

Minutes of the Transportation Committee Meeting

The Transportation Committee of the McLean County Board met on Tuesday, October 3, 2000 at 7:30 a.m. in Room 700, Law and Justice Center, 104 West Front Street, Bloomington, Illinois.

Members Present: Chairman Bass, Members Hoselton, Lawlis, Kinzinger

Members Absent: Emmett

Staff Present: Mr. John M. Zeunik, County Administrator; Mr. Terry Lindberg, Assistant County Administrator; Ms. Martha B. Ross, Executive Secretary, County Administrator's Office

**Department Heads/
Elected Officials**

Present: Mr. Jack Mitchell, County Engineer, County Highway Department

Chairman Bass called the meeting to order at 7:35 a.m. and declared that a quorum was present. Chairman Bass presented the minutes of the September 5, 2000 meeting for approval.

Motion by **Kinzinger/Lawlis** to accept and place on file the minutes of the September 5, 2000 meeting for approval. Motion carried.

Chairman Bass presented the bills, which have been reviewed and recommended for transmittal to the Transportation Committee by the County Auditor.

Mr. Hoselton asked why the bills could not be provided to the Committee members in advance of the Committee meetings so that they could be more thoroughly studied by the members before the approval vote is taken. Mr. Mitchell responded that the bills are provided to the Committee by the Auditor's Office and are prepared the day before the meeting.

FINANCIAL SYSTEM

PAGE 1
COMREPR
AUD7

MCLEAN COUNTY BOARD COMMITTEE REPORT
AS OF 9/30/2000
EXPENDITURE SUMMARY BY FUND

FUND	FUND TITLE	PENDING TOTAL	PREPAID TOTAL	FUND TOTAL
0120	HIGHWAY		\$97,154.29	\$97,154.29
0121	BRIDGE MATCHING FUND		\$48,720.59	\$48,720.59
0123	MOTOR FUEL TAX		\$64,760.01	\$64,760.01
COMMITTEE REPORT TOTALS		=====	\$210,634.89 =====	\$210,634.89 =====

Motion by **Kinzinger/Lawlis** to recommend payment of the bills as presented by the County Auditor. Motion carried.

Minutes of the Transportation Committee

October 3, 2000

Page Two

Mr. Mitchell explained that the letting results of September 27, 2000 addressed two (2) County culverts: Taylor Culvert and the Woods Culvert, both located near Bellflower.

Bids for the Taylor Culvert, were at 13% above the estimate. Those bids were rejected as being too high. Mr. Mitchell noted that Stark and Stuart then lowered their bids, and the Highway Department raised their estimate. Mr. Mitchell stated that, as a result of the changes in amounts, Stark is now the low bidder on the Taylor Culvert with a bid of **\$104,753.00**. He noted that Stark is also the low bidder on the Woods Culvert with a bid of **\$46,786.60**. The Woods Culvert estimate is $\frac{1}{2}\%$ below the estimate. Mr. Mitchell recommended that both projects be awarded to Stark.

Motion by **Lawlis/Hoselton** to approve the bids submitted by Stark for the Taylor Culvert and the Woods Culvert. Motion carried.

Mr. Mitchell explained that the three (3) 1999 Motor Fuel Tax (**MFT**) Audit Reports are submitted for the Committee's approval and to be placed on file. The reports were prepared by the Illinois Department of Transportation **MFT** Auditor in Ottawa, who examined the books for the Township Motor Fuel Tax Fund, the Township Bridge Program Fund, and the County Motor Fuel Tax Fund.

Motion by **Hoselton/Kinzinger** to approve and place on file the 1999 Motor Fuel Tax Audit Report for the Township Motor Fuel Tax Fund, the Township Bridge Program Fund, and the County Motor Fuel Tax Fund.

Mr. Lawlis asked whether the **MFT** Auditor offered any recommendations for the future. Mr. Mitchell responded that the **MFT** Auditor-only examined the records with regard to procedures that are to be followed, but that the **MFT** Auditor does not make recommendations with regard to changes that should be made. He noted that, in the event that inconsistencies were ever found, recommendations from the **MFT** Auditor might be offered.

Mr. Kinzinger asked whether the Audit occurs annually. Mr. Mitchell responded that it does.

Motion carried.

Mr. Mitchell presented a series of six (6) engineering petitions and bridge petitions. First, the Bloomington Road District - Senator Harber Hall Bridge at Crestwicke is experiencing a problem with deterioration of the wooden structure of the bridge, as well as a need for a widening of the structure to accommodate an increase in traffic flow. It is recommended that a new bridge is built and the Township has filed a petition to that effect in the amount of **\$370,000.00**. There is also an engineering agreement with Farnsworth and Wylie, Inc.

