



Introduction

What are Capital Improvements?

Capital improvements are often referred to as the bricks and mortar or infrastructure that governmental entities need to provide essential services to current residents and support new growth and development.

Counties in Arizona differ may differ from counties in other states, in that they are not responsible for fire stations, water treatment plants or sanitation collection, to name but a few. Rather, the primary focus of the counties is road maintenance and in some instances, road construction.

Pinal County is considered a rural county, by Arizona standards. By this definition, the County does not have adequate funding to provide for a true Capital Improvement Plan. The capital plan for the County's General Fund includes ANY purchase over one thousand dollars. This is a relatively small amount, but given the County's revenue-stream, it can make a large impact on how well the County functions financially.

As the County continues to grow, it was the one of the fastest growing counties in the nation in 2006, it should see an increase in its revenue stream due to the construction of homes and businesses. Once the revenues increase to an appropriate level, the County will be able to plan for larger capital improvements on a more schedule process. Some of these projects include a new jail pod, satellite offices, administration building, etc.

Paying for Capital Improvements

In many respects, the county planning process for selecting, scheduling and financing capital improvements – assesses many valid competing needs, determining priorities, evaluating costs and financing options (increasing revenues, reducing expenses or increasing debt) and establishing realistic completion timeframes – parallels the way an individual might plan for buying a new house or car. Initially, it must be decided if the purchase is a higher priority than other equally pressing needs. The analysis process may involve many familiar questions.

- Do I need a new home or car or just “want” one?
- Can I wait for another year or two?
- Are there other alternatives such as remodeling, using public transportation or carpooling?
- What other things will I need to forego if this item is obtained?
- What can I afford and how can I pay for it?
- Do I need outside financing and what will it cost?



If the purchase plan moves forward, a decision needs to be made about the down payment. A good planner might have started a “replacement fund” a few years ago in anticipation of the need. Other cash sources might include a savings account or a “rainy day” emergency fund. If the buyer is like most of us, he or she will need to find longer-term bank financing for some of the costs. Repaying the loan might require cutting other expenses like eating out at restaurants, or increasing revenue by taking a second part-time job. An unanticipated inheritance may speed up the timetable; a negative event, such as an uninsured hospitalization, might delay the plan.

Similarly, most large capital improvements cannot be financed solely from a single year’s county annual operating budget by simply increasing income or decreasing revenue.

Increasing Revenue by Raising Sales Tax Rates

County sales tax and state-shared sales tax revenue account for a large percentage of county revenues. These revenue sources are highly volatile and subject to wide fluctuations based on economic conditions. Furthermore, the amount of state-shared revenues a county receives is dependent upon state legislative actions.

Because sales tax revenue is very unpredictable, it is a good source of payment for smaller one-time capital purchases rather than major, long-term on time-sensitive capital improvement projects. For example, many equipment purchases are paid for from the county’s annual operating budget when the economy is healthy and revenues are above projected levels. During hard economic times, old equipment might be repaired rather than replaced so that the purchase can be postponed a year or two. However, building a new fire station or increasing public safety services in response to population growth cannot be postponed “until the economy improves” without threatening the welfare of the entire community.

Impact Fees

County property tax revenue is often insufficient to accommodate necessary infrastructure of new residential and commercial developments within the county. With the high growth rates currently experienced in the county, it has been determined that impact fees will be charged to help alleviate the stress of needed revenues to facilitate infrastructure needs such as road development and public utilities.

The county has assessed the needs of future development and has determined that impact fees will aid directly in the development in new roadways needed to accommodate new residential developments. Impact fees will be charged to developers of new projects and the revenues collected will be used on projects such as the Gantzel Road expansion and others that will help alleviate traffic concerns and access to these newer developments.



Decreasing Expenses by Curtailing or Eliminating Services

If 'same-year-pay-as-you-go' financing from the County's annual operating budget were the only funding mechanism available to pay for capital projects, the county might free operating budget dollars for a needed capital project by reducing its same-year operating expenses. If the County had to fund the construction of a new satellite office (\$3 million) from revenue generated in the same year, eliminating the entire budget for the new equipment and positions would have freed almost enough operating funds to cover the cost.

The short-term operating budget approach to financing large capital improvements depends heavily on General Fund balances and the state of the economy at the time a project needs to be implemented. It also places an unfair burden on existing residents to pay the entire cost for new facilities and services that will primarily benefit future residents.

Long-Range Pay-As-You-Go Financing

Issuing county bonds is one way source of funding for large capital projects. However, Pinal County's capacity to issue bonds and the amounts and purpose for which bond funds may be used, are limited by Arizona state law and the county's internal financial policies.

Arizona law requires citizen approval for the sale of General Obligation (G.O.) and Revenue bonds. Pinal County has not placed a proposal before its citizens for either type of bonding situation for many years. The county has maintained a conservative financial status that has allowed it to fund projects without asking for additional taxing authority as would be required with bond issues.

Guidelines and Policies Used in Developing the Capital Improvement Plan

The County's Board of Supervisors directives and the County's financial policies also affect the use and issuance of bonds for CIP projects. Pinal County's Capital Improvement Plan must comply with the following requirements and limitations without requiring an increase in the primary or secondary tax rate.

The Plan must:

- Support the Board of Supervisors goals and objectives;
 - Satisfactorily address all state and county legal and financial limitations;
 - Maintain the county's favorable investment ratings and financial integrity;
 - Ensure that all geographic areas of the county have comparable quality and types of services.
-



Capital projects should:

- Prevent the deterioration of the county's existing infrastructure, and respond to and anticipate future growth in the county;
- Encourage and sustain Pinal County's economic development;
- Be financed through growth in the tax base;
- Be responsive to the needs of residents and businesses, within the constraints of reasonable taxes and fees;
- Take maximum advantage of improvements provided by other units of government where appropriate.

