering parts of the roadway when the area experiences heavy rainfall. Also, the narrow width of bridges causes near sideswipe misses with large trucks. A review of the crash data revealed no significant number of either drainage related crashes or sideswipe crashes at bridges to warrant countermeasures. However, the pavement friction numbers are low in certain areas.
ARKANSAS STATE HIGHWAY COMMISSION

MINUTE ORDER

District: Ten

County: Lawrence

Category: Improvement Project

WHEREAS, IN LAWRENCE COUNTY, a crash analysis of Highway 25, Section 6 has been completed; and

WHEREAS, the predominant type of crashes in the study area is roadway departure crashes; and

WHEREAS, the analysis identified safety improvements such as pavement widening, ultra-thin bonded wearing course, shoulder rumble stripes, superelevation adjustments, guardrail replacement, chevron alignment signs, and tree trimming to address roadway departure crashes and provide substantial safety benefits; and

WHEREAS, the Arkansas Strategic Highway Safety Plan (2017) identified roadway departure crashes as a primary emphasis area; and

WHEREAS, these improvements are eligible for Federal-aid Safety funds.

NOW THEREFORE, the Director is authorized to proceed with plans and construction of a safety improvement project on this section of Highway 25 as funds become available.
El Dorado Partnering Agreement

- El Dorado requested alternatives outside regular scope of work of Department
- El Dorado agrees to assume ownership of a section of state highway
- El Dorado provides funding for upgraded design features
• First bypass study conducted 1974

• Update authorized January 28, 2015

• Purpose was “to identify feasible alternatives to reduce traffic and address safety concerns within Historic Washington State Park”

• Greatest safety concern is the high volume of pedestrian traffic crossing Highway 278
• Proposed solution is a western bypass

• Estimated total cost of nearly $10 million

• Recommends partnering with local stakeholders

• Letter with cost information sent to Parks & Tourism
State Highway vs General Revenue

Excludes County & City Aid funds | Excludes CAP funds
Percent of Highway vs. General Revenue

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fiscal Year</th>
<th>General Revenue</th>
<th>Highway Revenue</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td>$423M</td>
<td>$423M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>$434M</td>
<td>$434M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>$377M</td>
<td>$377M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1996</td>
<td>$297M</td>
<td>$297M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1998</td>
<td>$202M</td>
<td>$202M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1985</td>
<td>$139M</td>
<td>$139M</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Excludes County & City Aid funds | Excludes CAP funds

1985 Fuel Tax Increase
1991 Fuel Tax Increase
1999 Fuel Tax Increase

Billions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fiscal Year</th>
<th>General Revenue</th>
<th>Highway Revenue</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1980</td>
<td>$0.0</td>
<td>$0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1981</td>
<td>$1.0</td>
<td>$1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1982</td>
<td>$2.0</td>
<td>$2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1983</td>
<td>$3.0</td>
<td>$3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1984</td>
<td>$4.0</td>
<td>$4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1985</td>
<td>$5.0</td>
<td>$5.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1986</td>
<td>$6.0</td>
<td>$6.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1987</td>
<td>$7.0</td>
<td>$7.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

14.4% $139M
11.3% $202M
9.4% $297M
8.7% $377M
7.6% $434M
6.6% $423M

1980 1985 1991 1999 Fiscal Year
Highway Revenue at 14.4% of General Revenue

**General Revenue**

- 1980: $139M
- 1988: $259M
- 1996: $455M
- 2004: $626M
- 2012: $829M
- 2016: $931M

**Highway Revenue at 14.4% of General Revenue**

- 1980: 14.4% of $139M = $20M
- 1988: 14.4% of $259M = $37M
- 1996: 14.4% of $455M = $64M
- 2004: 14.4% of $626M = $90M
- 2012: 14.4% of $829M = $120M
- 2016: 14.4% of $931M = $132M

Excludes County & City Aid funds | Excludes CAP funds
## Arkansas State Highway Needs

### Exhibit III

Arkansas Department of Transportation (ArDOT)
Summary of Annual State Funds Needed to Meet Proposed Highway Construction Plan Over a 10-Year Period

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Annual Funds Needed for Highway Maintenance</th>
<th>Annual Funds Available for Highway Construction</th>
<th>Additional Annual State Revenues Needed for Highway Construction Plan</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$137,000,000</td>
<td>$250,000,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$90,000,000</td>
<td>$27,000,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$227,000,000</td>
<td>$277,000,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$157,000,000</td>
<td>$148,000,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$44,000,000</td>
<td>$42,000,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$30,000,000</td>
<td>$19,000,000</td>
<td>$11,000,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Equipment upgradesc | $19,000,000 | $19,000,000 | 
| Facilities upgradesc | $8,000,000  | $8,000,000  | 
| Intelligent Transportation System (ITS) | $3,000,000 | $3,000,000 | 
| Total Maintenance   | $30,000,000 | $19,000,000 | $11,000,000 |

**Totals**

$925,000,000

$447,000,000

$478,000,000

Note: Amounts shown are rounded.