Mr. Mitchell remarked that the culverts and tiles under the road near the Yolton Bridge in the Downs Road District are not adequate and cause the road to flood periodically. It is recommended that a larger culvert be built, a larger drop box be installed and the road be raised. The Township signed a bridge petition for **\$180,000.00**; the engineering consultant recommended is Ozyurt and Stone.

Mr. Mitchell stated that the Rinkenberger Bridge in the Gridley Road District, which sits on timber piles, is deteriorating. The total estimated cost for the replacement of the bridge is **\$200,000.00**. Rice, Barry and Uzeman are the engineering consultants for this project.

Mr. Lawlis asked whether the total cost for the replacement of the bridge would be shared between the County and the Township. Mr. Mitchell responded that five (5) of the bridge projects being considered at this time will be funded by Township Bridge Program Funds, the source of which is State money. The Martin Bridge project will be proposed using federal funds, from the Bridge Rehabilitation and Replacement Funds. The cost for the Martin Bridge project will be divided as follows: 80% federal funds, 10% County funds, and 10% local funds.

The Kaiser Bridge in the Lexington Road District is constructed from old railroad tank cars, which has resulted in an inadequate road leading up to and at the foot of the bridge. As a result of the increased growth in the area, traffic has subsequently increased on the road leading to the bridge, which has proportionately increased the risk to those using the road. Mr. Mitchell stated that the Township has a long-range plan in place to upgrade the road, by graveling its north section (the south section is already graveled) and then oiling and chipping the entire road. Mr. Mitchell noted that this project will be constrained by the amount of funding available to the Township, and that the current bridge petition is merely the first step in the long-range plan.

Chairman Bass asked what would happen to the railroad tank cars that would be removed from under the bridge during the upgrade process. Mr. Mitchell responded that the contractor will remove the tank cars and either dispose of them or salvage them for reuse, depending upon what the Township requests. Mr. Mitchell noted that the petition for the Kaiser Bridge project is **\$300,000.00** and the engineering consultant is Rice, Barry and Uzeman.

Mr. Mitchell stated that the Monroe Bridge in the Martin Road District is currently posted for single axle, three axle and five axle trucks. The bridge is constructed on timber piles which are deteriorating. The petition for replacement of the bridge is **\$230,000.00**, and the engineering consultant is Rice, Barry and Uzeman.

The Rudisill Bridge in the Old Town Road District is sitting on deteriorating timber pile; The Township wants to replace the bridge and the petition for such action is **\$200,000.00**. The engineering consultant for this project is Ozyurt and Stone.

Mr. Mitchell recommended that all of the Bridge Petitions and Engineering Agreements be approved.

Motion by **Hoselton/Kinzinger** to approve the Bridge Petitions and Engineering Agreements for Hall Bridge, Yolton Bridge, Rinkenberger Bridge, Kaiser Bridge, Monroe Bridge and Rudisill Bridge.

Mr. Lawlis asked why there were many different consultants for the Engineering Agreements. Mr. Mitchell responded that Farnsworth and Wylie, Inc. has been utilized for several years on road projects. Rice, Barry and Uzeman and Ozyurt and Stone have been utilized on the bridge projects. Mr. Mitchell remarked..that the personnel in both of the latter firms have been involved with local County and Township bridges for quite some time, and, consequently, they are the most knowledgeable with regard to local bridges.

Mr. Lawlis noted that, with regard to the Hall Bridge petition, for example, the hourly charge for a Senior Project Manager is listed at a rate of \$100.00 per hour. For the Yolton Bridge petition, Mr. Lawlis noted that the same position was listed at a rate of \$110.00 per hour. He asked why the rate escalated.

Mr. Hoselton explained that other technical positions are generally utilized more frequently and do not require such a high hourly rate.

Mr. Mitchell stated that the reason that the hourly rates for all positions are listed is that, in the past, consultants have charged too much. Mr. Lawlis noted that it was his understanding that the County already set an approved hourly rate. Mr. Mitchell responded that each contract specifies hourly rates pertaining to that contract. Mr. Lawlis then asked whether the Prevailing Wage that was established earlier this year pertained to this type of work. Mr. Mitchell responded that the Prevailing Wage Rate did not pertain to the engineering agreements, but rather it is an established wage that contractors must pay to their employees on construction projects. Mr. Mitchell stated that the hourly rates are seldom used, but are negotiated. They are the same rates that have been utilized for the last several years. Mr. Mitchell stated that hourly rates are utilized to determine how much a consultant is paid if the project is abandoned prior to completion or if changes are made after the project is designed.