By carefully coordinating our capital improvement projects and schedules with our revenue streams, the Board of Supervisors has not had to raise property tax for over six years, or even contemplate a bond proposal. In fact, this fiscal year property taxes were decreased by the Board of Supervisors.

Debt Service/Legal Limits

Pinal County attempts to limit its long-term debt to only large projects that cannot be pay-as-you-go capital projects. Examples of these are the Superior Court/Sheriff Administration Building - \$31 million, Adult/Juvenile Detention Expansion - \$73 million, Ironwood/Gantzel Road Project - \$80 million.

Pinal County is limited in its debt capacity by the State of Arizona. Pinal County General Obligation debt, that is debt paid for by General Fund revenues, may not exceed six percent of the value of the County's taxable property value, as of the latest assessment. For FY2007, this equates to approximately \$88 million. However, with voter approval, debt may be incurred up to 15 percent of the value of taxable property. This legal level, for FY2007, is approximately \$220 million.

Another area of debt is Flood Control. Counties within the State of Arizona may not exceed five percent of the Flood Control District's taxable property as of the latest assessment. For FY2007, for Pinal County, this equates to approximately \$64 million.

Pinal County's current debt policy is to limit its use of debt bonding. Pinal County has not had a bond election at any time since the County was created. The current Board of Supervisors has stated that their intent is to continue with this trend and to fund items either through the use of Certificates of Deposits or pay-as-you-go financing.



Pinal County Capital Improvement Plan

Since Pinal County is not required to provide services normally received in a city, the CIP is presented in different format than normal. The following schedules will detail the budget supplements for General Fund departments only. Some of the additions may appear immaterial to larger governmental entities, but with proper controls on spending, the county has been able to not only maintain its “rainy day” fund, but also add to it each year. This increase allows the county to meet Resolution 62803-GF, which states that the General Fund reserve should be equal to a minimum of fifteen percent of annual budgeted General Fund expenses.

The second portion of this CIP is the Public Works five-year plan. Counties in Arizona are responsible for the majority of roads in the unincorporated areas of their respective counties. All maintenance performed by the county is funded through the Highway User Revenue Funds (HURF) that the State shares with the counties. These funds come from tax revenue of fuel charges for trucking firms as well as the “common” citizen.

Once the General Fund projects have been submitted for consideration, by the individual departments, the CIP Committee, consisting of elected officials and county administrative staff, will hear presentations on the submissions. After all presentations have been completed, the committee members will vote, individually, for each project. The Budget Office will compile the results and return them to the committee. The committee will then decide how to best divide the appropriated funds between, equipment, personnel and vehicles.

After this stage, the recommendations of the CIP Committee are forwarded to the County Manager for his review. The County Manager can agree with the recommendation and send it on to the Board of Supervisors, or he may make changes to the recommendation.

Once the review by the County Manager is complete, the recommendation is forwarded to the Pinal County Board of Supervisors for their approval at the annual budget adoption Board meeting.

The Public Works department has three separate Transportation Advisory Committees, one committee for each of the three Board districts. The Transportation Advisory Committees (TAC) design the Public Works CIP for each of the three districts. The TAC will look at the forecasted revenue for their respective district and create a five-year CIP. Once this plan is developed it is presented to the County Manager for approval. After this stage each Board of Supervisor is presented with their respective district plan. After discussion and any possible changes the Road TAC plan is adopted at the annual budget adoption hearing.

As the County continues to grow the CIP process will grow and evolve with it. As revenues increase due to growth of businesses and housing, projects that have been “mothballed” may actually be placed into the CIP for the benefit of the citizens of Pinal County.



**Pinal County
Capital Improvement Projects
Equipment
Fiscal Year 2006-2007**

| Dept. # | Department | Description of Capital Requests | No. of Items | Est Cost | Est. Annual Operating Cost |
|----------------|-----------------------------|--|---------------------|-----------------|-----------------------------------|
| 1018 | Adult Detention | Handcuffs & Restraints | Multiple | \$9,888 | \$0 |
| 1018 | Adult Detention | Pistol Lockers for Courthouse | 1 | \$4,800 | \$200 |
| 1049 | Adult Probation | Network Printers | 3 | \$3,600 | \$0 |
| 1049 | Adult Probation | Body Armor – Vests | 6 | \$3,600 | \$0 |
| 1124 | Budget & Research | Dell Work Big X3 XGA Digital Multimedia Projector | 1 | \$1,230 | \$0 |
| 1035 | Building Safety | Laptops for Building Inspectors | 10 | \$17,950 | \$0 |
| 1035 | Building Safety | Building Safety Copier | 1 | \$10,200 | \$1,000 |
| 1035 | Building Safety | Sharp AR-C260P Digital Color Printer | 1 | \$4,290 | \$0 |
| 1004 | Clerk of the Superior Court | Postage Machine | 1 | \$16,484 | \$100 |
| 1004 | Clerk of the Superior Court | Sharp AR-M455UB Multi-Functional Digital Copier | 1 | \$8,445 | \$1,000 |
| 1004 | Clerk of the Superior Court | FTR Gold (For the Record) Recording System | 7 | \$20,422 | \$1,000 |
| 1056 | Correctional Health | Correctional Health Copier | 1 | \$7,382 | \$1,000 |
| 1031 | Elections | Additional Voting Equipment | 10 | \$50,000 | \$0 |
| 1041 | Facilities Management | New or Rebuilt Forklift for Maintenance | 1 | \$20,000 | \$1,000 |
| 1041 | Facilities Management | Small Scissor Lift & Genie Super Hoist for Maintenance | 1 | \$22,000 | \$0 |
| 1040 | Facilities Management | Maintenance Work Order Software | 1 | \$61,200 | \$0 |
| 1042 | Facilities Management | Misc.Vacuum, floor machines & equipment - custodial | 1 | \$10,000 | \$0 |
| 1044 | Facilities Management | Miscellaneous Tools for Construction Department | 1 | \$8,000 | \$0 |
| 1041 | Facilities Management | New Tools for Maintenance Department | 1 | \$6,000 | \$0 |
| 1044 | Facilities Management | Jackhammer attachment for CAT Backhoe | 1 | \$24,000 | \$0 |
| 1023 | Fairgrounds | John Deere Tractor w/Loader; Model 5325 | 1 | \$39,677 | \$500 |
| 1025 | Finance | Copier for Building A 2nd Floor | 1 | \$16,816 | \$1,000 |
| 1025 | Finance | CAFR-2000 | 1 | \$3,000 | \$0 |
| 1017 | Fleet Services | Fleet Services Facility Realignment | 1 | \$55,000 | \$0 |
| 2077 | Health & Human Services | ACC System Replacement Project | 1 | \$60,150 | \$0 |
| 1026 | Human Resources | Main Printer Replacement | 1 | \$2,441 | \$0 |
| 1026 | Human Resources | Copier Replacement | 1 | \$11,907 | \$1,000 |
| 1029 | Information Technology | Service Desk Software Upgrade | 1 | \$34,615 | \$0 |
| 1029 | Information Technology | Building B Copier/Printer Replacement | 1 | \$5,000 | \$1,000 |
| 1029 | Information Technology | VMware Server Installation Phase I | 1 | \$70,000 | \$0 |
| 1029 | Information Technology | IT Building A Copier/Printer Replacement | 1 | \$5,000 | \$1,000 |
| 1029 | Information Technology | Network Infrastructure Upgrades to Address Security | 1 | \$225,000 | \$0 |
| 1047 | Juvenile Court Services | MS Office Professional Suite Software | 26 | \$8,320 | \$0 |
| 1047 | Juvenile Court Services | Records Management System | 1 | \$23,700 | \$2,000 |
| 1047 | Juvenile Court Services | Casa Grande Office Furniture for two offices | 1 | \$8,840 | \$0 |