---

*Figure: Exhibit III from the Arkansas Department of Transportation (ArDOT)*
Highway Revenue at 14.4% of General Revenue

Excludes County & City Aid funds | Excludes CAP funds

Fiscal Year
Hwy vs. General Revenue – Employment Levels

Excludes County & City Aid funds | Excludes CAP funds

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fiscal Year</th>
<th>General Revenue</th>
<th>Highway Revenue</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1980</td>
<td>$30,000</td>
<td>$0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1990</td>
<td>$32,000</td>
<td>$0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>$43,000</td>
<td>$0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>$49,725</td>
<td>$0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2020</td>
<td>$56,099</td>
<td>$0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2025</td>
<td>$58,651</td>
<td>$0.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Hwy vs. General Revenue – Employment Levels

Excludes County & City Aid funds | Excludes CAP funds

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fiscal Year</th>
<th>General Revenue</th>
<th>Highway Revenue</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1980</td>
<td>4,070</td>
<td>3,965</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1996</td>
<td>3,842</td>
<td>3,807</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>3,807</td>
<td>49,725</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>3,571</td>
<td>58,651</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Billions
• Act 809 - Construction Manager/General Contractor
• Alternative Project Delivery
• Pilot Program
  ✓ Limit of Three Projects
  ✓ Grand Total Not to Exceed $200 million
  ✓ One Project at a Time
  ✓ Program Expires July 31, 2022
Construction Manager/General Contractor Selection

- First CM/GC project: Highway 10 (Cantrell Road) – Pleasant Valley Road to Pleasant Ridge Road
- Kiewit Infrastructure South Co. of Fort Worth selected as the CM/GC
- Innovative Contracting & Engineering of Las Vegas, Nevada, selected as the Independent Cost Estimator for the project
Federal Highway Funding Issues

• Continuing Resolutions and a Government Shutdown

• Current Funding Ends February 8th

• Current Impacts

• Potential Future Impacts

• 40% Reduction
Projects Withdrawn from February Letting

12 Projects

$26.5 Million
Federal Highway Funding Issues

Proposed Outline of Trump Infrastructure Package Leaked

Contents Similar to Past Discussions

Major Emphasis on Encouraging State, Local, and Private Investment
Federal Highway Funding Issues

Recently Leaked Infrastructure Plan

• **Infrastructure Incentives Initiative** – $100 Billion or 50%
• **Transformative Projects Program** – $20 Billion or 10%
• **Rural Infrastructure Program** – $50 Billion or 25%
• **Federal Credit Programs** – $14.1 Billion or 7.05%
• **Federal Capital Financing Fund** – $10 Billion or 5%
• **Public Lands Infrastructure Fund**
• **Disposition of Federal Real Property**
• **Private Activity Bonds**
Recently Leaked Infrastructure Plan

Weighting Of Evaluation Criteria For $100 Billion Infrastructure Initiatives Incentive

- Incorporation of New Technology: 5%
- Improved Procurement and Project Delivery: 10%
- Dollar Value of Project: 10%
- Economic/Social Return on Investment: 5%
- New Non-Federal Revenue for Capital: 50%
- New Non-Federal Revenue for O&M and Rehab: 20%
Federal Highway Funding Issues

Recently Leaked Infrastructure Plan

- Infrastructure Incentives Initiative – $100 Billion or 50%
- Transformative Projects Program – $20 Billion or 10%
- Rural Infrastructure Program – $50 Billion or 25%
- Federal Credit Programs – $14.1 Billion or 7.05%
- Federal Capital Financing Fund – $10 Billion or 5%
- Public Lands Infrastructure Fund
- Disposition of Federal Real Property
- Private Activity Bonds
A New Revenue Source?

“The Arkansas Casino Gaming and Highway Funding Amendment of 2018”
## Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Interstate Improvements</td>
<td>$1.00 Billion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pavement Preservation</td>
<td>$3.84 Billion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bridge Replacement and Preservation</td>
<td>$1.14 Billion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capital Improvements</td>
<td>$1.20 Billion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capacity Improvements</td>
<td>$0.72 Billion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Safety Improvements</td>
<td>$0.47 Billion</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Totals $8.37 Billion Over 10 Years**
I-69 in Arkansas

- Preferred Alignment Identified
- 180 miles
- Estimated Cost to Complete - $3.6 Billion
- 4 “Segments of Independent Utility” (SIUs)
- Federal Earmarked Funds - $300 Million
INTERSTATE 69 (SIUs 13 and 14)

Balance of Earmarked Funds - $66 M

Regular Federal Funds - $10 M

Total Available - $76 Million
Current I-69 Funding Scenario

Construct Monticello Bypass Western Leg 2-Lanes
Construct
Eastern Terminus of Monticello Bypass to Highway 65
2-Lanes
Both Scenarios

- Design
- Purchase
- Right of Way for 4-Lanes
Alternative Scenario

**SUPPORT**
- Drew County Judge and Quorum Court
- Chicot County Judge and Quorum Court
- Desha County Judge and Quorum Court
- Chicot-Desha Metropolitan Port Authority
- Monticello Mayor and City Council
- Monticello Economic Development Commission
- McGehee Mayor
- Crossett Economic Development Foundation
- Southeast Arkansas Cornerstone Coalition
- University of Arkansas at Monticello

**OPPOSE**
- Bradley County Judge and Quorum Court
- Bradley County Economic Development Corporation
Upcoming AHC Meetings

March 14
April 24
June 6
July 11
August 29
October 10
November 14
Federal Motor Carrier Safety Administration (FMCSA) published a rule on Dec 16, 2015 requiring motor carriers to use electronic logging devices (ELD).

This is a change in logging requirements. **No laws or regulations have been newly instituted or changed** for Commercial Driver License (CDL), Commercial Motor Vehicles (CMV) and or application of regulations to persons hauling livestock or cattle.
Electronic Logging Device Mandate

• ELD Mandate applies to commercial motor vehicle owners/operators only.

• Only impacted if weight is 10,001 pounds or more AND one of the following:
  • Prize money is declared for tax purposes
  • Expenses are deducted for tax purposes
  • Sponsor pays some or all expenses.