Mr. Hoselton asked for clarification on the Negotiated Overtime Request item with regard to the clerical positions. Mr. Mitchell stated that there has not been a situation where overtime was requested. He noted that most all projects are begun in sufficient time to meet their **timeline** so that overtime does not become necessary.

Mr. Lawlis asked whether there is enough money in the County budget to pay for the six (6) bridge petition jobs that are presently under consideration. Mr. Mitchell responded that there are

sufficient funds for the specified projects for the current year, the upcoming year and a third year.

Mr. Hoselton asked whether the County is paying 50% of the contract for bridge petitions. Mr. Mitchell confirmed that the County's correct amount is **10%**, with the Township Fund paying for engineering costs, making 80% of costs paid for by the State of Illinois.

Motion carried.

Mr. Mitchell explained that a letter has been received from **Contech** Construction Products offering to ~~extend their~~ Year **2000-culvert** pricing through the Year 2001. He explained that it is early in the year to receive such an offer, with most offers being received during the winter months. He noted that sometimes the offers are accepted, and at other times, the offers are rebid. He explained that the effect of accepting this offer would be to lock in culvert prices for the coming year.

Mr. Hoselton asked whether the current culvert pricing is what the estimates are based upon. Mr. Mitchell explained that bids were taken on four (4) sizes of pipe and the pipe stock is ordered on an as-needed basis. He noted that the stockpile inventory often becomes low during the summer and the object of taking the bids now is to replenish the stockpile at an established price in order to avoid being forced to buy at an increased price.

Chairman Bass asked whether this procedure was usual and customary. Mr. Mitchell responded that it is a customary procedure and the current prices available are as a result of bids that were taken in February; 2000..

Mr. Kinzinger asked whether it is expected that steel prices will increase. Mr. Mitchell responded that he was unable to determine whether an increase will occur, but that locking in a price has historically been beneficial to both the Highway Department and the supplier.

Mr. Hoselton asked whether there is a basic inventory kept by the Highway Department. Mr. Mitchell stated that certain types of products are usually kept in inventory year round. Mr. Hoselton then noted that it would be beneficial to lock in the price now if the budget has been constructed to reflect the current price. Mr. Mitchell remarked that the amount of pipe potentially utilized by thirty (30) townships, a dozen villages and the County Highway Department is the difficult variable to factor in this decision.

Mr. Hoselton asked whether the quote is for a twelve (12) month period. Mr. Mitchell responded that the quote was applicable through the year 2001.

Motion by **Hoselton/Kinzinger** to accept the supply agreement offered by **Contech** Construction Products in order to continue the current pricing for steel culvert pipe and end sections through the year 2001.

Mr. Lawlis asked what other companies have bid for the Highway Department's contract in the past. Mr. Mitchell responded that St. Regis, a former Havana Culvert, and **Contech**. Mr. Lawlis then asked how often bids are taken. Mr. Mitchell responded that bids have been taken every other year.

Mr. Lawlis stated that he is concerned that, under the present system, other companies may be locked out that would like to bid. Mr. Mitchell explained that, once the bid is accepted, the other companies would be locked out of participation for the current year.

Mr. Lawlis asked whether bids were taken every year on most projects and whether bids could be dispensed with in some instances. He noted that the price, in this case, has already been set. Mr. Mitchell explained that this type of inventory is customarily stocked on an ongoing basis and dictates what is purchased.

Mr. Lawlis stated that he questions the procedure and is concerned that another company might complain of unfair treatment. Mr. Mitchell remarked that other bidders would not be entertained for next year, but that the potential bidders either were not low bidders or chose not to participate.

Mr. Kinzinger stated that such action should provide enough motivation for others to bid more competitively in the future. Mr. Lawlis remarked that his only concern was with regard to the legalities of the bid process and whether there is potential for violations of that bid process.

Chairman Bass asked whether it would be more expedient to say that the bid letting would be for the upcoming two (2) years. Mr. Lawlis noted that such a statement would be acceptable for the original bid, but under the current situation, the process might be subject to criticism.

Mr. Hoselton stated that now is a good time to bid, as the winter cycle is usually a slow period for the steel manufacturers. They will lower their prices to reduce their inventory and purchasers can obtain a good price.

Mr. Lawlis asked when the orders are customarily submitted. Mr. Mitchell remarked that orders are placed when the stockpile becomes low, or when there is a specific need. Mr. Lawlis asked whether a project of \$5000.00 or more would require a bid process. Mr. **Zeunik** explained that projects or purchases valued at **\$10,000.00** or more must be competitively bid and advertised under State law.