| Dept. # | Department | Description of Capital Requests | No. of Items | Est Cost | Est. Annual Operating Cost |
|------------------------------------|------------------------|---|--------------|--------------------|----------------------------|
| 1012 | Maricopa Justice Court | Furniture for Judge & Staff | Multiple | \$9,946 | \$0 |
| 1016 | PCSO | Postage Machine/Personnel Division | 1 | \$5,965 | \$250 |
| 1016 | PCSO | Records Commercial Copier | 1 | \$6,869 | \$1,000 |
| 1016 | PCSO | Evidence Freezer Expansion/Extension | 1 | \$30,000 | \$200 |
| 1016 | PCSO | Personnel/Records/Support Serv Door Access Panel | 1 | \$11,294 | \$0 |
| 1030 | Planning & Development | Laptops for Attorney's | 1 | \$1,878 | \$0 |
| 1030 | Planning & Development | Code Compliance Laptops & Software | 8 | \$17,366 | \$0 |
| 1046 | Public Defender | Cellular Phones - Blackberry Phones w/text mgs capabilities | 15 | \$3,750 | \$0 |
| 1057 | Public Fiduciary | Public Fiduciary Outsource Automation | 1 | \$93,000 | \$0 |
| 1045 | Superior Court Admin. | Elan Mira A3 Stenograph Machine | 7 | \$32,753 | \$200 |
| 1028 | Telecom | Telecom Data Link Information/Access Buffer | 10 | \$33,705 | \$0 |
| | | Sub-Total Cost of Recommended Items | | \$1,125,484 | \$13,450 |
| Yearly Replacement Programs | | | | | |
| Dept. # | Department | Description of Capital Requests | No. of Items | Est Cost | Est. Annual Operating Cost |
| 1029 | Information Technology | Security and Firewall Redundancy Project | | \$126,332 | \$0 |
| 1029 | Information Technology | PC Replacement Program | 200 | \$305,000 | \$0 |
| 1028 | Telecom | County wide Telephone Replacements | 100 | \$74,480 | \$0 |
| 1028 | Telecom | Telecommunications PBX Software Upgrade | 1 | \$93,748 | \$0 |
| 1028 | Telecom | Communications Grounding Project Phase I | 1 | \$26,000 | \$0 |
| 1028 | Telecom | Call Pilot Expansion Phase II | 1 | \$10,200 | \$0 |
| 1029 | Information Technology | Infrastructure Upgrades | 1 | \$61,445 | \$0 |
| 1029 | Information Technology | Server Infrastructure Upgrades | 1 | \$199,234 | \$3,000 |
| 1034 | Conciliation Court | Phone Switch – PBX | 1 | \$27,470 | \$0 |
| | | Sub-Total Cost of Replacement Program | | \$923,909 | \$3,000 |
| | | Total Cost of Recommended Equipment Items | | \$2,049,393 | \$16,450 |



**Pinal County
Capital Improvements Projects
Facilities
Fiscal Year 2005-2006**

| Dept # | Department | Facility Project | Est. Cost | Est. Annual Operating Cost |
|--|--------------------------|---|------------------|----------------------------|
| 1041 | Facilities Mgmt.-Mainten | Replace A/C Cooling Tower @ Bldg F | \$15,000 | \$0 |
| 1041 | Facilities Mgmt.-Mainten | HVAC Replacements @ Adult Detention | \$87,000 | \$0 |
| 1047 | Juvenile Probation | Juvenile Court Apache Junction Office-Lighting | \$1,000 | \$0 |
| 1041 | Facilities Mgmt.-Mainten | Replace HVAC Fancoil Units @ Oracle Admin Bldg | \$20,000 | \$0 |
| 1017 | Fleet Services | Fleet Services Facility Realignment | \$20,000 | \$0 |
| 1003 | Board of Supervisors | Remodel First Floor of Admin Bldg A | \$15,000 | \$0 |
| 1041 | Facilities Mgmt.-Mainten | Replace HVAC Fancoil Units @ Conciliation Court | \$50,000 | \$0 |
| 1055 | Environmental Health | Partition space for Building F | \$4,000 | \$0 |
| 1047 | Juvenile Probation | Juvenile Court-Casa Grande Private Offices Building | \$1,500 | \$0 |
| 1041 | Facilities Mgmt.-Mainten | Replace HVAC Fancoil Units @ San Manuel | \$20,000 | \$0 |
| 1018 | PCSO | PCSO-Adult Detention-Intake Floor | \$5,000 | \$0 |
| 1030 | Planning & Development | Building Remodel | \$10,000 | \$0 |
| 1046 | Public Defender | Remodel Exit | \$1,100 | \$0 |
| 1035 | Building Safety | Expansion & Remodel of Front Office Area | \$15,000 | \$0 |
| 1045 | Court Admin | Superior Court-Courtroom | \$334,000 | \$0 |
| Total Cost of Recommended Items | | | \$598,600 | \$0 |

