

Meeting Date: February 11, 2026
Agenda Item No. 01
Distribution Date: February 5, 2026
Batch No. 01

From: henkinp@earthlink.net
To: [Lawson-Remer, Terra](#); [MontgomerySteppe, Monica](#); [Desmond, Jim](#); [Supervisor Joel Anderson District 2](#); [BOS, District1Community](#)
Cc: [FGG, Public Comment](#)
Subject: [External] PLEASE RESPOND: AWARD OF A CONSTRUCTION CONTRACT FOR THREE TRAFFIC SIGNALS (LAND USE AGENDA #1)
Date: Tuesday, February 3, 2026 9:18:02 AM

Good Morning, Supervisors,

re: Land Use Agenda #1. ESTABLISH APPROPRIATIONS IN THE ROAD FUND,
ADOPT RESOLUTION

AUTHORIZING SIGNALIZATION, AND AUTHORIZE ADVERTISEMENT
AND AWARD OF A CONSTRUCTION CONTRACT FOR THREE TRAFFIC
SIGNALS IN THE UNINCORPORATED COUNTY:

20% contingency fee is outrageous. That means that the contractor gets to keep the money and interest, and hopefully refunds the unused portion.

20% of the total cost of \$4,739,500 is \$947,900. The normal contingency fee is 5 to 10%. So why are we, the taxpayer, paying \$473,950 extra?

We are also told that the list of traffic signals to be installed is reviewed annually. I see no annual review and am wondering whether these are re-prioritized by actual danger to people?

Some of these traffic lights are ridiculous, for instance, traffic lights at three-way stops. And we're spending an average 1.4 mil/intersection.

Regards.

Paul Henkin