Mr. Lawlis remarked that, for the future, it should be stated for bidders that the bid cycles will be for **some time** frame other than one year. Mr. Mitchell stated that he would hesitate to bid for longer than a one year time frame, as the price of steel is unknown for the long term.

Mr. Kinzinger asked whether a rebid at this time would actually bring in a higher price than what is presently stated, and that the Highway Department would then be locked in to the higher amount. Mr. Mitchell stated that a second bid process would likely be higher, but that the bid amount, in actuality, is unknown.

Mr. Kinzinger stated that, if there is currently a good price, and a lower price is not guaranteed through a rebid process, it would not be in the Committee's best interest to rebid. Mr. Lawlis noted, however, that the Committee must be fair with all bidders.

Mr. Hoselton asked whether the materials are bid by diameter or by weight. Mr. Mitchell stated that material is bid by diameter and per lineal foot. He noted that there is a stockpile kept, but that new orders may not be submitted immediately. The orders will be placed according to inventory levels in the stockpile.

Mr. Kinzinger asked whether the Committee can actually accept Contech's bid under the present conditions. Mr. Zeunik explained that any amount over **\$10,000.00** must be competitively bid, as per state law. He noted that a possible exception to this condition might be in the event that the bid specifications and the contract stated that the contract term was for a two (2) year period.

Mr. Mitchell stated that, if the Committee is not comfortable with awarding the bid to **Contech** without offering the opportunity to bid to other firms as well, then the issue should be reconsidered.

Mr. Zeunik asked whether the prices that have been quoted originated through Illinois Central Management Services (CMS). Mr. Mitchell responded that they had not. The prices were initiated through the County Highway Department. Mr. Zeunik explained that if bids had been taken through CMS, that may change the process.

Mr. Mitchell stated that the item would be rebid. He noted that there was a motion to accept the bid on the floor. Mr. Hoselton stated that he would withdraw his motion.

Mr. Mitchell stated that the Appraisal Agreement for Towanda-Barnes Road would be withdrawn from the agenda, as it is not currently ready for the Committee's consideration.

Mr. Mitchell remarked that the East Side By-Pass Study is underway, with the proposal by Bemardin, Lochmeuller and Associates, Inc. being selected. The three (3) firms who returned proposals in response to the request for proposals were: 1) Clark Dietz, Inc., Urbana, Illinois; 2) Hanson Engineers, Inc., Springfield, Illinois; and 3) Bemardin, Lochmeuller &

Associates, Inc., Charleston, Illinois. He stated that the proposal submitted by Hanson Engineers was considered first, but it was found that their proposal and fee structure was significantly higher than the budgeted amount.

Mr. Mitchell explained that the Steering Committee then met with Bemardin Lochmeuller & Associates, Inc. and found that their proposal and fee structure of **\$149,649.00** was within the budgeted amount of **\$150,000.00**. Therefore, they were selected for the project and a contract is being negotiated at this time through the Regional Planning Commission.

Mr. Mitchell stated that the Highway Department was contacted by Mr. Riddle with regard to a gravel pit located near the Township Road near Sabina. The gravel pit is not currently active and has not been active for some time. Mr. Riddle would like to reactivate it. Mr. Mitchell explained that Mr. Riddle would need to pay for the necessary road upgrades himself. Mr. Riddle's contention is that, because of a smaller volume of traffic and lighter loads, he should be exempt from providing those upgrades. Mr. Mitchell remarked that a special use permit from the Building and Zoning Department may be a necessary requirement.

Chairman Bass inquired as to the size of Mr. Riddle's operation. Mr. Mitchell responded that **approximately** 50,000 tons of material extracted annually is the proposed amount.

Mr. Mitchell noted that the contract with McLean County Asphalt has been approved for the improvement of the parking lot at the Animal Shelter. He noted that the Highway Department is regrading the base of the parking lot and asphalt is expected to be laid in the near future.

Mr. Lawlis asked about the status of the Ellsworth location. Mr. Mitchell explained that the culvert has been installed, the fill dirt has been spread and seeded. Mr. Lawlis then inquired as to any communication with the Village of Ellsworth. Mr. Mitchell remarked that there has been no communication from village **officials** in Ellsworth and that the Highway Department has not billed them. for the job to date.

Chairman Bass noted that a Stand-Up Meeting will be needed immediately prior to the October 17, 2000 County Board meeting. The precise time for that meeting will be announced via the Stand-Up Meeting schedule that is provided as part of the County Board packet.