**Vehicle Requests
Fiscal Year 2005-2006**

| Dept # | Department | Description of Vehicle | No of Items | Est Cost | Est. Annual Operating Cost |
|---|--------------------|-------------------------|-------------|--------------------|----------------------------|
| 1001 | Assessor | GMC Canyon Extended Cab | 1 | 17,600 | \$500 |
| 1047 | Juvenile Probation | Mid-sized 4 door sedan | 2 | 18,000 | \$1,000 |
| 1048 | Juvenile Detention | 15 Passenger Van | 2 | 25,000 | \$1,000 |
| 1052 | Public Health | Chevy Cobalt | 1 | 13,000 | \$500 |
| 1001 | Assessor | GMC Canyon Extended Cab | 2 | 17,600 | \$1,000 |
| 1013 | Recorder | GMC Envoy | 1 | 25,100 | \$500 |
| 1049 | Adult Probation | Ford Crown Victoria | 1 | 23,000 | \$500 |
| 1029 | MIS | Chevy Cobalt | 1 | 13,000 | \$500 |
| 1047 | Juvenile Probation | Mid-sized 4 door sedan | 3 | 18,000 | \$1,500 |
| 1001 | Assessor | GMC Canyon Extended Cab | 3 | 17,600 | \$1,500 |
| Sub-Total of Recommended Requests: | | | 17 | \$187,900 | \$8,500 |
| Replacement Program - ALL REPLACEMENT VEHICLES | | | | 1,212,000 | \$25,000 |
| Total of Recommended Requests: | | | 0 | \$1,399,900 | \$33,500 |

Pinal County Five Year Transportation Plan

| District 1 | | FISCAL YEAR 2006-2007 | | PROJECTED REVENUE | | \$1,121,000 | |
|--|--------------------------------------|--------------------------------------|---------------|-----------------------------------|---------------------------------------|----------------------------------|--|
| PROJECT ROAD | LOCATION | SCOPE OF WORK | LENGTH | COUNTY COST (estimate) | NON-COUNTY COST (estimate) | TOTAL COST (estimate) | NOTES |
| Sunland Gin Road | Bridge So. to Kinley Alignment | Reconstruction | 1.0 | \$400,000 | \$0 | \$400,000 | |
| Kenilworth Road | Attaway Rd to Valley Farms Rd | Design, New Construction | 2.0 | \$300,000 | \$300,000 | \$600,000 | Contingent 50/50 IGA with City of Coolidge |
| Park Link Drive | To Be Determined | Design, Environmental Clearance, ROW | 8.0 | \$273,000 | \$0 | \$273,000 | |
| Jacobus Road | 3700' southerly to Republic Plastics | Design, New Construction | 0.7 | \$130,721 | \$260,000 | \$390,721 | Contingent on cost share and ESP Grant |
| SR 79 & Cactus Forest Road | Intersection | Design, New Construction | 0.0 | \$365,441 | \$0 | \$365,441 | IGA with ADOT |
| <i>2006-07 Subtotal New Construction</i> | | | 11.7 | \$1,469,162 | \$560,000 | \$2,029,162 | |
| ARDP Program | | | | | | | |
| Timberline Road | Mt. Lemmon Hwy south .5 mile | ARDP | 0.5 | \$40,000 | \$0 | \$40,000 | |
| Randolph Road | Hwy 87 to Wheeler Track Rd. | ARDP | 3.0 | \$110,000 | \$110,000 | \$220,000 | Contingent on cost share with City of Coolidge |
| Diversion Dam Road | Florence Town limits east 6 miles | ARDP | 6.0 | \$230,000 | \$230,000 | \$460,000 | Contingent on 50/50 split with District 2 |
| Briggs Road | Dogwood Rd. to Sweetwater Rd. | ARDP | 0.75 | \$60,000 | | \$60,000 | |
| Milligan Road | Vail Rd to Wheeler Track | ARDP | 2.0 | \$160,000 | | \$160,000 | |
| <i>2006-07 Subtotal</i> | | | 12.25 | \$600,000 | \$340,000 | \$940,000 | |
| TOTAL | | | 23.95 | \$2,069,162 | \$900,000 | \$2,969,162 | |

Pinal County Five Year Transportation Plan

| District 1 | FISCAL YEAR 2007-2008 | | PROJECTED REVENUE | | \$1,121,000 | | |
|--|------------------------------|--------------------------------------|--------------------------|--|--|---|--------------------------------------|
| PROJECT ROAD | LOCATION | SCOPE OF WORK | LENGTH | COUNTY COST <i>(estimate)</i> | NON-COUNTY COST <i>(estimate)</i> | TOTAL COST <i>(estimate)</i> | NOTES |
| Park Link Drive | To Be Determined | Design, Environmental Clearance, ROW | 8.0 | \$300,000 | \$0 | \$300,000 | |
| Florence/Kelvin Road | To Be Determined | Design, New Construction | 1.0 | \$350,000 | \$0 | \$350,000 | |
| <i>2007-08 Subtotal New Construction</i> | | | 9.00 | \$650,000 | \$0 | \$650,000 | |
| ARDP Program | | | | | | | |
| Los Molinas | SR77 cont' east 2000' | ARDP | 0.38 | \$30,400 | | \$30,400 | |
| Mountain View Estates | | ARDP | 2.20 | \$125,000 | \$125,000 | \$250,000 | Contingent cost share with Jim Wayne |
| Silverbell Estates | Scorpio and Libra | ARDP | 2.00 | \$160,000 | | \$160,000 | |
| Toltec Estate West | | ARDP | 3.0 | \$240,000 | \$0 | \$240,000 | |
| <i>2007-08 Subtotal ARDP</i> | | | 7.6 | 555,400 | \$125,000 | \$680,400 | |
| TOTAL | | | | | | | |
| | | | 16.58 | \$1,205,400 | \$125,000 | \$1,330,400 | |

Pinal County Five Year Transportation Plan

| District 1 | FISCAL YEAR 2008-2009 | PROJECTED REVENUE | \$1,121,000 | | | | |
|--|----------------------------------|--------------------------------------|--------------------|--|--|---|---|
| PROJECT ROAD | LOCATION | SCOPE OF WORK | LENGTH | COUNTY COST <i>(estimate)</i> | NON-COUNTY COST <i>(estimate)</i> | TOTAL COST <i>(estimate)</i> | NOTES |
| Park Link Drive | To Be Determined | Design, Environmental Clearance, ROW | 8.0 | \$283,000 | \$0 | \$283,000 | |
| Florence/Kelvin Rd | To Be Determined | Design, New Construction | 1.0 | \$370,000 | \$0 | \$370,000 | |
| Harmon Road | Toltec Hwy cont' east 1.25 miles | Design, New Construction | 1.3 | \$300,000 | \$600,000 | \$900,000 | Contingent on cost share. |
| <i>2008-09 Subtotal New Construction</i> | | | | \$953,000 | \$600,000 | \$1,553,000 | |
| ARDP Program | | | | | | | |
| Harmon Road | Sunland Gin Road to Lamb Road | ARDP | 1.0 | \$80,000 | | \$80,000 | |
| Martin Road | Picacho St to Nafziger Rd | ARDP | 1.5 | \$67,500 | \$67,500 | \$135,000 | Contingent on IGA with City of Coolidge |
| <i>2008-09 Subtotal ARDP</i> | | | | \$147,500 | \$67,500 | \$215,000 | |
| TOTAL | | | | | | | |
| | | | 11.75 | \$1,100,500 | \$667,500 | \$1,768,000 | |

Pinal County Five Year Transportation Plan

| District 1 | FISCAL YEAR 2009-2010 | PROJECTED REVENUE | \$1,200,000 | | | | |
|--|---------------------------------|--------------------------------------|--------------------|--|--|---|------------------------------|
| PROJECT ROAD | LOCATION | SCOPE OF WORK | LENGTH | COUNTY COST <i>(estimate)</i> | NON-COUNTY COST <i>(estimate)</i> | TOTAL COST <i>(estimate)</i> | NOTES |
| Park Link Drive | To Be Determined | Design, Environmental Clearance, ROW | 8.0 | \$350,000 | \$0 | \$350,000 | |
| Javelina Estates | Various Roads 4.5 miles | Design, New Construction | 1.0 | \$405,000 | \$0 | \$405,000 | |
| Phillips Road | Sunland Gin to City limits | Design, New Construction | 1.5 | \$67,500 | \$67,500 | \$135,000 | Cost Share with City of Eloy |
| <i>2009-10 Subtotal New Construction</i> | | | | \$822,500 | \$67,500 | \$890,000 | |
| ARDP Program | | | | | | | |
| Alsdorf Road | West of Lamb Rd for 1 mile | ARDP | 1.00 | \$90,000 | \$0 | \$90,000 | |
| Hennes Road | Battaglia South to Alsdorf | ARDP | 1.00 | \$90,000 | \$0 | \$90,000 | |
| 2 o'clock Hill Road | from existing ARDP for .25 mile | ARDP | 0.25 | \$22,500 | \$0 | \$22,500 | |
| Emilie Circle | Cody Loop 300' to dead-end | ARDP | 0.06 | \$5,114 | \$0 | \$5,114 | |
| Rock Cliffe Blvd | End of Pavement to Alice | ARDP | 0.25 | \$22,500 | \$0 | \$22,500 | |
| <i>2009-10 Subtotal ARDP</i> | | | | \$230,114 | \$0 | \$230,114 | |
| TOTAL | | | | 10.5 | \$1,052,614 | \$67,500 | \$1,120,114 |

Pinal County Five Year Transportation Plan

| District 1 | FISCAL YEAR 2010-2011 | | PROJECTED REVENUE | | \$1,400,000 | | |
|--|------------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-----------------------------------|---------------------------------------|----------------------------------|--------------|
| PROJECT ROAD | LOCATION | SCOPE OF WORK | LENGTH | COUNTY COST (estimate) | NON-COUNTY COST (estimate) | TOTAL COST (estimate) | NOTES |
| Park Link Drive | To Be Determined | Design, New Construction | 8.0 | \$1,000,000 | \$0 | \$1,000,000 | |
| <i>2010-11 Subtotal New Construction</i> | | | | \$1,000,000 | \$0 | \$1,000,000 | |
| ARDP Program | | | | \$400,000 | | \$400,000 | |
| Phillips Road | Curry Road to Sunshine Road | | | Unfunded | | Unfunded | |
| TOTAL | | | 8.0 | \$1,400,000 | \$0 | \$1,400,000 | |