Mr. Mitchell presented the County Highway Department's Recommended Budget for Fiscal Year 2001. Fund 0120 is designated as the County Highway Fund. He stated that the first line item is Property Tax Revenue in the amount of **\$1,693,000.00**. The levy rate is \$0.0748 per \$100 equalized assessed valuation and the maximum allowed levy rate is **.075**. The Personal Property Replacement Tax amount is **\$75,000.00**, which shows no change over the current amount. Licenses and permits revenues are at **\$15,000.00**. Construction and Maintenance revenue is **\$22,000.00**. Engineering revenue is **\$120,000.00** and Labor and Equipment revenue is **\$180,000.00**. Interest revenue is **\$13,000.00**.

Minutes of the Transportation Committee
October 3, 2000
Page Nine

Mr. Mitchell noted that the Commodities revenue line item is the reimbursement for culverts, signs, and sale of road salt. The amount in this line item is **\$160,000.00**.

Mr. Hoselton asked whether the charges for the line items of Engineering, Construction & Maintenance, and Labor & Equipment are in house charges. Mr. Mitchell responded that the Engineering fees are what the Highway Department charges the townships for performing the engineering on their maintenance and construction projects. He noted that there has been an hourly rate schedule in effect for several years. Mr. Hoselton asked to be provided with a copy of the rate schedule. Mr. Mitchell explained that the Engineering fees fluctuate as a result of the amounts of revenue received by the townships in Motor Fuel Tax and also how much is expended.

Mr. Mitchell noted that the Highway Department's budget is a balanced budget. He explained that the column headings at the top of the Revenue Budget Worksheet represent the revenue figures from Fiscal Year 1998, listed as Last Year's Budget; Fiscal Year 1999 is listed as the Adopted Budget; and Fiscal Year 2000 is listed as Current Year. The column marked Administration represents the projected budget for Fiscal Year 2001.

Mr. Mitchell returned to his explanation of the budget line items by stating that the Unclassified Revenue line is \$10,000.00. The Sale of Assets revenue line is **\$76,000.00**. It represents the proposed sale of vehicles and equipment.

Mr. Mitchell stated that the total revenue for the Highway Department is **\$2,364,000.00**.

The Bridge Matching Fund, number 0121, is the fund from which the County's share of Bridge Petitions is paid, as well as other drainage-related expenses. The property tax rate is \$0.04988 per \$100 equalized assessed valuation and the levy is **\$1,129,000.00**. The Personal Property Replacement tax is \$35000.00. The Special Bridge Program is **\$40,000.00**. Interest on Investments is **\$20,000.00**. Unclassified Revenue is **\$2,000.00**.

Mr. Mitchell stated that the total revenue for the Bridge Matching Fund is **\$1,226,000.00**.

The McLean County Matching Fund, number 0122, is the fund that is used to match Federal or County Motor Fuel Tax Funds on projects on the County highway system. Mr. Mitchell noted that the tax rate is \$0.03742 per \$100 equalized assessed valuation, with .0375 being the maximum rate that can be levied in this fund. The Property tax is **\$847,000.00**. The Personal Property Replacement tax is **\$8,000.00**. The Interest on Investments is **\$10,000.00**. Unclassified Revenue is **\$2,000.00**.

Mr. Mitchell stated that the total revenue for the County Matching Fund is **\$867,000.00**.

Minutes of the Transportation Committee

October 3, 2000

Page Ten

Mr. Mitchell remarked that the three (3) revenue funds delineated are the Special Revenue Taxing Funds.

The County Motor Fuel Tax Fund, number 0123, is expected to receive **\$2,810,000.00** in Fiscal Year 2001. Mr. Lawlis asked why this fund showed a decrease in revenue. Mr. Mitchell explained that in April, 2000, the Sales Tax transfer from the Illinois General Fund to the Motor Fuel Tax Fund was eliminated. That action was a part of the Illinois First Program from last year.

Mr. Mitchell noted that previously the County had received an increase in this line item from the State of Illinois as a result of the Illinois First Program. Mr. Lawlis asked what was received. Mr. Mitchell explained that approximately **\$395,000.00** was received in the County Consolidated Program. The County is receiving additional Motor Fuel Tax monies to offset the increased revenues received by the State with their increase in license plate fees.

Mr. Lawlis asked what effect the State's temporary repeal of the sales tax on gasoline will have on County revenues. Mr. Mitchell responded that the effect will be negligible.

In returning to the budget items for the Motor Fuel Tax Fund, Mr. Mitchell stated that the Interest on Investments is **\$70,000.00**. The Unappropriated Fund Balance is **\$200,000.00**. The Unclassified Revenues at **\$700,000.00**. The Unclassified Revenues amount represents a projected amount that is expected as a result of the \$1.4 million state funding that will be received from the legislative add-on that was approved at the September, 2000 County Board meeting. It is speculated that some of the money may come in prior to next year, but the entire figure has been assigned to the Recommended Budget for 2001.