Projects not funded will be re-submitted for consideration in FY2011-2012

Pinal County Five Year Transportation Plan

| District 2 | FISCAL YEAR 2006-2007 | | PROJECTED REVENUE | | \$1,000,000 | | |
|--|----------------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-----------------------------------|---------------------------------------|----------------------------------|--------------|
| PROJECT | LOCATION | SCOPE OF WORK | LENGTH | COUNTY COST (estimate) | NON-COUNTY COST (estimate) | TOTAL COST (estimate) | NOTES |
| Gary Road | Judd Rd. south to end | Design Only | 0.00 | \$150,000 | \$0 | \$150,000 | |
| Prospectors Road | End of pavement to Lost Dutchman | Design Only | 0.00 | \$100,000 | \$0 | \$100,000 | |
| Canyon Street | Idaho west 1/2 mile | Design, New Construction | 0.50 | \$350,000 | \$0 | \$350,000 | |
| J-Curve/Hunt/Elsworth | Curve Realignment | Design, New Construction | 0.00 | \$200,000 | \$0 | \$200,000 | |
| Hawes/Hunt Intersection | Intersection | Design, New Construction | 0.00 | \$200,000 | \$0 | \$200,000 | |
| <i>2006-07 Subtotal New Construction</i> | | | 0.50 | \$1,000,000 | \$0 | \$1,000,000 | |
| Apache Junction ARDP | | | | | | | |
| Saddlebutte Street | Tomahawk to Wolverine St. | ARDP | 0.5 | \$32,817 | \$0 | \$32,817 | |
| Moon Vista Street | Tomahawk to Wolverine St. | ARDP | 0.5 | \$32,817 | \$0 | \$32,817 | |
| Colt Street | McKellips north 660 feet | ARDP | 0.13 | \$8,213 | \$0 | \$8,213 | |
| Tonto Street | Thunderbird to Valley St. | ARDP | 0.13 | \$8,526 | \$0 | \$8,526 | |

Pinal County Five Year Transportation Plan

| PROJECT | LOCATION | SCOPE OF WORK | LENGTH | COUNTY COST <i>(estimate)</i> | NON-COUNTY COST <i>(estimate)</i> | TOTAL COST <i>(estimate)</i> | NOTES |
|--|---|---------------|--------|----------------------------------|--------------------------------------|---------------------------------|-------|
| Moon Vista Street | Ironwood to Thunderbird | ARDP | 0.38 | \$24,899 | \$0 | \$24,899 | |
| Moon Vista Street | Plaza Dr. to Apache Dr. | ARDP | 0.13 | \$8,526 | \$0 | \$8,526 | |
| Canyon Street | Ironwood east 2000 feet | ARDP | 0.38 | \$24,899 | \$0 | \$24,899 | |
| Frontier Street | Valley Dr. to Idaho Rd | ARDP | 0.75 | \$49,193 | \$0 | \$49,193 | |
| Apache Drive | Canyon north 1320 feet | ARDP | 0.25 | \$16,380 | \$0 | \$16,380 | |
| Plaza Drive | Canyon St. to Moon Vista | ARDP | 0.13 | \$8,526 | \$0 | \$8,526 | |
| Thunderbird Drive | Tonto St. to McDowell Rd. | ARDP | 0.13 | \$8,526 | \$0 | \$8,526 | |
| Valley Drive | Canyon St. to Moon Vista | ARDP | 0.13 | \$8,526 | \$0 | \$8,526 | |
| Valley Drive | Saddlebutte St. to Tonto St | ARDP | 0.13 | \$8,526 | \$0 | \$8,526 | |
| Nodak Road | Bell St. to Singletree St. | ARDP | 0.25 | \$16,380 | \$0 | \$16,380 | |
| Geronimo Road | Broadway Rd to Junction Dr. | ARDP | 0.5 | \$32,817 | \$0 | \$32,817 | |
| Geronimo Road & 28th Avenue | Southern Ave to 28th Ave. and 330 feet west | ARDP | 0.19 | \$12,302 | \$0 | \$12,302 | |

Pinal County Five Year Transportation Plan

| PROJECT | LOCATION | SCOPE OF WORK | LENGTH | COUNTY COST <i>(estimate)</i> | NON-COUNTY COST <i>(estimate)</i> | TOTAL COST <i>(estimate)</i> | NOTES |
|-------------------------------------|-------------------------|---------------|-------------|----------------------------------|--------------------------------------|---------------------------------|-------|
| SanTan/Queen Creek Area ARDP | | | | | | | |
| Gail Road | Gary Rd. to Royce Rd. | ARDP | 1.00 | \$71,026 | \$0 | \$71,026 | |
| Rolls Road | Royce Rd to Pamela Dr. | ARDP | 0.75 | \$57,409 | \$0 | \$57,409 | |
| Rolls Road | Royce Rd to Mildred Rd. | ARDP | 0.75 | \$53,274 | \$0 | \$53,274 | |
| 2006-2007 Subtotal ARDP | | | | | | | |
| | | | 7.11 | \$483,582 | \$0 | \$483,582 | |
| TOTAL | | | | | | | |
| | | | 7.61 | \$1,483,582 | \$0 | \$1,483,582 | |

Pinal County Five Year Transportation Plan

| District 2 | FISCAL YEAR 2007-2008 | PROJECTED REVENUE | \$1,000,000 | | | | |
|--|------------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------|-----------------------------------|---------------------------------------|----------------------------------|--------------------|
| PROJECT | LOCATION | SCOPE OF WORK | LENGTH | COUNTY COST (estimate) | NON-COUNTY COST (estimate) | TOTAL COST (estimate) | NOTES |
| Judy's Road Phase I | Skyline to Felix Road | Design, New Construction | 1.25 | \$500,000 | \$0 | \$500,000 | |
| Judy's Road-Phase II | Skyline to Felix Road | Design, New Construction | 1.25 | \$500,000 | \$0 | \$500,000 | |
| <i>2007-08 Subtotal New Construction</i> | | | | \$1,000,000 | \$0 | \$1,000,000 | |
| ARDP PROGRAM | | | | \$250,000 | | \$250,000 | |
| TOTAL | | | | 1.25 | \$1,250,000 | \$0 | \$1,250,000 |

Pinal County Five Year Transportation Plan

| District 2 | FISCAL YEAR 2008-2009 | PROJECTED REVENUE | \$1,000,000 | | | | |
|--|------------------------------|-----------------------------|--------------------|-----------------------------------|---------------------------------------|----------------------------------|------------------------------|
| PROJECT | LOCATION | SCOPE OF WORK | LENGTH | COUNTY COST (estimate) | NON-COUNTY COST (estimate) | TOTAL COST (estimate) | NOTES |
| Judd Road | Design, New Construction | Attaway Rd to Quail Run Rd. | 1.00 | \$450,000 | \$0 | \$450,000 | |
| Quail Run Road | Design, New Construction | Judd Rd to Bella Vista | 1.00 | \$450,000 | \$0 | \$450,000 | |
| Roberts Road | Judy's Rd. to Felix Road | Design, New Construction | 0.50 | \$250,000 | \$0 | \$250,000 | |
| <i>2008-09 Subtotal New Construction</i> | | | | \$1,150,000 | \$0 | \$1,150,000 | |
| ARDP PROGRAM | | | | \$250,000 | | \$250,000 | |
| Rolling Ridge Road | East of Schnepf 1 mile | Design, New Construction | | | | | Unfunded Need to acquire ROW |
| TOTAL | | | | \$1,400,000 | \$0 | \$1,400,000 | |

Pinal County Five Year Transportation Plan

| District 2 | | FISCAL YEAR 2009-2010 | | PROJECTED REVENUE | | \$1,100,000 | |
|--|--------------------------|------------------------------|---------------|--|--|---|--------------------------|
| PROJECT | LOCATION | SCOPE OF WORK | LENGTH | COUNTY COST <i>(estimate)</i> | NON-COUNTY COST <i>(estimate)</i> | TOTAL COST <i>(estimate)</i> | NOTES |
| Price Road | Hwy 79 east 2.2 | Design, New Construction | 2.20 | \$350,000 | \$350,000 | \$700,000 | Contingent on cost share |
| Lost Dutchman Rd | Val Vista to Prospectors | Design, New Construction | 0.50 | \$500,000 | | \$500,000 | |
| <i>2009-2010 Subtotal New Construction</i> | | | | \$850,000 | \$350,000 | \$1,200,000 | |
| ARDP PROGRAM | | | | \$250,000 | | \$250,000 | |
| TOTAL | | | | \$1,100,000 | \$350,000 | \$1,450,000 | |

District 2

FISCAL YEAR 2010-2011

PROJECTED REVENUE

\$1,100,000

| PROJECT | LOCATION | SCOPE OF WORK | LENGTH | COUNTY COST <i>(estimate)</i> | NON-COUNTY COST <i>(estimate)</i> | TOTAL COST <i>(estimate)</i> | NOTES |
|---------|----------|---------------|--------|----------------------------------|--------------------------------------|---------------------------------|-------|
|---------|----------|---------------|--------|----------------------------------|--------------------------------------|---------------------------------|-------|

| | | | | | | | |
|-------------------------|----------------------|--------------------------|------|-----------|-----|-----------|--|
| Kings Ranch Road | Alemeda north 1 mile | Design, New Construction | 1.00 | \$500,000 | \$0 | \$500,000 | |
|-------------------------|----------------------|--------------------------|------|-----------|-----|-----------|--|

| | | | | | | | |
|---------------------------|------------------|--------------------------|------|-----------|-----|-----------|--|
| Mountain View Blvd | US60 to Broadway | Design, New Construction | 1.50 | \$750,000 | \$0 | \$750,000 | |
|---------------------------|------------------|--------------------------|------|-----------|-----|-----------|--|

| | | | | | | | |
|--|--|--|------|-------------|-----|-------------|--|
| <i>2010-2011 Subtotal New Construction</i> | | | | | | | |
| | | | 2.50 | \$1,250,000 | \$0 | \$1,250,000 | |

| | | | | | | | |
|---------------------|--|--|--|-----------|--|-----------|--|
| ARDP PROGRAM | | | | | | | |
| | | | | \$250,000 | | \$250,000 | |

| | | | | | | | |
|--------------|--|--|------|-------------|-----|-------------|--|
| TOTAL | | | | | | | |
| | | | 2.50 | \$1,500,000 | \$0 | \$1,500,000 | |

Pinal County Five Year Transportation Plan

| District 3 | | FISCAL YEAR 2006-2007 | PROJECTED TAC REVENUE | \$1,300,000 | | | |
|---|----------------------|------------------------------|------------------------------|--|---|---|---------------------|
| PROJECT | LOCATION | SCOPE OF WORK | LENGTH | COUNTY COST <i>(estimate)</i> | OTHER COST <i>(estimate)</i> | TOTAL COST <i>(estimate)</i> | NOTES |
| Signal Peak Road | Kleck Rd. to SR 287 | Design, New Construction | 2.00 | \$1,076,848 | \$0 | \$1,076,848 | Funded from FY05-06 |
| McCartney / Overfield | Intersection | Design, Reconstruction | 0.70 | \$600,000 | \$170,000 | \$770,000 | CAAG Funds 170k |
| McCartney Rd | Turn lanes at Cox Rd | Design, New Construction | 0.70 | \$600,000 | \$0 | \$600,000 | |
| 2006 -2007 Subtotal New Construction | | | | \$2,276,848 | \$170,000 | \$2,446,848 | |
| ARDP Program | | | | | | | |
| Hopi Hills Area | | ARDP | 4.30 | \$230,000 | \$0 | \$230,000 | |
| N. Hidden Valley Area | Ralston Rd. | ARDP | 1.50 | \$100,000 | \$0 | \$100,000 | |
| Stanfield Area | Pala Rd. | ARDP | 1.00 | \$70,000 | \$0 | \$70,000 | |
| S. Hidden Valley Area | | ARDP | 4.30 | \$300,000 | \$0 | \$300,000 | |
| Subtotal ARDP Program | | | | \$700,000 | \$0 | \$700,000 | |
| TOTALS | | | | | | | |
| | | | 14.50 | \$2,976,848 | \$170,000 | \$3,146,848 | |