Mr. Mitchell stated that the total revenue for the Motor Fuel Tax Fund is **\$3,780,000.00**.

In delineating the County Highway Expenses, Fund 0120, Mr. Mitchell stated the correct amount for full-time employees' salaries is **\$788,741.00**. He noted that amount includes the new position of Fleet Manager that has been requested. He explained that the current equipment mechanic is the employee he would like to promote to the Fleet Manager. There is no anticipated salary increase for this new position at this time. The new hire position will be a new equipment mechanic.

Mr. Mark Leake, Highway Maintenance Coordinator, addressed the Committee by stating that the maintenance on the County's vehicles has been good, but there is considerable premature aging and damage occurring to the equipment as a result of the salt and chloride that is utilized to clear the roads of ice and snow during the winter months. He explained that much of the maintenance on County vehicles and heavy equipment requires a mechanic with a higher level of expertise than in the past.

Minutes of the Transportation Committee

October 3, 2000

Page Eleven

Mr. Leake stated that the mechanic presently on staff often does not have time to fix equipment that requires repair as he is occupied with additional duties. The mechanic often must travel to locations throughout the County to perform repairs on equipment that cannot be brought into the shop. He stated that there is a demonstrated need for two (2) mechanics.

Mr. Lawlis asked whether an additional mechanic could be easily found.' Mr. Leake responded that since the County, rather than the mechanic, will provide mechanic's tools, this will be an incentive and should make it easier to find qualified applicants.

Mr. Hoselton asked whether other employees, who are not working at outdoor locations, could assist the mechanic in his duties. Mr. Leake responded that much of the staff is not qualified to help the mechanic.

Mr. Hoselton asked what the current rate of pay per hour is for the mechanic. Mr. Mitchell responded that the Grade 8 for the mechanic would be at **\$13.90** next year. Mr. Hoselton noted that this is a Guaranteed Annual Wage for 2,080 hours annually. He stated that it is more cost effective to utilize current employees who may periodically have lighter duties to assist the mechanic, or anyone else in the department who is in need of help. Mr. Mitchell explained that reassignment of duties is already a regular occurrence when there are personnel available.

Chairman Bass asked how many people are assigned to signs. Mr. Mitchell remarked that there is one employee who works with signs regularly and he receives help, as personnel are available. Seasonal summer help is also usually provided.

Chairman Bass asked whether there are signs that are replaced on a daily basis. Mr. Leake responded that there are signs that are replaced frequently. Mr. Mitchell added that there is fluctuation in the amount of work involved with signs and barricades.

Mr. Hoselton asked whether the County has a sign truck. Mr. Mitchell stated that it does. He further stated that the Committee has an Equipment Inventory that lists all of the vehicle items that the County owns. There are 49 licensed vehicles, 99 pieces of equipment in the fleet, for an equivalency factor of 166 units. The equivalency factor is a comparative tool.

Mr. Mitchell stated that his employees have requested an additional mechanic for some time. The types of equipment that the mechanic must maintain are becoming increasingly complex.

Mr. Hoselton asked whether the agreement between the Highway Department and the union is such that other workers will not assist the mechanic in the performance of his duties when necessary. Mr. Mitchell responded that there is nothing in the contract that prohibits workers from assisting one another. He stated that, due to personnel absences for a variety of reasons,

he expects 1.85 men, on the average, to be absent daily throughout the year. If there are any unanticipated absences, he would like the ability to shift a worker to help in the maintenance crew.

Mr. Hoselton asked how many people are employed at the Highway Department. Mr. Mitchell responded that there are 19 in the maintenance crew and 36 total employees including the anticipated position of Fleet Manager.

Chairman Bass asked whether vacation time off could be withheld during peak times. Mr. Mitchell responded that there has never been a restriction on when vacation time can be taken. He explained that vacation time off is not usually a problem, but rather, the unexpected absences, such as sick leave, are more difficult to cover.

Chairman Bass asked what the Committee's purpose is in this request. Mr. **Zeunik** stated that it is the Committee's job to either approve or disapprove the request for the additional position.

Mr. Mitchell returned to his budget description, looking at **County Highway** Fund 0120 - Expenses. Full-Time positions were discussed previously. Seasonal positions are budgeted at **\$23,000.00**. Overtime is budgeted at \$55000.00. Performance Incentives are budgeted at **\$3,000.00**.