Pinal County Five Year Transportation Plan

| District 3 | | FISCAL YEAR 2007-2008 | | PROJECTED REVENUE | | \$1,000,000 | |
|---|------------------------|------------------------------|---------------|--|---|---|-------------------|
| PROJECT | LOCATION | SCOPE OF WORK | LENGTH | COUNTY COST <i>(estimate)</i> | OTHER COST <i>(estimate)</i> | TOTAL COST <i>(estimate)</i> | NOTES |
| Warren Rd | Fresno Rd.to Robin Rd. | Design, New Construction | 1.00 | \$600,000 | \$0 | \$600,000 | Completes Project |
| <i>2007 -2008 Subtotal New Construction</i> | | | | \$600,000 | \$0 | \$600,000 | |
| <hr/> | | | | | | | |
| ARDP Program (Summer 07) | | | | \$250,000 | \$0 | \$250,000 | |
| <hr/> | | | | | | | |
| TOTALS | | | | 1.00 | \$850,000 | \$0 | \$850,000 |

Pinal County Five Year Transportation Plan

| District 3 | FISCAL YEAR 2008 - 2009 | | | | | PROJECTED REVENUE | \$1,000,000 | | |
|---|--------------------------------|--------------------------|---------------|--|---|---|---|------------------|--------------------|
| PROJECT | LOCATION | SCOPE OF WORK | LENGTH | COUNTY COST <i>(estimate)</i> | OTHER COST <i>(estimate)</i> | TOTAL COST <i>(estimate)</i> | NOTES | | |
| Clayton Road | Candlestick Rd. west 3/4 mile | Design, New Construction | 0.75 | \$350,000 | \$100,000 | \$450,000 | Contingent on local property owners participation | | |
| Thornton Road | I-8 to Peters Rd. | Help Loan Repayment | 2.50 | \$724,000 | \$0 | \$724,000 | Construct in 2008 with Help Loan | | |
| Maricopa CG Turn Lane | One turn lane | Design, New Construction | n/a | \$100,000 | \$500,000 | \$600,000 | Moved from 09-10 CAAG funded | | |
| 2008 -2009 Subtotal New Construction | | | | | | | \$1,774,000 | | |
| ARDP Program | | | | | | | \$250,000 | | |
| | | | | | | | \$0 | | |
| TOTALS | | | | | | | \$1,424,000 | \$600,000 | \$2,024,000 |

Pinal County Five Year Transportation Plan

| FISCAL YEAR 2009 - 2010 | | | | | | | PROJECTED REVENUE | \$1,000,000 | | |
|---|---------------------------------|--------------------------|---------------|--|---|---|--|--------------------|--------------------|--------------------|
| District 3 | | | | | | | | | | |
| PROJECT | LOCATION | SCOPE OF WORK | LENGTH | COUNTY COST <i>(estimate)</i> | OTHER COST <i>(estimate)</i> | TOTAL COST <i>(estimate)</i> | NOTES | | | |
| Thornton Road | I-8 to Peters | Help Loan Repayment | 2.50 | \$701,120 | \$470,000 | \$701,120 | CAAG funded & requires other funding sources | | | |
| Maricopa CG Bridge | Over the Santa Cruz | Design | n/a | \$250,000 | | \$250,000 | | | | |
| Farrell/Porter Road | Bridge over the Santa Rosa Wash | Design | n/a | \$125,000 | | \$125,000 | | | | |
| 2009 -2010 Subtotal New Construction | | | | | | | \$1,076,120 | \$470,000 | \$1,076,120 | |
| ARDP Program | | | | | | | \$250,000 | | \$250,000 | |
| Hidden Valley Road | McDavid to Farrell | Design, New Construction | 2.00 | unfunded | | unfunded | | | | |
| Farrell Road | Warren to Hidden Valley | Design, New Construction | 1.00 | unfunded | | unfunded | | | | |
| TOTALS | | | | | | | 2.50 | \$1,326,120 | \$470,000 | \$1,326,120 |

Projects not funded will be re-submitted for consideration

Pinal County Five Year Transportation Plan

| District 3 | | FISCAL YEAR 2010 - 2011 | | | | PROJECTED REVENUE | \$1,000,000 |
|---|--------------------|--------------------------------|---------------|--|---|---|--|
| PROJECT | LOCATION | SCOPE OF WORK | LENGTH | COUNTY COST <i>(estimate)</i> | OTHER COST <i>(estimate)</i> | TOTAL COST <i>(estimate)</i> | NOTES |
| Thornton Road | I-8 to Peters Road | Help Loan Repayment | 2.50 | \$659,440 | \$470,000 | \$659,440 | Construct in 2008 with Help Loan Funds |
| 2010 -2011 Subtotal New Construction | | | | | | | \$659,440 |
| ARDP Program | | | | \$250,000 | \$0 | \$250,000 | |
| Maricopa CG Turn Lanes | Three turn lanes | Design, New Construction | n/a | unfunded | | unfunded | Moved from FY 09-10 |
| Storey / Overfield | Intersection | Design, New Construction | n/a | unfunded | | unfunded | May be constructed by developer |
| Powerline Road | Warren to Ralston | Design, New Construction | 1.20 | unfunded | | unfunded | May consider alternate route |
| TOTALS | | | | | | | \$909,440 |
| | | | | | | | \$470,000 |
| | | | | | | | \$909,440 |

Projects not funded will be re-submitted for consideration in FY2011-2012



(Left Blank Intentionally)