Mr. Mitchell stated that the total budgeted salary expenses for County Highway Fund 0120 is \$869,741. The Employee Medical expense is \$75600.00 and that cost is expected to increase. He explained that employee clothing expense is **\$9,000.00**. Fuel expense is budgeted at **\$90,000.00**, which is an increase over the **\$70,000.00** from the previous year. Operational supplies are \$25500.00, which is an increase over the **\$18,500.00** from the previous year. Group purchasing, which is primarily culverts, signs, and salt, is **\$170,000.00**.

Mr. Lawlis asked whether the cost of salt is a result of a bid by only the County. Mr. Mitchell responded that last year was the first year that the County shouldered this expense alone. In the past, he explained, the State bid had been utilized, but quality varied and there was some difficulty with supply.

Mr. Lawlis then asked whether Bloomington, Normal and the County could jointly bid for salt.

Mr. Mitchell responded that Bloomington uses the state bid. Mr. Hoselton then asked whether the Townships made a group purchase. Mr. Mitchell responded that the Townships that use salt purchase it from the County Highway Department.

Mr. Mitchell explained that a salt and cinder mix has been used in recent years that it is favored because the cinders are easily seen in the snow. However, the supply for this material is not

readily available and therefore, only salt is now utilized. He stated that the Highway Department does not stockpile the material, but orders it on an as-needed basis.

Mr. Lawlis asked whether a better price could be obtained on salt if a group of users ordered together. Mr. Mitchell remarked that he would look into it.

Mr. Mitchell returned to the budget expense sheet for the Highway Department by delineating the Contract Services line item, which is **\$85,000.00**. He stated that the Garbage Disposal line item has increased from **\$1,000.00** to **\$2,000.00**, as a result of an increase in the cost of disposal for large waste residue. He noted that the Equipment Maintenance line is **\$1 10,000.00**, with the increase being due in large part to salt and chloride damage to the vehicles and other equipment.

The Capital Improvement expenses, are budgeted at **\$50,000.00**. He explained that there is a new stockpile site needed for various materials, such as sand, **chips and** rock. The proposed site will be adjacent to the current salt storage building. Mr. Mitchell also stated that there is a need to construct an office within the current shop building, which would be build by an in-house crew, thus requiring only materials charges.

Expansion of facilities, is budgeted at **\$50,000.00**, with much of this amount being earmarked for the acquisition of land. He further explained that satellite sites are being considered, with the primary benefit being a more timely response time to road conditions. The primary disadvantage would be that Highway Operations would be more fragmented, as additional locations for facilities may be less cohesive. He noted that, if the option of establishing satellite sights is chosen, there will not be a need to expand the main Highway Department facility.

Mr. Hoselton asked what type of equipment would be stored at the satellite sites?

Mr. Mitchell responded that a backhoe, or some other type of loader, culverts, fill dirt, and rock would be stored there.

Chairman Bass asked what the cost would be to establish a satellite location. Mr. Mitchell responded that, if a suitable building was located, then the **\$150,000.00** to **\$250,000.00** range would be reasonable. The issue is still under consideration.

Chairman Bass asked how far into the future the Committee should anticipate Highway Department facility expansion. Mr. Mitchell responded that, if there is to be an expansion of the present Highway Department facilities, there is a need to acquire property next year. If satellite facilities are accepted, there may be many details to work out that will take several years.

Mr. Hoselton stated that more information is needed before any decision can be made.

Mr. Lawlis remarked that many of the villages in the County might wish to be included in the satellite option. The ability to have an immediate response and additional storage facilities may be very helpful.

Minutes of the Transportation Committee

October 3, 2000

Page Fourteen

Mr. Mitchell returned to the budget expenses by stating that Parking and Landscaping is **\$2,000.00**, construction of Roads and Bridges is **\$182,459.00**, and Right of Way purchase is \$15000.00. He noted that Furniture and Equipment is **\$12,000.00**, which will be for a copier, chairs and miscellaneous items. Computer equipment is **\$23,000.00**, which will be used to replace several CAD stations, a clerical station, a CD writer/scanner, and other items. Software is **\$1 1,000.00**.

Mr. Mitchell announced that the total expense budget for the County Highway Department Fund 0120 is **\$2,364,000.00**.

Mr. Hoselton remarked that he was surprised to see an expenditure of \$1.14 million on equipment over a period of three (3) years. -He asked whether lease agreements for equipment have been considered. Mr. Mitchell responded that he briefly considered leasing equipment, but does not currently lease equipment. Mr. Hoselton stated that leasing trucks and other equipment would be to the County's advantage monetarily.

Chairman Bass asked whether equipment could be leased on a trial basis. Mr. Leake responded that leases are not viable for the snowplows. Mr. Hoselton stated that the top of the fleet was not leased, but rather the $\frac{3}{4}$ ton trucks that receive the most use are the best choices for leasing.

Mr. Mitchell stated that there is no tax advantage to leasing vehicles for the County.

Mr. Hoselton remarked that operational costs would usually outrank tax advantages.

Mr. Mitchell asked whether the County is bound to any bidding requirements. Mr. Zeunik responded that a bid would need to be set up in the usual fashion.

Mr. Mitchell stated that he would look into leasing. He noted that the State bid process lowers the purchase price and that is an advantage to the County.

Mr. Mitchell returned the discussion to the expense portion of the County Highway Budget. The Bridge Matching Fund is Fund 121. He noted that salary expenses in that fund are at **\$79,744.00**. Seasonal salaries are \$1,000.00. Overtime is **\$8,000.00**.

Mr. Mitchell stated that under the contractual expense lines, Maintenance of Roads is **\$20,000.00**. Engineering and design is \$1 **10,000.00**. Contingency is **\$5,000.00**. Administrative Surcharge is **\$7,500.00**. He further stated that under capital expense lines, Construction of Roads and Bridges is **\$983,756.00**. Purchase of Right of Way is **\$10,000.00**.

Mr. Mitchell stated that the Bridge Matching Fund is a balanced budget of **\$1,226,000.00**.

Mr. Mitchell remarked that Fund 0122 is the County Matching Fund. The Administrative Surcharge is **\$7,500.00**. The construction of Roads and Bridges is **\$859,500.00**.

Mr. Mitchell stated that the balanced budget for the County Matching Fund is **\$867,000.00**.

The expenses for Fund 0123 for Motor Fuel Tax begin with full-time salaries at **\$524,859.00**. Seasonal salaries are **\$18,000.00**. Overtime pay is \$65000.00. Performance incentives are **\$3,000.00**.

Under the contractual expense lines, Mr. Mitchell explained that Road Maintenance expenses are **\$900,000.00**. Engineering and Design is **\$700,000.00**. School and Conferencing is **\$4,000.00** and Travel Expenses are **\$3,000.00**. Gas service is **\$3,000.00**.

Under the capital expense lines for the **MFT** fund, Mr. Mitchell stated that Road and Bridge construction is **\$1,259,141.00**. Purchase of Right of Way is **\$300,000.00**.

Mr. Mitchell stated that the total expenses for the Motor Fuel Tax Fund is **\$3,780,000.00** and that this is a balanced budget.

Mr. Hoselton asked why the budgets seemed to have increased when some individual items have become lower. He further asked whether some portions of the budget are based upon projections for work to come in the future. Mr. Mitchell responded that this is correct.

Motion by **Hoselton/Lawlis** to approve the Recommended Budget for Fiscal Year 2001 for the County Highway Department. Motion carried.

Mr. Mitchell noted that the Five Year Plan has been provided to the Committee in the form of a computer print out and a map. He asked that the Committee study the plan and submit any comments or changes at the next Committee meeting.

The reorganization with regard to engineering, remarked Mr. Mitchell, will go to the Finance Committee for approval. He explained that several employees in the Highway Department have been referred to in their job classifications as Highway Engineers, who are, in reality, technicians. The proposed reorganization would begin with an Engineering Technician I position, expanding to Levels II, III and IV, based upon an employee's experience. Upon achievement of Level IV, the Technician will be experiencing the same type of work that is typically encountered by a Civil Engineer, but the employee will not use that official title. The Civil Engineers will begin at Level I, moving through Levels II, III and IV, also based upon experience, with the added requirement of a professional engineering degree.

Mr. Lawlis asked how many employees are involved in the proposed reorganization. Mr. Mitchell responded that there are three (3) people affected, with two (2) being longtime County employees. Mr. Lawlis asked whether the employees have been informed of the proposed changes. Mr. Mitchell responded that they have been informed that changes have been proposed, pending Board approval.

Minutes of the Transportation Committee

October 3, 2000

Page Sixteen

Mr. Hoselton asked whether there would be any salary increases. Mr. Mitchell responded that there would not be salary increases associated with the reorganization at this time. The pay ranges will be affected, he noted, but this is a reclassification of the jobs at this time.

Motion by **Hoselton/Lawlis** to accept and approve the proposed reclassification of engineering positions within the County Highway Department. Motion carried.

Chairman Bass noted that there are significant improvements being made to Old Highway 150. Mr. Mitchell remarked that all of those projects are safety projects.

There being nothing further to come before the Committee at this time, Chairman Bass adjourned the meeting at 10:00 a.m.

Respectfully submitted,



Martha B. Ross
Recording Secretary

\\ALVIN\ADMIN\ANNMINVT_october.00.doc